

Daedalus' myth and its occurrences in Ovid: A three-term comparison and some considerations on *Ars 2*, 21-98

Simona Martorana*

Università di Trento

Resumen: One of the main features of Ovid's poetry is certainly the ability of the poet to modify the multiple versions of myths provided by the classical tradition, according to his own taste, to the literary genre in which a specific myth falls, to his needs and his aims. Sometimes this operation remains only a literary pattern, some others it reveals itself to be crucial for inquiring about the *modus scribendi* of the author and for literally entering his workshop. It is the case of the myth of Daedalus, which is told by Ovid both in *Ars amatoria* and in *Metamorphoses*, and is mentioned rapidly in two passages of *Tristia* as well. In the essay, it is run a comparative analysis of the two very similar passages of *Ars amatoria* and *Metamorphoses*, and their main differences are stressed. After that, these differences are put in comparison with the two passages of *Tristia*. Through this process, it will be possible to demonstrate that the passage of *Ars 2* reporting Daedalus' myth may have undergone a later reworking, i.e. was modified or changed somehow by the poet himself after he was banished from Rome.

Sommario: Una delle più significative caratteristiche della poesia di Ovidio è senza dubbio l'abilità del poeta nel modificare le molteplici versioni dei miti che la tradizione classica propone, ora in base al proprio gusto, ora al genere letterario in cui un determinato episodio mitico si presenta, ora in base alle sue esigenze e ai suoi scopi. Talvolta questo processo rimane soltanto un'operazione letteraria; in altri casi si può rivelare determinante per definire il *modus scribendi* dell'autore stesso ed entrare nel suo 'laboratorio'. Questo è quanto accade per il mito di Dedalo, che è narrato sia nell'*Ars amatoria* che nelle *Metamorfosi*, ed è menzionato rapidamente anche in due passi dei *Tristia*. In questo articolo sarà condotta un'analisi comparativa dei due passi dell'*Ars amatoria* e delle *Metamorfosi* che riportano il mito di Dedalo e ne saranno isolate le principali differenze. In seguito queste differenze saranno messe in relazione con i due passi dei *Tristia*. Attraverso quest'operazione sarà possibile dimostrare che *Ars 2*, 21-98 ha subito una rielaborazione d'autore successiva all'esilio del poeta a Tomi.

Keywords: Ovid, Daedalus, *Ars amatoria*, reworking, Ovid's exile.

Parole chiave: Ovidio, Dedalo, *Ars amatoria*, rielaborazione d'autore, esilio di Ovidio.

Recepción: 25/05/2016

Aceptación: 25/07/2016

* **Dirección para correspondencia:** Università di Trento, Dipartimento di Lettere e Filosofia, via Tommaso Gar, 14 - 38122 Trento. E-mail: simonamartorana92@gmail.com

Introduction: the myth of Daedalus and Ovid's Daedalus

The myth of Daedalus is rather spread in classical literature.¹ Concerning Ovid in particular, it is possible to identify two famous accounts of Daedalus' myth: the first one occurs in *Ars 2*, 21-98, the second one in *Met.* 8, 152-259. Chronologically the former should come before², at least in theory³. However, since it embeds many further meanings and has to be interpreted not only literally, but metaphorically as well and put in relation with its background and context, it needs a very careful and attentive analysis. For this reason, we will start to look at the account of *Metamorphoses* at first, even though it should come chronologically after the account of *Ars amatoria*. Only after that, it will be provided an analysis of the same myth in *Ars amatoria*, which will take into consideration the context in which Daedalus' episode falls and the relevant parallels with the passage of *Metamorphoses* previously analysed. In this way, the two different accounts will be compared and the main differences will be underlined⁴, so that it will be possible to stress clearly the main points of divergence of the two accounts (see below, p. 13 s.).

On one hand, this comparison will show how differently the poet works in relation to the context of the work in which he places the story he is telling, since the context of *Metamorphoses* is mainly a mythological one, while the context of *Ars amatoria* is a *quasi* didactic one, or at least involves some metaphorical issues that have to be analysed more deeply, as I mentioned above. On the other hand, this comparison will allow us to focus on the differences between the two passages. Actually, the episodes of *Ars amatoria* and *Metamorphoses* appear to be very similar, both in terms of themes, language patterns and style. Nevertheless, if we look at them carefully, we will be able to remark some slight differences between them.

¹ For more detailed accounts and for further surveys of the myth of Daedalus, see the relevant voice in the most important dictionaries or encyclopaedias of classical world: *Roscher*, 1884-1937, Bd. I, pp. 934-37; *RE*, 1893-1978, Bd. IV, s.v. 'Daidalos'; A. Ruiz de Elvira, 1975, vol. I, s.v. 'Dédalo'; *EV*, 1985, pp. 12-14; P. Grimal, 1996 [1951], s.v. 'Dédale'; *OCD*, 2012⁴ [1998], p. 409 f. For artistic references see *LIMC* 3.1, 1986, pp. 313-21. A detailed analysis of the occurrences of Daedalus' myth in art is provided by N. Rudd, 1988, pp. 247-53.

² The date of composition of *Ars amatoria* fluctuates between 1 B.C. and 1 C.E., while the *Metamorphoses* have been fixed between 2 and 8 C.E: see E. Fantham, 2004, p. 4.

³ Since I will try to demonstrate that the account of *Ars amatoria* may have undergone a later reworking, see below.

⁴ This comparison has raised a lot of debates among the scholars about the effective meaning of Daedalus' account: for an overview see F. Bömer, 1977, ad loc., p. 66 ff.

These slight differences have to be considered very attentively, since they reveal tones and accents that appear to be modified from a work to the other. In particular, the episode of *Ars amatoria* seems to be characterized by a more dramatic tone and by a more concerned attitude of the poet: yet, this difference in patterns can be justified with the difference in the genre of works we are dealing with, however, in my opinion, there is something more to be taken into consideration.

Thus, if we look at the whole poetic production of Ovid, we will find that there are other two passages in which the Daedalus' myth is mentioned, even though very shortly, that are *Trist.* 1, 1, 89-90 and 3, 4, 21-24. At the first sight they appear to be only insignificant quotes, especially if compared with the longer episode of both *Ars amatoria* and *Metamorphoses*. However, it is the whole context in which these quotes occur (*Trist.* 1, 1, 79-92; 3, 4, 15-32), that seems to be very interesting, since it reminds in a certain way, and because of some features I will show below, the differences in accents and tones between *Ars amatoria* and *Metamorphoses*. This means that we can take the two passages of *Tristia* as the 'third term' of our comparison and, thus, put it in relationship with the differences the episode of *Ars amatoria* shows to have in respect of *Metamorphoses*: these differences will be summed up in nine points, and these nine points will make us to perceive that probably something is intervened in the episode of *Ars amatoria*, something that may have modified it. I will try to demonstrate that what has intervened in the episode of *Ars amatoria*, slightly modifying it, was the poet himself, who while was in exile in Tomis, thus exactly when he was writing the *Tristia*⁵, changed some patterns of Daedalus' episode of *Ars amatoria* which made it appear more dramatic and suffering, for the reasons I will explain later on.

Thus, in the first and second sections of the essay I will simply provide an analysis of Daedalus' episode respectively of *Metamorphoses* and *Ars amatoria*; at the end of the second section as well I will stress the main differences the episode of *Ars amatoria* shows with *Metamorphoses*, listing them very clearly in nine points. After that, in the third section I will add to this comparison the two passages of *Tristia*, which will be reported, and I will put them in relation with the nine points listed previously. The result of this operation shows what *Ars amatoria* and *Tristia*

⁵ About the time span of composition of *Tristia* there is a great amount of uncertainty. Surely, they have been written after that the banishment of the poet had been decreed, but some scholars claim that at least the first book was not written in Tomis itself, but during the sea journey; see e.g. F. Della Corte, 1973, p. 202.

have in common that is something that, at the same time, *Ars amatoria* has not in common with *Metamorphoses*. This final result is what in my opinion Ovid has changed after his banishment in Tomis.

1. Daedalus-Icarus' episode in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Ov. *Met.* 8, 183-235)

In *Met.* 8, 183⁶ we find that Daedalus, after having been kept in Crete for several years, since he was *longumque perosus / exilium* and moved by the love of his birth place (*tactusque soli natalis amore*, 184), tried to escape through the sky, that certainly can not be hindered to him by the cruel Minos: *omnia possideat, non possidet aera Minos* (187). The allusion to the *longum...exilium* is a prolepsis to the episode of the murder of Perdix, told later (236 ff.); the double reference to the sky (*caelum*, 186; *aera*, 187) seems to anticipate the motif of the overcoming of human boundaries, represented by the two reigns of earth and sea⁷ belonging to the man, breaking abruptly into the reign of the sky⁸, belonging to Gods or superior beings.⁹ Thus, Daedalus started to build the fictional wings, practicing unknown arts and "renewing nature" (*ignotas animum dimittit in artes / naturamque novat*, 188-9): this dramatic opposition, *artes naturamque*, not only constitutes a brilliant way to put close two substantives constituting a clear antithesis, but also anticipates the tragic epilogue of the story. The adjective *ignotus* means "unknown" in the sense of "not attempted"¹⁰, and something could be never attempted since it is forbidden by the common thought, by an order or by a law, and usually turns out to be extremely dangerous.

⁶ For a detailed commentary of this passage see F. Bömer, 1977, cit., and E.J. Kenney, 2011, pp. 326-330. See also W.S. Anderson, 1972; M. Von Albrecht, 1977, pp. 63-9; M. Havelange, 1976-77, pp. 409-18; S. Viarre, 1988, pp. 441-8.

⁷ To say the truth, oftentimes in Latin literature the sea as well is seen as an unexplored territory for the human beings, and the first famous journey of Jason and the Argonauts through the sea is depicted usually as a violation of human limits and of natural borders; see, e.g. the account of the first navigation provided by the Chorus in Sen. *Med.* 301-79. For a wider dissertation about the theme of navigation and the role of the sea in Roman culture, see, e.g. E. de Saint-Denis, 1935.

⁸ For "die drei Regionen als klassischer poetischer Topos", see F. Bömer, 1977, ad loc.

⁹ M. Hoefmans, 1994, pp. 137-60, remarks in the myth of Daedalus the presence of both the theme of *hybris* and *homo faber*, and, at the same time, attributes some *topoi* to a Lucretian background. For this interpretation of surpassing human limits, related with the more common *Leitmotiv* of *hybris*, see the final and overall comment on the passage of *Metamorphoses* below, pp. 6-7.

¹⁰ This adjective is used widely in the *Metamorphoses*: see e.g. 1, 88; 1, 134; 3, 530; 13, 944. For the different meanings of the word, see *ThLL* VII, 1, 320, 26-325, 5 [Prinz].

Thus, the wings are joint with the wax (used presumably as glue), so that they imitate those ones of real birds (*vera imitetur aves*, 195): this new reference to art as imitation of nature is not intended only to stress a common literary *topos*, but especially to stress the ability of the artist, even though in his temerarious attempt to challenge nature.¹¹

In the following lines (195-200), *puer Icarus* makes his apparition and is said to play with the feathers, *ignarus sua se tractare pericla*: this additional comment of the poet makes us understand through a process of tragic irony (where the reader or the audience know exactly the tragic destiny will affect the character in the following developments of the story, while the character itself is completely unaware of that) that something bad is going to happen. Thus, after that the last hand has been given to the undertaking, *coepto* (this is significantly the same word with which Ovid addressed his own work in the very first lines of the poem¹²), Daedalus (*opifex*, 201) is able to hang on his wings, and before leaving, advises his son to fly neither too low, neither too high, neither *demissior*, nor *celsior* (204-8).

These suggestions recall abstractly the principle of *aurea mediocritas*, which, from Horace on¹³, had found his own space in the tradition of imperial literature.¹⁴ While Daedalus is giving these *praecepta volandi* to his son, he adjusts *ignotas... alas* to the shoulders of Icarus: the use of this adjective recalls the *ignotas... artes* of 188, stressing in this case that the wings are “unknown”, since they are unusual for human beings and, thus, potentially dangerous. Once again the motif of overcoming nature, even though is not mentioned openly, is suggested by all these allusions, to the point that even Daedalus feels a sort of negative omen before starting to fly (*genae maduere seniles / et patriae tremuere manus*, 210-1¹⁵).

So, the father gives kisses to his child, kisses which “were not to be repeated again”, *non iterum repetenda* (212): this parenthetic sentence is one of the multiple interventions of the author – or at least of the main narrator, who not always has to

¹¹ Daedalus has just produced the first metamorphosis of the episode: “Daedalus has become a bird” (W.S. Anderson, 1972, p. 201 ff.)

¹² *Met.* 1, 2-3, *di, coeptis (nam vos mutastis et illas) / adspirate meis...*

¹³ *Hor. Carm.* 2, 10, 5, *auream...mediocritatem*.

¹⁴ This connection with such a moral statement is slightly visible and remarkable in the middle of a mythological context, but it is worth saying that it would represent a connection, at least in this respect, both with the account of *Ars amatoria* and with the quotes of *Tristia* (see below, n. 70).

¹⁵ These lines recall Verg. *Aen.* 6, 33, *bis patriae cecidere manus*, and suggest a sort of presentiment of the following tragedy.

coincide necessarily with Ovid himself¹⁶ – which increases dramatically the *pathos* of the entire scene. The following metaphor (213-216) is taken from the animal world, as it is usual to find in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and we will meet again a similar one in the account of *Ars amatoria*¹⁷, even though in the case of *Metamorphoses* it appears to be more elaborated: what matters here is that the *artes* are mentioned again and defined, with a prolepsis, *damnosas* (215), in order to stress again that the courageous effort of Daedalus is destined to fail miserably.

The following lines (217-220) describing the astonishment of all those see the flying pair, are related closely with the motif of the first navigation and of the wonder of the spectators assisting to it:¹⁸ together with the subsequent geographic determination of the point in which Icarus will fall down into the sea, very similar lines can be found in *Ars amatoria* as well (2, 77-8; 79-82).

At this point, Icarus (*puer*, 223) *audaci coepit gaudere volatu*, and abandoned his guide (*scil.* the father), moved *cupidine caeli*¹⁹, and flew higher: the closeness of the sun melted the waxes and Icarus, moving *nudos lacertos* (227), does not catch the streams of air anymore and fell into the sea invoking the name of the father (*oraque caerulea patrium clamantia nomen / excipiuntur aqua, quae nomen traxit ab illo*, 229-30). This description of the fall of Icarus is very interesting, especially if we look at the comparison with the relevant passage of *Ars amatoria*: there, as it will be explained better below (p. 7 ff.), the figure of Icarus is assimilated with the figure of *praeceptor amoris*' pupil, who, not following the teachings of the poet, falls down irremediably. Interestingly, we find here two different kinds of limits: the first ones are the limits imposed by nature, the second ones are the limits imposed by the commands of Daedalus, i.e. human limits; the first ones are related more closely to the more abstract and general concept of *hybris* towards nature, while the second ones are related to a violation of a more specific and concrete order, which, on the basis of what it has been stated before, stands as a sort of transfer of the wider concept of

¹⁶ See, in this respect, what G. Rosati, 2002, pp. 271-304, states about the different voices telling a story in the *Metamorphoses*, including the voice of the narrator himself: oftentimes we find that the voice of the “primary narrator” does not have a correspondence with the actual point of view of the “implicit author” (273).

¹⁷ *Ars* 2, 73-4, *et movet ipse suas, et nati respicit alas / Daedalus, et cursus sustinet usque suos*.

¹⁸ See e.g. Apollonius' *Argonautica* 1, 549-52; 4, 316-22; Cic. *Nat. deor.* 2, 89; see also above, n. 7.

¹⁹ It is important to outline the fact that it has been recognised a certain similarity between this behaviour of Icarus and the reaction of Phaeton to the words of his father Phoebus in Book 2 of *Metamorphoses*; see e.g. F. Bömer, 1977, ad loc.

aurea mediocritas, translated into a mythological and narrative universe. When we will analyse the account of Daedalus' myth in *Ars amatoria*, we have to keep in mind these two important divisions in these different kinds of ways of overcoming limits.

In conclusion of the episode, Ovid reports the vane invocations of Daedalus to the son (231-33, the repetition of the vocative *Icare* is intended to increase the tragic impact of the scene) and the epilogue of the story with its etiological explanation (233-35).

As for further and less literally interpretations of this episode, in fact many scholars have supported the thesis of the existence of a strong connection between Daedalus and Ovid, since the mythical artisan would represent the artist, in other words the poet himself and his attempts to reach a higher level of accuracy in the expression of his own art, which will take him to go beyond the boundaries imposed to the human beings, to challenge nature and finally to see his son lost in a dramatic fall.

Among the scholars who have provided an interpretation of the Daedalus' myth of *Metamorphoses*, there is someone²⁰ who has seen a *trait d'union* behind the story of three different characters of the poem, Orpheus²¹, Pygmalion²² and Daedalus himself. Other analyses²³ are related to the structural patterns of the episode and underline some lexical and stylistic choices of Ovid, who provides a different account of the story from other Latin sources, and especially from Vergil (*Aen.* 6, 14-37); or focus on the difference between the fate of Daedalus and Pygmalion.²⁴ While the former is deceived by his own art and reveals himself too confident about his own power, so that he is guilty of *hybris* and deserves a punishment; the latter is depicted not only as a gifted artist performing his ability in the sculpture of a beautiful young women, but as devout and religious man, who trusts in the goddess (in his case Venus) and gets the prize for his faith.²⁵ Whether it is the case of over-interpreting the mythological figure of Daedalus in *Metamorphoses* or not, seeing him as a

²⁰ According to W.S. Anderson, 1989, pp. 1-11, the construction of those figures should thought as a representation of the struggle between art and nature, emotion and virtue, and it shows the final defeat of art, which has no possibility to overcome natural limits: "I think that Ovid was committed to the belief that art could not deny nature, could not try to use or control it without any understanding" (1).

²¹ See Ov. *Met.* 10, 1-85.

²² See Ov. *Met.* 10, 243-97.

²³ B. Pavlock, 1998-9, pp. 141-57.

²⁴ A. Schönbeck, 1999, pp. 300-16.

²⁵ For the interpretation of those myths see also W. Schubert, 1992, pp. 25-31, while for a wider dissertation about "flight myths" and their meaning see V.M. Wise, 1997, pp. 44-59.

transfer of the artist, i.e. Ovid himself, failing in his attempt, it is up to personal interpretations and further analyses. Now, it is time to take into consideration the previous account of the same episode falling in *Ars amatoria* 2, 21-98.

2. Daedalus-Icarus' myth in *Ars amatoria* (2, 21-98): principal patterns and features, similarities and differences in comparison with *Met.* 8, 183-265

The main purpose of this section is firstly to give some references about the most significant interpretations and studies provided by the scholars concerning the account of Daedalus in *Ars amatoria*, since it is important to make understand which its context and background are. Thus, provided that the episodes of *Metamorphoses* and *Ars amatoria* show many parallels and are surely closely related and similar, however, in the second part of this section, it will be stressed as well the most evident differences between the account of *Ars amatoria* previously analysed and the passage of *Metamorphoses*, some questions will be asked about the reasons of these differences, and it will be explained why Daedalus-Icarus' myth can be so significant for Ovid's poetry, thought and even life.

As for *Ars* 2, 21-98, firstly to say is that the whole passage has been taken into consideration by the scholarship oftentimes in relation with the correspondent passage of *Metamorphoses*. Along the repeated attempts to state the differences between the two passages, belonging to diverse poetic genres, respectively elegiac and epic²⁶, many scholars have underlined that the whole episode of the fall of Icarus in consequence of the *hybris* of his father Daedalus could be seen not only as a symbolic translation of the limits of the artist/poet at challenging the gods (or the "better nature"²⁷), but also as metaphorical displaying of what really means to be a *praeceptor amoris*, as Ovid professed to be in *Ars* 1, 17, and of which are the consequences for not having obeyed to teacher's advice. Moreover, this hypothetical metaphoric meaning can be the reason why the myth is told at the beginning of the second book of *Ars amatoria*, immediately after the *proemium*, since it has a programmatic content.

In this respect, someone has stressed the point for which Daedalus and Icarus would be transfers respectively for Ovid, as love's teacher, and the pupil, while the character of Minos would represent the social custom hindering them.²⁸ Other

²⁶ See M. Myerowitz, 1985, pp. 219-20, K. Heldman, 2001, pp. 395.

²⁷ See *Met.* 1, 21.

²⁸ C.F. Ahern, 1989, pp. 273-296: "Minos is more problematic than Daedalus or Icarus. He cannot, for instance, represent Amor as a simple inversion of Ovid's own analogy [...] My proposal is to see Minos as embodying the tyranny of the social custom" (280-1).

readings, instead of presenting Daedalus as the symbol of the failure of the artist, show a certain grade of awareness of Ovid's ironical game in the creative process of his mythological characters placed in a no-mythological context, that is the elegiac genre, in a way in which they can constitute *exempla* and embodiments of what should be better not to imitate, or better not to follow entirely.²⁹

Moving closely to the Latin text³⁰, the Daedalus-Icarus' episode occurs immediately after the prologue of Book 2: after that in Book 1 the *puella* has been conquered, in Book 2 the poet will teach his pupil how to keep his girl with him, since it is not enough to have captured her (*non satis est venisse tibi me vate puellam*, 11), but she has to be held through his *ars* (*arte mea capta est, arte tenenda mea est*, 12). Thus, after having stated the content and the purposes of the second book of his work, Ovid places the typical invocation to the deities, in this case Cupid, his mother Venus and Erato: the flying nature of Cupid and his levity make him difficult to be controlled (*et levis est et habet geminas, quibus avolet, alas*, 19).

From the wings of Cupid, the poet slides to the wings of Daedalus, starting to tell his story with a quite abrupt couplet resuming all the episode:³¹ as Minos hindered all the possibly ways for escaping (*omnia*, 21), Daedalus will find another gateway, *audacem viam*, with his feathers (22) – the adjective *audacem* is proleptic in respect of what will happen later.³² The following distich sums up the story of the Minotaur and the labyrinth, told widely in *Met.* 8, 153 ff., with a very famous *iunctura* that shows excellently the rhetorical ability of the poet (*semibovemque virum semivirumque bovem*, 24).³³

In 25-30 we find the first direct speech of Daedalus, addressed to Minos (*iustissime Minos*, 25, with an evident *captatio benevolentiae*). The unfortunate man asks the king to let him get home, desiring to be buried in *patria* (27), where, since he

²⁹ T. Gärtner, 2005, pp. 649-60: "Die Daedalus-Erzählung mit Ihrem Fokus auf der übermenschlich-tragischen Hauptperson bildet das zentrale Ingredient dieser parodistischen Konstruktion. Dabei ist die Figur des Daedalus, der seinen Schüler auf einen übermenschlichen, weil menschlichen Erfahrung fremden Weg und damit tragischerweise geradewegs in den Untergang führt, die Verkörperung dessen, was Ovid für seine Liebesschüler gerade nicht sein will" (660).

³⁰ For a more detailed analysis of the text and of its issues, see E. Pianezzola, 1991, p. 274 ff., but especially M. Janka, 1997, pp. 57-106. This passage of Book 2 of *Ars amatoria* has been analysed very deeply also by A. Sharrock, 1994, pp. 87-195.

³¹ *Ars 2*, 21-22, *Hospitis effugio praestruxerat omnia Minos: / audacem pinnis reperit ille viam.*

³² See *Met.* 8, 223 (*audaci...volatu*, see above).

³³ For the fame of this line see the account of Sen. *Controv.* 2, 2, 12.

was not allowed to live in, he hopes to be allowed to die in: *accipiat cineres terra paterna meos*, 26; *...vivere non potui, da mihi posse mori*, 28 (the two actions are listed in the opposite order, creating a *hysteron proteron*). This speech lacks in *Metamorphoses*, and this is the first and very relevant difference between the two accounts. There could be a lot of explanations for this lack, such as that Ovid would avoid to be repetitive, or would show another 'face' of the same character, or would make Daedalus appear more self-confident and proud in *Metamorphoses* than in *Ars amatoria*. This last reason can be considered to be one of the many features that link the account of *Ars amatoria* with the passages of *Tristia*, rather than with *Metamorphoses*, as I will explain later on. Moreover, concerning this lack of self-confidence of Daedalus, even the following distich, with the unusual proposal of exchange, *si non vis puero parcere, parce seni* (30), contributes to create a more pathetic atmosphere, to depict a rather different figure of Daedalus, who seems to be weaker and less confident than the Daedalus of *Metamorphoses*. These lines 25-30 are the first difference to be kept in mind.

In 31-32 the voice of the main narrator comes back to remark that by no means Minos would have allowed Daedalus to return home. In the subsequent ten lines (33-42), the word is given back again to the mythological artisan: here, he not only resumes with his own voice the reasons why he has undertaken the fabrication of the artificial wings (35-37, which are very close to *Met.* 185-187), but also pronounces an invocation to Jupiter (38-39) and provides a sort of justification for his temerarious attempt (40-42). It is crucial to underline that neither this invocation to Jupiter is present in the correspondent passage of *Metamorphoses*, nor this insistence and the repeated justifying tone with which Daedalus expresses the reasons have constricted him to undertake his challenge.

Da veniam coepto, Iupiter alte, meo:
Non ego sidereas adfecto tangere sedes:
Qua fugiam dominum, nulla, nisi ista, via est.
40 Per Styga detur iter, Stygias transnabimus undas;
Sunt mihi naturae iura novanda meae.

The lexical choices Ovid makes for this invocation ring a bell to an educated reader, since 38 sounds very similar both linguistically and structurally to the second opening line of *Metamorphoses*, *di, coeptis (nam vos mutastis et illas) / adspirate meis*, with the same vocative form (*di*), with the same word meaning "undertaking" (*coeptis*), with an usual imperative form (*adspirate*), and with a first person

possessive adjective at the very end of the sentence (*meis*). Thus, on one hand this line recalls the very beginning of the epic poem, on the other hand this invocation of Daedalus to Jupiter is completely absent in the episode of *Metamorphoses*. How should we interpret this discrepancy? Is it not true that at least in the four opening lines of *Metamorphoses* is the poet itself speaking with his own voice? We have said that the differences between *Ars amatoria* and *Metamorphoses* have to be considered in the light of the mentions of *Tristia*, but is it not true that, even though this line can be compared effectively with *Metamorphoses*, it deals with the incipit of the poem (in which the poet speaks in the first person), instead of the Daedalus' episode itself? Could this line represent a more subjective involvement of the speaking character, and could this speaking character represent the poet himself?

Coming to the next line, as for the use of the verb *tangere*³⁴, we have to underline that it is employed widely by Ovid especially concerning some violations human beings make in fields of God's jurisdiction, committing *nefas*, both in concrete and in abstract occurrences:³⁵ for what we will say later on (see below, p. 16 ff.), it is important to keep in mind the sense in which Ovid is using here this verbal form, i.e. in connection with an overcoming of limits. To be kept in mind as well is that this enlargement of the space given to Daedalus' direct speech conveys a more pathetic tone to the passage and, at the same time, gives to the protagonist himself the possibility to express his considerations with his own voice – that is the same 'own voice' speaking in the opening of the epic poem –, while in the relevant passage of *Metamorphoses* they were often provided by the main narrator and the point of view of the mythological artisan was not expressed in the first person.

The following three lines constitute in fact three separate sentences: the first one recalls the sense of necessity (*Ἀνάγκη*, 'ananke') has brought Daedalus to take the extreme decision to build the fake wings; the second one refers to the infernal waters of the Styx³⁶; the third one finds its pendant in *Met.* 8, 188-9, but in this case the perception of overcoming the *iura* imposed by nature is stressed more dramatically.³⁷

³⁴ It means not merely "to touch", but also "to touch with some degree of force, tap or sim."; see *OLD*, 1968-82, pp. 1904-5, s.v. 'tango'.

³⁵ See e.g. *Met.* 6, 173, where the infinitive form *tangere* is related with Tantalus' story and with his violation of God's banquets (*cui licuit soli superiorum tangere mensas*); see also M. Janka, 1997, ad loc.

³⁶ See also *Ars* 1, 635; 3, 14.

³⁷ This concept of the challenge of the artist is a *Leitmotiv* of the whole passage: see 2, 43-4, 48, 68, 75-6. More generally, the opposition *ars/natura* is stressed in many passages of *Ars amatoria* (2, 313; 3, 155; 200).

This higher degree of dramatisation may be due to the fact that it is Daedalus himself who is speaking with his own voice and realizing that his challenge is incredibly bold and is bound to a failure: thus, the passage appears to be affected by a higher amount of *pathos*.

This higher amount of *pathos* is perceivable in the subsequent couplet as well, where the intervention of the author remarks the same concept expressed just before: this motif that difficulties *ingenia movent* (43) is rather spread in Ovid³⁸; while the following direct question finds its closest parallel in Horace's account of Daedalus' myth (*car.* 1. 3. 34-5), and the verb *carpere* finds a correspondence also in *Met.* 8, 208.

After that, it comes a description of the work of the artisan (45-48), which shows Ovid's taste at narrating the way in which the process of artistic creation happens, and clearly alludes to the same process of creation that the poet himself undertakes. The last of these lines, *finitusque novae iam labor artis erat*, presents again the *iunctura novae...artis*, in this occurrence in a genitive, which specifies the word *labor*: now, *labor* can mean obviously "labour" or "work"³⁹, and in this case alludes to the task Daedalus has just completed. However, *labor* means "sufferance"⁴⁰ as well, and in this meaning it would anticipate the real sufferance of the father Daedalus having missed his son.

The unaware naivety Icarus shows in 49-50 by playing with the feathers Daedalus is working on, conveys essentially the same concept of *Met.* 8, 189-92: however, in *Ars amatoria* the image is more developed.

From 51 on, the word is given back to Daedalus. However, in the previous lines (34-42), the artisan was speaking basically on his own, and that monologue was used by the poet not only to talk about a specific situation, but also to hint to a more general issue (as the motif of overcoming the limits is). By contrast, here Daedalus is talking to his son and provides him with a long series of commands (51-64), playing both the role of the father and of the *praeceptor amoris*.⁴¹ Since the king of Crete has already hindered all the escaping ways, he has to be escaped (*effugiendus*, 52) *hac ope* (*scil.* the fake wings) and the native city (*patria*, 51), Athens, has to be reached

³⁸ See e.g. 1, 29; *Trist.* 5, 1, 27-8.

³⁹ For the specific meaning of *labor* as "work" in this passage, see M. Janka, 1997, ad loc.

⁴⁰ See *ThLL* VII, 2, 789, 26-797, 68 [Lumpe].

⁴¹ In *Met.* 8, 201 ff., Daedalus tries to fly with the new wings he has built before speaking with his son.

through a navigation (*carinis*, 51). In this couplet it seems worth underline a specific linguistic pattern. It deals with the use of the two forms of gerundive in the construction of the passive periphrastic, through which Daedalus stresses again the necessity of his uncommon attempt: this sort of explanation or *quasi* justification Daedalus gives for his challenge against nature and Gods as well (see the invocation to Jupiter) occurs many times in the passage. Another important feature is surely the assimilation of the flight with a navigation, which represents another *Leitmotiv* of the episode (see 45; 64), while in *Metamorphoses* yet this same pattern is present, but appears more softened (see e.g. in 228 the use of the word *remigio*) and barely perceivable.

Thus, after having said that Minos would be not able to hinder the air (see *Met.* 8, 187), Daedalus orders his son to break (*rumpe*) the air (*aera*, 54; the same word opens 53 as well), *quem licet*: on one hand the artisan softens the commands he is giving with this parenthetic (*quem licet*), trying to make his action appear as legitimate; on the other hand, the imperative form from the verb *rumpo* (54) seems to be rather strong and alludes to a violent action and to a sort of violation.⁴²

In lines 55-8, Icarus is provided with the indications for his 'navigation': he is advised not to look at the constellations (55-6)⁴³, but to follow straight the father (*me pinnis sectare datis; ego praeivus ibo*, 57), as a guide (*me duce*, 58).

After this primary indications that show a very Hellenistic taste, comes the actual didactic part of Daedalus' advise (59-64), which finds his pendant in *Met.* 8, 204-6, even though the order in which the too low and, by contrast, the too high flight are listed appears to be reversed in *Ars amatoria*, and significantly here the "too high" comes before the "too low". Thus, if they will fly too close to the sun (*aetherias vicino sole per auras*, 59), the wax will be melted because of the warmth (*impatiens cera caloris erit*, 60); if they will go too low, the feathers will become moist because of the waters (*pinna*⁴⁴ *madescet aquis*, 62). Thus, *puer Icarus* is instructed to fly between both them: *inter utrumque vola* (63) is a sentence inspired

⁴² A very similar expression is used by Horace in *carm.* 1, 3, 36 to indicate the overcoming of the human limits by Hercules. See *OLD*, 1968-82, pp. 1667-8: "To break through, overcome [...], violate, infringe..." (1668).

⁴³ The constellations quoted here were considered important orientation points for the sailor and constitute a typical catalogue (see e.g. *Hom. Il.* 18, 486-9; *Od.* 5, 272-5).

⁴⁴ The feather is defined here *mobilis*, an adjective that conveys a double meaning, both of "moving feather" and of "instable (or fallacious) feather", in this last case in a proleptic sense: "Ovid spielt hier mit dem Doppelsinn von *mobilis*..." (see M. Janka, 1997, ad loc.). See *ThLL* VIII, 1, 1197, 19-1201, 43 [Wieland].

by the *aurea mediocritas* motif (see *Met.* 8, 206). Finally, before closing his advisory speech, Daedalus provides a final indication for the flight (*quaqua ferent aurae, vela secunda dato*, 64), where the comparison with the navigation becomes in fact very clear, and closes the speech in a *Ringkomposition* with 51.

If we look to the correspondent passage of *Metamorphoses* (8, 204-6), although we will find some common patterns, it is important to remark that in *Ars amatoria* the whole advisory speech appears to be more elaborated. Furthermore, the closing line (64) referring openly to the navigation is an additional feature, which represents another of those significant differences we are inquiring about.

From 65 on, the poet retakes the word again, that will be not left for being given back to Daedalus until the artisan's final and tragic invocation to the son, fallen into the sea (91 ff.). The four couplets 65-72 refer to the last arrangements for the flight. In lines 65-8 there is a complete assimilation of Daedalus and Icarus with the birds: in 66, *erudit infirmas ut sua mater aves*, the main verb is a technical one⁴⁵ and alludes to the task of the *praeceptor amoris*, providing the passage with a Hellenistic tone.⁴⁶ In *Metamorphoses* as well the pair is compared to birds (8, 213 ff.), but in that case the simile is more developed.

After having adjusted the wings to the shoulders of his son and having tried to fly *per novum...iter*, Daedalus gives kisses to the son and cries, as he does exactly in *Met.* 8, 210-2: however, the anticipatory comment the poet makes in 212 (*non iterum repetenda*) is not present here. The following distich introduces us to the proper flight, and the lines 73-6 reproduce almost exactly some lines of *Metamorphoses* (see 8, 216; 223). As for the subsequent couplet, some editors have expunged it⁴⁷, but apparently without a satisfying reason: actually, it appears as though, on the contrary, are the lines 75-76 that have been inserted in a wrong place, since they anticipate a situation which will be developed from line 83 on, while the passage 77-82 seems to be too wide to represent a later interpolation.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ This word comes, indeed, from *ex* and *rudis* and means literally "to make someone less rude, i.e. to make someone better through education". The explanation provided by A. Ernout-E. Meillet, 2001⁴ [1932], p. 1022, s.v. 'rudis', is the following: "«degrossir»; au sens moral: «former», «instruire»". See also *ThLL* V, 2, 828, 11-833, 31 [Burkhardt].

⁴⁶ See e.g. *Met.* 8, 215 and *Ars* 3, 48.

⁴⁷ See e.g. R. Merkel, 1884, ad loc.

⁴⁸ These lines describe the flight with a certain amount of erudition: we can find their corresponding pendant in *Met.* 8, 220 ff.

Thus, it is very important to keep in mind this strong connection between 75-6 and 83-84. In these lines, introduced by the so-called *cum inversum*, Icarus, very reckless (*temerarius*, 83) because of his inexperience (*incautis...annis*, 84), *altius egit iter, deseruitque patrem* (84): *paucis verbis*, the *puer* does exactly what the father has forbidden him to do, i.e. flying too high and leaving the path traced by himself. Especially the *iunctura altius...iter* conveys the feeling of violation of limits⁴⁹, since Icarus dares to fly *altius*, "too high". So, as we have already said for *Metamorphoses*, the violation of the limits, that is *hybris*, comes not only from the challenge of the mythological artisan, but also from the violation of the *puer Icarus*, who does not obey to the father. This stress on the lack of obedience of *Icarus* is another significant motif that is more remarked in *Ars amatoria* than in *Metamorphoses*.

In the following lines 85-96 is described the dramatic moment of the fall (85-90), the invocation of Icarus to the father (91-92) and the corresponding invocation of Daedalus to the son (93-5): even though the whole account is said to be depicted more dramatically in *Ars amatoria*⁵⁰, the difference with *Met.* 8, 225-35 is not very remarkable in fact, and, in any case, is not particularly relevant for the point I am about to stress.

As we have seen, it is clear that there are many analogies between Daedalus' episode of *Metamorphoses* and the mythological digression of *Ars amatoria*, and surely there are no doubts that the two passages recall each other, since they share both thematic, linguistic and stylistic patterns. Nevertheless, in the previous pages, I mentioned also the differences existing between them. For the purpose of this essay, it is crucial to inquire about these differences and to understand why they exist. For this reason, I will resume these differences more clearly and I will repeat more accurately the reasons why it is important to underline them.

1. Firstly, the story of Daedalus starts suddenly: even though it is not unusual to find such a kind of digressions in the didactic poetry (to which the *Ars amatoria* can be ascribed), the attack of 21-2 is very unexpected;

2. The speech of 25-30, in which Daedalus asks Minos to have mercy and to let him go home with his son, is completely absent from *Metamorphoses*: this refuse of Minos could constitute a sort of moral justification for the undertaking of Daedalus;

⁴⁹ For the employment of the expression *altius...iter*, see *ThLL* VII, 2, 538, 27-545, 58 [Tessmer], s.v. 'iter': in particular, this *iunctura* occurs in a quite similar way in Verg. *georg.* 4, 108 and Hor. *sat.* 1, 5, 5.

⁵⁰ See E. Pianezzola, 1991, ad loc.

3. In general, the direct speech is more developed from 32 on, probably in order to convey more *pathos* to the passage, but especially to provide Daedalus with the possibility to justify his own behaviour;

4. The invocation to Jupiter of 39-40 represents the greatest difference with *Metamorphoses*, where it is totally absent;

5. In this invocation itself it is used the verb *tangere*, which does not find any correspondence in *Metamorphoses*, while in *Ars amatoria* alludes to the sense of *nefas* pervading the whole episode (and moreover finds an important parallel in one of the two passages of *Tristia* we will see below);

6. More generally, not only in 38-9, but also in the closing lines of Daedalus' speech (40-2), and in the following comment of the poet as well (43-4), the *pathos* is more developed than in *Metamorphoses*;

7. There is a significant insistence on the necessity of the challenge against nature, which makes Daedalus' *hybris* appear justified: see, e.g., the passive periphrastic of 51-2, but even before, as many times remarked, the mythological artisan was attempting repeatedly to explain the reasons of his actions;

8. The assimilation of the flight with a real navigation is much more stressed than in *Metamorphoses*, especially if we look at 64, where the language reflects a proper sea journey rather than a journey through the sky;

9. The violation of a limit does not deal with Daedalus alone, but is reflected in Icarus' lack of obedience as well: the behaviour of Icarus represents another *nefas*, another crime, even though apparently less serious and less general, since it is not related with the wider concept of violation of human or natural laws.

The points stressed raise the question why these differences do exist.⁵¹ On one hand it can be answered that they are due to the different poetic genre the two accounts belong to (see, for instance, point 6 above). Although we deal with the same episode, the context is radically different, since the account of *Metamorphoses* is only one of the many mythological stories of *Metamorphoses* themselves, while the

⁵¹ These differences are stressed in a very effective way by C. Tsitsiou-Chelidoni, 2003, pp. 164-81: even though his comparative analysis is conducted in the light of a more general analysis of Book 8 of the *Metamorphoses*, the scholar comes to the conclusion that essentially Daedalus' account of *Ars amatoria* represents a way to convey an exemplary story of the role of the *artes* taught by the *praeceptor amoris*, while in *Metamorphoses* the episode is inserted in a context proper of a mythological work as *Metamorphoses* are, even though its metaphorical meaning has not to be omitted.

account of *Ars amatoria* is placed in a book which has a didactic aim, even though this didactic aim is dealt with a great amount of irony. Surely, this mythological parenthesis of Daedalus' account has to be read as an *exemplum* of what happens to the pupil who does not follow the instruction of the *praeceptor* (see above, p. 7 ff.), but it is doubtless that this digression occurs abruptly and quite unexpected.

For this reason, it seems worth ask ourselves whether it is possible to think to a later insertion of the whole episode of *Ars amatoria* or, at least, to a reworking of it after the poet has been relegated in Tomis (8 C.E.). As I have already explained in the Introduction, to inquire about this, it has been not enough to make a comparison only between the accounts of *Metamorphoses* and *Ars amatoria*, even though this comparison has revealed itself to be necessary to stress the differences between these two accounts. Now, however, these differences have to be put in relation with a third and quite unusual term of comparison, that is found in another work of Ovid, i.e. *Tristia*.

In fact, Daedalus' episode is not mentioned only in *Metamorphoses* and *Ars amatoria*, but the poet alludes to it in one of his latest works, the *Tristia*, written when he was in Tomis. In this case, we do not deal with a full account of the myth, but only with a short quote included in the larger context of Ovid's complaint of his relegation. This may be considered the reason why in these passages Ovid has not to be compared with Daedalus (as it was for *Ars amatoria* and *Metamorphoses*), but surprisingly he has to be identified with Icarus and his negligent behaviour. In a similar way, the focus of both these quotes is mainly on Icarus and not on Daedalus, since it is Icarus himself that dared to fly too high, too close to the sun.

Actually, if we look closer to the two quotes of *Trist.* 1, 1, 89-92 and 3, 4, 21-4, we will realize that they amount to only eight lines and, since they constitute very short mentions of a sort of metaphorical transfer, i.e. Icarus, for the condition of the poet, they could not seem an adequate term of comparison. Nevertheless, in the light of the differences between *Metamorphoses* and *Ars amatoria* I have stressed, it seems worth analyse not only the mere quotes of Daedalus, or maybe better, Icarus, but also the whole context in which they occur. In doing so, we will realize that the tone of these two passages has much more in common with the account of *Ars amatoria* than we have ever imagined.

Thus, we will be allowed to suppose at least the possibility of a later reworking of *Ars amatoria*, since the *Tristia* certainly have been written after the poet's exile, while about Daedalus' account in *Metamorphoses* there is no evidence that it has

been reworked later. Moreover, it is not by chance that this passage of *Ars amatoria* presents a lot of *variae lectiones*, while the text of *Metamorphoses* is quite assured:⁵² obviously, the presence itself of *variae lectiones* does not allow to think necessarily to an author's draft, but a problematic text can authorize to suppose that there are some unsolved issues at the origin of it.

For all these reasons, in the next section I will analyse shortly the context in which the two quotes of Icarus occur in *Tristia*. Finally, I will put them in relation with some of the differences mentioned above between *Metamorphoses* and *Ars amatoria*, with the aim of showing that the hypothesis of a later reworking may be taken into consideration.

3. Ov. *Trist.* 1, 1, 79-92; 3, 4, 15-32: an unexpected third term of comparison

First of all, we have to take into consideration that *Tristia* represent a completely different genre of work from both *Metamorphoses* and *Ars amatoria*. Presumably⁵³, they have been written while the poet was in exile (from 8 C.E. on) and are made up of five books of elegiac poems, characterized by a very serious and dramatic tone (or, at least, by what *appears to be* a very serious and dramatic tone).⁵⁴ The poet now complains his condition, now asks to be allowed to come back home, now addresses his friends or the same emperor. In other cases, Ovid looks to his past behaviour and recognises his mistakes: and it is exactly in this context that we find the mentions of Icarus, that are the central matters of this section and what I will focus on in the light of my survey. I am aware, indeed, that the *Tristia* raise many issues and questions about Ovid's poetry and life, but for the aim of this paper I will consider them simply as the actual result of Ovid's exile poetry and as actual expression of his own feelings and thoughts.

⁵² For text and *apparatus criticus* see respectively E.J. Kenney, 1994, R.J. Tarrant, 2004, ad. loc.

⁵³ See above, n. 5.

⁵⁴ For many years the scholars have analysed the issue of the amount of sincerity in Ovid's *Tristia*. Some of them appear to be very sceptic to the point that believe that Ovid's exile is only a literary invention and has never taken place in fact (A.D. Fitton Brown, 1985, pp. 18-22); by contrast, some others underline that the *Tristia* represent the first example of Ovid's subjective poetry and are seen as real expression of his feelings; see U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, 1926, pp. 298-302; H. Fränkel, 1945, p. 117 ff.; A.G. Lee, 1949, p. 113 ff.; R.J. Dickinson, 1973, 158 ff.; E. Baeza-Angulo, 2011, pp. 15-37. See also below, n. 64.

The *incipit* of *Tristia* is featured with a personification of the book itself, with which the poet seems to create a dialogue⁵⁵, exhorting it to go to Rome, where he is forbidden to come back personally⁵⁶, and where it would be able to find either the people who used to be close related to Ovid⁵⁷, and those ones will reject the book itself, thinking that it could deal with Ovid's love elegy, condemned by the emperor.⁵⁸ However, they are immediately warned by the cover of the item itself (which does not appear as sophisticated as other Ovid's books used to be, but in fact it is rough and harsh⁵⁹) of the fact that its content is dramatically different from Ovid's usual poetry (65 ff.).

The significant digression about poetry of lines 39-44 is balanced by poet's clear reference to Augustus of 69 ff.; after that, Ovid sets a range of similes to describe his own condition, taken from the animal world at first, then inspired by mythological subjects. Among them falls the mention of Icarus.⁶⁰

vitaret caelum Phaethon, si viveret, et quos
optarat, stulte, tangere nollet equos. 80
me quoque, quae sensi, fateor Iovis arma timere:
me reor infesto, cum tonat, igne peti.
quicumque Argolica de classe Capherea fugit,
semper ab Euboicis vela retorquet aquis; 85
et mea cumba semel vasta percussa procella
illum, quo laesa est, horret adire locum,
ergo cave, liber, et timida circumspice mente,
ut satis a media sit tibi plebe legi.

⁵⁵ See in this respect M. Citroni, 1986, pp. 111-40, especially p. 121-30, and E. Baeza-Angulo, 2011, pp. 127-32, where the *incipit* of *Tristia* is analysed.

⁵⁶ See *Trist.* 1, 1, 59-60.

⁵⁷ *Trist.* 1, 1, 17-19; 27 ff.

⁵⁸ The reasons why Ovid was banished are not clear, but it seems that the main causes were a *carmen* and an *error* (see *Trist.* 2, 207), and the *carmen* has to be identified with the *Ars amatoria* itself. See also below, n. 66.

⁵⁹ *Trist.* 1, 1, 5 ff.

⁶⁰ For an introduction to the *Tristia* and to the general features of the work, see F. Lechi, 1993, pp. 5-51; for more complete notes see also D. Giordano, R. Mazzanti, M. Bonvicini, 1991, ad loc. For a commentary of Book 1, see S.G. Owen, 1885; for a complete commentary, see G. Luck, 1977. For a general overview on the *Tristia* and their principal themes, see G. Williams, 2002, pp. 337-81.

dum petit infirmis nimium sublimia pennis
 Icarus, aequoreis nomina fecit aquis. 90
 difficile est tamen hinc remis utaris an aura
 dicere: consilium resque locusque dabunt.⁶¹

A further analysis of the passage in relation to *Ars* 2, 21 ff. will be provided after has been presented the passage of *Trist.* 3, 4, 15-32 as well.

At the beginning of this poem (*Trist.* 3, 4) the poet exhorts a friend (not identified) to live on his own, avoiding the *praelustria* (5), in other words, following the epicurean *topos* of *lâthe biôsas*. This perpetual tension between an existence of celebrity and glory, but affected by the risk of a sudden fall, and an anonymous life, but safe and calm, materializes itself in the metaphor of *cortex* VS *grave onus* (11-12): the former is lighter and floats easily, the latter is too heavy and sinks. After a short reference to Rome (*Urbe*, 14), Ovid returns to the navigation motif (characterizing even the passage reported above), which materializes itself in the *cumba*, “boat”, and becomes symbol of the poet’s journey: the route of the boat is the way he walked his life. The anaphora *dum mecum...dum me* (15) stresses the *pathos* conveyed by the direct involvement of the poet, and the subsequent pentameter is featured by a chiasitic structure (*mea...placidus...cumba...aquis*). After another distich in which the theme of *aurea mediocritas* is enriched by the theme of the fall (*qui cadit; sic cadit*, 17-18), Ovid provides some mythological *exempla*: two among them, Icarus and Phaeton (29-30) find a correspondence with *Trist.* 1, 1.

dum mecum vixi, dum me levis aura ferebat, 15
 haec mea per placidas cumba cucurrit aquas
 qui cadit in plano – vix hoc tamen evenit ipsum –
 sic cadit, ut tacta surgere possit humo;
 at miser Elpenor tecto delapsus ab alto
 occurrit regi debilis umbra suo. 20
 quid fuit, ut tutas agitare Daedalus alas,
 Icarus inmensas nomine signet aquas?
 nempe quod hic alte, demissius ille volabat;
 nam pennas ambo non habuere suas.
 crede mihi, bene qui latuit bene vixit, et intra 25

⁶¹ The Latin text is based on the edition of S.G. Owen, 1885.

fortuna debet quisque manere suam.
non foret Eumedes orbus, si filius eius
stultus Achilleos non adamasset equos;
nec natum in flamma vidisset, in arbore natas,
cepisset genitor si Phaethonta Merops. 30
tu quoque formida nimium sublimia semper,
propositique, precor, contrahe vela tui.⁶²

After having presented the two passages of *Tristia* within their own context, we will put them into relationship with some points of *Ars amatoria* mentioned above (p. 13 f.).

As for point 1, it has not specifically to be put into relationship with the passage of *Tristia*, but only to be taken as an actual consideration: *paucis verbis*, the Daedalus-Icarus' episode of *Ars amatoria* occurs very suddenly and quite unexpectedly and can be supposed to have been inserted. Concerning points 2 and 3, they can related more generally with some patterns characterizing the entire *Tristia*.

As for point 2, Daedalus begging Minos to return home, here the connection with the *Tristia* is patent. For, in a lot of passages of the whole work Ovid manifests openly his desire to come home and oftentimes supplicates the emperor, or the most influential men around him, to let himself come home.⁶³

Point 3 is closely related to point 2: by providing Daedalus with a greater amount of direct speech, the poet is allowing the protagonist to speak out his voice clearly and loudly. In other words, giving the word to his character, Ovid makes him able to express a point of view that is both personal and private, and dramatic and tragic at the same time. We have not to forget that in *Ars amatoria* the poet plays the role of the *praeceptor amoris*: but in fact, Daedalus is in no way an embodiment of the *praeceptor*, but, on the contrary, of the poet as artist. In other words, by creating Daedalus, Ovid has not created a double of himself as a *praeceptor*, but a double of himself as poet and, consequently, artist. Thus, the only way to make evident this other side of himself as poet and of his own poetry is to give the word to Daedalus. And, if we look to the *Tristia*, we will see that they are characterized by a dramatic elegiac tone and, in them, the voice of the poet is almost the only voice we are allowed to listen to. Both for the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, the crucial question

⁶² For Latin text see above, n. 61.

⁶³ See F. Lechi, 1993, p. 15 ff.

we asked for all the other works of Ovid – i.e. which of the voices of the many characters involved, both mythological and not, would represent the voice of the poet, if actually it is expressed – has no point: in the exile's works Ovid shows his pure thoughts and concerns.⁶⁴

With point 4 we come to a very crucial issue, the invocation of Jupiter. In *Trist.* 1, 1, 79-80, after having quoted Phaeton as *exemplum* of *hybris* and attempt of overcoming the human limits, Ovid recalls his own misfortune and, in doing so, he mentions Jupiter. Surely, this connection is aimed to create a double correspondence: Jupiter-Augustus VS Phaeton-Ovid. It is crucial to underline the importance of this metaphor, not only because it can be related with the invocation to Jupiter of *Ars amatoria*, but also because it will come back in the passage of *Trist.* 3, 4, 15 ff., together with the reference to Icarus.⁶⁵

Closely related to Phaeton himself is point 5, since the verb *tangere* of *Ars* 2, 49 appears in *Trist.* 1, 1, 80 as well, where it is said that Phaeton would have not wanted to touch the horses of the father (*tangere nollet equos*), if he had been alive; and we have seen as this verb conveys the sense of a sort of violation or *nefas* (see above, p. 10).

As for point 7, it underlines Daedalus' aim to justify his actions: as we can see from both the passages of *Tristia*, all the mythological *exempla* represent in fact an account of the wrong actions these characters have did and that have brought them to their own destructions. Even though they do not stress openly any sense of necessity, they allude certainly to that *error*⁶⁶, whatever it was, in consequence of which Ovid

⁶⁴ Only in the last decades the *Tristia* have been studied more carefully and have undergone a reevaluation, not only in terms of Ovid's sincerity, but also in respect of their artistic value: "Ovid hat scheinbar den dichterischen Wert der Exildichtungen zum Teil wörtlich sehr gering eingeschätzt, und die meisten Philologen haben Ovids Selbstkritik zum Teil wörtlich übernommen und sich dadurch den Weg zum Verständnis verbaut" (G. Luck, 1977, on the reevaluation of Ovid's exile poetry, p. 4).

⁶⁵ It has been remarked (see E.J. Kenney, 2011, ad. loc.) that the two mythological characters of Icarus and Phaeton (see *Met.* 1, 750 ff.; 2, 1 ff.) are linked through many common patterns, first of all their disobedience to the commands of the respective fathers and their tragic fall. In this respect, M.C. Álvarez Morán, R.M. Iglesias Montiel, 1995, 49-69, run a very interesting comparative analysis of these two figures and of their presence in myths concerning "cielo, [...] espacio cuajado de peligros y prohibido para los hombres" (49).

⁶⁶ The issue of Ovid's banishment has been inquired for years, but in fact it is far to be solved and presents itself as a riddle; see e.g. J.C. Thibault, 1964; F. Norwood, 1963, pp. 150-63; P. Green, 1982, pp. 202-20. A great contribution has been recently provided by A. Luisi, N.F.

was banned, and, even more important, they surely recalls the *hybris* as common pattern (a *hybris* that is a *Leitmotiv* in *Ars amatoria* and that Daedalus was trying to justify by expressing strongly the sense of necessity of his attempt).

As for point 8, the assimilation of the flight with a real navigation in *Ars amatoria* finds here an actual pendant in the metaphor of the *cumba*⁶⁷ Ovid stresses in 1, 1, 85-6, 91-2 and 3, 4, 15-15, 31-2: the *cumba* can represent both the entire journey of the life of the poet, but also his poetic production.⁶⁸ Especially 3, 4, 31-2, *tu quoque formida nimium sublimia semper, propositique, precor, contrahe vela tui*, an exhortation to the reader,⁶⁹ recalls *Ars 2*, 64 (*quaque ferent aerae, vela secunda dato*), with which Daedalus closes his advisory speech.⁷⁰

Finally, the violation of Icarus (9), stressed in *Ars amatoria* as representation of another smaller crime, i.e. the lack of obedience to the orders he has received, permeates the whole book of the *Tristia* as *Leitmotiv* of embodiment of the concept of a general violation of a given order: a violation was the reason for which Ovid was banished, a lack of obedience to the order of a greater father, that is Augustus, was the reason for Ovid's dramatic metaphoric fall. Furthermore, this disobedience of Icarus stresses for a moment the main focus on the *puer*, instead of on the *pater*: it is not surprising that this pattern creates another connection with the two passages of *Tristia*, in which one of the main features is in fact this focus on Icarus instead of the father Daedalus. Thus, in *Tristia*, the Daedalus' episode turns itself into the 'Icarus' episode', or better, the Icarus' fall: this dramatic fall of a mythological character becomes a way to express Ovid's real situation.

Berrino, 2008, who analyse separately the implications and the consequences of both the *carmen* and the *error*, inquiring about their effective influence in determining Ovid's exile.

⁶⁷ See *ThLL* IV, 1587, 51-1588, 37 [Mertel]. For an overview on the theme of the *cumba*, see M. Tartari Chersoni, 1974, 219-28; J. González Vázquez, 1988, pp. 219-32. It is interesting what E. Tola, 2001, 45-55, states about the different ways in which the author deals with the metaphor of the boat in his elegiac works of exile, i.e. *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*.

⁶⁸ According to S.G. Owen, 1885, ad loc., in lines 1, 1, 91-2 the navigation would represent the journey of the book of *Tristia* itself. However, it has to be said that the metaphor of navigation and sea journey, and the assimilation of the poet with Ulixes as well, are general motifs of the entire work.

⁶⁹ We are not able to see precisely which particular friend Ovid is addressing in this poem (see F. Lechi, 1993, ad loc.) and, in any case, the anonymous addressee is a very usual pattern in the *Tristia*.

⁷⁰ It seems right to underline that both passages of *Tristia* are permeated by the concept of *aurea mediocritas*. However, since this concept is not a peculiarity of *Ars amatoria*, but is present in *Metamorphoses* as well, it is in no way a prove of a closer similarity between *Ars amatoria* and *Tristia*.

If we look at the points we have analysed, they reveal a sort of perception or feeling of a later influence of *Tristia* on *Ars amatoria*. Naturally, we have to consider that, given the different genre of the works, even if the patterns of *Tristia* had actually produced a later reworking of Daedalus episode of *Ars 2*, they would have to be translated in a language that was suitable for this didactic work, and this could be the reason why they appear expressed in a rather different way. Moreover, we are not sure at all about the production process of literary works in antiquity, which was more complex as we can imagine.⁷¹ Thus, it may be possible that an exiled Ovid worked again on this work, the *carmen* that had been considered one of the principle reasons of his banishment, to make appear some of its patterns in some way less guilty, or in this specific case to confess his own boldness and ask forgiveness. If not Ovid himself, it may be possible that someone of Ovid's relatives or closest friends changed it under the indication of the *praeceptor* itself. Naturally, there is no way to prove a reworking or to totally deny it: in my opinion, the question of a possible reworking of some passages of this work remains open.⁷²

Certainly, we have to keep in mind that all the elements listed above constitute only a little piece of evidence of a possible reworking of the passage of *Ars amatoria*. Nevertheless, it is meaningful to state once again their relevance.

In the case of *Tristia*, we deal with a work which has been written in its entirety during the exile and with the exact purpose of referring to the personal situation of the poet himself: thus, the comparison between *Tristia* and *Ars amatoria* becomes much more significant than the comparison between *Ars amatoria* and *Metamorphoses* in establishing the possibility of a reworking of the text, even though the quotes of *Tristia* are only rapid mentions of that same myth that is told more widely in both the two earlier works. However, as it has been considered all the background of this two mentions of *Tristia*, the context in which they occur, the tone and the accent of the poet, it is easy to recognize in them some patterns of the

⁷¹ See in this respect, e.g., O. Pecere, 2010.

⁷² Actually the *Ars amatoria* is quoted many times both in *Tristia* (see e.g. 1, 1, 109 ff.; 3, 14, 5-6; very famous is the passage of *Trist.* 2, 225-34, in which Ovid states that the three books of *Ars amatoria* did not deserve Augustus' attention, since he had to attend to more official tasks) and *Epistulae ex Ponto* (2, 9, 71-6), and sometimes it is defended strongly (in *Pont.* 3, 3, Ovid addresses Cupid and in 50 he states that with the poem he did not intend to disturb *legitimos...toros* and Cupid himself answers that in fact *Artibus et nullum crimen inesse tuis*, 70), sometimes is accused and the poet wishes that it would be burned (*Trist.* 3, 14, 5-6).

points of difference stressed between *Ars amatoria* and *Metamorphoses*. Moreover, while the text of *Metamorphoses* does not present relevant issues, because the variant readings are few and do not seem to be really significant, the text of *Ars amatoria* appears generally speaking more problematic, because affected by a lot of *variae lectiones* in the manuscripts.⁷³

This does not mean that we have to take for sure that this passage has undergone a reworking by the poet; but we have at least to take into consideration this possibility.

* * *

Whether it is the case of a reworking of the passage of *Ars amatoria* or not, the survey I conducted allows us to enter literally the laboratory of the author. The most extraordinary skill of Ovid is maybe his capacity to deal with the same themes, topics or stories, but changing the way in which they are presented. In other words, the mythological universe in which Ovid himself used to live is shaped according to his own needs: some features maintain the same form, others are slightly modified, some others are completely different. Oftentimes, it is the genre that imposes the differences, in other cases is the tone or the purpose. However, what is important to underline is that Ovid deals with the myth in a really peculiar way.⁷⁴

We have assumed easily that in the Daedalus-Icarus' episode of *Metamorphoses* there is a certain amount of self-reference. Nevertheless, in this case the poet seems to enjoy himself in telling his own version of the myth and to not take care of the subtle hints we, as modern critics, are able to remark: his main purpose remains to amuse himself and the reader. And if these hints to his personal activity or situation are present, they are a part in this game.

The situation will change when Ovid was relegated in Tomis: for the first time we do deal with a poet who takes with great seriousness his own poetry, either it is in form of poetic epistles, small compositions or accusatory poems.⁷⁵ Thus, the Daedalus-Icarus' myth becomes suddenly a means to stress his regrets, his pains, and ultimately to ask forgiveness for his excessive ambition.

⁷³ See in this respect the *apparatus* of A.J. Kenney, 1994, cit.

⁷⁴ See e.g. F. Graf, 2002, p. 108 ff.

⁷⁵ The references are respectively to the three exile's works of Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto*, *Tristia* and *Ibis*.

Therefore, it is not surprising if it is in one of these later works that it would be possible to find a new key for interpreting some passages of a previous work. Significantly, both the more sentimentally involved poetry, and the tragic accents, and the return to his own feelings and to himself, and the desertion of the usual hilarious tones as well, can change the *Tristia* from a point of arrival into a point of start to understand what has come before. And, if what has come before is in fact a work (*Ars amatoria*) for which Ovid was banished, and if we suspect that the poet wished to change some parts of it to repair his mysterious mistake through the guilty *carmen* itself⁷⁶, we are allowed to look at *Ars* 2, 21-98 at least from a different point of view, the point of view of a poet aware of his mistakes, asking sorry and trying to come back home.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions, translations and commentaries

- W.S. Anderson, 1972, *Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Books 6-10, University of Oklahoma Press
- E. Baeza-Angulo, 2011, *Ovidio, Tristezas-Pónticas*, Madrid
- F. Bömer, 1977, *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen: Kommentar Buch VIII-IX*, Heidelberg
- F. Della Corte, 1973, *I Tristia. Commento*, Genova
- E. Fantham, 2004, *Ovid's Metamorphoses*, New York : Oxford University Press
- D. Giordano, R. Mazzanti, M. Bonvicini, 1991, *Ovidio / Tristia*, Milano
- M. Janka, 1997, *Ovid Ars amatoria, Buch 2. Kommentar*, Heidelberg
- E.J. Kenney, 1994, *P. Ovidi Nasonis / Amores; Medicamina Faciei Femineae; Ars amatoria; Remedia Amoris*, Oxford
- E.J. Kenney, 2011, *Ovidio / Metamorfosi*, vol. IV, Torino
- F. Lechi, 1993, *Ovidio / Tristezze*, Milano
- G. Luck, 1977, *P. Ovidius Naso, Tristia, herausgegeben, übersetzt und erklärt von Luck (Georg)*, Heidelberg
- R. Merkel, 1884, *Ovid*, Lipsiae
- S.G. Owen, 1885, *Ovid: Tristia Book I*, Oxford

⁷⁶ In *Trist.* 1, 1, 99, the elegiac poetry is compared with Achilles, who at the same time wounded and healed Telephus: now, the elegiac poetry of the *Tristia* has to constitute a remedy for the previous *carmen*, the *Ars amatoria*.

- E. Pianezzola, 1991, *Ovidio, L'arte di amare / a cura di Emilio Pianezzola, commento di Gianluigi Baldo, Lucio Cristante, Emilio Pianezzola*, Milano
- A. Ruiz de Elvira, 1988, *Ovidio, Metamorfosis; texto revisado y traducido por Antonio Ruiz de Elvira*, Madrid
- R.J. Tarrant, 2004, *P. Ovidi Nasonis / Metamorphoses*, Oxford
- A.L. Wheeler, 1939, *Ovid, Tristia – Ex Ponto*, Harvard University Press

Essays and studies

- C.F. Ahern, 1989, "Daedalus and Icarus in the *Ars amatoria*", *HSPH* 92, pp. 273-296
- M.C. Álvarez Morán, R.M. Iglesias Montiel, 1995, "Insuetum per iter: *Faetón y Dédalo*", in 7°. *Coloquio de Estudiantes de Filología Clásica* 15, pp. 49-69
- W.S. Anderson, 1989, "The artist's limits in Ovid. Orpheus, Pygmalion and Daedalus", *SyllClass* I, pp. 1-11
- M. Citroni, 1986, "Le raccomandazioni del poeta: apostrofe al libro e contatto col destinatario", *Maia* 38, pp. 111-46
- R.J. Dickinson, 1973, "The «*Tristia*»: Poetry in Exile", in *Ovid*, J.W. Binns (ed.), London and Boston
- A.D. Fitton Brown, 1985, "The Unreality of Ovid's Tomitan Exile", *LCM* 10, pp. 18-22
- H. Fränkel, 1945, *Ovid. A Poet Between Two Worlds*, Berkley-Los Angeles
- T. Gärtner, 2005, "Zur Bedeutung der mythologischen Erzählung über Daedalus und Icarus am Anfang des zweiten Buchs von Ovid's «*Ars amatoria*»", *Latomus* 64, pp. 649-60
- J. González Vázquez, 1988, "La imagen de la nave en las elegías ovidianas del destierro", in *Studia graecolatina C. Sanmillan in memoriam dicata*, Granada, pp. 219-32
- F. Graf, 2002, "Myth in Ovid", in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Philip Hardie (ed.), Cambridge, pp. 108-21.
- P. Green, 1982, "Carmen et error", *ClAnt*, pp. 202-20
- M. Havelange, 1976-7, "Lecture structurale de 'Dedale et Icare' d'Ovide (*Métam.* VIII 183-325)", *Humanités Chrétiennes* 20, pp. 409-18
- K. Heldman, 2001, *Dichtkunst oder Liebeskunst? Die mythologischen Erzählungen in Ovids «Ars amatoria»*, Göttingen
- M. Hoefmans, 1994, "Myth into Reality : The Metamorphosis of Daedalus and Icarus (Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, VIII, 183-235)", *L'antiquité classique* 63, pp. 137-60

- A.G. Lee, 1949, "An Appreciation of *Tristia III viii*", *G&R* 18, pp. 113-120
- A. Luisi, N.F. Berrino, 2008, *Carmen et Error nel Bimillenario dell'Esilio di Ovidio*, Bari
- M. Myerowitz, 1985, *Ovid's game of love*, Detroit
- F. Norwood, 1963, "The riddle of Ovid's *relegatio*", *CPh* 58, pp. 150-63
- O. Pecere, 2010, *Roma antica e il testo*, Bari
- B. Pavlock, 1998-9, "Daedalus in Ovid's «Metamorphoses»", *CW* 92, pp. 141-57
- N. Rudd, 1988, "Daedalus and Icarus in Art", in *Ovid Renewed: Ovidian influences on literature and art from the Middle Ages to the twentieth century*, C. Martindale (ed.), Cambridge, pp. 247-53
- G. Rosati, 2002, "Narrative techniques and narrative structures in the *Metamorphoses*", in *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, B. W. Boyd (ed.), Leiden
- E. (de) Saint-Denis, 1935, *Le rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine*, Paris
- W. Schubert, 1992, "Explizite und implizite Mythendeutung: (Ovids Daedalus-Ikarus-Erzählung *Met.* 8, 183-235)", *Eirene* 28, pp. 25-31
- A. Sharrock, 1994, *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars 2*, Oxford
- H.P. Schönbeck, 1999, "Erfüllung und Fluch des Künstlertums: Pygmalion und Daedalus bei Ovid", *Philologus* 143, pp. 300-16
- M. Tartari Chersoni, 1974, "La navicella dell'ingegno: da Properzio a Dante", *BStudLat* 4, pp. 219-28
- J.C. Thibault, 1964, *The mystery of Ovid's exile*, Berkley
- C. Tsitsiou-Chelidoni, 2003, *Ovid Metamorphosen Buch VIII: Narrative Technik und literarischer Kontext*, Frankfurt am Main
- E. Tola, 2001, "La metáfora de la nave en *Tristia* y *Epistulae ex Ponto* o la identidad fluctuante en la escritura ovidiana del exilio", *CFC (L)* 21, pp. 45-55
- S. Viarre, 1988, "Doublets mythologiques chez Ovide: de l'Art d'aimer aux *Métamorphoses*", in *Hommage à H. Le Bonniec*, Bruselas, pp. 441-8
- M. von Albrecht, 1977, *Römische Poesie. Texte und Interpretationen*, Heidelberg
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 1926, "Über Ovids Tristien", *Hermes* 61, pp. 298-302
- G. Williams, 2002, "Ovid's exilic poetry: worlds apart", in *Brill's companion to Ovid*, Leiden, pp. 337-81
- V.M. Wise, 1997, "Flight myths in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *Ramus* VI, pp. 44-59

Dictionaries/Encyclopaedias

EV, 1984, *Enciclopedia virgiliana*, Roma

A. Ernout-A. Meillet, 2001⁴ [1932], *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris

P. Grimal, 1996 [1951], *Dictionnaire de la mythologie grecque et romaine*, Paris

LIMC, 1986, *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, Zürich-München

OCD, 2012⁴ [1998], S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford

RE, 1893-1978, A. Pauly, W.S. Teuffel, G. Wissowa, *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft: neue Bearbeitung*, Stuttgart

Roscher, 1884-1937, W.H. Roscher, *Ausführliche Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig

A. Ruiz de Elvira, 1975, *Mitología Clásica*, Madrid

ThLL, 1900-, *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Lipsiae