Transactions of the American Philological Association 125 (1995) 99–111

The Silence of Cephalus: Text and Narrative Technique in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 7.685ff.*

R. J. Tarrant
Harvard University

Flentibus haec lacrimans heros memorabat (*Met.* 7.863). Thus, with both teller and audience in tears, ends the episode of Cephalus and Procris, the last of Book 7 of the *Metamorphoses*. The story concludes as it began, since Cephalus opened his narrative *lacrimis . . . obortis* (7.689). The mournful frame appears well suited to what has been described as "a tale of high pathos and tragic misunderstanding" (Segal 175).

The facts as related by Cephalus are as follows. He had been blissfully happy in his marriage to Procris for two months when he was seen and carried off against his will by the dawn-goddess Aurora. While with her he harped so constantly on his love for Procris that Aurora eventually sent him back, avenging herself for the slight by planting suspicions in him that Procris might have been unfaithful in his absence. With Aurora's help Cephalus disguised himself and attempted to seduce Procris. After many futile approaches he offered everything he had in return for one night with her, which caused her to hesitate in her reply: he then revealed himself and denounced her for faithlessness. In shame and anger Procris left him and became a follower of Diana; Cephalus was overcome with longing, made an abject confession, and begged for pardon. The two were then reconciled, and to seal their renewed union Procris gave Cephalus a preternaturally swift hunting-dog she had received from Diana and also a magical spear that never failed to hit its target. The story then continues with the parallel suspicion of Cephalus by Procris—he is overheard murmuring endearments to "Aura," according to him a cooling breeze but interpreted as the name of a mistress by Procris—which results in the accidental death of Procris at Cephalus' hands, using the very spear she had

* Fragmentary versions of the arguments developed here have appeared in papers given over several years in Toronto, Cambridge, Eng., New Haven, and Los Angeles; I am grateful to audiences on each of those occasions for much helpful comment. I wish to thank Sander Goldberg in particular for his encouragement and understanding.

given him. A moving story, it would seem, of devoted but singularly unfortunate love.

Two aspects of Ovid's handling of this material are especially noteworthy. The first is that Cephalus himself is the internal narrator, relating events that had taken place many years previously. His involvement in the story, and in particular the remorse he feels as he reflects on his own part in it, gives the episode its distinctive emotional coloring.[1] Cephalus' story is also remarkable in that it differs in some important details from the version of the Cephalus-Procris myth preserved in later mythographic sources ("Hyginus" 189 and Antoninus Liberalis *Met. Syn.* 41), which probably derives from Nicander and was therefore known to Ovid and his readers (for details and discussion, cf. Otis 410-13). The most significant difference concerns the reconciliation of Cephalus and Procris. In Ovid, Cephalus seeks out his estranged wife, confesses to having wronged her, and obtains her forgiveness. In the Nicandrian account, Procris avenges herself for her deception by Cephalus by a precisely parallel deceit: she disguises herself as a young man and offers Cephalus the gifted dog and the magical spear in return for allowing himself to be sexually used by her.[2] Only after he has agreed does she reveal her true identity and return to Cephalus as his wife.[3]

It seems clear that Ovid's choice of Cephalus as narrator and this change of story at a crucial point are linked. The straightforward inference (and the one drawn by many critics in this century) is that Ovid has transformed his source material by replacing the reverse deception with Cephalus' voluntary confession, thereby deepening and elevating the emotional level of the episode and throwing greater emphasis on the narrator-protagonist's feelings of love and guilt.[4]

This conclusion—which I believe to be essentially correct—could be readily accepted if Ovid's (or, more precisely, Cephalus') account contained no reference to the other version of events. At two points, however, the text

[1] Expressions of regret or amazement at his folly punctuate the first half of Cephalus' narrative: cf., e.g., 699, 718f., 729, 732f., 737-39, 741 (text uncertain), 744.

[2] Critics often refer to a homosexual "seduction" of Cephalus by the disguised Procris, but the language of "Hyginus'" summary (which is here atypically vivid in its use of direct speech) has a blunter tone: 189.7 (quoting Procris) *'sed si utique' ait 'perstas id* [i.e., the spear and dog] *possidere, da mihi id quod pueri solent dare.'*

[3] The other divergence of some note is that the role of Diana in Ovid (as Procris' protector when she leaves Cephalus and as the source of the magic spear and dog) was played in Nicander by the less virginal Minos.

[4] Cf., e.g., Pöschl, whose treatment has influenced much subsequent criticism; a similar view was expressed earlier by Rohde, though he attributed Ovid's departure from the earlier version to generic motives (specifically a sense of "epic" decorum).

alludes more or less explicitly to that version. The first passage in question comes at the beginning of the episode, when Cephalus is invited by Aeacus' son Phocus to explain the origin of the unusual-looking spear he carries (685f.). Although the text of the following line (687) is obviously disturbed in the manuscripts (for details see below, 102-3), its sense is clear: Cephalus responds to Phocus' inquiry, but "he remains silent about the price at which he obtained it" (*qua tulerit mercede silet,* 688), a silence that is somehow connected to his sense of shame (*pudor*). Despite the textual uncertainty it seems obvious that the reference is to the version of events found in the mythographers, and that the "price" in question is Cephalus' sexual humiliation by the disguised Procris. While *merces* can be used in a figurative sense to mean "cost, effort, pain" (cf. Virg. *G.* 2.62 [*arbores*] *multa mercede domandae*, Liv. 8.39.11 *expiandum id bellum magna mercede*), that sense can hardly be present here: first, because Cephalus' entire narrative dwells on the "cost" in the extended sense of his obtaining the spear, and it would thus be absurd to say that he is silent on this point, and second, because his silence is explicitly linked to his *pudor*, which implies that the *merces* in question is particularly shameful to him.

On this reading of the lines (and no other seems possible), the version of the story involving the deception of Cephalus remains very much present in Ovid's account: Cephalus as narrator may decline to reveal it, but his silence and its motive are explicitly noted in the text. Furthermore, the overt reference at 687f. makes it impossible not to see another allusion to the Nicandrian version later in Cephalus' narrative (747ff.): following his plea for forgiveness, he describes Procris as "having avenged the injury to her modesty" before she returns to him (*laesum prius ulta pudorem*, 751). As we shall see (below, 106), the phrase in isolation can be interpreted in more than one way, but when combined with 687f. it must evoke memories of Procris' successful humbling of her husband.

Previous discussions have not ignored the difficulties raised by these lines, but a fully satisfactory solution to them has yet to be offered. Pöschl (Pöschl 342 n. 1; see below, 105) wished to excise the reference in 687f. and considered interpolation a possibility in 751 as well; he provided no detailed case and his proposal has not found support, though I shall suggest that his instincts as regards 687f. were sound. Segal (176) argued that Ovid had indeed removed the homosexual deception from his version of the story, and that the allusions in 687f. and 751 would indicate to a sophisticated reader that the traditional myth had been deliberately transformed. This conclusion seems to me correct, but we need a way of accounting for the apparently contrary meaning of the text, of 687f. in particular.

Other critics have proceeded on the assumption that the story as preserved by the mythographers is also true for Ovid's Cephalus, and have tried to account for its near-suppression. Wilamowitz laconically declared that Cephalus' presence as narrator prevented Ovid from relating the most embarrassing details,[5] but it will become evident that Ovid is perfectly capable of supplying information omitted by an internal narrator (below, 104-5). Dismissing Pöschl's doubts of the authenticity of the text, Otis firmly asserted that "the double seduction was real enough, but Cephalus' love was sufficient to ignore (or almost ignore) it."[6] This chivalrous thought overlooks the fact that Cephalus does not simply glide over the embarrassing incident reported by the mythographers, but presents an account that denies and excludes it, and in a way that serves his own interest at least as much as his wife's. If Cephalus' narrative is to be seen as false and self-serving on this point, what reason is there to believe other parts of his story (e.g., the nature of his relations with Aurora and "aura") where he might have similar reasons to suppress incriminating details?[7]

Most previous treatments have glanced at the textual problems of 687f. as secondary to the larger question of Ovid's treatment of the story. My aim is to focus attention on the text and to argue on both verbal and narratological grounds that the critical passage 687f. is so problematic as to raise strong doubts of its genuineness. On the other hand, the same considerations can be used to show that the text of 751 is sound.

To begin with the text of 687ff.:[8]

685 tum uero iuuenis Nereius omnia quaerit,
cur sit et unde datum, quis tanti muneris auctor;
687a quae petit ille refert et cetera; nota pudori/pudore,
687b quae patitur pudor, ille refert et cetera narrat;

[5] Wilamowitz 425 n. 2: "das ärgste muss Ovid verschweigen, weil bei ihm Kephalos selbst erzählt, aber er deutet seine Kentnisse an (687.749)."

[6] Otis 412. In his note on 7.687, W. S. Anderson takes a similar view: "As to why Procris gave him the spear, Cephalus glides over the situation with the affectionate suggestion that she wished to cement their reconciliation." In his note on 7.751, however, Anderson suggests that "Ovid probably alludes decorously to the details we meet in Hyginus and Liberalis. . . . However, Ovid rejects that version and makes the reconciliation one motivated by penitence and love, not by greed."

[7] This uncertainty was taken to its logical extreme by Peter Green in a provocative reading of Cephalus' narrative that presents both husband and wife in the most squalid light possible; an effective rebuttal was offered by Fontenrose.

[8] For this and other passages examined in detail, I have constructed my own text and apparatus; for manuscript identifications see Tarrant 1983.

687c quae petit ille refert; ceterum narrare pudori
688 qua tulerit mercede silet tactusque dolore
coniugis amissae lacrimis ita fatur obortis eqs.

687a $M^{2c}N^{3v}U$ RWZ EFLP
687b N^{1} e^{v} codd. recc.
687c M^{1}

This somewhat cumbersome way of setting out the variants is meant to highlight one of the most extraordinary aspects of the passage: the major manuscripts offer three versions of line 687, a division essentially without parallel in the text of the poem. (The second half of 13.333 is transmitted in an even larger number of versions, but the entire line is omitted by the first hand in almost all the oldest manuscripts.)

In itself such disagreement is not a basis for doubting the authenticity of some form of the line in question, but in this case none of the transmitted variants yields credible Ovidian Latin. In the lines designated 687a and 687b, *et cetera* is either flatly tautologous after *quae petit* or *quae patitur pudor* or, if it describes a response distinct from them, it leaves no room for any omission. (That is, if Cephalus relates what he has been asked—or what modesty allows—"and the rest," what remains for him to suppress?) A similar logical inconsistency attaches to any form of the lines involving the phrase *quae petit ille refert*: since Cephalus' interlocutor has explicitly asked how and why he obtained the wondrous spear (*cur sit et unde datum*), a reply that omits "the price at which he acquired it" cannot be introduced with the unqualified "he relates what the other is seeking." Furthermore, all the transmitted versions of 687 require *ille* to denote Cephalus, but a glance at the preceding context shows that *ille* should refer to one of his companions (rightly emphasized by Bömer 1976 *ad loc.*). At lines 665-67 Cephalus, accompanied by the two sons of Pallas, calls on King Aeacus but finds him still asleep; the three are met and entertained by his son Phocus. It is Phocus who notices the spear Cephalus is carrying and asks what wood it is made from (672-80); one of Pallas' sons (*Actaeis e fratribus alter*, 681) answers him by describing the spear's magical properties, which prompts further questions from Phocus in 685f. (see above). In 687, therefore, an unqualified *ille* would most naturally name the son of Pallas who spoke previously rather than Cephalus, who has not taken any part in the conversation to this point. (The detail reveals Ovid's careful shaping of the scene: as soon becomes apparent, Cephalus is reluctant to speak about the spear because of the painful memories it evokes for him, while his younger

companion regards the spear simply as a marvelous curiosity and so is eager to point out its capabilities.)[9]

No transmitted form of 687 is therefore believably original. Many attempts have been made to elicit acceptable sense from one or another of the transmitted versions by conjecture, but none has been fully persuasive.[10] The best are perhaps Heinsius' *quae petit, ille refert, sed quae narrare pudori est, / qua tulerit mercede, silet* ("he relates what the other seeks, but about what it shames him to tell, the price at which he obtained it, he is silent") and Burman's *quae patitur pudor ille refert, et cetera narrans, / qua tulerit mercede silet* ("he relates what shame permits and, while telling the rest, he is silent about the price at which he obtained it"). Both avoid some, though not all, of the problems noted above, and while neither is wholly satisfactory, they offer a basis on which the substance, as opposed to the wording, of the transmitted text can be further examined.[11]

The most remarkable aspect of the lines in question is that they overtly allude to a version of events that the reader is expected to have in mind when listening to Cephalus' story, but that is nowhere related in Ovid's own text. I know of no parallel for such a procedure, while several examples show that Ovid's usual practice when dealing with analogous situations is quite different. The closest parallel in the *Metamorphoses* for Cephalus' behavior as described in lines 687f. comes in Book 11, when Peleus has been exiled from his homeland for the murder of his brother and seeks asylum with Ceyx in Trachis. When received by the king he identifies himself and gives his parentage, but conceals the true reason for his flight (278-81): *copia cum facta est adeundi tecta tyranni, / . . . qui sit / quoque satus memorat, tantum sua crimina celat / mentiturque fugae causam.*[12] Peleus' omission causes no difficulty for the

[9] Other verbal objections apply to one or another of the manuscript variants, e.g., in 687a the awkwardness of *nota pudori* (presumably "things known to his sense of shame"?), and the appearance in 687c of *ceterum*, a word Ovid is not otherwise known to have used.

[10] Magnus's apparatus contains a generously full record of proposed emendations, of which only the most noteworthy are mentioned here.

[11] Merkel's *quae petit ille refert; sed enim narrare pudori est / qua tulerit mercede; silet* has enjoyed some popularity (it was adopted by Magnus and by F. J. Miller in the Loeb edition), but it does not produce a coherent sequence of actions: *quae petit ille refert* shows Cephalus launched on his narrative, while the phrase beginning *sed enim* is meant to describe his initial reluctance to proceed. (For the latter idea, and the possible connection of *silet* with what follows, see below, 109-10.)

[12] This passage throws into relief another oddity of the text at 7.687f.: expressions like *quae petit ille refert* or *qui sit quoque satus memorat* are appropriate as summary replacements for a directly quoted speech but are not found as lead-ins to an extended narrative. The most nearly similar passage I know is *Met.* 5.576, where the introduction to Arethusa's story of her

reader since the background has been sketched in only a few lines before: *fraterno sanguine sontem / expulsumque domo patria Trachinia tellus / accipit* (268-70). Similarly, when Ovid's Lucretia proves unable for shame to relate the details of her rape by Tarquin (*F.* 2.827f. *quaeque potest, narrat. restabant ultima: fleuit, / et matronales erubuere genae*), the gap created by her tears can be filled in from Ovid's preceding narrative (793-812). Finally, the verbal form of the allusion to Cephalus' silence (*qua tulerit mercede silet*) has a noteworthy parallel in 12.471ff., a taunt directed at the warrior Caeneus, who began life as a woman and was changed into a man following her rape by Neptune: *'nec te natalis origo / commonuit, mentemque subit quo praemia facto, / quaque uiri falsam speciem mercede pararis?'* The incident referred to was narrated in full earlier in the same book, at 12.189-209.

The narrative technique of 687f. is thus as anomalous for Ovid as is the language of the transmitted text. Before drawing any conclusions, it will be useful to look more closely at the other place in Cephalus' story where a reference to his seduction by the disguised Procris has been seen. At lines 747ff. Cephalus narrates his reconciliation with Procris:

'Tum mihi deserto uiolentior ignis ad ossa
peruenit; orabam ueniam et peccasse fatebar
et potuisse datis simili succumbere culpae
me quoque muneribus, si munera tanta darentur.
haec mihi confesso, laesum prius ulta pudorem,
redditur et dulces concorditer exigit annos.
dat mihi praeterea, tamquam se parua dedisset
dona, canem munus, quem cum sua traderet illi
Cynthia, "currendo superabit" dixerat "omnes."
dat simul et iaculum, manibus quod (cernis) habemus.'

751 haec M RWZ L : hoc cett. 753 se M^1 RWZ^{2c} FLP : si M^2NUZ^1 E
755 superabit] -uit M^2 (N^1?) RS : -bat Urb 756 manibus quod] quod nos ut M RWZ

The text of these lines appears free of serious problems; the manuscript variants listed above relate only to individual words or phrases, and choices made between them do not affect the overall sense. Pöschl's suggestion (made without supporting argument) that interpolation may have been at work here has nothing to support it. Complexities do arise over the interpretation of the

attempted rape by Alpheus ends with the words *fluminis Elei ueteres narrauit amores*; here the content of the story is digested into something resembling a title (for which compare also 3.139f., introducing the story of Actaeon, *alienaque cornua fronti / addita uosque, canes, satiatae sanguine erili*). At 13.404ff. (where Hecuba's metamorphosis is summarized before the narrative proper begins) there is reason to doubt the authenticity of 404-407.

passage, in particular of the words *laesum prius ulta pudorem* in 751. Readers aware of the Nicandrian story can hardly avoid seeing an allusion to it here, especially since Cephalus has just spoken of a reversal of situation in the previous two lines. But it is also possible, as several critics have seen, to take these words in a purely "innocent" sense, as referring to the admission of fault and plea for forgiveness that Procris' withdrawal has forced Cephalus to make: "when I had made this admission, and she had (thereby) avenged the injury to her modesty" (so, e.g., Rohde 45 and Herter 33). Indeed *only* this reading of the phrase coheres with the version of events Cephalus is presenting, in which the notion of his giving in to a like temptation is stated in a contrary-to-fact form and the gifts of spear and dog are offered only after the couple have been reconciled. As a result, the reader who recognizes the allusion to the Nicandrian story must decide whether it is a "Freudian slip" on Cephalus' part, through which the truth that he has so carefully tried to efface finds covert expression in his own words, or whether it is Ovid's way of underscoring the radical transformation he has produced in his inherited material.

Arguments based on authorial practice cannot definitively settle a question of this sort, but it is surely relevant that in several other episodes of the *Metamorphoses* Ovid calls attention to a detail or an entire version of a story that he has rejected by incorporating it in his own narrative.[13] One way in which this is done is by simple negation. Thus Ovid's Eurydice, condemned a second time to the Underworld by Orpheus' rash backward glance, "made no complaint about her husband's action (for of what could she have complained, except of having been loved?)" (10.60f. *iamque iterum moriens non est de coniuge quidquam / questa suo [quid enim nisi se quereretur amatam?]*). The reaction here overtly excluded is precisely that of Virgil's Eurydice in *G.* 4.494-98, who complains bitterly at some length and implicitly accuses Orpheus of *furor*. Similarly, Ovid's Pygmalion, when praying to Venus, did not dare to ask that his ivory statue itself might become his wife and so prayed that his wife might be "like the ivory maiden" (10.275f. *'sit coniunx, opto [non ausus 'eburnea uirgo' / dicere Pygmalion] 'similis mea' dixit 'eburnae'*). In Ovid's likely source, the *Kypriaka* of Philostephanus, the Pygmalion-character (a ruler of Cyprus) did attempt sexual relations with a statue, a cult-statue of Venus.[14] The other way in which Ovid's narrative can point to a variant of itself that has not been adopted is by a hypothetical expression, a reference to what might happen or have happened under other circumstances. Thus Byblis

[13] The material briefly presented here forms part of a larger discussion of "untold stories" in the *Metamorphoses* that I hope will appear shortly in another place.

[14] Cf. the introductory note in Bömer 1980: 94.

seized by passion for her brother Caunus, as she meets her scruples with increasingly sophistic argument, finally induces herself to yield by imagining their roles reversed: "but if he had first been taken with love for me, perhaps I might feel able to indulge his mad passion. And so, since I would not have rejected him as a suitor, let me seek him myself!" (9.511-14 *'si tamen ipse mei captus prior esset amore, / forsitan illius possem indulgere furori. / ergo ego quem fueram non reiectura petentem / ipsa petam!'*).[15] In at least one of Ovid's sources, Nicaenetus as reported by Parthenius in the *Erotika Pathemata*, the positions of the siblings were indeed reversed and Caunus was the pursuer of the reluctant Byblis (cf. the introductory note in Bömer 1977: 411-12).

These examples (the last in particular) show that in the passage under discusssion it would be entirely in Ovid's manner to allude to the homosexual seduction of Cephalus just at the point where that form of the story is most decisively rejected. It is also worth noting that in each of the passages mentioned the variant not followed is brought to the alert reader's attention in a way that casts light on the *ethos* of the character being depicted: the resignation of Eurydice, the piety and self-restraint of Pygmalion, the ingenious self-deception of Byblis. In Cephalus' case the corresponding trait would be belated self-awareness; his admission that "he could have fallen had he been tempted as Procris was" would mark the discovery of his own fallibility and the unjustness of his suspicions of Procris.[16] Such a reading seems fully consistent with the character of the episode as a whole, in which feelings and perceptions (often mistaken) count for more than overt actions. In this light even the telltale *ulta* of 751 becomes emotionally apt, since for this Cephalus the remorse caused by his own actions is as bitter a punishment as was a humiliating deception for his Nicandrian avatar.

Close inspection of lines 747ff. shows their language and narrative technique to be fully Ovidian and makes the un-Ovidian qualities of 687f. yet more obvious: in particular the way in which those lines explicitly refer to a form of the story not related can now be seen as totally alien to Ovid's manner. There is thus a strong case for suspecting interpolation in the earlier passage; its precise extent and effects may not be discoverable, but some tentative proposals can be made.

A basis for interpolation is suggested by the overt reference to what Cephalus does not reveal: a well-informed reader who knew of the reverse

[15] In 513 the manuscripts divide between *quem* and *quae*, and some editors place a question-mark after *petam* in 514.

[16] The importance of retrospective insight in Cephalus' narrative is well treated by Segal 178-83.

deception (either from some form of "Hyginus" or another mythographical source) may have noted its absence from Cephalus' story, and this annotation—perhaps not originally meant for insertion in the text—could have been subsequently worked into a rough approximation of poetic form.[17] (This putative process of recasting could help to account for the unusual variety of manuscript readings in 687.) There may be an exact parallel for this type of interpolation in Ovid's account of the Apollo-Daphne story, since one view of the disputed lines 1.544ff. holds that Daphne's appeal to Tellus has been interpolated on the basis of a mythological variant (Daphne as daughter of Tellus) that Ovid chose to disregard.[18] That passage, however, requires much fuller discussion than can be offered here, since it needs to be considered in connection with several other places in the *Metamorphoses* where evidence of Ovidian "double recension" has been seen.

Whatever the motive for interpolation in 7.687f., the process must have begun at a fairly early stage in the transmission to have left its results (albeit in somewhat differing forms) in all extant manuscripts. It is also clear that removing the interpolated matter will require more than a straightforward excision, since neither 687 nor 687-88 can be simply removed without creating a break in the sense. The neatest operation so far proposed is by Pöschl (342 n. 1), who wished to read:

> quae patitur pudor, ille refert [et cetera narrat,
> qua tulerit mercede, silet] tactusque dolore eqs.

This procedure does not deal with some of the verbal shortcomings of the paradosis (e.g., *ille* referring to Cephalus); more fundamentally, it leaves intact the most objectionable feature of the transmitted text, the unexplained reference to an omission on Cephalus' part (if he relates *quae patitur pudor*, he must leave out what *pudor* does not allow).[19] With a slightly greater change to the transmitted text, Bentley produced a far more promising result:

> quae petit ille, refert <Cephalus> [et cetera; nota pudore,
> qua tulerit mercede, silet] tactusque dolore eqs.

Even this incisive recasting, however, does not remove all doubts. The shift of emotional gears between the brisk *quae petit ille, refert Cephalus* and the grief-

[17] Some instances of this type of learned interpolation are collected in Tarrant 1987: 290-94.

[18] Cf. Murgia for a contrasting view of this passage.

[19] Curiously, Pöschl strongly believed that Ovid meant to suppress the reverse seduction as unsuited to the tone of his story.

laden *tactus dolore / coniugis amissae* is jarring, and *quae petit ille refert*, though much improved by the naming of Cephalus, still looks too much like a substitute for a speech to sit comfortably in the introduction to a speech. (To make the latter point more explicitly: *referre* can lead directly into a quoted speech, as in the phrases *ille refert* [2.35, 11.352] or *talia uerba refert* [14.28], and it can also describe the content of a statement that is not quoted, as in 7.710 *primaque deserti referebam foedera lecti*, 9.394 *dumque refert Iole factum mirabile*; in this context, however, the two functions seem ineptly conflated.[20])

Solutions that combine some version of the first part of 687 with the last part of 688 run up against the problem that no part of 687, in any version, seems viable. A more complicated hypothesis needs to be considered, namely, that interpolation is responsible for 687 as a whole and for part of the extant 688, and that some part of the original text of 688 has been lost.[21] If the reference to Cephalus omitting part of his story is, as I have argued, non-Ovidian, then at least the words *qua tulerit mercede* must form part of the interpolated matter, since they are integral to that reference. In fact only the final words of 688 (*tactusque dolore*) are completely free of suspicion, and both Bentley and Pöschl regarded *silet* as part of the interpolation, perhaps because they thought it syntactically awkward for *silere* to be followed by an object-clause.[22] But it is worth asking whether Cephalus' silence is better understood not as applying to his actual story, but as describing his first response to the request that he tell it.

Several times in Ovid characters react initially with silence to a distressing inquiry or experience: cf., for example, *F.* 2.819f. (Lucretia on being asked the reason for her mournful appearance) *illa diu reticet pudibundaque celat amictu / ora*, *Met.* 4.681f. (the chained Andromeda accosted by Perseus) *primo silet illa nec audet / appellare uirum*, 7.307 (Medea feigning hesitation when asked by Pelias' daughters to rejuvenate their father) *ille breui spatio silet et dubitare uidetur*, 9.472f. (Byblis after dreaming of making love with

[20] In 13.738f. *referre* apparently forms part of a speech-introduction without actually introducing a speech: *quam, dum pectendos praebet Galatea capillos, / talibus adloquitur referens suspiria dictis*; but the variant *repetens* has a good chance of being correct (cf. 2.125), and even if *referens* is the true reading, the combination with *suspiria* separates it from the speech-introduction formula. See also above, n. 12.

[21] This situation can arguably be paralleled at 13.332f.; see the brief discussion in Tarrant 1987: 295-96.

[22] See Pöschl 342 n. 1 (who mentions earlier doubts as to the Latinity of the syntax). It may not be coincidental that the closest analogy for the construction also involves the words *merces* and *ferre* in conjunction: Hor. *C.* 4.8.20-22 *neque, / si chartae sileant quod bene feceris, / mercedem tuleris.*

her brother) *silet illa diu repetitque quietis / ipsa suae speciem dubiaque ita mente profatur*, 10.359 (Myrrha at her father's question *cuius uelit esse mariti*) *illa silet primo*.[23] It would thus be highly appropriate for Cephalus, confronted with an innocent query that brings back the most bitter memories, to respond at first with silence.[24] Furthermore, the motif of a naive question that provokes painful recollections has appeared twice in the previous 200 lines (cf. 478-81 [Aeacus to Minos], 515-17 [Cephalus himself to Aeacus]); hence there would be additional point in highlighting Cephalus' initial silence.

These considerations suggest that the sense of the passage in its original form might be recovered as follows:

> at silet ipse diu Cephalus tactusque dolore
> coniugis amissae lacrimis ita fatur obortis

If the textual disturbance in this passage is as deep as I have suggested, any effort at reconstruction can only be offered *exempli gratia*, and in the knowledge that other possibilities remain open.[25] The most tangible results of this discussion have been to demonstrate that any reference to an omission in Cephalus' story is not likely to be genuine, and, as a result, to suggest that Ovid did omit the incident of Cephalus' deception by Procris from his version of the myth, and alluded to it only in such a way as to underline the difference between the earlier form of the story and the one he had chosen to present.

[23] For a similar use of initial silence to heighten the drama of a moment cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.12.2 (Tiberius reacting to Asinius Gallus' insolent question *'interrogo . . . quam partem rei publicae mandari tibi uelis'*) *perculsus improuisa interrogatione paulum reticuit; dein collecto animo respondit eqs.*

[24] A similar reading of Cephalus' behavior was proposed by Herter 33 n. 1, though without argument: "wie immer die Worte [i.e., the text of 687f.] herzustellen sein mögen, sie könnten doch auch besagen, dass Kephalos aus Scham eine Zeitlang schwieg, ehe er sich, vom Schmerz um die verlorene Gattin ergriffen, zum Reden entschloss." It also appears to underlie Merkel's emended version of 687, on which see above, n. 11.

[25] For example, a more extensive loss of text could be postulated.

Works Cited

Anderson, William S. 1972. *Ovid's* Metamorphoses: *Books VI-X*. Norman, Okla.
Bömer, Franz. 1976. *Ovid* Metamorphosen. *Buch VI-VII*. Heidelberg.
_____. 1977 *Ovid* Metamorphosen. *Buch VIII-IX*. Heidelberg.
_____. 1980 *Ovid* Metamorphosen. *Buch X-XI*. Heidelberg.
Fontenrose, Joseph. 1979-80. "Ovid's Procris." *CJ* 75: 289-94.
Green, Peter. 1979-80. "The Innocence of Procris." *CJ* 75: 15-24.
Herter, Hans. 1933. Rev. of A. Rohde, *De Ovidi arte epica capita duo*. *Gnomon* 9: 30-34.
Magnus, Hugo. 1914. *P. Ovidi Nasonis* Metamorphoseon *Libri XV*. Berlin.
Miller, F. J. 1916. *Ovid*. Metamorphoses. London.
Murgia, C. E. 1984. "Ovid *Met.* 1.544-547 and the Theory of Double Recension." *CA* 3: 207-35.
Otis, Brooks. 1970. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*^{2}. Cambridge.
Pöschl, Viktor. 1959. "Kephalos und Prokris in Ovids Metamorphosen." *Hermes* 87: 328-42.
Rohde, Alfred. 1929. *De Ovidi arte epica capita duo*. Berlin.
Segal, Charles. 1978. "Ovid's Cephalus and Procris: Myth and Tragedy." *GB* 7: 175-205.
Tarrant, R. J. 1983. "Ovid, *Metamorphoses*." In Reynolds, L. D., ed. *Texts and Transmission*. Oxford. 276-82.
_____. 1987. "Toward a Typology of Interpolation in Latin Poetry." *TAPA* 117: 281-98.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. 1883. "Phaethon." *Hermes* 18: 396-434.