

UC Berkeley

Cabinet of the Muses: Rosenmeyer Festschrift

Title

The Example of Procris in the Ars Amatoria

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5xx8c1wj>

Author

Anderson, William S.

Publication Date

1990-04-01

Peer reviewed

THE EXAMPLE OF PROCRIS IN THE *ARS AMATORIA*

William S. Anderson
University of California, Berkeley



Ever since Richard Heinze developed his masterful study of Ovid's narrative styles by pitting similar stories recounted in elegiac meter against those of the *Metamorphoses*, starting from the near-contemporaneously composed myths of Persephone of *Fasti* 4 and of *Met.* 5, a methodology of contextualization has been legitimated for exploring these materials.¹ As perhaps the richest pair of such narratives, elegiac and hexameter, the story of how Cephalus loved, married, and then accidentally killed Procris in a hunting accident has generated numerous studies since Heinze's time.² The earliest adherents of Heinze used the account in *Ars Amatoria* 3.687ff. to demonstrate the greater weight and epic character of the account in *Met.* 7.672ff. (or of 7.796ff., to limit ourselves to the death of Procris in the *Met.* as the strictly parallel passage).³ In more recent years, as the "epic" character of the *Met.* has been called into question, the procedures of contextualization have altered somewhat. On the one hand, many studies have continued to emphasize the greater power and pathos of Procris' death in the *Met.* and so called attention to features of *Ars* 3 that appear to be earlier and less artistic details consciously changed and improved by Ovid in the later *Met.* On the other hand, a few studies have recognized that both narratives owe much to the elegiac art of which Ovid had made himself a master and that what should be emphasized is not the inferiority of Ovid's achievement in *Ars* 3 so much as the successful pursuit of a quite different goal.⁴ The unquestioned assumption in the study of these two narratives has been that Ovid wrote of Procris in *Ars* 3 first, that he used that single-phased account for his brilliant, larger, more moving triptych of the *Met.* I believe that there are some serious difficulties with such analysis of Ovid's two stories and that they arise from the initial axiom that *Ars* 3 is earlier and a "first effort," and that *Met.* 7 is a later, corrected, improved version. In the course of this paper, I shall regularly reverse the order of contextualization, in order to explore the possibility that Ovid completed *Met.* 7 *before* composing the death of Procris at the end of *Ars* 3 and that accordingly he planned that composition in conscious dialogue with his earlier masterpiece of the *Met.*

The date of *Ars* 3 was once seemingly well fixed to no later than 1 B.C., securely separating it from the commencement of the major compositions of the *Fasti* and *Met.*, which scholars agree in locating in the span of years A.D. 1-8. However, it has long been recognized that Ovid wrote and published *Ars* 1 and

2 separately, then wrote Book 3. Recent studies by Syme and Murgia have proposed important changes in the traditional picture of the chronology of [132]Ovid's poetry.⁵ For the purposes of this paper, the new theory may be summarized as follows: Ovid published *Ars* 1-2 about 1 B.C., completed work on at least *Met.* 1-7 in the next years, and then revised the *Ars*, at that point adding Book 3 and publishing the three books close to A.D. 8 (an unpremeditated affront to Augustus, who exiled his grandchild Julia for adultery that year and then relegated Ovid to Tomi). Murgia in fact used one passage in the Procris story of *Ars* 3 to help demonstrate that the story and book were composed later than *Met.* 7.

Murgia employed a unique methodology based upon the number of repeated verbal motifs, from which he could establish a stemmatic sequence of imitation. Another consideration which I have thought important is the different frequency of echoes in the two passages of the *Met.* which are developed from the supposedly earlier *Ars*. The story of Daedalus in *Met.* 8, which does derive from the prior published account at the beginning of *Ars* 2, has many lines and phrases and images that have been patently adapted from the elegiac distich to the dactylic hexameter.⁶ When we look for a similar density of imitation from the Procris of *Ars* 3 in *Met.* 7, we are quickly disabused. Only two sequences have close verbal resemblance (the appeal to Aura in *Ars* 3.727-28 and *Met.* 7.811-15 and 837 and the fatal wounding of Procris in *Ars* 3.733ff. and *Met.* 7.840ff.); and, as I shall argue, it is not hard to read the two passages of the *Ars* as Ovidian improvements on what has been composed for the *Met.* Then, once granted the possibility that the correct chronological order might be first *Met.* 7 and second *Ars* 3, the fact that the story of Procris uses phrases that also occur in various books of the *Met.* and of the *Fasti* and narrative motifs that Ovid perfected in those two works might admit of a simple explanation: the poet has drawn widely from previous works to produce the single narrative of Procris in the *Ars*. Finally, a number of problems exist in the account found in the *Met.*, such as vagueness of scene-setting, inadequate motivation, and failure to complete a major and emphatically announced motif. The most conspicuous of these problems is regularly admitted by most critics, even those who assume the later and more successful character of the *Met.* story. However, if, as is generally conceded, *Ars* 3 presents a more integrated narrative in this particular respect, it is worth examining the other problem areas, to test the hypothesis of a later, improved version in *Ars* 3.

The difficulty that regularly receives comment in *Met.* 7 centers on the spear of Cephalus.⁷ Ovid draws attention to it at the very beginning of his story (672-73), when Phocus, son of Aeacus, admires it and asks about its wood; and one of Cephalus' companions responds that it indeed is a marvelous weapon, even more so than Phocus would guess. It hits whatever it is thrown at, unaffected by chance, and it flies back smeared with blood: no person carries it back (*consequitur quodcumque petit, fortunaque missum / non regit, et revolat nullo referente cruentum*, 683-84). When Phocus, all excited, asks more eager

questions about it, Cephalus himself proceeds to answer selectively, beginning with tears and declaring that the spear paradoxically has been no blessing for him, but the cause of permanent misfortune. It has destroyed him and his beloved wife (689ff.). Once this theme has been so strongly announced and our interest and feelings aroused, Cephalus holds us in long suspense. Ovid lets [133]him tell us about the first phase of his marriage, before he even owned the spear, when his suspicion created a disastrous rift between him and Procris. After the couple became reconciled, Procris gave two special gifts to Cephalus that came from Diana and signified a willing return to love and marriage. Both gifts had special powers. We have already heard what the spear supposedly can do, and so Ovid and Cephalus continue our suspense, by concentrating on the second gift, a marvelous hunting dog that can outrun all others (754ff.) At the end of the story of the last hunt and metamorphosis of the dog, Phocus gets to ask the question that we all have been waiting to hear answered (794): what was so bad about the spear? It has been a hundred lines since Ovid introduced this motif and began our suspense.

When Cephalus, then, describes how he went out to hunt in this second period, he carefully relates that he took no companions or dogs with him, for he felt entirely safe and protected with his spear (808). Another thirty lines pass before the moment comes for the fatal wound to Procris. Hearing some possible animal cries and movement in the brush, Cephalus thought it was a wild beast and threw his spear (*telum volatile*, 841). Of course, it was Procris, who is pierced in the breast (842), and when Cephalus rushes desperately to her, he finds her weltering in blood and tugging at the spear, her own tragic gift, which is still lodged in her body (*et sua—me miserum!—de vulnere dona trahentem / invenio*, 846-47). Now, if we recall the way Ovid and Cephalus prepared us back at 683-84, we have, most readers agree, a legitimate expectation of hearing that the spear, having done its inevitably fatal task, would have returned in the air, like a boomerang, but (because it had not missed) covered with the blood of its victim. When we hear that Procris is still tugging at the spear and trying to pull it from her breast, it seems that somehow Cephalus and Ovid have disappointed the very expectations that they created. Why bother with all the mumbo-jumbo about the magical weapon if, in the end, it appears to do no more than any normal spear, no more than the perfectly ordinary spear that, in other versions, Cephalus hurls ignorantly in the direction of Procris? One of those other versions is that of *Ars* 3, where the spear receives no preparatory emphasis and raises no false expectation, but performs its fatal wound speedily and then yields to the principal themes that *Ars* 3 has carefully announced and consistently pursues to the very end of its well-told story. Is it not possible, then, that Ovid has recognized and corrected the infelicity of his account in *Met.* 7 when he *later* came to write *Ars* 3?

I should now like to go through the differences between the two accounts from this new perspective, considering first that of *Met.* 7. It should be understood that differences may be due either to independent themes and poetic strategies or to a decision on Ovid's part to improve on prior treatment.

Cephalus, the narrator of the story in the *Met.*, proclaims as his theme the destruction of all that meant the most to him, namely, his beloved wife Procris, by the fateful spear. As I have already noted, he builds up a splendidly suspenseful story, a triptych that consists of the two similarly unhappy phases of his marriage, which are separated by a sequence about the hunting dog. Most readers who have commented on the matter have been predisposed to believe that this narrative, because considerably more complex than that of *Ars* 3, must be a [134]later and better-designed version. When the narrator introduces his Procris-story in *Ars* 3, he calls it an *exemplum* (686): it will demonstrate to his female audience how dangerous it is to suspect too readily the infidelity of one's man. I would not assert that the simple, one-phase account that follows on this topic should necessarily be considered later because simpler and more consistently told; but at least it should remain an open question whether simplicity is in itself an indication of early composition.

In *Met.* 7, Cephalus has a lot of business to dispose of before describing the series of misunderstandings that led to disaster: he tells of his and Procris' ecstatic love after their reconciliation (796ff.), then of how he would regularly go out at dawn to hunt (804ff.), alone with his spear. The spear would presumably do its magical task, for eventually he would be glutted with the slaughter of animals (808-809) and look for a place to rest. In all this, Cephalus has given us no precise picture of where he hunts; he has said vaguely only that he went into the woods (805). That may seem inconsequential, but the account in the *Met.* exhibits a kind of systematic imprecision of locale that eventually causes problems.

Contrast the opening of the account in *Ars* 3.687: "Near the purple hills of flowery Hymettus is a sacred fountain" (*est prope purpureos collis florentis Hymetti / fons sacer*). Now, it so happens that the final two words of the hexameter, which identify the setting, also appear in *Met.* 7, but at a different point, namely, as Cephalus starts the initial phase of his story and the first hunting that caused *his* groundless suspicions of Procris (702, *vertice de summo semper florentis Hymetti*). I doubt that we can argue persuasively that one line is better, therefore later than the other; e.g., that *summo* and *semper* constitute obvious padding that Ovid removed from *Ars* 3.687. However, if we ask which line would be more likely to account for the other's place in the narrative, I suggest that *Met.* 702 is the original. Both references to Hymettus start and situate the stories. But if Ovid already had before him the account of the *Ars*, where the death of Procris was located on Hymettus at a spring, it does not seem likely that he would have displaced it to another episode and left the final locale imprecise (just "woods"). If, on the other hand, as he started out at *Ars* 3.687 he had before him or in his memory the whole account of *Met.* 7, which made an early reference to Hymettus, but vaguely located the actual Procris-sequence, it is possible to understand the shift of Hymettus to the beginning of his simplified story as part of what proves to be a consistent search for specific, reasonable data about the setting.

Cephalus continues in *Met.* 7 with a very brief list of the things which he sought as necessary conditions for his rest after hunting: coolness, shade, and a breeze that arose from the chilled valleys (*frigus et umbras / et quae de gelidis exhibat vallibus auram*, 809-10). In so doing, he and Ovid quickly focus our attention on *aura* and then continue with the long personifying apostrophe to the breeze that will lead to suspicions that he is conducting an affair with a nymph named Aura. But at this point a curious detail should give us pause. The tired hunter predictably seeks to rest in the cool shade, yes, and a breeze would certainly enhance such a spot (though it does not usually receive mention). What, however, would most obviously be sought by the hot, [135]fatigued hunter—and is specifically sought by such hunters of the *Met.* as Actaeon, Diana, Narcissus, and Arethusa—is water to slake the accumulated thirst of a long, dusty chase, often also to bathe the tired limbs. In pressing forward to the key detail of the breeze, Cephalus has ignored the more customary need of water (which could easily have been accommodated in a subordinate position before the expansion about *aura*). In *Ars* 3.688ff., Ovid quickly focuses on the spring, and surrounds it with a decor of grass, trees, and flowers, and then concludes his detailed description with a distich about the breezes, Zephyrs and *aura*, that stir the leaves and grass (693-94). I consider this a traditionally ordered scene-setting that carefully builds toward the special detail of *aura*. The water is indeed the chief need of the hunter, as is implied here and specifically reported later at 726; only after he has satisfied his thirst and settled down to rest does it occur to him to invoke a breeze (697, 728). We could perhaps say that Cephalus, narrator in *Met.* 7, shows a selective memory and concentrates on details which express his emotions most tellingly; therefore, he ignores everything but the fatal Aura.

However, an additional problem occurs in *Met.* 7 which Ovid has avoided in *Ars* 3. Procris is going to receive a report about Cephalus' invocation of *aura*. Now, it makes no difference whether or not her informant in *Met.* 7.824ff. also told her where he overheard this suspicious business: since Cephalus seeks only shade and a breeze, he can get that almost anywhere in the woods where he hunts, once he stops. So Procris cannot know where her husband will have his supposed tryst with the nymph Aura and cannot have a definite place to lie in wait for the event. In *Ars* 3, however, Ovid has defined the fountain and particular locale to which Cephalus regularly repairs, to which then, on the final tragic occasion, he again makes his way. And Procris, who has not, like her namesake in *Met.* 7, waited a whole day to collect her wits, quite naturally rushes out to that precise spot and quite understandably then has her disastrous encounter with her husband. It seems to me that this intensely detailed and functional concern with the setting for Procris' death in *Ars* 3 could not have been ignored by Ovid if written first. Rather, I believe that Ovid recognized the earlier account of the *Met.* as deficient in this respect, and introduced the circumstantial details of the fountain on Hymettus as a definite improvement in *Ars* 3.

In *Met. 7*, having mentioned his longing for the breeze at the end of 810, Cephalus moves emphatically toward his personifying apostrophe: in 811 and 812 he begins with forms of *aura*, and then in 813 the appeal to the breeze starts the line. His invocation, extending through 820, has a short interruption in 816-17 as he tells his audience that he possibly added further amatory blandishments, then proceeds to quote what he might have said. He also calls attention to his victimization by fate in a parenthetical remark—*sic me mea fata trahebant*, 816—that Ovid had used more affectively in the third person of Actaeon at 3.176. It is a bit curious that Cephalus does not seem to know whether or not he spoke the words which he then cites so carefully, but at the same time insists on the malignancy of fate. In general, this section of the *Met.* seems expansive; Cephalus wants to re-live the scene in which he acted so [136]prominently and to make his male audience grasp it in all its emotional potential.

The narrator of the story in *Ars 3* has no intention of letting us or his female audience dwell on Cephalus' apostrophe or even find it very deceptive. He gets the scenario precise, the idyllic setting and the tired young man reclining on the flower-studded grass (696), but then he races through the invocation of the breeze in a single distich:

“quae” que “meos releves aestus,” cantare solebat
 “accienda sinu, mobilis aura, veni.” (697-98)

These two lines cover the same ground as the three lines which form the first half of the long appeal in *Met. 7*:

“aura” (recordor enim) “venias” cantare solebam,
 “meque iuves intresque sinus, gratissima, nostros,
 utque facis, relevare velis, quibus urimur, aestus.” (812-14)

Although simple comparison cannot determine which of these passages is the original, the three hexameters or the distich, I suggest that the odd way of tentatively adding three more hexameters in *Met. 7* owes nothing to *Ars 3* and indeed would be a dubious poetic decision after the functional spareness of the other account. However, from the reverse perspective, Ovid might, as he looked again at the earlier Procris-story of *Met. 7*, have decided to abandon the over-elaboration of his apostrophe (816-20) and to cut back the three lines of 813-15, so as to accomplish the entire business in a single hemistich.

In *Met. 7*.821-25, Cephalus continues with events which he knows from hearsay, not from personal memory. An unknown passerby interpreted the repetitive apostrophe as an appeal to a real nymph and so reported to Procris in a whisper that her husband was in love with a nymph named Aura. The important point is that the informer invents Cephalus' infidelity. That then allows Procris the chance to decide whether or not to believe the report. Ovid covers the same ground in *Ars 3*.699-700, again in a single distich. In this case, the wretched busybody merely memorizes what he has heard and reports it to the wife. She then takes full responsibility for interpreting the words of Cephalus. Since the teacher-narrator in *Ars 3* has announced Procris as a negative example, he deliberately shapes his account to emphasize her unhappy

responsibility for her death; whereas Cephalus, the tearful, guilty narrator of the story in *Met.* 7, does everything in his power to exonerate his beloved dead wife. Here, we should admit with admiration that the different characterizations and thematic emphases of the two narratives justify each sequence in itself.

Lines 826-34 of *Met.* 7 analyze Procris' reactions to the malign rumor and interpret them sympathetically in Cephalus' words. At first, she believed the worst, but Cephalus excuses that reaction with a *sententia*: *credula res amor est* (826). Then, although wracked by anguish (with which her husband sympathizes, declaring her *infelix*, 831), she pulled herself together and refused to credit the report without testing Cephalus with her own eyes. Procris thus emerges as an engagingly loyal spouse, more so than Cephalus had been earlier; and many readers have preferred this sympathetic portrait to that of the furiously jealous, instantaneously impetuous Procris of *Ars* 3. But remember the bias of the narrator in the elegiac poem.

[137]*Ars* 3.701-10 describes the simple fury of Procris at about the same length as served in *Met.* 7 to narrate the changing emotions of the wife. Whereas Cephalus knows what his wife said (7.828ff.), the narrator in *Ars* 3.702 declares that she was dumb with grief (*muta dolore*). He goes on to describe how she paled, in a pair of similes that each occupies a distich (703-706). Recovering her senses from her collapse, she vents her violence on herself (707-708) and then rushes out through the city with all the wild appearance of a maenad (709-10). The narrator intends to present Procris in the most emphatic manner as a woman out of her mind, possessed by a fury which will only do her harm. He wastes no pity on her; she is simply wrong, as all women prove to be in his biased presentation. (They supposedly do not know how to handle their own emotions successfully, and Procris perfectly exemplifies the consequences of such failure.)

Here, again, it would be idle effort to try to detect a later correction and improvement in either of these variants. Both serve the purposes of the particular narrator, and such service adequately accounts for the different motifs and language. Cephalus in *Met.* 7 is re-living his personal tragedy and reconstructing the past to focus exclusively on his guilty actions. The teacher in *Ars* 3 concentrates on Procris' guilt. However, the passage of the *Ars* shares some phrases with other parts of the *Fasti* and *Ars* that might bear on the question of chronology. In the simile of 703-704, Ovid compares the paleness of Procris to the way leaves lose their color when injured by winter, ending with the hemistich *quas nova laesit hiems*. A comparable simile for pallor appears in *Fasti* 6.149-50 and concludes with the identical hemistich. That pallor belongs to a nearly dead baby, but its nurse exhibits some of the wild behavior of Procris, in particular scratching her cheeks: *sectas invenit ungue genas* (148). Procris recovers consciousness in *Ars* 3.707 with the same initial hemistich Ovid applies in *Fasti*. 3.333 to the recovery of Numa from terror: *ut rediit animus*. The description of Procris' wild actions in 707-10 parallels in words and behavior the frenzy of various women in the *Met.* She rips her dress

open at the breast as Byblis does in 9.636 and Alcyone in 11.681; the same clausula, *pectore vestes (-em)* occurs. And she rushes out with disheveled hair (*passis furibunda capillis*, 709); Scylla's wild appearance in *Met* 8.107 is closely similar: *fusis* (or, in a frequent variant, *passis*) *furibunda capillis*. It is at least a plausible theory that Ovid drew on separate representations of wildly emotional women in the *Fasti* and *Met.* to create this one composite portrait of frenzy in *Ars* 3.⁸

According to the time scheme announced by Cephalus in *Met.* 7, he would have come home at the end of the day, contented with his hunting success, and Procris would have been so artful in cloaking her pain that he would have noticed nothing. Cephalus passes over the events of the evening and leaps forward to the following dawn, when, in his customary carefree manner, he went out to hunt (835ff.). In two lines, he recapitulates the usual routine: easy success, location of a place to rest, and then in 837 he invokes *aura* in words that briefly echo the much longer apostrophe of 813ff.

There is no difficulty with these details so far as Cephalus is concerned. He seems to have set out vaguely into the woods—no reference here to [138]Hymettus—and thrown his spear comfortably at whatever he saw of interest and of course been victorious (*victor*, 836). Then, he simply found a soft grassy spot—no mention of shade and coolness now or even valleys—, sank down in it (*per herbas*, 836), and called upon the breeze. All this, as I say, is quite understandable as an account of Cephalus' actions, given the vague setting that Ovid has developed here. The spot need not have been the same as before, and the details do not suggest that it was the same. But then how did Procris find the place where her Cephalus would come to rest and invoke the breeze? Ovid seems to have become interested in the mounting pathos of Cephalus and the ingenious possibilities of his indirect presentation of Procris, identified only at the moment that Cephalus' spear hits its target, the imagined "beast"; and he has not cared to tighten up the details of setting and motivation for all characters.

What Cephalus' narrative sketchily covers in three lines, takes the *praeceptor amoris* eighteen lines. Since his main character is Procris, he maintains his focus on her from the moment she hears about *aura* until she discovers the truth from her hiding place (*Ars* 3.701-32). Thus, when she rushes through the city, she continues out the gates and toward the very spot where she has learned Cephalus had been singing for *aura*. She leaves her companions in the valley and climbs up the slope to the woods, quietly so that she can hide unheard (711-12). Here, the narrator introduces suspense and emotional problems for himself and his audience, because he apostrophizes Procris in her hiding place and tries to imagine what she is feeling (713-18). She is in turmoil, a prey to *incertus amor* (718), but she has come to the place that the informer named for her (719).⁹ Indeed, she sees the very place where his body (and perhaps *Aura's*?) crushed the grass. And in due course Cephalus comes to the same fountain for a drink (726) and reclines on the customary grass (*solitas...per herbas*, 727). This is a meticulously organized narrative,

and the participle *solitas* almost seems to insist on the corrections that Ovid has introduced to insure consistency of scene.

Ovid has also developed this scene of *Ars* 3 in terms of a familiar narrative pattern, an idyllic setting in the woods which should be the perfect place for tranquil relaxation, but instead witnesses tragic violence, most often rape, but here the woman's death. This pattern became perfected in the *Met.*, where Ovid repeatedly used it in the early books to explicate the myths of such virginal characters as Io, Callisto, Actaeon, and Arethusa.¹⁰ Typically, the character is a hunter/huntress who has become tired of hunting at midday (high noon) and seeks a convenient place to rest that includes shade, grass, and water. Then, as s/he starts to relax, the violence occurs. Having already described the place where Cephalus regularly rests (687-96), Ovid needs only to remind us of that in 726-27. But one formulaic detail, high noon, needs and receives particular emphasis, in a distich:

iamque dies medius tenues contraxerat umbras,
inque pari spatio vesper et ortus erant. (723-24)

It so happens that 723 is identical with a hexameter that develops this same pattern for Actaeon in *Met.* 3.144. I assume that the line in *Met.* 3 was original, not only because the *-que* of *iamque* serves there as a true connective [139] with another verb but also because Ovid had already used two other phrases, with Io and Callisto, to describe the midday heat; this is the only such scene in all three books of the *Ars*. Thus, in planning the setting for the tragedy of Procris in *Ars* 3, I believe that Ovid decided not only to clarify the inconsistencies of *Met.* 7 but also to utilize a narrative scheme that he had used in other stories that involved tired hunters. The setting, then, in itself paradoxically leads to expectations of disaster.

Somehow or other, Procris has managed to guess where Cephalus in *Met.* 7 would come for his tryst, and she is waiting for him in ambush. In addition to the details of setting and the magic spear, the two accounts also differ on the state of Procris' mind just before the fatal wound. For the version of *Met.* 7, where Ovid has utilized every motif to emphasize the guilty pathos of his narrator Cephalus, it is highly affecting that Procris should remain in anguish and not understand her mistake about *aura* as she personally listens to the apostrophe. She groans (838) in anguish, a sound which, in the woods, Cephalus would automatically associate with wild beasts.¹¹ He hears the imprecise rumble and continues his apostrophe (839). There follows a rustling in the brush that neither Cephalus nor we can clearly interpret, but he now believes that surely a wild animal causes the noises (840-41). When he hurls his spear, it suddenly becomes clear (what we, if not he, have suspected): *Procris erat* (842).

By contrast, in *Ars* 3.729, as soon as she has heard Cephalus' invocation, because as before at 693 he names first the non-personal zephyrs before *aura*, Procris knows that she has made a mistake and that her husband is loyal. She recovers her *mens* and the color (730) which she had lost at the first news of *aura*. With a firm control of the scene, the narrator clearly explains what

happens. She gets up from her presumed crouch and pushes her way excitedly, happily—my adverbs—through the brush in order to fall into her husband’s arms like the loving wife that she is (731-32). We know, accordingly, the ironic source of the noise and we can appreciate how it sounds like a body crashing toward the reclining Cephalus; it is a body, a human body. But Cephalus thinks he sees a wild beast. He quickly springs into action from his recumbent position, spear in hand and ready for use (733-34). At this moment, the narrator stops the account to apostrophize the man with the spear, applying to him the adjective *infelix* (735) that betrays his bias. However, he cannot stop the action: in the time that he has vainly been trying to warn the hunter, the spear has been thrown and hit its target. At her moment of happiness, Procris has been fatally wounded.

Ovid has achieved rich pathos in both these variants. Procris suffers the wound in the depths of despair and in a moment of ecstasy, just as she has emerged from despair. I can see merits in thinking a wild animal is there in the bush and in thinking one sees a wild animal just before one hurls a spear. Thus, to my mind neither of these motifs can be claimed as superior and an obvious improvement on the other. However, as in the other sequences, I believe that Ovid in *Ars* 3 has visualized the situation more precisely and rendered it in a more plausible fashion. We are enabled to perceive exactly what Procris is doing and how she feels and what Cephalus does in response. In *Met.* [140]7, the noise in the brush remains unexplained, and, for all we know, Cephalus threw his magic spear while still lying in the grass! Such clear visualization in *Ars* 3 coheres with the other “improvements” which I have attempted to identify.

Procris’ outcry in the first hemistich after she has been hit, “*ei mihi,*” *conclamat*, is identical in *Met.* 7.843 and *Ars* 3.737. Since the same hemistich also appears in *Met.* 6.227 (where a Niobid suffers a fatal arrow wound), the three passages provided Murgia material for applying his method of stemmatic sequence of imitation.¹² The two contexts of the *Met.* prove closely similar, whereas *Ars* 3.737 shows considerable independence apart from the hemistich; and Murgia infers that the order of composition must be *Met.* 6 and 7, then *Ars* 3.

The pathetic narrative in *Met.* 7 continues for twenty lines after Procris suddenly cries out and Cephalus discovers what his wonderful spear has done. He tries desperately to tend to the wound and save Procris’ life (844-50). As she sinks towards death, she speaks again and reveals her misery over the suspected affair with Aura (852-56). When her error is cleared up, at least she can die content with the fidelity of her husband (857-62). The troubled marriage, with its alternations of passionate trusting love and deadly distrust, has arrived at its destined end of mixed smiles and tears, as Cephalus weeps over his dead but tranquil Procris and renews his tears in recollection many years later.

After her cry of pain in *Ars* 3.737, Procris continues in an elegiac complaint that balances the pains of love, which seem to be her marital history,

with the joyful confidence that he has been faithful and not betrayed her with a female rival. She knows that she is dying, and Cephalus realizes it, too, so there is no need to describe attempts at first aid. He holds her dying limbs close to his heart and bathes her cruel wound with his tears (743-44). As she breathes her last, he catches that breath in his mouth (745-46), a touching gesture that also ends the account in *Met.* 7.861. Both accounts refer to Procris' *vulnera saeva* (*Met.* 7.849 and *Ars* 3.744), but with different verbs. Both deal with the mistake over the name (*nominis error*, *Ars* 3.729 and *Met.* 7.857) in quite distinct sequences. Both have their respective narrators, Cephalus and the teacher, exclaim *me miserum* (*Met.* 7.846 and *Ars* 3.736) in connection with the wound to Procris. Even though we obviously sympathize with Cephalus and respond to the dramatic scene which provoked his exclamation, whereas we have legitimate doubts about the teacher's feelings here, it seems evident that the poet aimed at these two different responses in the two endings.

* * * * *

Rosenmeyer has warned us that criticism based on contextualization "is often endowed with a passion and a spirit of discovery that leave the sobriety and the rules of evidence of traditional criticism far behind."¹³ In this paper, I have tried to take the warning to heart and to be constantly aware that, though I hope to establish a temporal relationship between two texts that varies from the accepted sequence, the first and primary result of relating *Met.* 7 and *Ars* 3 will be to define their separately creative utilization of common poetic materials. Accordingly, my analysis operates from the firm conviction that Ovid produced separate masterpieces in each account of Procris' death. If I have exhibited a [141] little more attention to *Ars* 3, that is mostly because critics have given it less admiring attention.

I need not go into the many aspects of Ovid's achievement in constructing and shaping the tale of Cephalus and Procris in *Met.* 7. I have here emphasized the use of Cephalus as tearful narrator, his selective memories with their emphasis on his own guilt and refusal to see any fault in dead Procris, and his rather fuzzy attention to detail while privileging his own feelings. Cephalus dominates his fictional audience on Aegina and compels them, men like himself, to join him in tears (cf. 7.863). For the most part, the poet keeps himself out of our attention, and modern audiences do not sense a strong critical voice that disagrees with Cephalus. However, in the three lines with which he introduces Cephalus' narrative (687-89), as Otis emphasized, the poet suggests that *pudor* acts as a constraint on Cephalus while *dolor* inspires his tears.¹⁴ Thus, no matter how much the fictive audience identifies with Cephalus' viewpoint, no matter how much we may be tempted to do so also, the poet has established some distance.

In composing the account of *Ars* 3, Ovid ingeniously aimed at and achieved a narrator, a narrative manner, a fictive audience, and a critical distance that combine to produce a powerfully different reading of Procris' death. The narrator sets himself up as an expert on love, intent on instructing others in the way to master erotic opportunities to their advantage. He does not

advocate or teach the way to success in marital love, but in extramarital relationships, most especially those between young Romans of the leisure classes and young women prostitutes. Thus, when he chooses to narrate the death of Procris, he exhibits no interest or sympathy in the fact that she was married, and his theme does not center on the tragic distrust, among men as well as women, in even the closest of loves, as it did in the *Met.*: he deflects his emphasis to the damage that too rapid distrust can cause a woman. His narrative manner is didactic. Selecting the story as an example (3.686) of his assertion, he means to use Procris without tears as a “bad example,” against which he and his students react. Thus, unlike Cephalus in the *Met.*, this teacher definitely does not exculpate Procris or shift the guilt to the husband: in the teacher’s view, Procris alone caused her own death by her wild suspicions and even wilder behavior afterward. The teacher has announced at the beginning of Book 3 that he is now addressing his lessons to women, so we must imagine that this story is told to a group of women. Whereas Cephalus in the *Met.* enralls a group of like-minded men, who end by sharing his tears, we should ask ourselves whether a story told to women the way the teacher tells about Procris would gain full assent, whether the female audience condemns the emotional folly along with the male narrator. Does he show adequate understanding of the woman’s situation? Does the story actually prove his point? The answer to both questions is: no.

Ovid, then, in *Ars* 3 creates a narrator whose professional stance, male sex, and “objective” manner open up a significant distance between him and Procris, on the one hand, and him and his female students on the other. And his utilitarian attitude toward love, that it is an emotion which, if controlled in oneself, can be profitably exploited in others, sets up conflicts with the [142]assumptions of most readers and therefore demands deconstruction. Neither the Romans nor modern audiences, at least in the privacy of their hearts, would accept an identification of sexual success with love. When Procris falls pierced by Cephalus’ spear in *Ars* 3, she may be called a “bad example” of hasty suspicion by the teacher, but we can read the incident as a “good example” of genuine love, elation in the loyalty and love of her husband which sends her running happily through the brush to her doom.¹⁵

Finally, we should consider the significance of hunting in the two accounts. Gregson Davis’ recent study of love and the hunt in this myth as told in *Met.* 7 treats it as the most subtle representative of a thematic paradigm.¹⁶ That paradigm defines hunting as the implicit, if not explicit, rejection and denial of love. The hunter or huntress consciously chooses virginity, not marriage and love; or, in the case of Cephalus, unconsciously makes the choice by spending most of his time away from Procris in total dedication to the excitement of the hunt and kill. It is thus perversely logical that, in the end, Cephalus should kill Procris with his hunting spear rather than give up his crazy passion for the breeze and all the other circumstances of the chase.

The hunting motif in *Ars Amatoria* is primarily a symbol that represents the debased view of love that the teacher tries to foist on his audience. For the

teacher, there is no opposition whatever between love and the image of the hunt: love is a “hunt”; the lover is a “hunter,” and the women he pursues are his “prey,” “game” that he aims to “trap,” “snare,” or bring to the “kill.” We hear the hunter first proposed as a model to imitate in 1.45ff., and by 1.89 hunting has become a metaphor for the lover. As soon as the teacher starts discussing women and male attitudes towards them (1.263ff.), he applies the imagery to them. They are animals or just “game” (*praeda*) to be tricked and captured by the dishonest and cruel “art” of the hunter. Celebrating the success of his program so far, the teacher opens Book 2 as follows: *decidit in casses praeda petita meos* (2.2). But if the hunt (and warfare) symbolize the lover’s attitude and actions and constitute for the teacher a positive image of male superiority, they do not possess the same positive connotation for the female or for Ovid’s sensitive audience.

The male dominance that lies behind the use of the hunting image turns love into an abuse of power and latent, if not overt, expression of hostility. There can be no mutuality in such love. Indeed, what most convinces the teacher that women are animals is their powerful emotionality, what he both hopes to exploit for his advantage and also instinctively fears as a threat. Now, if Ovid had to look for a myth that would ideally epitomize this hunting image and develop it to its tragic end, he could hardly have chosen a better one than the death of Procris. For while the teacher intends to use it to demonstrate the fatal consequences of rash credulity by women, Ovid also employs it to spell out the consequences of regarding the lover as hunter and women as wild beasts, mere prey to hunt down. At the conclusion of the story, the teacher, Cephalus, and chauvinistic men have what they really secretly want: not a lover embracing a compliant female in selfish sex but a husband, in the full panoply of hunter, holding the corpse of the wife whom he has speared as an animal. The [143]masculine *error amoris* has been far more disastrous and basic than Procris’ *error nominis*.

It seems to me that there is enough evidence in others’ data and in what I have here presented as Ovid’s conscious corrections of inconsistencies and imprecisions of scene in *Met.* 7 to indicate that *Ars* 3, and specifically the story of Procris’ death, were composed later than *Met.* 7 and to some extent in the light of them. The tone of *Ars* 3 approaches the sardonic, because the teacher’s advice to women is so patently demeaning and self-serving, not helpful to women’s true interests as lovers, let alone even their possible desire to dominate men. That differs radically from the tone of *Ars* 1 and 2, earlier addressed to chauvinistic men and frankly aiming to help them. Accordingly, I suggest, it is consistent with the new tone of *Ars* 3 for Ovid to decide to spell out the hunting image in all its bleakness, to correct his version of *Met.* 7 not only in descriptive consistency but in the critical significance of its basic theme. Cephalus could tell his own story as a pathetic and endearing tale of a husband who instinctively rejected his wife and love to enjoy a macho sport like hunting and thus accidentally killed his wife as a beast of prey. Ovid subsequently sees that hunting, as an image of debased male sexual exploitation, reveals thereby

the latent hostility of males towards emotionality in females. So he employs the narrative of *Ars* 3 on two levels to correct the congenial pathos of *Met.* 7. At the surface level, the *praeceptor* takes over the role of narrator and crudely blames Procris for her strong emotions, blandly excuses and sympathizes with Cephalus for spearing his wife. At the deeper level, Ovid the poet shows that love and hunting are not just diverse, incompatible activities (as the *Met.* imply), but that hunting symbolizes a cluster of basic feelings that aim not only to control but also to eliminate love because it is man's enemy. Thus, after all, the changes at the end fall into place: Cephalus thinks he actually sees an animal; he rouses himself to action; he holds in his hand a normal spear that requires his deliberate aim and cast, not a magic shaft; and this phallic weapon pierces Procris as she comes to him in all her love (not as she thrashes about in despair). That seems to me an improvement that is both terrible and masterful.



NOTES

1. Richard Heinze, *Ovids elegische Erzählung (Berichte der Sächsischen Akad. der Wiss., Phil. Hist. Klasse 71 [1919] no. 7)*. For a recent re-examination of the achievement of Heinze and of the two Ovidian narratives about Persephone, see Stephen Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge 1987). Hinds discusses the relationship of the two accounts, which he believes is "one of mutual dependence" (p. 77; cf. also 44). The chronological connection of the early books of the *Met.* and the *Fasti* would be so close, that a theory of "mutual dependence" assuming simultaneous workmanship and correction is quite legitimate. For the term "contextualization," I refer the reader to Rosenmeyer's admirable monograph, *DEINA TA POLLA. A Classicist's Checklist of Twenty Literary-Critical Positions (Arethusa Monographs 12, 1988) 40ff.*

[144]2. A. Rohde, *De Ovidi arte epica* (diss. Berlin 1929); Viktor Pöschl, "Kephalos und Prokris in Ovids *Metamorphosen*," *Hermes* 87 (1959) 328-43; F. W. Lenz, "Kephalos und Prokris in Ovids *Ars Amatoria*," *Maia* 14 (1962) 177-86; Brooks Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet* (2nd ed., Cambridge 1970) 176-81 and 410-13; M. Labate, "Amore coniugale e amore 'elegiaco' nell' episodio di Cefalo e Procri (Ovidio *Met.* 7.661-865)," *ASNP* 5 (1975) 103-28; Franz Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen, Buch VI-VIII* (Heidelberg 1977); Charles P. Segal, "Ovid's Cephalus and Procris: Myth and Tragedy," *Grazer Beiträge* 7 (1978) 175-205; Peter Green, "The Innocence of Procris. Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 3.687-746," *CJ* 75 (1979-80) 15-24; J. E. Fontenrose, "Ovid's Procris," *CJ* 75 (1979-80) 289-94; also, *Orion: The Myth of the Hunter and the Huntress (Univ. of Calif. Publ. Cl. Studies 23, 1981) 86-111*; F. O. Brenk, "Tumulo solacia or foedera lecti: The Myth of Cephalus and Procris in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*," *Augustan Age* 2 (1982-3) 9-22; Augustin Sabot, "Heur et malheur d'un amour conjugal: Céphale et Procris (Ovide, *Mét.* vii, 661-862)," *Journées ovidiennes de Parménie (Collection Latomus 189, Brussels 1985) 199-214.*

3. See especially Rohde (supra n. 2). Otis (supra n. 2) also expresses his great debt to Heinze's distinction between epic and elegiac styles.

4. See Labate (supra n. 2), Segal (supra n. 2), and Sabot (supra n. 2). The general perception that Ovid uses an “elegiac style” in the hexameter of the *Met.* has been presented by E. Doblhofer, “Ovidius urbanus. Eine Studie zum Humor in Ovids *Metamorphosen*,” *Philologus* 104 (1960) 63-91, 223-35; H. Tränkle, “Elegisches in Ovids *Metamorphosen*,” *Hermes* 91 (1963) 459-76; and now Peter E. Knox, *Ovid’s Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry* (Cambridge Philological Society, Suppl. vol. 11, 1986).

5. Ronald Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford 1978); Charles E. Murgia, “The Date of Ovid’s *Ars Amatoria* 3,” *AJP* 107 (1986) 74-94, and “Influence of Ovid’s *Remedia Amoris* on *Ars Amatoria* 3 and *Amores* 3,” *CP* 81 (1986) 203-20.

6. See Rohde (supra n. 2); W. S. Anderson, *Ovid’s Metamorphoses, Books 6-10* (Norman, Oklahoma 1972) 348ff. (commentary on Daedalus); and Niall Rudd, “Daedalus and Icarus (1): From Rome to the End of the Middle Ages,” in *Ovid Renewed: Ovidian Influences on Literature and Art from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century*, ed. C. Martindale (Cambridge 1988) 21-35.

7. See for example Segal (supra n. 2) 183 n. 13, and Bömer (supra n. 2) on 7.846. Bömer, 367, also points out that it is very odd that Cephalus should be carrying with him everywhere the spear that he claims has permanently ruined his life: the spear serves the purposes of the poet more than verisimilitude.

8. In 710, the phrase *ut . . . concita Baccha* has appeared in the same metrical position in *Ars* 1.312 and *Her.* 10.48.

9. In 716, the phrase *oculis probra videnda tuis* closely follows *Am.* 3.14.44 (substituting *tuis* for *meis*). In 718, the hemistich *pectora versat amor* is taken verbatim from *Am.* 1.2.8. In 722, *corde micante* has the same metrical position as in *Fasti* 6.338.

10. See Hugh Parry, “Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*: Violence in a Pastoral Landscape,” *TAPA* 95 (1964) 268-82; and Charles Segal, *Landscape in Ovid’s Metamorphoses* (*Hermes Einzelschriften* 23, Wiesbaden 1969), Chapter 1. I am tempted to believe that Ovid particularly recalled his account of Actaeon as he wrote of Procris in *Ars* 3. Apart from the repetition of *Met.* 3.144 (mentioned below), he would have found the victimization of innocent Actaeon, his metamorphosis into a huntable animal, his actual death killed by his own dogs, and the role played by another hunter in the kill quite applicable to Procris, who like a huntress tracks her husband, then is seen by Cephalus and speared as a wild beast.

11. For *gemitus* as a natural animal sound or one that an animal and a human being can utter, see Vergil, *G.* 3.223, 506, and 517 (bulls and horses); *Aen.* 7.15 (lions) and [145]12.722 (cows); and Ovid, *Met.* 1.124 (oxen), 1.732 (Io as a cow), 2.486 (Callisto as a bear).

12. Murgia, “The Date...” (supra n. 5) 78.

13. Rosenmeyer (supra n. 1) 40.

14. B. Otis (supra n. 2) 177ff. and 412.

15. Peter Green (supra n. 2) took the position that Procris was definitely not innocent, either in *Ars* 3 or *Met.* 7, as is guaranteed by the other versions of the story. But Fontenrose, “Ovid’s Procris” (supra n. 2), took him to task for succumbing to the documentary fallacy; Ovid’s story insists on Procris’ innocence.

16. G. Davis, *The Death of Procris. “Amor” and the Hunt in Ovid’s Metamorphoses* (*Instrumentum Litterarum* 2, Rome 1983).