

**The *Metamorphoses* of Ovid:
35 Years of Research
(1980-2014)**

**Luis RIVERO GARCÍA
(coord.)**

2021

Note from the authors:

The extent of the bibliography analysed in this work is vast. For this reason, the authors have been allowed to organise it in a different way to the normal standards observed in *Lustrum*. The references will be listed chronologically in each chapter, ordered independently. In this way, we hope to make it easier for the reader to consult the work.

Huelva, May 2021.

THE *METAMORPHOSES* OF OVID: 35 YEARS OF RESEARCH (1980-2014)¹

CONTENTS AND AUTHORS

- I. **Bibliographies** (Antonio RAMÍREZ DE VERGER)
- II. **Reference Works** (Pere FÀBREGAS SALIS)
- III. **Websites** (Pere FÀBREGAS SALIS)
- IV. **Transmission and Textual Criticism**
 - 1. Manuscripts (Juan A. ESTÉVEZ SOLA)
 - 2. Textual criticism (Antonio RAMÍREZ DE VERGER)
 - a. Tendencies
 - b. References
 - c. Studies on particular passages
 - 3. Translations (Antonio RAMÍREZ DE VERGER)
 - 4. Editions with translation (Antonio RAMÍREZ DE VERGER)
- V. **General Aspects of the *Metamorphoses***
 - 1. In General (Luis RIVERO GARCÍA)
 - 2. Structure (Beatrice LAROSA)
 - 3. Literary genres (Luis RIVERO GARCÍA)
 - 4. Generic compositions (Luis RIVERO GARCÍA)
 - 5. The concept of ‘metamorphosis’ (Beatrice LAROSA)
 - 6. The concept of ‘myth’ (Beatrice LAROSA)
 - 7. Religion and cult (Samuel DÍEZ REBOSO)
 - 8. Magic (Samuel DÍEZ REBOSO)
 - 9. Philosophical content (Samuel DÍEZ REBOSO)
 - 10. Nature and landscape (Beatrice LAROSA)
 - 11. History, politics (Samuel DÍEZ REBOSO)
 - 12. Love (Ángela SUÁREZ DEL RÍO)
 - 13. Sexuality (Ángela SUÁREZ DEL RÍO)
 - 14. Gender (Ángela SUÁREZ DEL RÍO)
 - 15. Humour (Luis RIVERO GARCÍA)
 - 16. Other aspects (Juan A. ESTÉVEZ SOLA)
- VI. **Language, Style and Metre**
 - 1. Language and style of the *Metamorphoses*: General aspects (Pere FÀBREGAS SALIS)
 - 2. Images (Pere FÀBREGAS SALIS)
 - 3. Similes (Pere FÀBREGAS SALIS)
 - 4. Rhetoric (Beatrice LAROSA)
 - 5. Word order (Pere FÀBREGAS SALIS)
 - 6. Etymology (Beatrice LAROSA)
 - 7. Greek names (Ángela SUÁREZ DEL RÍO)

¹ This volume has been produced with the help of the Research Projects FFI2013-42529 and PGC2018-098024-B-I00, financed by the Spanish Government and “FEDER una manera de hacer Europa” funds, and of the Centro de Investigación en Patrimonio Histórico, Cultural y Natural at the Universidad de Huelva (Spain). The contributors want to express their gratitude to Prof. Pedro P. Fuentes and the team of *L'Année Philologique* for their help at the initial stage of our work, and to Fiona Flores Watson for her translation of the English version. Titles marked with an asterisk (*) throughout the volume could not be read directly by the authors.

8. Linguistic and stylistic details (Pere FÀBREGAS SALIS)

9. Metre (Pere FÀBREGAS SALIS)

VII. Sources and Models

1. The antique tradition as a whole (Ángela SUÁREZ DEL RÍO)

2. Ancient Greek authors (Luis RIVERO GARCÍA)

a. Epic

b. Tragedy

c. Comedy

d. Lyric

e. Philosophy

f. Mythographers

g. Others

3. Hellenistic authors (Ángela SUÁREZ DEL RÍO)

a. Poets

b. Philosophers, historians, mythographers

4. Latin authors (Juan A. ESTÉVEZ SOLA)

a. Archaic period

b. Virgil

c. Others

d. 'Ovid and Ovid'

VIII. Reception and Pervivence in Antiquity

1. Iconography (Luis RIVERO GARCÍA)

2. Latin literature (Luis RIVERO GARCÍA)

a. General

b. *CLE*

c. 1st and 2nd Centuries CE

d. Late Antiquity

3. Greek literature (Luis RIVERO GARCÍA)

IX. Appendix: Pervivence in music and plastic arts (Ángela SUÁREZ DEL RÍO)

V.3 General Aspects of the *Metamorphoses*: Literary Genres

V.3 General Aspects of the *Metamorphoses*: Literary Genres

1. G. Lieberg, "Zur Kombination literarischer Gattungen Ovids Erzählung von Philemon und Baucis (*Metamorphosen*, VIII,611-728)", *Aevum* 54, 1980, 35-45.
2. W. S. M. Nicoll, "Cupid, Apollo, and Daphne (Ovid, *Met.* 1.452 ff.)", *CQ* 30, 1980, 174-82.
3. M. Lausberg, "Ein epigrammatisches Motiv in Ovids *Metamorphosen*", *GB* 10, 1981, 181-91.
4. A. La Penna, "I generi letterari ellenistici nella tarda repubblica romana: epillio, elegia, epigramma, lirica", *Maia* 34, 1982, 111-30.
5. G. Davis, *The Death of Procris. "Amor" and the Hunt in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Roma 1983.
6. A. H. F. Griffin, "Unrequited love. Polyphemus and Galatea in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *G&R* 30, 1983, 190-7.
7. C. R. Dobinson, *The Continuation of Elegiac Themes and Attitudes in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, M.A. Thesis, University of Queensland 1984.
8. F. Dupont, "Le furor de Myrrha (Ovide, *Métamorphoses*, X, 311-502)", in J. M. Frécaut, D. Porte (eds.), *Journées Ovidiennes de Parménie. Actes du colloque sur Ovide*, Bruxelles 1985, 83-91.
9. J. M. Frécaut, "« Le barbier de Midas » ou « Le vent instrumentiste » (Ovide, *Métamorphoses*, XI, 180-193)", in M. Renard, P. Laurens (eds.), *Hommages à Henry Bardon*, Bruxelles 1985, 147-62.
10. H. Hofmann, "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: *Carmen Perpetuum*, *Carmen Deductum*", in F. Cairns (ed.), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar V*, Liverpool 1985, 223-41.
11. C. Segal, "Ovid: Metamorphosis, Hero, Poet", *Helios* 12, 1985, 49-63.
12. P. E. Knox, *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry*, Cambridge 1986 (Cambridge Philol. Soc. Suppl. 11).
13. S. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone. Ovid and the self-conscious Muse*, Cambridge 1987.
14. J. B. Solodow, *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Chapel Hill-London 1988.
15. A. Barchiesi, "Voci e istanze narrative nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio", *MD* 23, 1989, 55-97 (transl. "Voices and Narrative "Instances" in the *Metamorphoses*", in *Speaking Volumes. Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*, London 2001, 49-78, and in P. E. Knox (ed.), *Oxford Reading in Classical Studies. Ovid*, Oxford 2006, 274-319).
16. J. T. Kirby, "Humor and the Unity of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. A Narratological Assessment", in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History V*, Bruxelles 1989, 233-51 (Coll. Latomus 206).
17. M. Labate, "Forme della letteratura, immagini del mondo: da Catullo a Ovidio", in AA.VV., *Storia di Roma*, Torino 1990, 923-65, II.1.
18. M. Pechillo, "Ovid's Framing Technique: The Aeacus and Cephalus Epyllion (*Met.* 7.490-8.5)", *CJ* 86, 1990, 35-44.
19. G. Conte, *Generi e lettori. Lucrezio, l'elegia d'amore, l'enciclopedia di Plinio*, Milano 1991 (English transl. by G. Most, Baltimore-London 1994).
20. A. R. Sharrock, "Womanufacture", *JRS* 81, 1991, 36-49.
21. C. E. Newlands, "Ovid's Ravenous Raven", *CJ* 86, 1991, 244-55.
22. S. Casali, "Enone, Apollo pastore e l'amore immedicabile: giochi ovidiani su di un topo elegiaco", *MD* 28, 1992, 85-100.

23. J. Farrell, "Dialogue of Genres in Ovid's 'Lovesong of Polyphemus' (*Metamorphoses* 13. 719-897)", *AJPh* 113, 1992, 235-68.
24. A. Houriez, "D'Eschyle à Ovide: le traitement du mythe d'Io à travers divers genres littéraires", *Uranie* 2, 1992, 43-62.
25. C. Santini, "La morte di Orfeo da Fanocle a Ovidio", *GIF* 44, 1992, 173-81.
26. F. Grewing, "Einige Bemerkungen zum Proömium der 'Metamorphosen' Ovids", *Hermes* 121, 1993, 246-52.
27. P. Esposito, *La narrazione inverosimile. Aspetti dell'epica ovidiana*, Napoli 1994 (Università degli Studi di Salerno. Quaderni del Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità 15).
28. K. S. Myers, *Ovid's Causes. Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*, Ann Arbor 1994.
29. K. S. Myers, "*Ultimus ardor*: Pomona and Vertumnus in Ovid's *Met.* 14.623-771", *CJ* 89, 1994, 225-50.
30. G. Baldo, *Dall'Eneide alle Metamorfosi: il codice epico di Ovidio*, Padova 1995.
31. R. Gentilcore, "The landscape of desire: the tale of Pomona and Vertumnus in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *Phoenix* 49, 1995, 110-20.
32. S. J. Heyworth, "Some Allusions to Callimachus in Latin Poetry", *MD* 33, 1995, 51-79.
33. S. A. Cecchin, "Medea in Ovidio fra elegia ed epos", in R. Uglione (ed.), *Atti delle giornate di studio su Medea (Torino 23-24 ottobre 1995)*, Torino 1997, 69-89.
34. S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext*, Cambridge 1998.
35. A. Pérez Vega, "Ovid, on the birth of love (*Met.* I 452 ff.)", *Exemplaria* 2, 1998, 15-23.
36. D. Estefanía, "Ovidio, Quintiliano y el 'canon' literario", in W. Schubert (ed.), *Ovid: Werk und Wirkung. Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht zum 65. Geburtstag*, Bern-Frankfurt am Main 1999, II, 829-40.
37. I. Gildenhard, A. Zissos, "'Somatic Economies'. Tragic Bodies and Poetic Design in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", in P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, S. Hinds (eds.), *Ovidian Transformations. Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception*, Cambridge 1999, 162-81.
38. E. Pianezzola, "Molteplicità e leggerezza nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio", in *Ovidio: modelli retorici e forma narrativa*, Bologna 1999, 199-210.
39. C. Segal, "Ovid's Meleager and the Greeks: Trials of Gender and Genre", *HSPH* 99, 1999, 301-40.
40. M. von Albrecht, "Feinarbeit in Großformat: Das Prooemium der *Metamorphosen*", in *Das Buch der Verwandlungen. Ovid-Interpretationen*, Darmstadt 2000, 158-67.
41. D. Fowler, *Roman Constructions. Reading in Postmodern Latin*, Oxford 2000.
42. E. Gallego Moya, "El mito de Escila en Ovidio (*Met.* VIII 1-151)", *CFC(L)* 18, 2000, 217-37.
43. I. Gildenhard, A. Zissos, "Inspirational fictions: autobiography and generic reflexivity in Ovid's proems", *G&R* 47, 2000, 67-79.
44. I. Rutherford, "Formulas, Voice, and Death in *Ehoie*-Poetry, the Hesiodic *Gunaikon Katalogos*, and the Odysseian *Nekuia*", in D. Obbink (ed.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge, MA-London 2000, 81-96.
45. C. Harrauer, "Zitat und Originalität in Ovids *Metamorphosen*-Prooemium", *WS* 114, 2001, 297-302.

46. I. Jouteur, *Jeux de genre dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide*, Louvain 2001 (cf. I. Mervaud, *Métamorphoses génériques: le mélange des genres dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide*, 2 vol., Thèse de doctorat de l'université de Paris IV, 1997).
47. S. Raval, "A lover's discourse: Byblis in *Metamorphoses* 9", *Arethusa* 34, 2001, 285-311.
48. M^a C. Álvarez Morán, R. M^a Iglesias Montiel, "Cruce de géneros en las *Metamorfosis*: Medea entre la épica y la tragedia", in A. López López, A. Pociña Pérez (eds.), *Medeas: versiones de un mito desde Grecia hasta hoy*, Granada 2002, I, 411-45.
49. T. M. Brady, *The Margins of Epic: Three Studies in an Ovidian Homer*, Ph. D. Thesis University of Bristol 2002.
50. S. Harrison, "Ovid and Genre: Evolutions of an Elegist", in P. Hardie (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge 2002, 79-94.
51. A. M. Keith, "Sources and Genres in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1-5", in B. W. Boyd, *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, Leiden-Boston 2002, 235-69.
52. A. R. Sharrock, "An a-Musing tale: gender, genre and Ovid's battles with inspiration in the *Metamorphoses*", in E. Spentzou, D. P. Fowler (eds.), *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, Oxford-New York 2002, 207-27.
53. D. Curley, "Ovid's *Tereus*: Theater and Metatheater", in A. Sommerstein (ed.), *Shards from Kolonos: Studies in Sophoclean Fragments*, Bari 2003, 163-97 (Le Rane 34).
54. S. Daams, *Epische und elegische Erzählung bei Ovid: Ars amatoria und Metamorphosen*, München 2003 (Forum europäische Literatur 1).
55. J. Fabre-Serris, "Ovide et la naissance du genre pastoral: réflexions sur l'*ars noua* et la hiérarchie des genres *Mét* 1,668-719)", *MD* 50, 2003, 185-94.
56. J. Farrell, "Classical Genre in Theory and Practice", *New Literary History* 34, 2003, 383-408.
57. M. Patti, "*Agnoscis Ceyca, miserrime coniunx?* (Ov. *Met.* 11,658). Il sogno di Alcione come tributo normativo all'epos", in L. Landolfi, P. Monella (eds.), *Ars adeo latet arte sua: riflessioni sull'intertestualità ovidiana. Le metamorfosi*, Palermo 2003, 103-18.
58. F. Rosiello, "La favola di Cefalo e Procri: tra elegia e epica (*ars* III 687-746; *met.* VII 661-865)", in V. Viparelli (ed.), *Tra strategie retoriche e generi letterari. Dieci studi di letteratura latina*, Napoli 2003, 131-47.
59. J. B. DeBrohun, "Centaur in Love and War: Cyllarus and Hylonome in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 12.393-428", *AJPh* 125, 2004, 417-52.
60. E. Fantham, *Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Oxford 2004.
61. A. Feldherr, "Flaying the Other", *Arethusa* 37, 2004, 77-87 (in A. Feldherr, P. James, "Making the most of Marsyas", *Arethusa* 37, 2004, 75-103).
62. E. Merli, "Esculapio e Chirone in *Fasti* e *Metamorfosi*: tradizione mitologica e definizione del genere letterario", *Hermes* 132, 2004, 459-71.
63. A. D. Nikolopoulos, *Ovidius polytropos. Metanarrative in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Hildesheim 2004 (Spudasmata 98).
64. Y. Syed, "Ovid's Use of the Hymnic Genre in the *Metamorphoses*", in A. Barchiesi, J. Rüpke, S. Stephens (eds.), *Rituals in Ink. A Conference on Religion and Literary Production in Ancient Rome held at Stanford University in February 2002*, Stuttgart 2004, 99-113 (Postdamer altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 10).

65. G. Baldo, "Pathos ed elegia nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio", in C. Santini, F. Santucci (eds.), *Properzio nel genere elegiaco: modelli, motivi, riflessi storici. Atti del convegno internazionale (Assisi, 27-29 maggio 2004)*, Assisi 2005, 325-58.
66. L. Chappuis Sandoz, "Les *puellae* des *Métamorphoses* d'Ovide: des jeunes femmes de mauvais genre?", *LEC* 73, 2005, 319-57.
67. J. Farrell, "Precincts of Venus: Towards a Prehistory of Ovidian Genre", *Hermathena* 177/78, 2004/05, 27-69.
68. R. Henneböhl, "'Stumm vor Schmerz ist die Lyra': der Gesang des Orpheus und die Entstehung der Liebeselegie. Zur Aussageabsicht des zehnten Buches der *Metamorphosen* Ovids", *Gymnasium* 112, 2005, 345-74.
69. C. E. Newlands, "Ovid", in J. M. Foley (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, Malden 2005, 476-91.
70. J. J. O'Hara, "'Some God ... or his Own Heart': Two Kinds of Epic Motivation in the Proem to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *CJ* 100, 2004/05, 149-61.
71. A. Barchiesi, "Music for Monsters: Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Bucolic Evolution, and Bucolic Criticism", in M. Fantuzzi, Th. Papanghelis (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*, Leiden 2006, 403-25.
72. J. Á. Delgado Santos, "Una historia elegíaca en las *Metamorfosis* de Ovidio: el mito de Ifis y Anaxárate", in M. Rodríguez-Pantoja (ed.), *Las raíces clásicas de Andalucía. Actas del IV congreso andaluz de estudios clásicos*, Córdoba 2006, 271-7, I.
73. J. J. O'Hara, *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan*, Cambridge-New York 2006 (Roman Literature and Its Contexts).
74. H. Seng, "Ovids Phaethon-Tragödie (*met.* 1,747-2,400)", in M. Janka, U. Schmitzer, H. Seng (eds.), *Ovid: Werk – Kultur – Wirkung*, Darmstadt 2007, 163-81.
75. G. Rosati, "Le *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio, un'epica del desiderio", in R. Uglione (ed.), *Atti del convegno nazionale di studi Arma virumque cano... L'epica dei Greci e dei Romani (Torino, 23-24 aprile 2007)*, Alessandria 2008, 139-57.
76. V. Subias-Konofal, "La ronde d'Apollon et Daphné: prière et poésie au seuil des *Métamorphoses*", *Euphrosyne* 36, 2008, 105-18.
77. J. Farrell, "Ovid's Generic Transformations", in P. E. Knox (ed.), *Companion to Ovid*, Malden, MA, 2009, 370-80.
78. S. Laigneau-Fontaine, "Jupiter, figure d'Ovide dans l'épisode de Sémélé (*Mét.*, III, 253-315)?", in H. Casanova-Robin (ed.), *Ovide, figures de l'hybride: illustrations littéraires et figurées de l'esthétiques ovidienne à travers les âges*, Paris 2009, 267-78 (Colloques, congrès et conférences sur la Renaissance 64).
79. S. Laigneau-Fontaine, "Procris et Céphale dans les *Métamorphoses*: un épisode épique entre tragédie et comédie", in I. Jouteur (ed.), *La théâtralité de l'œuvre ovidienne*, Paris 2009, 157-72.
80. H. Vial, "Comparaisons, métaphores et images théâtrales: la complexité générique portée sur la scène poétique", in I. Jouteur (ed.), *La théâtralité de l'œuvre ovidienne*, Paris 2009, 249-64.
81. J. Fabre-Serris, "Le cycle thébain des *Métamorphoses*: un exemple de mythographie genrée?", *Eugesta* 1, 2010, 99-120.
82. J. Brasil Fontes, "*Bella gerunt uentis*: o sítio de Troia em *Metamorfoses* XI, 410-748", *Phaos* 10, 2010, 5-43.
83. A. Hardie, "'Canens' (Ovid *Metamorphoses* 14.320-434)", *SIFC* 8, 2010, 11-67.

84. A. Hunt, “Elegiac grafting in Pomona’s orchard: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 14.623-771”, *MD* 65, 2010, 43-58.
85. A. Videau, *La poésie d’Ovide, de l’épique à l’épopée des «Métamorphoses»*: essai sur un style dans l’histoire, Paris 2010 (Rome et ses renaissances).
86. C. Battistella, “Genere e intertestualità in Ovidio: qualche riflessione su *Met.* 13.771-5; *Her.* 14.45-50; *Ibis* 153-8”, *Dictynna* 8, 2011, sine pagina.
87. I. Ziogas, “Ovid as an Hesiodic Poet: Atalanta in the *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 72-6 M-W) and the *Metamorphoses* (10.560-707)”, *Mnemosyne* 64, 2011, 249-70.
88. M. von Albrecht, “Ovid and the Novel”, in M. P. Futre Pinheiro, S. J. Harrison (eds.), *Fictional Traces. Receptions of the Ancient Novel*, Groningen 2012, 3-19, I (Ancient Narrative Supplementum 14.1) (see also in T. N. Jackson et al. (eds.), *Gaudeamus igitur. Studies to honour the 60th birthday of A.V. Podossinov*, Moscow 2010, 33-48, and “Ovids *Metamorphosen* und der Roman”, *Ovids Metamorphosen: Texte, Themen, Illustrationen*, Heidelberg 2014, 157-66).
89. B. W. Boyd, “On starting an epic (journey): Telemachus, Phaethon, and the beginning of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*”, *MD* 69, 2012, 101-18.
90. J. Heath, “Poetic Simultaneity and Genre in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*”, *CJ* 107, 2011/12, 189-211.
91. M. Labate, “Polifemo in Ovidio: il difficile cammino della civiltà”, in M^a C. Álvarez Morán, R. M^a Iglesias Montiel (eds.), *Y el mito se hizo poesía*, Madrid 2012, 229-45.
92. A. Romeo, *Orfeo in Ovidio: la creazione di un nuovo epos*, Soveria Mannelli 2012 (Studi di filologia antica e moderna 25).
93. D. Curley, *Tragedy in Ovid. Theater, Metatheater, and the Transformation of a Genre*, Cambridge 2013.
94. F. Klein, “*Omnia turbasti*: l’épisode de Térée, Philomèle et Procné dans les *Métamorphoses* d’Ovide”, in S. Barbara (ed.), *Couples mythiques: origines, transgressions et falsifications. Imaginaires mythologiques des sociétés anciennes*, Lille 2013, 119-40 (Ateliers 45).
95. G. Mader, “The be(a)st of the Achaeans: turning tables / overturning tables in Ovid’s centauromachy (*Metamorphoses* 12.210-535)”, *Arethusa* 46, 2013, 87-116.
96. A. Romeo, “Metamorfosi della declamazione: metodo declamatorio e creazione epica nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio”, *FAM* 39/40, 2012/13, 57-73.
97. I. Ziogas, *Ovid and Hesiod. The Metamorphosis of “The Catalogue of Women”*, Cambridge-New York 2013 (revised version of his Ph. D. Thesis, *Hesiod in Ovid. The Metamorphosis of the “Catalogue of women”*, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., 2010).
98. M. von Albrecht, “Das Prooemium”, in *Ovids Metamorphosen: Texte, Themen, Illustrationen*, Heidelberg 2014, 139-46.
99. A. Feldherr, “Modeling Reception in *Metamorphoses*: Ovid’s Epic Cyclops”, in J. F. Miller, C.E. Newlands (eds.), *A Handbook to the Reception of Ovid*, Chichester (New Sussex) 2014, 22-35.
100. P. Martínez Astorino, *La apoteosis en las Metamorfosis de Ovidio. Diseño estructural, mitologización y «lectura» en la representación de apoteosis y sus contextos*, Bahía Blanca 2017.

V.3 General Aspects of the *Metamorphoses*: Literary Genres

Some interesting works partially dealing with genre can be found in ‘Reference Works’ and ‘General Aspects of the *Metamorphoses*: In General’.

The generic delimitation of the *Metamorphoses* has traditionally been an object of study and debate, from those who consider the poem to be defined correctly as an epic composition, to those who consider it a *sui generis* work, as well as those who see *met.* as an original combination of epic and other genres, especially elegy (the *locus classicus* is R. Heinze, *Ovids elegische Erzählung*, Leipzig 1919 [= Stuttgart 1960³; there is a new Italian edition, Trieste 2010], responded to *in extenso* by D. A. Little, in E. Zinn (ed.), *Ovids Ars amatoria und Remedia amoris. Untersuchungen zum Aufbau*, Stuttgart 1970, 64-105; a clear, comprehensive and recent vision, although referring to all of Ovid’s work, in Farrell, 77; some insightful thoughts can be found in Pianezzola, 38, in chapter 9 of Fantham, 60 (119-32), and in Newlands, 69 (esp. 476-81), and see also Esposito 27, 147-64; brief considerations, in La Penna, 4, 119, Davis 5, 153-4, Solodow 14, 18-25, Estefanía 36, esp. 836-40, Harrison, 50, 87-9, Daams 54, 79-90, and Merli 62, 460-1; for Anne Videau’s book, 85, see ‘Reference Works’).

A review of the bibliography available up to his time can be found in the 5th chapter of Hinds (13, 99-114 “Elegy and Epic: A Traditional Approach”). He reasonably advocates a middle way which, while recognizing the genre-awareness of Ovid in the poem (see e.g. 120), points out the difficulties in establishing clear-cut lines of generic ascription (esp. chapter 6: “Elegy and Epic: A New Approach”, 115-34). Isabelle Jouteur offers another overall study of the material in the first half of her monograph (46, 3-195), based on her Ph. D. thesis (Paris IV 1997). This scholar sees in *met.* a melting pot of genres, a “kaléidoscope générique”, and analyses the presence of other genres, particularly strong in the cases of elegy and tragedy (esp. 99-162).

Charles Segal views the generic originality of *met.* as the result of – often combined – techniques (11, 49): “first, the suppression or undermining of the heroic element by displacement of emphasis or lightness of tone; second, the conflation with other styles and genres” (and the author illustrates this with examples from Books 9-13); and then by the constant use of metamorphosis, which “is in itself a mode of undercutting the traditional epic heroism” (54), be it through the dissolution of identity, or by breaking down the barrier between nature and culture viz. civilization, or by reminding us “that we are dependent on physical substances and physical processes whose very essence is transformation” (57), an evidence opposite to the belief in eternal fame: “The metamorphosed hero, fixed in a transsubstantiation of his bodily nature, becomes plant

or animal rather than monument”. Further elements which help to create this particular kind of epic are the lack of a single mythic paradigm of heroic existence, and – correspondingly – the lack of a central narrative focus. Among this variability and mobility, it is the poet’s eternal fame which stands at the end of the poem: “If the heroic *kleos* of the epic hero has dissolved in the fluid boundaries of metamorphosis, it finds a new embodiment in the epic glory of the poet himself, the poet as a hero” (62).

In a work focused on arguing the importance of humour for the cohesion of *met.*, John Kirby (16) also starts by summarizing the various studies regarding the genre of this poem (233-7). Although his study goes beyond Ovid, the chapter “Il genere tra empirismo e teoria” by Gianbiagio Conte (19, 145-73) is worthy of attention. Plentiful interesting information regarding Ovid’s sensitivity to issues of genre and literariness can be found in Barchiesi (15) and, on his experimentalism in matters of genre, in Labate (17, “Dopo i generi: lo sperimentalismo di Ovidio”, 960-5; for *met.*, 964-5); for *met.* as ‘rewriting’ of the *Aeneid*, Baldo (30), Hinds (34, 99-122), Rosati (75, 139-48). A theoretical approach to Ovid’s narrative in *met.* can be found in Nikolopoulos (63).

Joseph Farrell offers a short resume of the topic in his first pages (23, and see also 56, 422-3). He bases his study on Wilhelm Kroll’s concept of *Kreuzung der Gattungen*, going a step further in order to analyse the story of Acis, Galatea, and Polyphemus (13.719-897) in terms of ‘dialogue’ or ‘polyphony’. In other words, he considers that “all of the constituent genres represent different ‘voices’ or even ‘languages’ present in a state of constant interaction throughout the poem” and thus dismisses “a primary generic background”, i.e. epic in the case of this episode, which is therefore read as a dialogue between bucolic, elegy and epic. Concerning this same viewpoint, although adhering explicitly to the thesis of Richard Heinze, Alison Keith (49) carries out a complete and bibliographically up-to-date exercise of *Quellenforschung* regarding the first five books of *met.*, pointing out first of all Ovid’s indebtedness to epic (Homer, Homeric Hymns, Ennius, Virgil) and didactic epic (Hesiod, Nicander, Aratus, Lucretius), a combination already present in the first four programmatic verses, and which therefore “signals that the *Metamorphoses* will combine the traditions of heroic and didactic epos in a comprehensive culmination of the genre” (239). Afterwards she studies, in line with Heinze’s thesis, the debt to elegiac themes and sources (Callimachus, Parthenius, Catullus, and Roman elegy, Ovid himself included), which she finds “consonant with his [sc. Ovid’s] demonstrable engagement with the generic conventions of epic” (251). And she adds (*ibid.*): “[W]hat does seem novel is Ovid’s self-conscious commentary on his

V.3 General Aspects of the *Metamorphoses*: Literary Genres

contamination of epic with elegy, “his continual awareness of the system of genres,” whether observed, transgressed, or problematized” (the quotation belongs to Conte, 19, English transl., 124). Lastly, Keith addresses the influence of tragic authors and sagas (a brief summary on the mixing of genres in *met.* is available in O’Hara, 73, 118-21). Also following the thesis of Heinze, Elena Merli (62) analyses the differences in the treatment of the characters of Aesculapius and Chiron in *met.* (2.640-75) and *fast.* (5.379-414; 6.746-62).

8

A different study – and, in my opinion, less fruitful – of the theme of literary genres in *met.* can be found in Gildenhard and Zissos (37), who analyse from the perspective of trans-generic and cross-cultural poetics the way in which Ovid incorporates the physical suffering of Greek tragic material into his text. Alison Sharrock (20) suggests that the story of Pygmalion (10.243-97) reflects on the eroto-artistic relationship between the poet and his *puella* explored in Latin love elegy (49): “By foregrounding the lover as artist/artist as lover, the text consciously or unconsciously exposes the workings of gendered power relations in erotic and specifically elegiac discourse”. In a later work (52), Sharrock in turn studies the gender and sexual undertones of Ovid’s relationship with the Muse, which she illustrates using the episode of Salmacis and Hermaphroditus in Book 4, and interprets that “the poet is emasculated through his connection with the overpowering Muse of epic” (217); also “Throughout the poem there is a tension between these two elements: independence from the Muse (and the intertextual tradition) and desire for the Muse and the epic grandeur she can bestow” (219).

Sylvie Laigneau-Fontaine (78, 269-76) observes that in the episode of Semele (3.253-314) Ovid resumes and freely modifies various elegiac topics (the love triangle, the *lena* and the *puella*, the *servitium amoris*, the *paraclausithyron*, or the fire of love), parodying them. She notes that in doing so, Ovid presents Jupiter as a degraded elegiac hero, so that secondarily and metapoetically he is presenting himself as a poet incapable of producing a completely epic work (276-8).

In a long article concerning Meleager’s episode (8.268-546), Charles Segal (39) studies Ovid’s techniques of incorporating traditional material (Homer, Bacchylides, Euripides, Calimachus, Nicander, Accius) in such a particular way that he manages “to include a contrasting range of genres and registers: martial and erotic, tragic and comic tones, heavy and light narratives, male-centered and female-centered points of view, public and domestic realms. Ovid here exhibits two complementary features of his artistry at its most subtle, a self-conscious sense of both belatedness and comprehensiveness”

(301). According to Segal, “Ovid’s answer is just the reverse of Virgil’s, namely to produce a poem of epic length, contents, and style that continually refuses to take itself and its heroes with epic seriousness” (337). Comparing the treatment of the myth of Io in Homer, Aeschylus, Moschus and Ovid, Houriez (24, 61) arrives at this conclusion: “Le traitement du mythe d’Io dans le *Métamorphoses*, et déjà dans l’*Europé*, est par conséquent le résultat d’une redefinition de l’*épos*”.

Some years later, Joseph Farrell returned to the topic (67) with the intention of outlining a “Prehistory of Ovidian Genre”, especially regarding *met.* and *fast.* What is new is that, in the absence of literary forerunners of Ovid in the generic practice, Farrell focuses on a number of literary and artistic designs (which he refers to as ‘precincts’ here) that are related to Venus, a goddess he chooses because of her strong presence in the politics, literature, and art of the late Republican and Augustan periods, and also because of Ovid’s personal affinity with her. The three ‘precincts’ that he takes into consideration are the complex of buildings dedicated to *Venus Victrix* by Cn. Pompeius Magnus in 55 BCE, the fourth book of Ovid’s *Fasti*, and the fourth book of Horace’s *Odes*. By comparing these (the author applies the rhetorical concept of ‘genre’ in the sense of ‘type’ to the fields of architecture and religion), Farrell tries to show “the generic sophistication of their designs and of the ways in which they represent the goddess herself” (29). His starting hypothesis “is that Ovid’s characteristic attitude towards genre has strong affinities with attitudes that are very much in evidence in the realms of late Republican architecture and cult, and that it exhibits equally distinct divergences from the characteristic tendencies of antecedent literature, which was generally more conservative in this respect” (30). Specifically, Farrell finds a parallel – not necessarily a model or source – in the architectural composition of the *opera Pompeiana*. He focuses on its combination of different elements (*curia, theatrum, templum, porticus*) and even the double nature of elements like the *cavea*, which allows him to qualify the collection of buildings as ‘ambiguous’ and to consider it explicitly (37) as an example of “Kreuzung der Gattungen”, “a true and very advanced hybrid”: “Like the *Metamorphoses* or *Fasti*, which combine so many disparate generic elements, the *opera Pompeiana* amount to a kind of Kataloggedicht, and [...] the individual elements of the composition change their meaning in combination with one another, even to the extent that their generic identity becomes unstable” (37-8). Continuing along this line, Farrell even contends that “[t]he genre of Venus also comprises a number of subtypes” (40) and mentions the similarities of *Venus Victrix* with Minerva, but also with Mars. With this background in mind, Farrell

goes on to consider *Fasti* 4 as “poetic precinct of Venus”, to the extent that *Aprilis* is the month of Venus, and hers only. Now, the association of Venus with other goddesses in the heart of the book has as a consequence that “Ovid’s Venus becomes a complex figure whose cult extends to both matrons and streetwalkers, whose generative force animates both farmlands and the Roman imperial family, and whose manifestations extend from literally naked sexuality to ritual chastity” (cf. 67: “Ovid’s treatment of Venus in *Fasti* 4 does [...] expand the goddess’ frame of reference without sacrificing [...] her basic character as the Goddess of Love”). Lastly, Farrell analyses the presence of Venus in *Hor. carm.* 4, not as Ovid’s forerunner but as “an exceptionally important comparandum” (53), although from this comparison he deduces the vast difference between the two treatments: Horace is the more traditional or conservative in terms of generic adscription, while “Ovid develops the numinous and the literary-generic aspects of Venus and her sister goddesses in closely analogous ways”; “The closest analogue to Ovid’s practice ... is found not in other literary manifestations of the Augustan Venus, but in the late Republican Venus of the *opera Pompeiana*” (68).

Explaining and developing certain theses of Otis (*Ovid as an epic poet*, 1970²), Nicoll (2) argues that Apollo’s theophany (Apollo-Cupid and Apollo-Daphne) shows Ovid’s connection to the elegiac genre through his comparison with *am.* 1.1 at the same time as with *Call. Ait.* 1 fr. 1, seeing the Apollo-Cupid episode as a “disguised *recusatio*”, and therefore with a programmatic purpose at this point in the poem (a similar approach, in Syed, 64, esp. 100-2). The Apollo-Daphne episode could be interpreted humorously in the sense that “the patron of epic and serious poetry should be obliged to abandon his epic pretensions in order to get his hands on the tree which was the symbol of his own poetic craft” (177). Just as *am.* 1.1 opens with an obvious reference to the *Aeneid*, so he then analyses the similarities between the entire section of *met.* 1 which precedes the theophany of Apollo, and the beginning of the *Aeneid*: “This combination of ‘epic’ and ‘anti-epic’ surely exactly fulfils Ovid’s initial promise in *Met.* 1.4 of a *carmen* which was to be both *perpetuum* and *deductum*” (180).

This initial double characterisation of the poem in programmatic code (the apparent paradox had already been pointed out by O. S. Due, *Changing Forms. Studies in the Metamorphoses of Ovid*, Copenhagen 1974, 95, and see Myers, 28, 2-15, Heyworth, 32, Von Al, 40 and 98, Gildenhard and Zissos, 43, Harrauer, 45, Jouteur 46, 234-71, Brady, 49, 75-81, O’Hara, 70, 155 n. 19, and Martínez Astorino, 100, 83-9, as well as Barchiesi in the comm. *Ovidio. Metamorfosi*, I, 133-45) is the purpose of both Heinz Hofmann’s

article (10), which recognises in it Ovid's aim to eroticize epic, and Farouk Grewing's (26), who sees in this apparent paradox the cryptic adscription by Ovid to the Alexandrine poetic ideology (see also 'Sources and models: Hellenistic authors – poets'). This thesis, however, had already been one of the central topics of Peter Knox's monograph (12, abbreviated version of his dissertation: *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Tradition of Elegy*, Diss. Harvard 1982). He illustrates Ovid's Alexandrianism through the 'Alexandrian' Orpheus in Book 10 and through the aetiological stories which make up books 14 and 15. The article by James O'Hara (70) returns to this same aspect of the proem, focusing attention on Ovid's use of the topos of divine vs. human motivation for poetic composition (152: "Who changed Ovid's plans, his own heart or the immortal gods?"), and authority or causation (156: "Who is in charge in Ovid's poem?"). The reasoning which O'Hara uses can be found *in extenso* in the 5th chapter of his later monograph (73, 104-30), dedicated to Ovid, where certain episodes are analysed from the perspective of the relationship between inconsistency and narrative authority. John Heath (90) also addresses the way in which Ovid manipulates, in the very prologue of the poem, the topos of 'poetic simultaneity' ("the illusion that a poem is really only coming into being as it evolves before the readers' eyes, that the poet/persona is composing it 'as we watch'", 189) to evoke the tension between the poet and the gods in their dispute for generic control of the work. Finally, a more literal reading of the poem is offered by Esposito (27, 162-4).

Ana Pérez Vega (35) finds a combination of elegy with the cosmogonic hymn, didactic wisdom and the epyllion in the Apollo-Daphne episode. The article by Subias-Konofal (76) also considers the 'hybridité générique' (epos, bucolic, *komos*, elegy, hymn, personal panegyric) of the Apollo-Daphne episode and draws attention to its common points with that of Polyphemus-Galatea (with regards to genre, the problematic connection between both and the pastoral genre). For the generic diversification of the character of Polyphemus in *met.* 13 (pastoral and elegy) and 14 (epic and tragedy), see Griffin (6), Labate (91), and Feldherr (99, 27-34).

Marion Lausberg (3) devotes her study to the use of Hellenistic epigram in 10.515-8: she sees in this use, in addition to further evidence of Ovid's desire to enrich the traditional genres, a means of adding cohesion to the *carmen perpetuum*. Moreover Lausberg addresses other epigrammatic passages – funereal (2.327-8, 14.443-4) and votive (9.794) – in the poem, a practice already present in Homer and Virgil but which Ovid moves to the sphere of private life. Christopher Dobinson's M.A. thesis (7) analyses

the way in which Ovid expresses in narrative form the poetic credo which had guided his elegiac work; that is, how this elegiac attitude influenced his epic telling of the myths. As far as the love theme is concerned, the author states that Ovid does not seem to have changed his stance from his elegiac days. The article by Rudolf Henneböhl (67) offers us a poetological analysis of book 10 through Orpheus' song: he studies how Ovid represents Orpheus, Apollo and Venus, through their tragic experiences, as founders of the genres of epigram and elegy. Carlo Santini (25) had already put forward the view that certain characteristics which differentiate Ovid's Orpheus from Virgil's originate in the work of Phanocles. Orpheus as the central symbol to exemplify the new kind of Ovidian epos ("la 'maniera' epica ovidiana") is the thesis of Alessandra Romeo (92), who pays special attention to Ovid's *aemulatio* of Virgil. On the other hand, Ioannis Ziogas (97, 8) suggests relating Orpheus' song, as well as many other elements of *met.*, with the epic subgenre of *Ehoiai*, as distinguished from martial epic (for a formal description of this subgenre, see Rutherford 44, 89-93, Ziogas 97, 8-9, with references; see also Papaioannou, *Mnemosyne* 67, 2014, 854). This, in turn, implies reading Ovid through Hesiod's direct engagement with Homeric epic (87, 267-8): "By casting himself as a Hesiodic poet against the background of Vergil's Homeric epic, Ovid revisits the long-standing debate between Homeric and Hesiodic epic. Ovid re-uses the language of martial epic in his amatory tales, in order to contrast the *Metamorphoses* with the *Aeneid*, and deflate the battle narrative of his epic predecessor. Likewise, Hesiod employs the diction of martial epic, but recasts it in a context of love affairs. Of course, this is not the only way to interpret Ovid's references to heroic epic, but, in my view, one worth pursuing. Ovid is engaged in a poetic competition with Vergil, hoping that in the end he, like Hesiod, will be crowned with the victory laurel".

Sergio Casali (22) analyses the character of Apollo-shepherd in love with Daphne (1.519-24) and his elegiac nature, since he is subject to *servitium amoris*, and the equally elegiac nature of Apollo-hunter in love with Hyacinthus (10.162-219). Casali notes Apollo's inability to maintain his own cognitive powers: the gift of prophecy (Daphne) and that of medicine (metaphorically in the case of Daphne, literally in that of Hyacinthus). Sara Myers' article (28) addresses the contrast of genres: she focuses on Pomona-Vertumnus as the last amatory episode, complementary to the first, that of Apollo-Daphne, which "also functions in a similarly programmatic way in introducing themes which are important in the remainder of the poem" (225) and "forms with the first erotic episode a sort of amatory frame within the broader cosmic framework" (226).

According to Myers, “this final amatory episode is emphatically placed where it is because Ovid was concerned to assert once again the affiliations of his epic with the traditions of Alexandrian and neoteric poetry, both erotic and aetiological, as he approached the emphatically grand epic nationalistic and cosmological themes with which the *Metamorphoses* concludes” (226). Gianluigi Baldo (65) devotes his attention to the same episode and to Byblis, observing the mechanisms used by Ovid to adapt the elegiac code to the narrative demands of the epic. Ailsa Hunt (84) studies the use of the grafting image for the georgic, but also unexpectedly elegiac, characterisation of the Vertumnus-Pomona amorous union.

José Ángel Delgado (72) analyses the inclusion of the elegiac episode of Iphis and Anaxarete (14.698-758) in the epic setting of *met.* as a means of persuasion by Vertumnus over Pomona. Roxanne Gentilcore (31, 117) had already wanted to see “Ovid’s mockery of the elegiac genre” in this episode. Jeri DeBrohun (59) interprets the love story of Cyllarus and Hylonome as “typical of lyric-elegiac love poetry” (432) and highlights the constant presence in the passage of opposing elements, among them, elegy and epic. Fowler (41, 159-60) also has observations about the similarities between Pyramus and Thisbe and the elegiac lovers

Carole Newlands (21) compares Ovid’s treatment of the Apollo and the raven episode (*fast.* 2.243-66, and *met.* 2.542-632) with his source in the now fragmentary crow’s story in Callimachus’ *Hecale* (fr. 260) and concludes that Ovid makes a “creative transgression of generic norms” (254): “The version in the *Metamorphoses* represents an attempt to translate material that is more typical of elegy into the grand style. (...) Whereas Callimachus tries to adapt the hexameter metre to narrower, more domestic topics and “unepic” style, Ovid seeks to raise such topics to the level of the hexameter metre and a weightier style” (253).

Jacqueline Fabre-Serris (55) studies Ovid’s version of the birth of pastoral poetry (1.668-719). She finds in this episode, and in its characterisation as an *ars nova*, the paradoxical effect that it is assigned by Ovid the position traditionally reserved for epic: that of first literary genre, both chronologically and hierarchically. Through the analysis of three instances of Ovidian pastoral: Mercury and Argus (1.664-723); Midas (11.146-92); Poliphemus (13.750-898), Alessandro Barchiesi (71) defends this thesis (406): “The Ovidian poem tells the origins of bucolic song, how it became too ambitious and was put in its place, and how it ended up (in a specifically Roman version) transgressing its

borders” (a brief reference to the possible presence of satyr play and pantomime in the Cyclops’ episode, in 419, n. 30).

Andrew Feldherr (61) relates the theme of dismemberment in 6.382-400 (Marsyas) to the generic ambiguity (epic, hymn, pastoral, elegy) of the episode and to issues of imitation. For her part, Elena Gallego (42) maintains that, in the episode of Scylla (8.1-151), Ovid focuses on the character’s psychological and sentimental aspects, his interior conflict, and therefore the elegiac and almost dramatic tone of the episode; hardly epic. Shilpa Raval’s perspective is similar in her study (47) of the character of Byblis, whose reasoning and behaviour she sees as built on conventions originating from Ovid’s own elegy and love poetry (*Heroides*, *Ars amatoria*). Florence Dupont (8) focuses on the tragic elements of Myrrha’s character (10.311-502), and especially her *furor*, and proposes that Ovid’s story was built on a previous tragedy or pantomime in which she was the main character.

In the wake of Heinze’s and Hinds’ (13) method of comparing a single myth or character within the works of Ovid, Sergio Cecchin (33) analyses Ovid’s character of Medea and the different treatment of her in *epist.* and *met.* In the epic poem Medea maintains the dual state of *relicta* and *maga* which she had acquired in the epistles: “l’amore domina nella parte della Colchide, mentre nella parte greca [...] si manifesta il potere nefasto della magia” (81). Compared with its main models (Eur. and A.R.), in *met.* magic is not instrumental, but “si espande e si sviluppa in modo tale da segnare definitivamente il personaggio di Medea e da costituire un ineliminabile precedente per le successive versioni di Seneca e di Valerio Flacco” (89). The same method of comparing within Ovid, although at a more superficial level, inspires Susanne Daams’ monograph (54), wherein she studies the characters of Mars and Venus, on the one hand, and of Cephalus and Procris, on the other, both in *ars* and in *met.*, and analyses some differences probably due to “Gattungsbedingungen”.

Ovid’s Medea as the original ‘cross-genre’ between epic and tragedy is the thesis defended by M^a Consuelo Álvarez and Rosa Iglesias (48), who point out, moreover, characteristics of Medea’s personality that are attributed to Procne. Dan Curley (53) examines the remains of Sophocles’ *Tereus* and analyses the mechanisms which Ovid uses to adapt his primary model for the creation of the Tereus character. Curley also dedicates a whole monograph (93), a re-elaboration of his Ph. D. thesis, supervised by Stephen Hinds (*Metatheater: Heroines and Ephebes in Ovid’s Metamorphoses*, Univ. of Washington 1999), to analysing the different types of presence of tragedy and the tragic

in Ovid, mainly in *met.* and *Heroides*. For our purpose, the final part of chapter 3, on the identification of key aspects of genre, and chapters 4, 5 and 6, dealing with space and time, the tragic monologues, and tragic heroes and heroines, are especially interesting.

The interaction between tragedy and erotic elegy in the (epic) episode of Procne, Tereus and Philomela is taken into consideration in Florence Klein's study (94). The presence of tragedies like *Oedipus rex* and *Bacchae*, but also of mythographic sources in Ovid's 'theban cycle' (Books 3-4) are addressed, together with other elements, in the work by Fabre-Serris (80). Marilyn Pechillo's article (18) is focused on the epyllion of Aeacus and Cephalus (7.490-8.5), arguing that Ovid's deliberate juxtaposition of epic and didactic poetry, on the one hand, with the elegiac and tragic genres, on the other, suggests "that for him elegy and tragedy outweigh epic and didactic poetry, although Augustus' poetic program emphasized the latter genres" (35). Helmut Seng (74) considers the formal tragic elements (five-act structure, development of the action over the course of one day...) of the Ovidian episode of Phaethon, which nevertheless "ist episch erzählt und in ein größeres Epos integriert" (178). In fact, Seng shows more interest in Ovid's skill in combining very distinct literary models to redevelop his character in order to create, in the end, an encyclopedic and universal collective poem.

Marianna Patti (57) addresses Alcyone's dream (11.650-80) and the debt which Ovid incurs in it regarding the 'objective' dream, characteristic of the epic genre (Homer, but also Ennius), as well as the Hellenistic erotic dream, and she points to new elegiac elements in the characterization of Ceyx and Alcyone. Joaquim Brasil Fontes (82) also focuses on this same episode, examining how Ovid combines both the elegiac and epic registers here. Federica Rosiello (58) compares the poet's treatment of the myth of Cephalus and Procris in *ars* (3.687-746) and in *met.* (7.661-865), pointing out the greater complexity of the latter, in which Ovid moreover must implement "l'inserimento di una situazione elegiaca tutta al femminile in un contesto epico ancora al maschile" (141), and concludes that in his transfer between elegiac and epic poetry Ovid "cerca di azzerare le distanze al punto che diviene arduo stabilire i confini tra i due generi" (146). Sylvie Laigneau-Fontaine's work (79) is dedicated to the same Cephalus and Procris episode: she examines the theatricality in Ovid's epic treatment, which owes much to tragedy, but also, "de façon sans doute plus surprenante, mais assez indéniable" (157), to comedy. In the same collective volume, Hélène Vial (80) defends "l'hypothèse qu'à travers l'alliance fugace qui s'opère parfois entre ces deux réalités poétiques de nature différente que sont le monde du théâtre et l'usage des figures, c'est l'hybridité fondamentale et revendiquée

de l'œuvre ovidienne" (249). To this point she analyses the text of all Ovid's work, including *met.* (254-8). Alex Hardie (83, 44-7) considers, among other topics, the connections of the character of "Canens' interplay of grief and song" (14.428-9) with the origins of Roman elegy and specifically with the Gallan elegiac tradition. Laure Chappuis Sandoz (66) analyses the 13 passages in *met.* in which Ovid uses the term *puella*, typical of elegy, as opposed to *virgo*, more typical of epic, and reaches the conclusion that these passages are always strongly erotic episodes, but that they also imply sexual behaviour which is outside accepted social norms. Therefore the intrusion of this vocabulary, alien to the epic genre, serves to show up the deviation from love which is referenced, while also contributing to the "variabilité générique" which characterises the poem (322). Chiara Battistella (86) notes in Polyphemus' words "*altera iam rapuit*" (13.774) a hint to the elegiac amatory code, since "*altera* definisce un'opposizione tra non più di due elementi ed è proprio su questa intenzionale 'alterità' che è costruito il codice della poesia amatoria" (§ 4).

Barbara Boyd (89) professes to see in Homer's *Telemacheia* the model of Ovid's 'poetic journey' towards the epic genre, as this is viewed in the poem's first verse (cf. *in nova fert animus* and Hom. *Od.* 1.347 ὄππῃ οἱ νόος ὄρνυται). Gottfried Mader (95) notes in Ovid's *Centauromachy* (12.210-535), as narrated by Nestor, "a transition from Augustan restraint to the explosion of *Schmerz und Tod* in Seneca and Lucan" (87), as well as an ironic criticism of the traditional epic *virtus* and a way of dismantling and parodying the ideology of his epic pretext using the rhetoric of violent mutilation and disfigurement, with an alternation between epic and bucolic-elegiac registers: "This is high epic replaying itself as black comedy" (113).

The study by Godo Lieberg (1) is focused on the episode of Philemon and Baucis (8.611-724), analysing the presence of elements of other genres, especially the popular tale and the Hellenistic idyll. The presence of the popular tale in the Midas episode (11.180-93) is also the topic of Jean Marc Frécaut (9). Alessandra Romeo (96) examines the transmitted text of a *controversia* pronounced by the young Ovid (*Sen. contr.* 2.2), regarding the extreme fidelity of two spouses, and compares it with similar episodes in *met.* (Philemon and Baucis, Pyramus and Thisbe, Orpheus and Eurydice, Ceyx and Alcyone), as well as other episodes where a character involuntarily causes the death of a loved one, and those which consider different types of love (marital, filial, familiar...). Then she analyses more *in extenso* such a highly oratorical piece from *met.* as the

V.3 General Aspects of the *Metamorphoses*: Literary Genres

Armorum iudicium (13.1-398). Finally, she considers examples of ethopoeia and prosopopoeia, as well as monologues.

Michael von Albrecht (88) studies the relationship between Ovid (in general) and the novel. In the second part of his paper he considers Ovid's potential use of previous novels, but he concludes that (18) "the subject must be left open to discussion", and that "the importance of Callimachus to Petronius and Ovid as well as the position of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in the context of "historical novels" and "science fiction" ought to be illuminated by further research".