Prayer and Power in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

Megan Elena Bowen
Bozeman, Montana

B.A., University of Colorado, 2008
M.A., University of Virginia, 2012

A Dissertation presented to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Virginia in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Classics

University of Virginia
October, 2018

K. Sara Myers, Co-Director
John Miller, Co-Director
Gregory Hays, Third Reader
Jane Alison, Outside Reader

ABSTRACT

My dissertation argues that prayers for divine assistance in the *Metamorphoses* emphasize and problematize the effects of power inequalities. I analyze how three particular factors—gender, cosmological status, and the way language is employed in a plea itself—influence the relative success of an appeal's result for its beneficiary in the poem's fourteen prayers for help (Deucalion and Pyrrha (1.377-80); Daphne (1.546-47); Syrinx (1.704); Cornix (2.577); Mercury disguised as a shepherd (2.699-701); Pentheus (3.719-20); Arethusa (5.618-20); Perimele (8.595-602); Mestra (8.850-51); Iphis (9.773-81); Caenis (12.201-3); Anius' daughters (13.669); Acis (13.880-81); and Myscelus (15.39-40)). Previous scholarship characterizes prayers as largely ignored and unsuccessful, but my study shows that virtually no appeal to a god remains unanswered. Rather, most deities provide responses that are of ambiguous benefit, with the particular degree of advantageousness varying based on the status differential between the individuals involved and the way the appeal has been worded. Typically, the greater the inequality of power, the less obviously beneficial the outcome, but virtually all results exhibit substantial ambivalence (the clear exception is Iphis). Moreover, appeals for assistance in the *Metamorphoses* are gendered, as women both pray for help more frequently and experience different types of results than men; in particular, all women undergo corporeal transformations, whereas men are able to receive changes to their external circumstances rather than their physical bodies (e.g. Myscelus), and women additionally experience an increased proportion of speech loss (e.g. Daphne, Syrinx, Anius' daughters, and Perimele). A further significant observation is that all of the most successful entreaties are answered by non-Olympian deities (e.g. Themis, Isis, and Hercules). Because the poem compares Jupiter and the Olympians to Augustus and the political center of Rome, the absence of unambiguously positive responses from Olympian deities may problematize contemporary Roman political authority. Finally, I demonstrate that a divinity's response to a prayer may be influenced by how well the speaker constructs the plea. The importance attributed to language formulation helps cast language, and by extension poetry, as a possible way to negotiate with higher powers. Ovid does not promote either a wholly positive or wholly negative view towards sources of authority; rather, by drawing attention to the ambivalent effects of power inequalities, he invites critique of and destabilizes the systems of power operative in Roman culture.

SITE OF SIGNATURE PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am tremendously grateful for the considerable and varied support I have received throughout this process from many people. One of many strengths I attribute to the University of Virginia's Classics Faculty is the collaborative and collegial atmosphere which it fosters. This has been apparent in my committee, and especially in my co-directors, John Miller and Sara Myers, whose ability to work in tandem has benefitted me enormously. They both have offered keen criticism, perceptive insights, and timely encouragement. I am particularly thankful to John Miller for miraculously providing comments that were both speedy and incisive at every stage. I cannot overstate my indebtedness to Sara Myers for frequent and helpful conversations, her pointed critiques, and challenging me to locate my contribution within a broader dialogue. I am also grateful to Greg Hays for devoting valuable time to this project as well as his formative role in my graduate education as the supreme exemplum of both innovative, thoughtful instruction and TA mentoring. I am likewise appreciative to Jane Alison for generously offering her time to serve as a reader on my committee. A number of other faculty members have expanded my knowledge and enriched my experience at UVA in various ways, including Jenny Clay, John Dillery, Jane Crawford, Coulter George, Tony Woodman, and Ted Lendon. I would like to single out Jon Mikalson in particular for his seminar on Dionysus, which first inspired me to begin thinking about literary prayers and planted the seeds for this dissertation. Much gratitude is due also to Bryce Carpenter, who introduced me to Latin and Greek and whose brilliant instruction spurred my love of language and instilled in me a deep appreciation for the complexity of the ancient world. My family and friends also deserve ample recognition. Foremost, I am thankful to my parents for their unwavering confidence in me and constant support. I do not have words sufficient to convey my gratitude, but the closest I have encountered can be found in Billy Collins' *The Lanyard*, and I hope you will accept this dissertation as my "lanyard." I owe much, emotionally and intellectually, to Kevin, Lindsay, Gwen, Mary, Hilary, Jocelyn, Tim, Ben, Courtney, and Katie, without whose conversations, advice, wit, and encouragement I might never have been able to climb this particular mountain.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION …………………………………………………………………... 1

CHAPTER

1. **PRAYER AND ATTEMPTED RAPE**………………………………….. 45

   I. Daphne ……………………………………………….. 52
   II. Syrinx ………………………………………………… 62
   III. Cornix ...…………………………………………….. 67
   IV. Arethusa ……………………………………………… 75

2. **PERMUTATIONS OF A PATTERN** ………………………………… 96

   I. Perimele ……………………………………………… 97
   II. Mestra and Caenis/Caeneus ...………………………… 116
   III. The Daughters of Anius ………………………………. 136
   IV. Acis and Galatea ……………………………………… 148

3. **EFFECTIVE ENTREATIES—BENEVOLENT RESPONSES FROM NON-OLYMPIAN DEITIES** ………………………………………….. 166

   I. Deucalion and Pyrrha ………………………………….. 167
   II. Telethusa and Iphis …………………………………….. 193
   III. Myscelus ……………………………………………….. 209

CONCLUSION ……………………………………………………………… 219

BIBLIOGRAPHY …………………………………………………………… 246

APPENDIX

I. **PRAYERS IN DIRECT SPEECH** ……………………………………… 274

II. **PRAYERS FOR DIVINE HELP** ……………………………………….. 277

INTRODUCTION

I. SURVEY OF SCHOLARSHIP ON PRAYER AND THE *METAMORPHOSES*

Prayers are a frequent and integral component of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, yet relatively little scholarly attention has been devoted to the topic. Appel's eminent study of Roman prayer was the first attempt to gather the prayers of the *Metamorphoses,* executed as part of his larger research that collects extant prayers.[1] While an enormously important work for understanding Roman prayer in general and invaluable as a resource for the study of prayer in an array of authors, it is not concerned with illuminating the *Metamorphoses* specifically. Decades after Appel, Anderson was perhaps the first to comment on how widespread prayer is within Ovid's epic, but again the primary focus of his discussion is not solely prayer in the *Metamorphoses*. His 1993 article explores the gesture of suppliants in Vergil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Much of his discussion concerns the language each poet uses uses to describe prayerful gestures (for instance, Vergil strongly prefers *tendere* combined with *manus* or *palmas,* whereas Ovid uses *tendere* and *tollere* as well as *manus, palmas,* and *bracchia*), but he also makes broad characterizations about prayer in each work. In particular, he contrasts the *Aeneid* and the *Metamorphoses*: "If *pietas* and the impassioned needs of prayer are the standards

---

[1] 1909.

[2] 1993: 171.

[3] "What in Vergil was a special, understandable, but regrettable violation of human

in the *Aeneid*, from which the hero and the poet move only in exceptional circumstances that serve to reinforce the accepted value of prayer and the importance of the divine realm over human beings, in the *Metamorphoses* Ovid makes a theme of the way human expectations from prayer suffer regular violation, most notably from the gods themselves."[2] To support this claim, Anderson analyzes six episodes in the *Metamorphoses*: Learchus, Itys, Pentheus, Io, Actaeon, and Callisto. As he notes, the first three of these make appeals to humans, and therefore illuminate more about human response to prayer than the relationship between mortal and divine.[3] As to the latter three episodes, Anderson argues that they show how the gods abort and pervert human prayer.[4] Ultimately, from these six examples Anderson concludes that, "Ovid portrays a world where there is much prayer, but only rare success in the appeal, whether to a god or another human being. All too often, piety attracts destruction or metamorphosis."[5]

---

[2] 1993: 171.

[3] "What in Vergil was a special, understandable, but regrettable violation of human entreaty, to capture the great issues of the epic in supreme starkness, has become for Ovid an all too regular theme. Human beings behave inhumanly toward each other, crazed by their passions or possessed by the terrible hatred of the Ovidian gods. As he describes their rejection of prayer, Ovid epitomizes their inhumanity." (Anderson 1993: 172-73).

[4] "Pentheus has not remorsefully prayed to the god, and we cannot assert that Ovid has shown the god spurning prayer. Earlier in the poem, however, that had been precisely the Ovidian theme: that the gods abort and pervert human prayer in the most appalling and grotesque manner." (Anderson 1993: 173).

[5] 1993: 177.

Anderson clearly uncovers a fascinating pattern of frustrated prayers, but it is difficult to accept his conclusions about the efficacy of divine response without further support, since none of his given examples concern prayers actually spoken to a god. The first three are addressed to humans, and the last three are prevented from being verbalized at all. Nonetheless, Anderson expresses the same sentiment in his commentary on Books 1–5, "Deities in this poem often ignore prayers and deserving piety."[6] I will return to these remarks below, as a significant portion of my analysis will concern to what extent Anderson's interpretation is accurate (i.e. how successful are prayers in the *Metamorphoses*?). For now it is enough to note that his assertion requires further qualification and examination.[7]

---

[6] 1997: on 1.381-83.

[7] Lateiner (1996) also addresses suppliant gestures in the *Metamorphoses*, though prayer and prayer-gesture are not the sole focus of his analysis. Rather, he explores all nonverbal and paralinguistic communication in Book 14. Any mention of prayer is largely tangential to his main discussion, but in passing he briefly comments that characters "posture properly in prayer for pity, compassion, and mercy, but hardly a soul gains assistance." (231). All but one of the examples he cites (Achaemenides' quotation of the Cyclops' curse on the Greeks 14.190-91) are failed attempts at erotic magic or entreaties: Glaucus and Circe's exchange (14.11-12, 14.35); Circe to Picus (14.374); Vertumnus disguised as an old woman (14.687-93, 14.762); and Iphis as a suppliant to Anaxarete (14.702-4), (14.730-35). Both magic and a lover posing as a suppliant are *topoi* in Roman elegy, where the efforts of the lover commonly fail (cf. Myers 2009: on 14.12-24, 374, 702), and the failure of these gestures and pleas in this book of the *Metamorphoses* likely relates to this generic convention. The other two amatory prayers in the *Metamorphoses*, Apollo's (1.504-24) and Polyphemus' (13.789-869), also fail to convince their recipients.

Subias-Konofal's recent publication, *Poétique de la prière dans les œuvres d'Ovide* recognizes the longstanding void in scholarship on Ovidian prayer and provides a solid foundation for studying the topic.[8] Her ambitious work is not restricted to the *Metamorphoses*, but rather treats the entire Ovidian corpus. This breadth of scope has many advantages, but also inevitably flattens to some extent the particularities of individual works and contexts. This is not to say that Subias-Konofal is not attentive to the individual character of each work; indeed, she often notes places where the specific work or narrator influences the type or form of a prayer.[9] Instead, it is merely to suggest that there is much more to say about prayers within the context of their individual works. In addition to isolating prayer as a phenomenon worthy of study in Ovid, Subias-Konofal compiles the prayers in Ovid and discusses their formal features. Appel's work on Roman prayer also gathers Ovidian prayers, but Subias-Konofal's catalogue is a significant improvement. Whereas Appel lists 29 instances of prayer in the *Metamorphoses*,[10] Subias-Konofal includes 86 examples.[11] The primary disadvantage of Appel is not that he

---

It may also be worth noting that the most recent list of prayers by Subias-Konofal (2016) does not include Vertumnus' speeches (see below for more on Subias-Konofal).

[8] 2016.

[9] E.g. 2016: 61, 110, 185, 207.

[10] 1909: 49-50.

[11] 2016: 48. In her appendix, she includes 104 entries (2016: 338-43).

identifies fewer speeches as prayer, but rather that he does not explain what criteria he uses to determine a prayer, and his reasoning appears to be inconsistent. For instance, he includes Daphne's (1.546-47), Arethusa's (5.618-20), and Achelous' (8.595-602) prayers for help, yet excludes nearly identical requests for help by Anius' daughters (13.669) and Acis (13.880-81). He also typically omits prayers spoken by divinities or semi-divine figures, but makes a few exceptions without providing his reasoning.[12] Because no context is offered for why apparently similar passages are treated differently, the list seems internally inconsistent.

Not only does Subias-Konofal assemble a more inclusive list, but she also specifies supplementary features about each prayer. For instance, she lists the speaker and recipient, the divine status of the speaker and recipient (i.e. divine, hero, human), the number of lines, whether the prayer begins and/or ends a line, and whether it is in an embedded narrative. Furthermore, she creates a typology of the prayers in Ovid's entire oeuvre, using Pliny the Elder[13] and Guittard[14] as her chief foundation. In his discussion of whether words and formulaic prayers have inherent power (*Ex homine remediorum*

---

[12] E.g. Daphne 1.546-47; Hermaphroditus 4.383-86; Arethusa 5.618-20; Medea 7.615-18, 7.192-219; Achelous 8.595-602; Aurora 13.586-99.
[13] Plin. *NH* 28.10-11.
[14] Guittard 1987: 157-58.

primum maximae quaestionis et semper incertae est, polleantne aliquid verba et incantamenta carminum), Pliny mentions three types of prayers: one for obtaining good omens; one for averting evils; and one for praise (*praeterea alia sunt verba inpetritis, alia depulsoriis, alia commendationis*). Guittard later adapts Pliny's categories into a different set of three groups: *precatio* (request), *votum* (contract with a divinity), and *carmen* (hymn in honor of the gods).[15] Subias-Konofal expands on these types with a number of further categories and sub-classifications.[16] In all, she identifies sixteen types:

---

[15] Guittard 1987: 157-58.

[16] Forming a classification system for ancient prayers can prove challenging, and while broad categories are relatively agreed upon, they have evolved slightly over time, and scholars include different sub-categories depending on individual needs. Modern classification systems differentiate prayers primarily by the prayer's function or speaker's intention—not by formal features of the prayers themselves. The typologies which have been created apply to both Greek and Roman prayer, since the main difference between Greek and Roman prayers is that Roman prayers rely more heavily on traditional formulae, and often have a different performance setting (Cf. Jakov and Voutiras 2005: 105). Hahn (2007: 239-45) presents a classification system that is largely representative of current consensus. She discusses five types of prayers: petition, vow, oath, thanksgiving, and hymn. The defining feature of a petition is that it makes a request. A vow is a particular class of petition in which the speaker promises a gift in exchange for the fulfillment of the request, for instance when a general promises to build a temple if he is successful in battle (cf. Appel 1909: 68-69; Hickson 1993: 91). Similarly, an oath may be considered a class of petitionary prayer, in which a speaker asks a deity to serve as a witness to a statement or agreement and to punish whoever lies or violates the terms of the agreement (cf. Hickson 1993:107). Prayers of thanksgiving are relatively straightforward in that they offer gratitude in exchange for a divine favor that has been previously granted. Hymns offer praise to a divinity. Since Hahn considers vows and oaths a sub-category of petitionary prayers, her basic scheme is again tripartite:

vows (6); hymns (5); requests/varied petitions (including atonement) (20); requests for help/favor and propitiatory prayers (21); requests for favor towards the author's work (1); requests for information (2); varied petitions and long/complex prayers (12); prayers for love (3); complaints (2); oaths (4); curses (5); commands (0); invitations (1); advice (1); apostrophe (1); and wishes (2).[17] This typology is extremely useful for gaining a general sense of the kind and frequency of prayers within the work, but as Subias-Konofal herself states, the classification of many individual prayers is difficult and open to multiple interpretations.[18]

---

petitionary, thanksgiving, and honoring. It is worth noting that curses may also be included under petitionary prayers. *precor* and the related noun, *preces*, may refer to both prayer and curses, since curses are essentially requests for negative results. As Watson (1991: 3) notes, "Such lexical ambivalence reflects a material interrelationship between actions of praying and cursing."

[17] 2016: 48. Unfortunately, she does not provide line numbers for prayers in each category; while her appendix includes line numbers and classifications of every prayer, the categories and numbers do not match precisely with the earlier table, and so cross-reference is difficult. For instance, the appendix includes two commands (6.159-61; 3.689-90), whereas the table on page 48 indicates there are no commands in the *Metamorphoses*. Similarly, her appendix shows two examples of advice rather than one (6.28-33; 8.696-701). Her appendix also includes the additional category of challenges (6.25; 6.280-85), which is absent from the table. Furthermore, the appendix lists a number of passages that are prayers in indirect speech, but it is not a complete list of prayers in indirect speech, so that the appendix contains 104 passages, whereas her typology table contains 86. The list of prayers in direct speech in the *Metamorphoses* which I provide in my appendix is a modified version of Subias-Konofal's appendix.

[18] 2016: 47.

Much of Subias-Konofal's study of Ovidian prayer is lexically focused, but she does not exclusively concentrate on cataloguing Ovid's adherence to or detachment from cultic formula. Instead, she identifies three inputs which create Ovid's unique religious language: liturgical language, expressions from the literary tradition, and expressions of his own formation. For the latter category she uses metrical analysis especially to argue that Ovid's prayers possess a musical quality, distinct from the rest of his poems, which imbues the work with a sacred status and blends the definitions of *carmen* as poetry and religious song/incantation. One of the expressions Subias-Konofal identifies as creating Ovid's unique religious language is *ferre opem*.[19] The imperative form of this phrase, *fer opem*, is a particular feature of the *Metamorphoses* and critical to my study, as I will expand on below. While the use of this phrase in prayers may partly function to lend a sacred status to both the *Metamorphoses* and Ovid's oeuvre broadly, it also seems to have a more specialized function within the *Metamorphoses* specifically.

II. SURVEY OF SCHOLARSHIP ON PRAYER IN HOMER AND VERGIL

In order to further illuminate this distinctive character of Ovid's petitions and their purposes, it will be useful to briefly consider scholarship on the function of prayer in two of Ovid's chief epic predecessors, Homer and Vergil, and contrast the role of Ovid's

---

[19] 2016: 321-27.

pleas for divine assistance. In his discussion of prayer in Homer, Morrison characterizes prayer scenes as a Homeric type scene, analogous to arming scenes, and assesses their narrative function.[20] He shows that the standard function of Homeric prayer scenes is to anticipate future narrative. Generally, after a mortal makes a request to a god, it is followed by the formula τοῦ δ᾽ ἔκλυε, which foreshadows to the audience that the request will be fulfilled later in the narrative (e.g. *Il.* 1.43; 457; 5.121; 10.295; 16. 527; 23.771; 24.314; *Od.* 3.385; 6.328; 9.536).[21] Similarly, when a god denies a petition, there is commonly explicit mention, such that the audience again is able to anticipate the future narrative.[22] In Ovid, on the other hand, entreaties are not used to foreshadow future events. The text never explicitly states that a god rejects a prayer, and when there are passages that affirm a god assents to an appeal, the entreaties do not concern future events and so the god's approval does not foreshadow anything.[23] Additionally, most

---

[20] 1991: 145-46.

[21] Cf. Morrison 1991: n. 14.

[22] Morrison 1991: 149.

[23] Ovid does not adopt the Latin equivalent of the Homeric formula, using the verb *audio*. Vergil uses the formula in a number of passages cf. Hickson 1993: 116-17. *adnuo* is sometimes used in the *Metamorphoses* to indicate positive response to a request: 2.531 (sea gods); 4.539 (Neptune); 5.284 (Muses); 8.352 (Apollo); 8.560 (Theseus); 8.780 (Ceres); 11.104 (Bacchus); 12.206 (Neptune); 12.597 (Apollo);13.600 (Jupiter); 14.593 (gods); 14.816 (Jupiter); 15.683 (Asclepius). Cf. Appel 1909: 138. For *adnuo* in Vergil cf. Hickson 1993: 52. *moveo* is used in this context in the *Metamorphoses* at 1.381 (Themis); 2.579 (Minerva); 4.387 (Hermes and Aphrodite); 5.283 (Muses); 5.621

pleas are too vague to provide much useful information about future events. This is noticeably true for *fer opem* prayers, whose primary request (to bring assistance) can be, and is, interpreted in many ways. Second, while some passages explicitly indicate that a god assents to a prayer, they never explicitly express that a god rejects a petition.

Lateiner's investigation of Homeric prayer (mostly in the *Iliad*) supplements Morrison's analysis.[24] For the purposes of his study Morrison defines prayer as a request to a god by a mortal,[25] essentially limiting himself to petitionary prayers. Lateiner, on the other hand, embraces a more expansive definition of prayer as "humans addressing themselves directly to gods."[26] This definition allows him to include complaints and accusations in addition to requests, and ultimately leads Lateiner to find a wider array of functions for Homeric prayer (though he also affirms Morrison's finding that prayer serves to foreshadow).[27] For instance, he adds that prayers are used to characterize

---

(Diana); 6.264 (Apollo); 7.169 (Medea); 7.711 (Aurora); 10.643 (Venus).

[24] 1997.

[25] 1991: 147. Lateiner (1997:252-53) also offers an important reminder that prayer is one element of a four-part ritual, which includes: 1) Cleansing; 2) Prayer; 3) Sacrifice; and 4) Libation.

[26] 1997: 252.

[27] 1997: 268-70. In addition to conclusions about additional functions of Homeric prayers, Lateiner provides a survey of prayers in the *Iliad* (256-68) and observations about what constitutes prayer and differences between ancient and modern mentalities on the subject (241-45).

protagonists and to mark moments where individuals experience extreme threats. He furthermore identifies locations in Books 1, 9, 16, and 24 where these appeals born of crisis serve as pivot points for the plot.[28]

These additional narrative functions are more applicable to Ovid's epic than foreshadowing. Prayers surely play a role in developing the portrayal of both the speaker and recipient in various episodes. For instance, in the episode of Galatea, Acis employs a petition that resembles those of endangered women elsewhere in the poem, which characterizes him as feminine.[29] Any further generalizations about the role of prayer in characterization are challenging, however, since the particular portrayal will vary from character to character and episode to episode, and therefore must be considered on an individual basis. Additionally, as in Homer, entreaties often highlight instances of imminent danger to characters. While not valid for all types of prayers,[30] this function is especially pertinent to petitions for divine assistance, since these appeals serve as the climax of their episodes. Individuals pray at the exact moment they are on the verge of capture, and the imminence of the threat is frequently emphasized in the text (e.g. 1.542-

---

[28] 1997: 265-69.

[29] See a fuller discussion at 149-66.

[30] For instance, Hippomenes does not request assistance from Venus in gaining Atalanta because of any extreme danger (10.638-41). Still, the prayer may emphasize Hippodamas' heightened emotions and mark a point of crisis for the speaker.

44, 5.616-18, 13.667-69, 13.884-85).

Studies of Roman prayer in authors, including Vergil, have been focused primarily on establishing how closely an author's language follows the religious formulae in state rituals. The central work on prayer in Vergil, Hickson's *Roman Prayer Language: Livy and the Aeneid of Vergil*, is chiefly a lexical study examining if and how the two authors employ the traditional religious language of cult. Hickson finds that both authors employ language from cult and adapt formulae to a literary setting, but Livy adheres more closely to the technical formulae. This in turn leads her to provide at least a cursory conclusion about the function of prayer in the *Aeneid*. In particular, she contrasts the prayers of Livy and the *Aeneid*, arguing that the former evoke official Augustan religious occasions through their use of technical formulae, whereas the latter conjure "literary images of religious practices that extend beyond space and time."[31] This conclusion rests on her observations about the dearth of traditional technical Roman prayer formulae from cult in Vergil's work. Still, she finds that he retains technical usages of certain words or employs technical prayer vocabulary in novel ways. Hickson additionally suggests Vergil's prayers resemble Greek, especially Homeric prayers (e.g. *Aen.* 1.326-34 and *Od.* 13.228-35, 16.183-85; *Aen.* 11.477-85 and *Il.* 6.297-307; *Aen.*

---

[31] Hickson: 1993: 141.

11.785-93 and *Il.* 16.233-48).[32]

Amanda Sherpe's dissertation on prayer in the *Aeneid* disputes Hickson's claim that Vergil's prayers are unconnected to a specific time and place. Although she concurs that Vergil is further removed from the ritual formulae found in inscriptions and cultic prayers than Livy, she believes Vergil's prayers are formed from the same source material as Livy and similarly reflect specifically Roman cultural identity.[33] She does not dispute that many of the prayers are intentionally Homeric, but rather argues that there is also significant Roman material that connects Ovid's work to specifically Roman "authors, time periods, Roman rituals and cultural norms."[34] Allusions to Homeric prayer allow Vergil to compare his characters to those in Homer, while at the same time he incorporates Roman and Italic ritual and language to focus on the foundation of Rome and Roman traditions (e.g. *Aen.* 1.326-34, 8.68-78, 10.421-25, 11.477-85, 11.785-93).[35]

III. PETITIONS FOR DIVINE ASSISTANCE IN OVID'S *METAMORPHOSES*: DEFINITION, SUCCESS, AND FUNCTION

My study focuses on a particular subset of prayers in the *Metamorphoses*, requests for divine assistance. This group resembles a subset of Subias-Konofal's largest

---

[32] Cf. Hickson: 1993: 28-31, 142-44.

[33] 2011: 9.

[34] 2011: iii.

[35] See Sherpe (2011: 38-73).

category of prayers in her typology: requests for help/favor and propitiatory prayers.[36] In particular, I consider the prayers of the following individuals: Deucalion and Pyrrha (1.377-80); Daphne (1.546-47); Syrinx (1.704); Cornix (2.577); Mercury disguised as a shepherd (2.699-701);[37] Pentheus (3.719-20); Arethusa (5.618-20); Achelous' prayer for Perimele (8.595-602); Mestra (8.850-51); Telethusa's prayer for Iphis (9.773-81); Caenis (12.201-3); Anius' daughters (13.669); Acis (13.880-81); and Myscelus (15.39-40). Whereas Subias-Konofal combines prayers for aid, prayers for favor, and propitiatory prayers into a single category, I examine solely the first subset, prayers for aid.[38] Even so, my grouping differs slightly from her list of prayers for aid because my study stems from a consideration of the repetition of a particular way of asking for assistance, the request *fer opem*. The frequent recurrence of this phrase does not escape Subias-Konofal. In fact, she considers the formulation emblematic of the *Metamorphoses*,[39] but she primarily

---

[36] 2016: 48. The second largest category is requests/varied petitions (including atonement) at 20. This grouping may also be considered a sub-classification of Pliny's first category of prayers, *verba inpetritis*, which Guittard adapts to *precatio*. While *impetritum* has technical application to omens, *impetro* has a basic meaning of "entreat" (*OLD* 1a). Both Pliny's and Guittard's categories essentially may be considered petitionary prayer, i.e. prayers that make a request; for this sub-classification the prayers make requests for help.

[37] Listed as an ironic prayer in Subias-Konofal's appendix (2016: 338), but included in her discussion of prayers for aid (2016: 83).

[38] 2016: 78-85.

[39] 2016: 84.

surveys the usage of *ops* (i.e. not specifically in the imperative form of *fer* + *opem*), and does not delve into its function in individual passages.[40] I will expand on the phrase *fer opem* below, but first I will specify how the set of petitions I discuss differs from Subias-Konofal's list of prayers for aid.

The criteria for what constitutes a request for aid versus a simple request are by no means clear-cut. Nearly all requests for divine intervention may arguably be considered requests for "aid" in some sense. For instance, at 7.615-18, after a severe plague, Aeacus appeals to Jupiter to restore his population (*mihi redde meos*). Subias-Konofal classifies this as a simple petition, rather than a request for aid,[41] but it could also be argued that Aeacus is asking for help in returning his people; most requests ask for some sort of aid or assistance, and so the differentiation becomes somewhat subjective and imprecise. Still, despite this inevitable ambiguity, an attempt at categorization is valuable, since creating classifications highlights similarities and differences between individual prayers.

The core of my study develops from an examination of prayers that explicitly ask for help (*opem*). This list is then supplemented with additional prayers that possess strong

---

[40] 2016: 82-85; 321-27.
[41] 2016: 341.

thematic and verbal ties to those episodes. As such it excludes four prayers Subias-Konofal considers requests for aid, but which do not include the request specifically for help and do not have a particularly strong connection to the main group of *fer opem* prayers: 4.532-38 (Venus to Neptune); 6.262-64 (Ilioneus to the gods); 10.320-24 (Myrrha to gods); and 12.120-21 (Achilles). Additionally, my investigation incorporates four episodes omitted by Subias-Konofal which I believe are central to understanding the *fer opem* prayers, despite not employing the phrase. For two of these, Syrinx (1.704) and Cornix (2.577), the prayers are not reported in direct speech and therefore are absent from Subias-Konfal's study. The other two, Mestra (8.850-51) and Caenis (12.201-3), she categorizes respectively as "petition" and "vow."[42] While these designations are suitable, both prayers could easily belong to other categories. Subias-Konofal chooses to categorize any speech explicitly called *votum* in the text as a vow,[43] but Ovid uses *votum* interchangeably with *prex* in the *Metamorphoses*.[44] It therefore seems that Subias-Konofal categorizes Caenis' and Mestra's prayers differently solely because one is explicitly termed *votum* in the text (12.199-201) and one is not, but the circumstances of Caenis' and Mestra's petitions greatly resemble each other—both women make requests

---

[42] 2016: 341-42.

[43] 2016: 49.

[44] E.g. 4.372.

to Neptune after he has raped them, citing his violation as a reason for him to intervene; in both cases Neptune responds by transforming the woman into a man.

Given these similarities, the designations "petition" and "vow" seem equally appropriate for both prayers. Vows usually entail a promise for a future service offered,[45] but can also be interpreted as a contractual obligation with a divinity for a benefit provided. For both Caenis and Mestra the "service" granted is virginity, and in exchange the girl receives the fulfillment of her request. In both stories, the request occurs after her virginity has already been taken. Because Mestra's appeal does not follow the rape immediately, and is not called *votum* in the text, it is perhaps less obviously a vow, but the circumstances of exchange are not markedly different from Caenis. The term used for Mestra's prayer, "petition," is apposite to both Mestra's and Caenis' speeches, because the category includes any prayer that makes a request;[46] Mestra appeals for rescue from slavery (*eripe me domino* 8.848) and Caenis requests not to be female so as to avoid rape again (*tale pati iam posse nihil; da, femina ne sim* 12.202). Why Subias-Konofal does not grant Mestra's prayer the additional sub-categorization as a request for aid is not entirely clear. Not only does deliverance from slavery seem to constitute a type of help, but her

[45] Hahn 2007: 272.

[46] Hickson 1993: 4 and Hahn 2007: 271.

request occurs as she is on the verge of capture, which brings it into close alignment with other women who pray to escape apprehension.[47] Regardless of the most appropriate nomenclature for these two particular prayers, their similarities to and differences from *fer opem* prayers are illuminating enough to merit inclusion in my discussion, and Ovid additionally fosters their juxtaposition through verbal parallels, as will be discussed in greater detail in their respective sections.

Now that I have detailed the group of prayers under consideration, it remains to examine the phrase that links these prayers, *fer opem*. The collocation of *ferre* and *opem* in various forms is well attested in authors of both prose and poetry, in religious as well as secular contexts, but is particularly common in Ovid.[48] The imperative form, *fer/ferte opem,* is rather less common, but is deployed particularly frequently in the *Metamorphoses*.[49] Before the *Metamorphoses*, uses of the phrase occur nearly exclusively in tragedy and comedy.[50] It also occurs once at *Heroides* 14.125, but how this

---

[47] For instance Subias-Konofal categorizes the prayers of Daphne (1.546-47), Arethusa (5.618-20), and Anius' daughters (13.669) as prayers for aid (2016: 341-43).

[48] Cf. Subias-Konofal 2016: 321. Appel (1909: 127-31) surveys ways of asking gods for help (with *fer opem* covered at 128). Hickson (1993: 79-83) includes *iuvare, servare, pro deum fidem,* and *pro Iuppiter* in her discussion.

[49] Cf. Subias-Konofal 2016: 324.

[50] Ennius *Trag. Fr.* 42 W.; Plaut. *Mil.* 1387; Plaut. *Rud.* 617; Ter. *Adel.* 487; Sex. Turpilius 118; IncTrag. 241; Cic. *Pro Ligario* 30.14; *Tusc.* 4.73.6 (quoting tragedy); *De Div.* 1.67.4 (quoting Ennius). The phrase also occurs in *Priapea* 37.8 (of uncertain date;

fits into the chronological sequence of the phrase's occurrence depends on the fraught question of the authorial authenticity of *Heroides* 14.[51] After the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid employs the phrase four additional times: *Tristia* 5.3.35 and *Ex Pont.* 1.6.17, 2.3.48, and 2.9.6. Seneca the Younger uses it three times in his tragedies: *Phaedra* 726, 948 and *Sen. Oed.* 10.57. Finally, it occurs in epic after Ovid twice, once each in Valerius Flaccus and Silius Italicus: *Arg.* 3.385 and *Pun.* 14.436. Ovid's usage therefore accounts for half of all extant instances of the phrase (15/30),[52] and two thirds of his usage belongs to the *Metamorphoses* (10/15).

The frequent recurrence of the request *fer opem* in the *Metamorphoses* should not be taken as a banal coincidence, but a deliberate gesture.[53] Here, Fulkerson and Stover's recent volume on Ovidian repetition lends valuable insight and context. They contend that while repetition is to some extent inherent in literature generally,[54] for Ovid in particular it may be the principal defining characteristic of his poetics. As they observe, "Perhaps the most easily noticeable fact about the poet Ovid is that he repeats himself,

---

cf. Parker 1988).

[51] Reeson 2001: 2-3.

[52] 15/28 if we exclude Cicero's quotations of other authors.

[53] Phrasing from Fulkerson and Stover 2016: 9.

[54] On repetition see also Wills 1996.

both thematically … and lexically, via reuse of noteworthy phrases."[55] The majority of their volume focuses on this thematic, rather than lexical, repetition, but many observations are equally applicable to both categories. Furthermore, lexical repetition may be used as a tool to highlight thematic repetition, as is the case for *fer opem* prayers. As Fulkerson and Stover stress, "The reader of the *Metamorphoses* is consistently challenged, through its repetitiveness, to find similarity-within-difference, difference-within-similarity."[56] The otherwise uncommon plea *fer opem* creates a web of interlocking scenes to compare and contrast.[57]

My study develops from two primary questions about this subset of prayers—1) How successful are prayers for help in the epic? 2) What is their function both within their immediate context and within the narrative of the poem as a whole? For the first question, it will be useful to grant at least a cursory consideration to success in the context of prayers in the work generally before specifically appraising the subset of prayers for help. The question of whether or not prayers are successful in the

---

[55] 2016: 3.

[56] 2016: 9.

[57] In a similar fashion, Hershkowitz (1997) identifies a pattern of repeated scenes in the *Thebaid*, marked by the phrase *parce metu*. The *parce metu* scenes in the *Thebaid*, however, allude to the *parce metu* scene in the *Aeneid*. She therefore discusses both their intertextual relationship as well as their intratextual relationship. Ovid's *fer opem* scenes, on the other hand, display solely intratextual repetition.

Metamorphoses has not been examined in any great detail, but as noted above, Anderson twice characterizes them as unsuccessful.[58] A closer examination of the prayers in the work, however, reveals that Anderson's assessments are not entirely accurate. At the crux of the question about whether prayer is successful in Ovid's epic is how we define "success." In studies about prayer in other authors, the "success" of a prayer hinges foremost on whether or not a god decides to respond to a prayer (e.g. Mikalson 1989; Morrison 1991), and Anderson follows this same standard when he labels prayers "ignored." In fact, by this metric prayers in the *Metamorphoses* are rather successful.

Only 13 prayers can be considered obviously not answered (15.9%):[59] 1.504-24 (Apollo to Daphne); 2.692-94 (Mercury disguised as a shepherd to Battus); 3.719-20 (Pentheus to Autonoe); 6.262–64 (Ilioneus to gods); 6.299–300 (Niobe); 6.349-59 (Latona to the Lycians); 6.496-503 (Philomela's father to Tereus); 10.320-24 (Myrrha to the gods); 13.789-869 (Polyphemus to Galatea); 14.12-24 (Glaucus to Circe); 14.372-76

---

[58] In her discussion of the effectiveness of prayer, Subias-Konofal concentrates on the *Fasti*, which she characterizes as a work where prayer is particularly effective (2016:170-73). First, in his article on the gesture of suppliants in Vergil and Ovid Anderson remarks (1993: 177), "Ovid portrays a world where there is much prayer, but only rare success in the appeal, whether to a god or another human being. All too often, piety attracts destruction or metamorphosis." Then, in his commentary on Books 1–5, he asserts (1997: on 1.381-83), "Deities in this poem often ignore prayers and deserving piety."

[59] See appendix for a list of 82 prayers in direct speech, modified from Subias-Konofal.

(Circe to Picus); 14.759-64 (Vertumnus disguised as an old woman to Pomona); 15.765-78 (Venus to the gods). This number is misleadingly large for assessing divine responsiveness, however, since five are addressed to mortals (Battus, Autonoe, the Lycians, Tereus, and Picus).[60] Additionally, five of the failed petitions are instances of an

---

[60] The prayer of Achilles in Book 12 (120-21) could be considered another example of an unanswered prayer, but in fact is another instance of the ubiquitous phenomenon in this epic whereby the prayer is answered, but not in the way the speaker expects or intends. After Achilles has struck down one enemy, Menoetes, with a spear, he says, "This is the hand, this is the spear by which I have just now been victorious: I shall use the same ones against this man; may there be the same end in this, I pray!" (*haec manus est, haec, qua modo vicimus, hasta:/ utar in hoc isdem; sit in hoc, precor, exitus idem!'*). As most famously occurs in Daphne's prayer (1.546-47) with the word *figura,* Achilles employs a word with multiple meanings (*exitus*) and the narrative capitalizes on the discrepancy between the speaker's intended meaning and another possible interpretation. In this particular episode, Ovid also manipulates Homeric patterns to mislead his audience into assuming the prayer has been fulfilled in an uncomplicated manner, and then thwarts their expectations, further highlighting this incongruity between speaker's intent and divine interpretation. Directly after Achilles finishes his petition, the narrator indicates, "Thus he spoke, and hurled again at Cycnus, nor did the ashen spear miss" (*sic fatus Cycnum repetit, nec fraxinus errat* 12.122). *sic fatus* translates the Homeric formula ὣς εἰπών (Bömer Vol. 6, 1982: 370-73). As discussed below, the results of Homeric prayer are commonly revealed directly after they are spoken in order to foreshadow future action. Ovid appears to follow this pattern, but he subsequently thwarts expectation with the additional information that the spear did not pierce Cycnus' skin (12.123-24). Achilles thinks it has wounded his enemy and rejoices, but the narrative notes his celebration is in vain (*et frustra fuerat gavisus Achilles* 12.136). After more fighting, Achilles eventually pins Cycnus and suffocates him, and prepares to strip Cycnus' armor, but Cycnus has already transformed into a swan. This escape from death may initially appear to imply that Achilles' prayer was unsuccessful, but the ultimate evaluation of the success of Achilles' prayer hinges on how to interpret the word *exitus*. It appears Achilles means for Cycnus to meet the same death as Menoetus, but *exitus* can also mean result or

erotic suitor trying to woo his beloved (2.699-701; 13.789-869; 14.12-24; 13.372-76; 14.759-64). The outcome of these prayers is influenced by elegiac convention, which expects a lover's pleas to be rebuffed and erotic magic to fail.[61] When we disregard these examples, only four prayers remain unanswered (5.6% or 4/72)—Ilioneus' prayer to be spared (6.262–64);[62] Niobe's prayer to save at least one of her children (6.299–300); Myrrha's prayer to prevent her crime (10.321–23); and Venus' prayer to prevent Caesar's murder (15.765-78).[63] Furthermore, for two of these prayers (Ilioneus' and Venus') the gods are moved, but changing the circumstances is beyond their capacity.[64] In contrast, Morrison calculates the number of unanswered prayers in Homer to be 37%.[65]

---

outcome in a more general sense (*OLD* 5a). Immediately before his request, Achilles cries out '*vicimus*' and then asks for the same outcome in relation to Cycnus. At 12.150 Achilles is then described as *Cycni victor.* Under the latter definition, Cycnus experiences the same result as Menoetus in the sense that Achilles is victor over both men. Achilles' thwarted expectation when he rejoices mirrors the experience of the reader who may initially assume that *exitus* means "death," but later realizes it may also mean "outcome" more generally.

[61] Cf. Myers 2009: on 14.12-24; 374; 702.

[62] Although Ilioneus still dies, Apollo is moved by the prayer. Nevertheless he cannot call back his arrow, which has already been sent (*motus erat, cum iam revocabile telum/ non fuit, arcitenens* (6.264-65).

[63] Again, as with Ilioneus, the gods are moved by the prayer, but cannot change the outcome (*verba iacit superosque movet, qui rumpere quamquam/ ferrea non possunt veterum decreta sororum* 15.780-81).

[64] This would place the number of ignored prayers at 2.8% or 2/72.

[65] 1991: 149.

Why then, if the gods respond to such a large proportion of prayers in the *Metamorphoses*, does Anderson characterize prayer as "unsuccessful"? Likely, he does so because the way the gods respond often does not correspond to the speaker's intentions. Ovid frequently constructs prayers such that the phrasing of the words is vague enough to allow multiple interpretations that do not align with the speaker's intended meaning. The gods do not ignore prayers; instead, they frequently respond in a way that technically answers the literal meaning of the words, but does not match what the speaker would want. The inclination to explore the ambiguity of language is, of course, not unique to Ovid. Many prophecies, for instance, take advantage of double-meanings, or multiple ways of construing the same speech. Examples are ubiquitous in ancient literature, for instance various scenes in the *Aeneid* hinge on the proper interpretation of ambiguous language (e.g. Delian Apollo's prophecy that the Trojans will find a new home in their ancient mother's land at 3.94-98, and Anchises' instruction to establish a home when hunger compels Aeneas' crew to eat their tables at 7.116-27). The notion that wording must be precise in prayers in particular is, in fact, a rather widespread, traditional Roman belief. For instance, Servius comments that *in precibus nihil esse ambiguum debet* (*ad Aen*. 7.120). This underlying notion that precision of language is vital contributes to the Roman preoccupation with fixed formulae, attested in

a number of sources. Cato's *De Agri Cultura,* for example, endorses the importance of formulae by offering exact prayers to recite before various aspects of farming (134-41). His prayer on purifying fields is especially lengthy and full of archaisms and formulae (141).[66] Cicero (*ND* 2.10) expresses the importance of precise language when he says *At vero apud maiores tanta religionis vis fuit ut quidam imperatores etiam se ipsos dis inmortalibus capite velato verbis certis pro re publica devoverent*. He also criticizes Clodius in *De Domo Sua* (140) for performing prayers incorrectly, with distorted formulae (*praeposteris verbis*). Macrobius speaks of the ancient Roman custom of calling upon the tutelary gods of the city they were besieging *certo carmine* (3.9.2).[67]

By exploiting ambiguous language in prayers throughout the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid adheres to traditional Roman religious beliefs about the importance of exact phrasing in prayer. This also appears to be part of Ovid's penchant for exploring ambiguities of language generally.[68] For instance, the story of Cephalus and Procris (7.661-865) depends on the understanding of "aura" as breeze versus "Aura" as a name (*vocibus ambiguis deceptam praebuit aurem/ nescio quis nomenque aurae tam saepe*

---

[66] See Courtney 1999: 62-67.
[67] Cf. Appel 1909: 205-7; Norden 1939: 92; Fyntikoglou 2005: 161.
[68] On Ovid's distinctive tendency to blur and exploit the literal and figurative meanings of words see Tissol 1997.

vocatum/ esse putat nymphae: nympham mihi credit amari 7.821-23). Procris believes her husband is in love with a nymph, but in reality he is just speaking to the cool breeze. Similarly, in the story of Mestra (738-878), Mestra and her potential master interpret the same sentence differently to comic effect. Her father has sold her into slavery, but when the man is close to taking her into custody, she is transformed into a fisherman. She then swears an oath to her potential master that no man or woman has stood on the shore except her (*quoque minus dubites, sic has deus aequoris artes/ adiuvet, ut nemo iamdumdum litore in isto,/ me tamen excepto, nec femina constitit ulla* 8.866-68). Every word of her oath is technically true, but the slave-master does not understand that Mestra and the fisherman are the same person.[69]

Similar stories, which take advantage of double meanings, are frequent in the poem; still, it is noteworthy that Ovid repeatedly offers scenes where the gods interpret the language of prayers contrarily to the speaker's intent. As Anderson observes, the gods' responses to prayers often entail a bodily metamorphosis of the speaker,[70] but this

[69] Ceres also draws attention to the possibility of different interpretations of the same words in her complaint to Jupiter after she "finds" her daughter (*en quaesita diu tandem mihi reperta est,/ si reperire vocas amittere certius, aut si/ scire, ubi sit, reperire vocas.* 5.518-20). Cf. 13.669-71 (*tulitque/ muneris auctor opem,—si miro perdere more/ ferre vocatur opem*).

[70] 1993: 177.

is rarely what the speaker expects. The discrepancy between actual outcome of a petition and the speaker's desires makes assessing the success of a prayer's result more complicated and difficult. This challenge is compounded by the text's lack of explicit evaluation for most consequences, such that it is left to the reader to conclude whether the effect of the prayer is beneficial to the speaker. In fact, instead of promoting a single interpretation, the text often explicitly notes that there is ambiguity about how to judge metamorphosis (e.g. Daphne 1.578, Actaeon 3.253-55, Anius' daughters 13.669-71).[71] Although it is important to acknowledge that virtually all outcomes exhibit some degree of ambivalence, there also seems to be a discernable ranking of relative benefit for entreaties' results.

My classification system will only address entreaties offered to divinities. Drawing broad conclusions about the "success" of prayers for help addressed to human recipients is less appropriate, since the sample size is so small and the episodes are so unique. The two examples of *fer opem* pleas addressed to mortals seem to operate under a slightly different framework than the prayers for help addressed to divinities, and additionally serve different purposes from each other. The first of these occurs in the story of Mercury's theft of Apollo's cattle (2.676-707). While Mercury hides the stolen

---

[71] Cf. Solodow 1988: 170-72.

cattle, a shepherd named Battus sees him (2.687-90). The disguised god offers Battus a cow if he promises not to disclose that he has seen anything (2.691-95). Battus swears that he will not tell, and adds that a nearby rock would sooner break its silence than he would (2.695-97). Mercury then changes his disguise, begs Battus to tell him where the cattle are (*"rustice, vidisti si quas hoc limite" dixit/ "ire boves, fer opem furtoque silentia deme!* 2.699-700), and promises him a bull and a cow in exchange (2.701). Battus readily breaks his first oath because of his greed for the promised cow, and responds to the petition for help by disclosing the location of the stolen cattle (2.702-3). For his lack of loyalty and silence, Mercury transforms Battus into stone (2.704-7). Evaluating the "success" of Mercury's prayer for help is not relevant in the same way as prayers addressed to divinities, since Mercury is not really in danger and the request is part of his planned deception. The plea is "successful" in that Battus responds to it, but because the god is the individual with greater power all along, the outcome of the request has greater consequences for the recipient of the prayer than the speaker. In this comedic scene, Ovid plays with dramatic reversals. Whereas in other scenes *fer opem* prayers often result in transformation of the speaker, in this episode the prayer leads to a transformation of the prayer's recipient. The use of *fer opem* highlights this ironic reversal, but also Mercury's

application of the phrase is meant also to mimic human speech convincingly.[72]

The second prayer for help addressed to a mortal, Pentheus' prayer to Autonoe to rescue him from the attacking bacchants (3.719-20), is one of the few examples in the poem of a denied prayer, and the only example of a plea for help that is refused. In part, by employing the phrase *fer opem*, this entreaty may demonstrate that mortals are not bound to respond to prayers in the same way as gods. Still, even if mortals are technically capable of denying petitions, refusing them is reprehensible. The denial of Pentheus' plea has tragic consequences for both the speaker and recipient. Anderson remarks about the prayer, "*fer opem*: standard appeal for help (cf. 1.380 and 546), which no human being and few gods would ignore."[73] While a more accurate characterization might be that no gods and few human beings would ignore the prayer, Anderson successfully captures the *pathos* that the desperate plea *fer opem* typically evokes. Pentheus' request resembles other distressed prayers, but his former irreverent behavior makes him a less deserving recipient of help than other speakers, and his own family cannot recognize him.[74]

---

[72] Subias-Konofal 2016: 82.
[73] 1997: on 3.719-20.
[74] Notably, in Ovid's version, Pentheus' prayer is not ignored by a god. Additionally, Bacchus is not explicitly responsible for his punishment. See Anderson (1997: on 3.511-733) on the difference between Bacchus' role in the *Metamorphoses* and Euripides' *Bacchae*.

The episode showcases violation of various types of proper relationships (i.e. between men and gods and between family members).[75] Pentheus is characterized as blatantly impious in Ovid's version of the tale.[76] He is described as *contemptor superum* (3.514), and Tiresias warns that if Pentheus does not honor Bacchus properly, he will be torn to pieces (3.517-25). This prayer and its emphatic, disturbing outcome emphasize the negative effects of sacrilegious behavior by men. Pentheus' original impiety breeds further impiety to both his own detriment and that of his family. While other (more innocent) speakers of *fer opem* appeals may not have ideal results, Pentheus fares the worst of all. Even if Bacchus is ultimately responsible for Pentheus' disastrous end, by having Pentheus address his entreaty to Autonoe, rather than a god, Ovid is able to maintain the impression that words have binding power over the gods, while at the same time heightening the emotion of the scene and emphasizing the destruction of proper relationships.

As regards prayers for divine assistance,[77] I have generated a classification for

---

[75] Feldherr (2010: 182-88) examines the tension between reading and seeing in the context of evaluating fiction versus reality in this episode, as well as connections to contemporary ideologies of Roman power.

[76] Cf. Janan 2004: 131.

[77] All conclusions that follow are specifically about the subset of prayers for help in the *Metamorphoses*, but for convenience I consistently write "prayers" rather than "prayers for help."

how advantageous the outcome of a god's response is,[78] composed of four groups: 1) least desirable; 2) mixed; 3) good, but contingent on prior rape; and 4) good. The first category includes individuals who pray for help to avoid physical violence, are transformed, and lose their voices as a result. The second category I term "mixed" because, while the members are metamorphosed like the first group, they retain their voices and therefore fare comparatively better. In the third category, requests are fulfilled according to the speaker's intentions, but only after these women suffer rape. The fourth category consists of members who do not experience corporeal transformation or violence and whose requests are fulfilled according to their intentions. In summary, the first two groups avoid physical violence through prayer, but the outcome of the prayer does not fulfill their intentions; furthermore the first group is silenced, whereas the second is not. The outcomes in the third group match the petitioner's request, but they experience physical violence beforehand. The fourth group has members for whom the outcomes conform to their intentions and do not experience any physical violence. The following table provides a convenient resource for considering the relative success of

---

[78] Two prayers for help are not addressed to gods (Pentheus' to Autonoe at 3.719-20 and Mercury's to Battus at 2.699-701), and therefore are excluded from the present table about success of divine response. The difference between these two prayers and the others will be discussed in greater detail below.

prayers to divinities for help and key influencing factors.

Relative Success of Outcome	Gender	Cosmological Hierarchy	Argument
Least Desirable Outcome			
Daphne to Peneus	F ⟶ M	S ⟶ S	No
Syrinx to her sisters	F ⟶ F	S ⟶ S	No
Anius' daughters to Bacchus	F ⟶ M	H ⟶ O	No
Achelous for Perimele to Neptune	M ⟶ M	S ⟶ O	No
Mixed Outcome			
Arethusa to Diana	F ⟶ F	S ⟶ O	Yes
Cornix and Minerva	F ⟶ F	H ⟶ O	No
Acis to Galatea	M ⟶ F	S ⟶ S	No
Good Outcome Contingent on Rape			
Caenis to Neptune	F ⟶ M	H ⟶ O	Yes
Mestra to Neptune	F ⟶ M	H ⟶ O	Yes
Good Outcome			
Deucalion and Pyrrha to Themis	M&F ⟶ F	H ⟶ N	Yes
Telethusa for Iphis to Isis	F ⟶ F	H ⟶ N	Yes
Myscelus to Hercules	M ⟶ M	H ⟶ N	Yes

F = Female; M = Male; H = Human; S = Semi-divine; O = Olympian deity; N = Non-Olympian deity

The relative value of a prayer's outcome to the beneficiary is affected by three primary factors—gender, cosmological status, and the language of the appeal itself. While there is no strict, mechanical formula for exactly how a prayer will play out, the particular intersection of these influences shapes the outcome and shows Ovid's acute awareness of and emphasis on various power structures throughout the work.[79] As we consider the

[79] Cf. Feldherr 2010: 7. Fulkerson (2016: 2-3) also states, "Among the stories [Ovid] finds most compelling are those which focus on aberrant behavior and its aftermath, and on the exploitation of power differentials."

second guiding question of my study, namely the function of petitions for divine assistance in the *Metamorphoses*, it appears that because greater power differentials between the individuals in an episode tend to result in less positive results for beneficiaries, part of these petitions' larger purpose is to highlight and problematize power inequalities, as I will explore more fully both below and especially in the Conclusion. While the above table inevitably oversimplifies and flattens the complexity of Ovid's great work, it nonetheless serves as a useful reference for exploring the different power structures at play.

The gender of the speaker, recipient, beneficiary,[80] and the other participants in the episode all contribute to a prayer's result. Typically, women occupy a lower status than men of the same divine status (i.e. mortal men are more powerful than mortal women, but less powerful than goddesses), but among the Olympians this norm is not guaranteed (e.g. Minerva's victory over Neptune, which she portrays on her tapestry at 6.75-82). For female beneficiaries of prayer, their inferior status generally results in less favorable outcomes than for men, especially an increased proportion of silencing. Furthermore, their prayers consistently result in a transformation to their physical bodies.

---

[80] Typically the beneficiary is the same individual as the speaker, but speaker and beneficiary differ in the case of Perimele and Iphis.

How beneficial these metamorphoses are depends on other factors, but the inevitability of corporeal change differs from men in comparable circumstances, who may experience a change to their external circumstances. In terms of the gender of a prayer's recipient, praying to a male god does not ensure a better outcome. In fact, female divinities seem more sympathetic to the needs of female beneficiaries, and divinities in general may best understand the needs of those who are most like them, either in terms of gender or cosmological status. Additionally, the gender of other actors in the episode besides solely the speaker, recipient, and beneficiary can have an impact on the outcome of an appeal. For instance, in many episodes an individual prays for help to escape from another character, and the status of the threatening character vis-à-vis the responding divinity limits the responding deity's action (e.g. Alpheus vis-à-vis Diana).[81]

The second type of power that is involved in determining a prayer's outcome is status within the cosmological hierarchy. This term requires some clarification, as it is my own expression for indicating the status of different categories of existence. The most common way of dividing classes of existence into gods, humans, and animals/the inanimate is specified within the text of the poem in the opening book's cosmogony (1.69-78 and 1.395-437). This tripartite classification can then be subdivided further into

---

[81] Cf. Pg. 93.

additional categories of heroes, demi-gods/ minor gods, and Olympian gods. Jupiter himself brings up the distinction between different classes of gods during the council of the gods in Book One (*plebs habitat diversa locis*).[82] In particular, he declares (1.192-95):

> sunt mihi semidei, sunt rustica numina, nymphae
> faunique satyrique et monticolae silvani;
> quos quoniam caeli nondum dignamur honore,
> quas dedimus, certe terras habitare sinamus.
>
> I have demigods, rustic deities, nymphs, fauns, satyrs, and sylvan deities on the mountains; since we do not yet consider them worthy of an office in heaven, surely we should allow them to inhabit the lands, which we granted them.

Furthermore, there is a hierarchy among the Olympian gods, and the status of individual gods forms an important theme within the *Metamorphoses* (e.g. 1.452-65, 4.426-31, 6.75-82). This complete sequence of categories (animal/inanimate, human, demigod, minor gods and nymphs, Olympian gods, and inter-Olympian status) is what I term the "cosmological hierarchy," i.e. an individual's status within the universe based on these divisions.

Again, the position within the cosmological hierarchy of all actors in an episode influences the success of an entreaty's outcome. Most beneficiaries of prayers for help hold a relatively low status within the cosmological hierarchy.[83] This intuitively makes

---

[82] Cf. Feeney 1991: 194-224.

[83] The exception is the Olympian god Mercury, but as he makes his prayer disguised as a human, he is a special case, especially since he makes the request to a human recipient.

sense, as those of lower status are likely to experience imminent danger more easily and rely on prayer due to their lack power and other resources. Within the subset of prayers I consider, Deucalion, Pyrrha, Cornix, Pentheus, Anius' daughters, Perimele, Caenis, Mestra, Telethusa, and Myscelus are all mortals. Daphne, Arethusa, and Acis belong in the category of nymphs and minor gods. Whether an individual belongs to the former or latter group appears to have little bearing on the outcome of the prayer.[84] The status of the rest of the actors in an episode is a much larger determining factor. As mentioned in the discussion of gender, the status of the responding deity vis-à-vis the individual threatening the prayer's speaker (e.g. the status of Peneus vis-à-vis Apollo in the Daphne episode)[85] influences the outcome, as a minor god's response is limited by the more powerful deity. Surprisingly, however, the gods with the highest status in the cosmological hierarchy—Olympian gods—do not provide the most beneficial outcomes, as I discuss in greater detail in Chapter Three. Instead, the divinities that deliver the most beneficent outcomes exist outside the Olympian order: Themis, Isis, and Hercules. This characterization of non-Olympian deities as more amenable to human needs may have

---

The respondent does, in fact, heed the request for help, but in order to do so breaks a former promise to the god. Mercury therefore punishes the respondent's transgression by transforming him into a rock (2.680-707).

[84] On the complex definition and status of nymphs see Larson 2001, esp. 3-60.

[85] Cf. Pgs. 58-61.

interesting ramifications for thinking about the contemporary socio-political structure which featured Augustus as the dominant figure, especially since within the poem Augustus is connected to both Jupiter (1.168-76, 199-208, 15.858-60) and Apollo (1.557-65),[86] and because the Olympians are explicitly compared to the Roman ruling class at 1.170-76.[87] By selecting non-Olympian deities to be the most sympathetic, Ovid may dissociate traditional sites of supreme power from beneficial responses to prayer. This, in turn, seems to problematize traditional power hierarchies, question the typical foundations of authority, and contribute to a larger movement of destabilization observed throughout the work, as will be explored more fully in the concluding chapter.[88]

The third factor that influences relative success of a prayer is how it is constructed in terms of both phrasing and how closely it conforms to the ideal composition of a Roman prayer, especially whether or not it contains an "argument." The ideal Roman

---

[86] See Miller 2009: 332-73.

[87] Fulkerson (2016: 19-20; 75-77) suggests that much of Ovid's concern with who possesses power and how they wield it stems from the loss of power equestrian and senatorial classes faced under the Augustan regime. Feldherr similarly analyzes the relationship between power structures in Ovid's epic and Roman society, summarizing his aim thus (2010: 7): "My goal is to expand our understanding of the modes by which the work facilitates the audience's reflection on and redefinition of the hierarchies operative within Roman society." I will explore the possible implications of Ovid's attention to power inequalities in the Conclusion.

[88] Cf. Myers 1999: 197; Miller 2009: 332-73; Feldherr 2010.

petitionary prayer is comprised of four parts: 1) Invocation;[89] 2) Request; 3) Beneficiary; and 4) Argument.[90] The invocation generally includes epithets and often further information to identify or praise the deity. Second, a standard petition includes a verb that makes a request. Third, it often identifies the specific beneficiaries of the request, though this is the least essential component, since frequently the speaker and beneficiary of the prayer are the same person. Lastly, it provides an argument for why the deity should respond, for instance because of services rendered to the deity by the speaker in the past or because of future gifts promised to the deity.[91] This final element, the "argument," seems particularly important for how beneficial the outcome of a prayer is in the *Metamorphoses*. All of the most successful prayers provide an explicit argument, whereas none of the least successful petitions do.[92] Additionally, divinities often exploit

---

[89] On various names, epithets, and other characteristics of invocations cf. Appel 1909: 75-114; Norden 1913: 143-76.

[90] This portion of a prayer has been identified by a number of different terms. Ogilvie (1969: 496) is responsible for the term "argument," accepted and promoted by Bremer (1981: 196; n. 15). Most schemes are tripartite: according to Miller (1986: 2), 1) invocation 2) hypomnesis 3) request; Meyer (1933: 5) used the term "hypomnese." Bremer: invocation, argument, and petition. The additional element I include, specifying the recipient, is often absent because the speaker and recipient are identical, and so not markedly different from subsequent classification schemes.

[91] Ogilvie 1969: 407-656; Bremer 1981:193-96; Hickson 1993: 9-11; and Hahn 2007: 239-40.

[92] Subias-Konofal (2016: 334) notes that Ovid respects traditional components of prayer (invocation, request, and argument), and utilizes all three of the most common types of

ambiguous language in a request, opting to fulfill a petition according to an overly literal interpretation of words, rather than a speaker's intended meaning (e.g. Daphne's request *figuram perdere* at 1.547).

The importance which is afforded to an appeal's argument and wording for its success helps to confirm the intrinsic power of words and the concomitant power in how individuals construct and use language. Belief in the innate power of spoken ritual words is traditional and widespread in Roman thought, as exemplified by the Roman obsession with precision of language during performed rituals. A number of authors demonstrate that meticulous attention to exact wording and formulae was necessary in the performance of Roman prayers.[93] The discussion of prayer by Pliny the Elder shows that the question of whether words hold innate power was germane to the Romans (*Ex homine remediorum primum maximae quaestionis et semper incertae est, polleantne aliquid verba et incantamenta carminum*).[94] Pliny lists a number of examples and passages from literature that support belief in the power of ritual words and incantations.[95]

Ovid perpetuates this traditional belief and affirms that words possess intrinsic

---

arguments: *da quia dedi, da ut dem, da quia dedisti*.

[93] Cf. Appel 1909: 205-6.

[94] Plin. *NH* 28.10-11.

[95] Plin. *NH* 28.11-21.

power through the way he portrays responses to prayer in the *Metamorphoses*. In addition to making construction of language an important factor in a plea's success, he also dispenses with the Homeric practice that depicts gods rejecting prayers or parts of prayers. This gives the impression that when a god hears a prayer, he must respond. This binding ability of language is confirmed in the Phaethon episode when the Sun desperately wishes to deny his son's request to drive his chariot (2.31-102). He begs Phaethon to change his mind (*at tu, funesti ne sim tibi muneris auctor,/ nate, cave, dum resque sinit tua corrige vota!* 2.88-89), but cannot refuse him outright (*vox mea facta tua est; utinam promissa liceret/ non dare! confiteor, solum hoc tibi, nate, negarem./ dissuadere licet: non est tua tuta voluntas!* 2.51-53).[96]

Episodes of frustrated prayer also contribute to the impression that language holds intrinsic power. Throughout the *Metamorphoses* there are a number of instances in which characters are expressly unable to pray. Io (1.731-33), Callisto (2.482), Actaeon (3.237-41), and Myrrha (10.507) all attempt to pray, but are thwarted by their physical transformation.[97] Frustrated prayers are a subset of impeded speech that permeates the

---

[96] In part, the sun is additionally obligated to fulfill Phaethon's petition because he has sworn to grant his son anything (2.43-46). This compulsion required by the oath is further evidence of the binding power of language.

[97] In a similar vein, Philomela's desire to swear an oath on the gods is also frustrated (*sed non attollere contra/ sustinet haec oculos paelex sibi visa sororis/ deiectoque in humum*

poem generally. The theme of silencing and loss of speech in the *Metamorphoses* has been well explored, especially since speechlessness is one of the primary results of metamorphosis throughout the poem,[98] but the further specification of prayer has not been extensively treated. While frustrated prayer shares a number of similarities with frustrated speech, it also contributes to understanding the distinctive role of prayer within the poem. Not only does loss of speech dehumanize individuals, but the inability to pray additionally deprives them of the agency to alter their circumstances. For instance, Juno transforms Callisto into a bear specifically so that she cannot pray, because this might obligate a divinity to spare her (*neve preces animos et verba precantia flectant,/ posse loqui eripitur* 2.482-83).[99]

Because the success of petitions for assistance in the *Metamorphoses*, marked especially by the phrase *fer opem,* seems dependent on these three sources of power (gender, cosmological status, and language), and because power inequalities frequenty result in ambivalent or detrimental outcomes for the beneficiaries of petitions, the function of these appeals appears partly to be to problematize power inequalities. If

---

vultu iurare volenti/ testarique deos, per vim sibi dedecus illud/ inlatum, pro voce manus fuit. 6.605-9).

[98] E.g. de Luce 1993; Forbis 1997; Gauly 2009.

[99] Cf. Anderson 1993: 175.

divinities in the work were to understand humans perfectly and respond to all of their appeals in unambiguously favorable ways, power inequalities would seem beneficial and unproblematic. Instead, the ambivalent nature of responses to prayer brings into question power inequalities and destabilizes traditional hierarchies.

IV. OUTLINE OF DISSERTATION

My study will explore the context, form, and function of each prayer and its response in greater detail, especially focusing on the intersection of the three types of power previously enumerated (power based on gender, power based on position within the cosmological hierarchy, and the power intrinsic in language) in the poem's fourteen prayers for help. Individual discussions of each episode are divided between the three body chapters. Chapter One identifies a pattern of appeals for divine aid in scenes of attempted rape, consisting of the tales of Daphne (1.452-567), Syrinx (1.689-712), Cornix (2.569-95), and Arethusa (5.572-641). In each of these stories a woman makes a petition for divine assistance to prevent being raped by a pursuing assailant, which ultimately results in her own corporeal metamorphosis. Importantly, this pattern is gendered, as divine petitions are a specifically female way of preventing rape. While rape and attempted rape have received considerable scholarly attention,[100] the importance of

[100] E.g. Parry 1964; Segal 1969; Stirrup 1977; Curran 1978; Mack 1988; Richlin 1992;

prayer as a means of preventing rape for women has not. Appeals for divine assistance are the only way women effectively prevent rape and defend themselves against aggressive male pursuit. But in no case is the appeal fully successful, as preventing rape always entails an ambivalent transformation of the threatened women themselves. The prominence of this gendered model in the first third of the epic, I argue, also establishes expectations (to be upset) for similar prayers for help in the rest of the epic. Chapter Two discusses stories that capitalize on these expectations. The tales of Perimele (8.547-610), Mestra (8.738-878), Caenis (12.146-209), Anius' daughters (13.632-74), and Acis (13.738-897) each exploit expectations about the established pattern in a unique way. Because of this, the effect and function of the variation within its immediate context differ in every episode. These distinctive functions will be addressed individually in Chapter Two, but we may additionally note that each of the appeals contributes to the larger observation that the success of petitions is contingent on the extent of power inequalities. Furthermore, both Chapters One and Two contain prayers with markedly ambivalent results, which especially reveal distinctions between mortal and divine, and men and women. In contrast, Chapter Three focuses on the most effective entreaties for assistance. The joint prayer of Deucalion and Pyrrha (1.377-80), Telethusa's prayer to

---

Segal 1998; James 2016.

Isis (9.773-81), and Myscelus' petition to Hercules (15.39-40) all have positive outcomes for the petitioner. Even so, the riddling oracle Themis offers to Deucalion and Pyrrha in response to their prayer reinforces a difference between divine and mortal understanding. Additionally, a comparison between Myscelus' outcome and Iphis' reveals that even beneficial responses to prayer differ in kind based on gender—while men may receive changes to their external circumstances, women receive bodily changes, which in turn reinforces the precarious position of women. Furthermore, because they are all answered by divinities outside the main Olympian order, the appeals in Chapter Three perhaps indicate that non-Olympian deities display greater sympathy for human needs. After introducing and analyzing all the petitions for divine aid through the lens of various structures of power, in the concluding chapter I will expand on some of the more salient political and thematic implications. When we consider all the petitions for divine assistance collectively, it is clear that episodes which exhibit a difference between the responding deity's interpretation of help and the beneficiary's recur frequently. This repetition thematizes the incongruence between individuals of dissimilar status and ultimately destabilizes traditional hierarchies by allowing an avenue for critiquing them, even without specifically condemning them.

CHAPTER ONE: PRAYER AND ATTEMPTED RAPE

The prominence of prayer in episodes of erotic pursuit has often been overlooked, but petitions for help are prevalent—they constitute a vital component particularly in scenes of attempted, rather than completed, rape.[101] The stories of Daphne (1.452-567), Syrinx (1.689-712), Cornix (2.569-95), and Arethusa (5.572-641) comprise the core of a narrative pattern in which a woman is desired, flees, is pursued, prays for help, and then undergoes a transformation to avoid capture and rape. As variations of this basic narrative repeatedly play out, prayer is revealed to be the sole means of defense against male violence for powerless women in flight. These entreaties for aid prevent male attackers from successfully raping women, but only through corporeal metamorphoses of the threatened women themselves.

Throughout the *Metamorphoses*, flight from a desirous suitor is primarily the plight of women. In addition to the four women who explicitly pray during their pursuit (Daphne, Syrinx, Cornix, and Arethusa), Io (1.597-600) and Lotis (9.346-48) flee from a pursuer. Io does not pray during her chase, likely because Ovid is interested in showing prayer as a means to avert rape, and Io is unable to do this. Additionally, her pursuer is

---

[101] See James (2016: 157-58) for a list of rapes and attempted rapes.

Jupiter, and no god is powerful enough to prevent his will.[102] Instead, Io's prayer appears to be both displaced to after her rape and frustrated by her inability to use human speech, which in turn emphasizes traditional beliefs about the power of spoken words themselves (*nec illa manus lambit patriisque dat oscula palmas/ retinet lacrimas et, si modo verba sequantur,/ oret opem nomenque suum casusque loquatur* 1.646-48). Lotis' story involves a metamorphosis that seems to prevent her rape, but does not mention prayer as averting her rape or causing her transformation. Still, this sequence of events may be implied, since the tale is syncopated into a mere two lines (9.346-48). Elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses*, details from a more elaborately narrated episode may be supplied to a more condensed version of a similar tale.[103] Similarly, details for Lotis' story may be expected to be filled in from Daphne's. Anderson connects the scene with Daphne and Syrinx, but notes that no information is actually given about how Lotis is transformed.[104] Hesperia similarly does not pray, but her pursuit is cut short, since she is unexpectedly bitten by a snake during her flight and dies (11.767-77).

Primarily, women flee from an erotic male suitor, but the exceptions of Narcissus (3.339-510) and Hermaphroditus (4.274-388) help shed light on the gendered nature of

---

[102] Cf. 2.435-36; Otis 1970: 105; for possible generic justification Nicoll 1980: 178.
[103] Cf. Heath 1992.
[104] 1972: on 9.346-48.

prayer in scenes of pursuit. In these two episodes the gender of pursuer and pursued are reversed—a desirous woman seeks an unwilling man. In this way as well as many others, both stories cleverly play with and destabilize expected gender roles, but neither episode completely reverses them.[105] While a full analysis of these rich and complex episodes is beyond my present scope, [106] a brief contrast between female victims of attempted rape and the accounts of these men underscores why prayer plays such a prominent role in scenes of female flight: prayer is the sole remaining tool for otherwise resourceless women, whereas men retain other means against their female pursuers.

Narcissus flees the female nymph Echo (*quid me fugis* 3.383-84, *ille fugit fugiensque* 390), but his story differs from the fleeing women Daphne, Syrinx, Cornix, and Arethusa in that he does not pray for divine help to thwart his pursuer. Instead, he directly confronts Echo and commands her to refrain from touching him (*"manus conplexibus aufer!/ ante" ait "emoriar, quam sit tibi copia nostri."* 3.390-91), and she obeys (*spreta latet silvis* 3.393). Narcissus does not need to rely on an appeal to a divinity because he has the power to directly command the nymph. This difference in power

---

[105] Cf. Nugent 1990; Salzman-Mitchell 2005a.

[106] For a fuller discussion of these episodes along with relevant bibliography (esp. Salzman-Mitchell 2005a and Keith 1999b) see Barchiesi and Rosati (2007: 175-83, 283-85). Cf. also Janan 2009 (with further bibliography at 115-16 n. 3, n. 4) and Fulkerson and Stover 2016: 9-14.

between pursued men and women helps explain the frequency of divine petitions made by women in scenes of attempted rape—prayers are made when the speaker lacks the agency to protect herself, when she has no other recourse but an appeal to the gods. In the case of Narcissus and Echo, Narcissus' male status enables him to directly command Echo to keep her hands off him; Echo's status as semi-divine appears to have little impact on their power dynamic—Narcissus is also semi-divine and does not require any outside help to resist Echo. Even when it appears traditional gender roles are switched, and a man runs from a woman, the gender reversal is incomplete. Narcissus maintains a degree of agency and is able to deny Echo's advances on his own.[107] Females, on the other hand, appear to require the assistance of a more powerful third party for any sort of deliverance.

In Hermaphroditus' story, he never actually runs from Salamacis, but the verbs *fugio* and *effugio* recall the typical pattern of female flight (Daphne *fugit* 1.502; Syrinx *fugisse* 1.701; Cornix *fugio* 2.576; Arethusa *fugio* 5.601). Hermaphroditus threatens to take flight (*'desinis, an fugio tecumque' ait 'ista relinquo.'* 4.336) and when he fights against Salamacis' advances (*perstat Atlantiades sperataque gaudia nymphae/ denegat* 4.368-69), she declares he will not escape (*non tamen effugies* 4.371). Despite the

[107] For ways that Narcissus resembles Daphne and other nymphs cf. Davis 1983: 84-85.This supports Salzman-Mitchell's conclusion that gender roles are never completely reversed in the poem (2005a: 9).

masculine position Salamacis assumes, she is not powerful enough to fully achieve her desires through force; she successfully clings to Hermaphroditus (*inhaerebat* 4.370), but he denies any sexual union (4.368-69). Again, this reinforces the gendered nature of prayer as a means for deliverance—women rely on pleas to higher powers because they do not have the ability to reject erotic pursuers themselves. Both Narcissus and Hermaphroditus, on the other hand, find ways (at least initially) to avert the nymph who desires them without divine help (Narcissus through a command and Hermaphroditus through physical resistance).

Salamacis eventually partially overcomes Hermaphroditus' resistance through her own prayer. In order to do so, however, she must turn to divine intervention from gods of higher status (*di* 4.371), since she does not have the physical power to execute her wishes. She calls upon the gods to grant that no day separate her from Hermaphroditus, and the gods comply (4.371-73). As in numerous prayers that I discuss, the gods interpret the prayer in a way that is perhaps more literal than the speaker intends. Like the appeals which belong to many victims of attempted rape, Salamacis' prayer results in metamorphosis of her body that deprives her of speech. It also transforms Hermaphroditus, but he is able to retain his speech. The voice that remains at the end of the episode is Hermaphroditus'. Even if it is no longer entirely male (4.382), the final

plea clearly belongs to him as he calls upon his divine parents (4.383-86). This final reliance on a divine appeal, however, may be an indication of Hermaphroditus' new, ambiguously gendered status, as he relies on outside help in his new form.

The difference between how Narcissus and Hermaphroditus avert rape and how Daphne, Syrnix, Cornix, and Arethusa do so assists in confirming the gendered character of divine petitions in scenes of pursuit. Prayer is shown to be the means through which powerless women endeavor to gain agency. James anticipates this conclusion when she says, "The number of mythic victims who seek to be rendered un-rapable, sometimes after the fact, attests to a recognized eagerness to exercise choice—even if that choice is to become a tree (Daphne, book 1), a reed (Syrinx, book 1), a crow (Cornix, book, 2) a pool (Arethusa, book 5), a flower (Lotis, book 9), or an invulnerable man (Caenis, book 12)."[108] I disagree, however, with James' conclusion that all of these women choose these specific transformations. Instead, the responding deities decide how to interpret their vague requests for help, irrespective of the women's intentions, as I will explain more fully in my discussion of individual episodes. As women struggle for control over their bodies in scenes of attempted rape, prayer becomes a locus in which to observe the intersection of and competition between various power hierarchies. The extent to which

---

[108] James 2016: 155.

prayers for help are beneficial to the speaker ultimately depends on: 1) the gender of both the speaker and recipient of the prayer; 2) the position of both the speaker and recipient within the cosmological hierarchy; and 3) the specificity of the prayer's wording and its adherence to the ideal form of cultic prayer. The particular way these three factors impact the stories of Daphne, Syrinx, Cornix, and Arethusa will be explored in greater detail throughout this chapter.

On a more practical level in terms of narrative and thematic construction, prayers also create the impetus for transformation. Numerous metamorphoses are the result of divine intervention, and prayers provide a motivation for divinities to interfere in human activities that would otherwise not concern them.[109] Typically, a character turns to prayer when she is on the verge of capture. When physical capabilities fail them, victims turn to their last and only resort—a prayer for divine assistance. At this final moment of crisis, women rely upon their voices, but the divine assistance that is offered to them usually results in a disfiguring transformation of their body that deprives them of that very voice.[110]

[109] Prayer is, of course, only one of a myriad of narrative choices that spur divine involvement or catalyze transformations. For instance, Jupiter transforms Io into a cow to avoid Juno recognizing his infidelity (1.605-11) and Diana transforms Actaeon as a punishment for entering her sacred grove and seeing her bathing (3.175-99).
[110] Discussions of women and loss of speech in the *Metamorphoses* include Joplin 1984;

I. DAPHNE

The story of Daphne and Apollo emphatically announces itself as the first amatory episode of the poem (marked especially by *primus amor* 1.452). Accordingly, it has been recognized as establishing the paradigm for all subsequent erotic tales and as serving a programmatic function.[111] Similarly, it operates as the model for and develops our expectations about a particular subset of amatory episodes, namely attempted rapes. The stories of Daphne, Syrinx, Cornix, and Arethusa share the same basic narrative components: a woman is desired, flees, is pursued, prays for help, and then undergoes a transformation to avoid capture or rape. Each story is brought into relief through the particular way it adheres to or departs from the expectations established in the Daphne and Apollo episode.[112]

The story of Daphne and Apollo begins when Apollo challenges Cupid's right to wield the bow and arrow (1.452-62). Cupid subsequently uses his weaponry on Apollo to inflict a passion for the nymph Daphne and uses another arrow to cause Daphne to flee from her admirer (1.463-76). As the nymph runs from the god, he attempts to seduce her

---

de Luce 1993; and Forbis 1997.

[111] E.g. Fraenkel 1945: 78; Due 1974: 112; Nicoll 1980; Davis 1983; Knox 1986; Wills 1990; Myers 1994b; Holzberg 1999; Miller 2009.

[112] Cf. Davis 1983.

by singing his own praises in a sort of self-hymn (1.504-24).[113] When the god's words do not convince her, he focuses solely on capturing her (*sed enim non sustinet ultra/ perdere blanditias iuvenis deus* 1.530-31).[114] As he is mere inches from successfully overtaking the nymph (1.540-42), Daphne makes a plea for help (1.546-47).[115] As an end result of this prayer, Daphne is transformed into a laurel tree (1.548-52).

Daphne's prayer is fraught with textual problems,[116] but if we follow Tarrant's widely accepted text, in which she prays only to her father, Peneus, the prayer reads

---

[113] Fuhrer 1999; see also Wills 1990, who connects the episode to Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* (*Hymn* 4).

[114] Gauly (2009: 71) notes that this is the beginning of a pattern where gods first try words to seduce women and then turn to force; he also observes that pursuits therefore generally end in rape or metamorphosis. Below I will discuss how this is also an ironic literalization of the amorous euphemism to seduce a woman with *preces*. It becomes especially ironic because the *preces* Apollo employs are in fact self-prayers, though here termed *blanditiae* (1.531).

[115] In Parthenius' summary, she asks Zeus to take her away from men (15): Ἀπόλλωνα δὲ Δάφνη ἐπ᾽αὐτὴν ἰόντα προιδομένη, μάλα ἐρρωμένως ἔφεθγεν: ὡς δὲ συνδιώκετο, παρὰ Διὸς αἰτεῖτο ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπαλλαγῆναι: καὶ αὐτήν φασι γενέσθαι τὸ δένδρον τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἀπ᾽ἐκείνης δάφνην.
(but Daphne, looking ahead at Apollo coming for her, very vigorously fled. And as he pursued her, she begged Zeus to be taken away from men: and it is reported that she became the tree which is called *daphne* (laurel) after her.)

[116] There are two versions of Daphne's prayer in the manuscripts, one addressed to Tellus and the other addressed to Peneus (so-called double recension). Debate has centered on which version to accept, or, as Murgia (1984) suggests, whether to combine the two versions. Knox (1990: 196-200) has an excellent review and analysis of the question. Cf. Blänsdorf 1980; Murgia 1984; Knox 1990: 196-200; Galasso et al. 2000: 787-90; Barchiesi 2005.

(1.546-47):

> 'fer, pater,' inquit 'opem! si flumina numen habetis,
> qua nimium placui, mutando perde figuram!'
>
> "Help, father! If your waters have divine power, destroy the appearance that made me too pleasing by changing it!"

While her transformation is not explicitly identified as a response to the prayer, the text notes that the prayer was scarcely finished before Daphne's form began to change (1.548-52). Here, as elsewhere, Ovid spends time describing the physical process of transformation rather than focusing on the author of the transformation. The immediacy with which metamorphosis follows upon her completion of speaking, however, implies that it results from the prayer. This lack of specificity about divine response differs from Homeric prayers, where a request by a mortal to a god is commonly followed by the formula τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε, which clearly indicates that the god makes a choice to answer the prayer.[117] Presumably, however, the addressee of Daphne's prayer, her father, Peneus, is responsible for her transformation following her prayer.[118]

---

[117] E.g. *Il.* 1.43; 457; 5.121; 10.295; 16. 527; 23.771; 24.314; *Od.* 3.385; 6.328; 9.536.
[118] Cf. McNamara 2010: n.54 "Around half of the speech acts (direct and indirect speech) in the *Metamorphoses* meet with no explicit response; just under 16% elicit a directly spoken response, and 35% elicit some other form of response (e.g. indirect speech, a gesture, an inner response) explicitly detailed in the narrative. Of course, these figures tell very little of the story: there are some extremely ambiguous response moments." One possible interpretation is that this lack of specificity is meant to deny divine causation. If this were the case, however, we might equally expect a statement specifically stating that

Although Daphne's prayer enjoys success insofar as it is not ignored, it is rather less clear whether Daphne would have chosen the divine response she receives. Her first request is *fer opem* (help!), which is a rather vague imperative. An earlier scene, however, lends insight into what Daphne really desired. Daphne's father had wanted her to marry, but she pleads with him to let her remain a virgin *('da mihi perpetua, genitor carissime,' dixit/ 'virginitate frui: dedit hoc pater ante Dianae.'* 1.486-87). He agrees (*ille quidem obsequitur* 1.488), but despite her father's acquiescence, the narrator suggests that her prayer has only limited success (*sed decor iste, quod optas/ esse vetat, votoque tuo tua forma repugnat* 1.488-89).[119] The interplay between the pair of two-line appeals by Daphne to her father (1.486-87 and 1.546-47) suggests that neither prayer is completely successful. Based on the promise she exacts from her father in her first prayer to be allowed to remain a virgin (1.485-88), her primary desire in her second appeal seems to be to avoid rape. At the most literal level, she achieves this goal, but she does not actually receive what she wants (*quod optas esse vetat*). Indeed, if we follow James'

Peneus was not responsible for the metamorphosis or questioning whether he was responsible (e.g. 7.789-93).

[119] The attribution of her limited success to her beauty (*forma* 1.489) is echoed in the phrasing of Daphne's prayer itself when she attributes Apollo's attack to her overly pleasing *figura* (1.547). Her eventual transformation hinges on the ambiguous meaning of *figura*; *forma* similarly has a dual meaning.

slightly more nuanced definitions of rape as "sexual contact the victim does not choose,"[120] her success seems more limited, since Apollo caresses and kisses her after the transformation and claims her as his symbol (1.553-58). While it has been suggested that Daphne eventually nods in consent of this action, a more convincing interpretation is that lines 1.566-67 are focalized through Apollo.[121]

In addition to the limited success that the threatened Daphne enjoys in her request for help (presumably in escaping Apollo), Daphne also experiences questionable success in regards to her request that her *figura* be destroyed (1.547). It has commonly been noted that the term *figura* in Daphne's prayer is ambiguous. Daphne herself likely desires her father to destroy the beauty of her appearance (especially given that earlier her inability to remain a virgin is attributed to her beauty),[122] but instead Peneus destroys her physical form. Because *figura* encompasses both of these meanings (*OLD* 3 and 1, respectively), Daphne's prayer is technically answered in terms of the literal meaning of the words, but not in terms of the speaker's intent. In fact, beauty is the one aspect of Daphne's former appearance that emphatically remains in her new form (*remanet nitor unus in illa*

---

[120] James 2016:155. Her definition is informed especially by Rozée 1993 (cf. James 2016: 155-56).
[121] Cf. Miller 2009: 348-49; James 2016: 192 n. 11.
[122] *sed decor iste, quod/ esse vetat, votoque tuo tua forma repugnat* 1.488-89.

1.552).[123]

Daphne's transformation thus appears successful in some regards, but completely devastating in others. This ambiguity about how to regard her fate becomes explicit in the text when all the rivers convene in Tempe and are unsure whether to congratulate or console the river Peneus about his daughter's recent fate (1.577-82). Creating uncertainty about whether the transformation is positive or negative is exactly the point; Ovid encourages the reader to explore a multiplicity of perspectives, and ultimately consider the limitations of female (and human) agency as well as the importance of precise language.

The vague and ambiguous wording of Daphne's prayer is one factor that contributes to the limited success she experiences.[124] Her outcome may also be influenced by the status of the god responding to her prayer, Peneus. As a river god, he

---

[123] Wills 1990: 148; Adams 2003: 146.

[124] Ambiguity in the language of Daphne's request for help may already have been part of the tradition of her transformation, if we are to guess from Parthenius' surviving account (15). He describes that Daphne asked to be removed (or escape) from men (παρὰ Διὸς αἰτεῖτο ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπαλλαγῆναι). ἀπαλλαγῆναι has a meaning of both take away and escape, and ἀνθρώπων may be interpreted as men (meaning those of the male sex) or humankind. Parethenius' version, therefore already generates the impression that the prayer was ambiguous. Presumably Daphne is asking for virginity, not to enter a different state of existence altogether, but her language is not specific. Ovid's narrative exploits verbal ambiguities even more blatantly.

may not have the power to completely deny the will of greater Olympian deities, such as Apollo. Power discrepancies between different gods have already formed an important theme within the *Metamorphoses*. Jupiter himself brings up the distinction between different classes of gods during the council of the gods in Book One (*plebs habitat diversa locis*).[125] He then specifically enumerates types of lesser divinities (1.192-95):

> sunt mihi semidei, sunt rustica numina, nymphae
> faunique satyrique et monticolae silvani;
> quos quoniam caeli nondum dignamur honore,
> quas dedimus, certe terras habitare sinamus.
>
> I have demigods, rustic deities, nymphs, fauns, satyrs, and sylvan deities on the mountains; since we do not yet consider them worthy of an office in heaven, surely we should allow them to inhabit the lands, which we granted them.

Peneus likely belongs to the *rustica numina* mentioned by Jupiter, whereas Apollo resides on Olympus. Since the rustic divinities are of a lesser status than Olympian deities, Peneus may not have enough power to overcome Apollo completely, but he still answers Daphne's prayer to the extent that he can. The precise way he responds to Daphne's prayer may furthermore be connected to his specific jurisdiction. Elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses* various gods' powers are linked with a physical place or realm of power. For instance, Juno prays to the sea divinities for help with Callisto because they have sway over the marine realm (2.512-30). Similarly, Venus prays to Neptune to

---

[125] On this passage and the social organization of the gods see Feeney (1991: 198-205).

transform Ino and her son into sea deities because she does not possess power over the sea herself (4.532-38).

In addition to Jove's preoccupation with the divine social order, hierarchical differences between gods have already been raised as a key issue in the narrative preceding the pursuit of Daphne. The quarrel between Apollo and Cupid that leads to Daphne's chase is a conflict over divine power. Apollo charges that Cupid has no right to his weapons, and Cupid in turn asserts his own supremacy. At 1.464-65 Cupid taunts Apollo by saying:

> quantoque animalia cedunt
> cuncta deo, tanto minor est tua gloria nostra
>
> And as much as all animals yield to a god, by so much is your glory less than mine.

This passage draws attention to what I term "the cosmological hierarchy," namely an individual's status within the universe.[126] The most common way of dividing classes of

---

[126] Cf. Introduction pgs. 34-35. Davis (1983: 137) posits a tripartite division for the categories in this passage, with *animalia* referring to "all living things," *deo* referring to "gods like Apollo," and the final category being reserved only for Cupid. More likely, however, the reference is to the standard tripartite division of animals, humans, and gods. Cupid then argues for divisions within the category of gods that are as great as the status differentials between animals and divine. Davis (1983: 53-54) also argues that Apollo begins as a god, then behaves as a human hunter, and finally acts as a predatory animal thereby occupying multiple categories of existence in descending order of importance. Miller (2009: 343-49) nicely surveys the tension between Apollo's erotic defeat and his victorious claim over the laurel and Pythian games.

existence into gods, humans, and animals/the inanimate is specified within the text of the poem at the cosmogony (1.69-78 and 1.395-437).[127] This tripartite classification can then be subdivided further into additional categories of heroes, demi-gods/ minor gods, and Olympian gods (1.192-95). Cupid's assertion of supremacy over Apollo at 1.464-65 further highlights a hierarchy within the divine realm. This cosmological hierarchy sets the framework for power negotiations throughout the *Metamorphoses*. The conflict between Cupid and Apollo prepares us to be attuned to status differences among the divine.[128] In this particular episode, Apollo's pretentions at superiority are largely

---

[127] See Feeney (1991: 194-224) for an excellent discussion on the importance of these categories in the poem and the complex relationship between them (especially the question of how much divinity rests in humanity); see also Myers (1994a: 42-44). On the "humanization" of the gods see Galinsky (1975: 162-73). On their "bestiality" see Robson (1999) and Bloch (2014: 18-33).

[128] The theme of power differences and struggle for status among the gods is also clearly expressed at 5.365-680, the beginning of Calliope's song, when Venus urges her son to extend their power above other divinities, and claims to have been slighted by Minerva and Diana remaining virgins (*"arma manusque meae, mea, nate, potentia" dixit,/ "illa, quibus superas omnes, cape tela Cupido/ inque dei pectus celeres molire sagittas,/ cui triplicis cessit fortuna novissima regni./ tu superos ipsumque Iovem, tu numina ponti/ victa domas ipsumque, regit qui numina ponti:/ Tartara quid cessant? Cur non matrisque tuumque/ imperium profers? Agitur pars tertia mundi,/ et tamen in caelo, quae iam patientia nostra est,/ spernimur, ac mecum vires minuuntur Amoris.*" "Son, my weapons, my hands, my power," she said, "take those shafts, Cupid, with which you overcome everyone and hurl your swift arrows into the heart of the god to whom the final fortune of the tripartite realm fell. You overcome the gods and Jupiter himself, you overcome the conquered deities of the sea and the god who rules the deities of the sea. Why does Tartarus delay? Why do you not extend your mother's rule and your own? The third part

negated by Cupid's control over him.[129] Still, Peneus' response to Daphne's prayer and Apollo's eventual claim over the laurel reveal that Apollo holds a more complicated status. Peneus thwarts the great god's primary desire (to make Daphne his "wife" 1.557), but cannot completely frustrate the wishes of a god of higher status. The formulation of Daphne's prayer itself questions the divine status of Peneus and raises the issue of divine hierarchy. When she qualifies her prayer with *si flumina numen habetis* (1.546), she acknowledges that rivers occupy an uncertain status in terms of their divinity.[130] Because he is able to respond to the prayer, Peneus exercises some divine authority, but not enough to entirely overcome the Olympian god Apollo.

Parthenius' version of the story provides an interesting comparandum. In his summary, he asserts that Daphne requested help from Zeus, not Peneus. The decision not to follow this account may, in part, stem from wanting to exploit power differentials among the divine. Jupiter's authority presumably trumps Apollo's, and so if Jupiter had

---

of the world is at stake and yet we are spurned in heaven, something which we have long been enduring, and the strength of love is weakening with me. 5.365-74).

[129] In one sense Apollo as Olympian should have a higher status than Cupid, but Cupid is also inextricably linked to Venus (cf. 5.365-680). Still, this may point to a different Ovidian scale of statuses when *eros* is involved; cf. above n. 26.

[130] This conditional resembles a common formula in prayers *si divus, si dea es*, but this formula is only used when the speaker addresses an unknown divinity (cf. Hickson 1993: 41-42). Here Daphne addresses her own father, so this seems to be a somewhat ironic adaptation of the formula, which draws attention to Peneus' marginal status.

responded to the prayer, Apollo's power would not have been a limiting factor in the success of the outcome. Ovid also may change the responding deity because Jupiter's interference would be incongruous with the god's own erotic endeavors elsewhere in the poem (i.e. raping Io, Callisto, etc.). Jupiter, therefore, may also not have been an ideal recipient of Daphne's prayer. Likely, Daphne would have experienced the most success by appealing to a deity who is both more powerful, and more sympathetic to the cause of virgins, namely Diana. In her first appeal to her father, Daphne implies that she strives to be like Diana (*'da mihi perpetua, genitor carissime,' dixit/ 'virginitate frui: dedit hoc pater ante Dianae.'* 1.486-87), and she additionally is described as emulating the virgin goddess (*innuptaeque aemula Phoebes:/ vitta coercebat positos sine lege capillos* 1.476-77). As we shall see later in this chapter, when Arethusa appeals to Diana (5.618-20) she appears to have greater, if still limited success. Daphne devoted herself to a Diana-like lifestyle, but may have erred in not devoting herself sufficiently to the powerful goddess herself and in not requesting her help.

II. SYRINX

In his attempt to put Argus to sleep Mercury begins the tale of Pan and Syrinx (1.689-712). The opening of his narrative describes Syrinx in terms that greatly resemble

the characterization of Daphne.[131] This prepares the reader for a repetition of the story of Apollo and Daphne, an expectation that is largely borne out. The majority of the story of Pan and Syrinx is related in indirect speech (the narrator explains what still remained to be told when Argus fell asleep), but the basic outline of the story resembles Daphne's so closely that we can fill in the details from the previous story.[132] One day Pan caught sight of Syrinx, and when she resisted his entreaties (*precibus spretis* 1.701), he chased after her. Syrinx's flight is blocked by the river Ladon, so she prays to her sisters to transform her (1.702-4). Pan reaches for the nymph and thinks he has caught her, but discovers that his hands merely hold reeds. He sighs at his failure and that breath creates music in the reeds. He then claims the reeds as his instrument, now known as the syrinx (1.705-12). Each of these basic elements corresponds to a component of Daphne's tale, such that Syrinx is clearly intended as a sort of doublet to Daphne.[133] Nonetheless, the similarities and differences in specific details and the style of narration are valuable background against which we better appreciate both tales.

The most obvious difference between the two episodes is that Mercury's narration is cut short, and the majority of the episode is then related in indirect speech,

---

[131] Cf. Davis 1983: 49-50.

[132] Barchiesi 2005: 224-25.

[133] Cf. Heath 1992: 235-38 and additional bibliography at 236 n. 10.

including Syrinx's brief prayer. Although the exact wording of Syrinx's prayer is not quoted, a number of similarities to Daphne's prayer can be observed. Ovid reports the following summary of Syrinx's plea (1.704):

ut se mutarent liquidas orasse sorores

[It was remaining to tell that] she begged her river sisters to transform her.

The report of Syrinx's prayer resembles Daphne's in that it specifically requests a transformation (*mutando* 1.547; *mutarent* 1.704). Both prayers are also addressed to a family member, father and sisters respectively. Furthermore, in each scene the address to family members is aurally marked in a verbal juxtaposition to a verb (fer pater; orasse sorores). Additionally, the recipients of both prayers are river deities.

The abundant similarities connect the two prayers closely, but the relative success of each prayer is more complicated to surmise. Above I defined the success of Daphne's prayer as limited because Peneus answered the literal meaning of Daphne's prayer, but not according to his daughter's intentions. The mode of narration in the Syrinx episode makes it somewhat difficult to judge whether the interpretation by the respondents aligns with Syrinx's intentions, however. The narrator seems to suggest that Syrinx specifically asks for a transformation. Does this mean that Syrinx desired to be transformed into reeds? Or are we to imagine that Syrinx hoped for her beauty to be changed as Daphne

did?[134] Both the situational and verbal similarities between the episodes of Daphne and Syrinx suggest the latter, such that Syrinx experiences the same limited success as Daphne.

One element of Daphne's story that especially calls into question the success of her prayer is that she ultimately belongs to Apollo (*arbor eris certe mea* 1.558). While she may escape the physical penetration of rape, she still experiences unwanted physical contact and Apollo succeeds in asserting his power over Daphne through ownership.[135] Syrinx's situation is nearly identical; while she escapes rape in her human form, Pan still claims her (1.710):

> "hoc mihi colloquium tecum" dixisse "manebit,"
>
> "This exchange will persist for me with you," he said.

Both stories are *aetia* in which the gods claim not just ownership over the metamorphosed women, but *perpetual* ownership (*semper* 1.558; *manebit* 1.710).

Pan's supremacy is also reflected in the way the narrative is presented. Syrinx's final moment of speech (her prayer) is expressed via indirect speech—something that the

---

[134] The difference between a prayer quoted in direct speech and a summary of a prayer brings to the fore questions about the reliability of a narrator and the truth or fiction of a story. How would the narrator have summarized Daphne's prayer in indirect speech? Presumably, just as he summarizes Syrinx's prayer, but could Syrinx's prayer really be considered an accurate description of Daphne's plea?

[135] Cf. Miller 2009: 349.

narrator pointedly elided when he ‘took over’ the storytelling from Mercury. But Pan’s statement of ownership overcomes the expected mode of narration and is granted direct speech. The form of narration reflects the power imbalance between Syrinx and Pan: as Syrinx is robbed of her voice through her transformation while her pursuer maintains his voice, also in the narrative Syrinx’s speech is summarized in someone else’s words whereas Pan is granted the narrative space to express his own words in direct speech. This emphasizes the limited success Syrinx experiences in her attempt to gain agency.

Just as the effectiveness of Daphne’s prayer may have been influenced by the status of the responding deity, so too Syrinx’s outcome is dependent on the status of her prayer’s recipients. In Daphne’s case, the rustic god Peneus holds less power vis-à-vis the Olympian god Apollo. How does this compare to Syrinx? Syrinx’s pursuer, Pan, does not belong to the class of Olympians, but rather is in the same group of *rustica numina* as Peneus. As nymphs, Syrinx’s sisters also belong in this category, so any limitations cannot be attributed to a disparity in the class of divinities. Instead, the power negotiation between Pan and the river nymphs is based upon gender and number. While Pan and nymphs belong to the same class of divinities, Syrinx’s sisters cannot completely obstruct him because of their inferior power as women. Nonetheless, as a larger group, Syrinx’s sisters are able to gain a degree of power. They cannot physically restrain Pan, but at least

prevent a literal rape.[136]

III. CORNIX

Cornix (= Crow) is the first victim of attempted rape to narrate her own pursuit. The story is the second of three tales she recounts, which are all embedded within a story told by the main author (Ovid) about how the Raven was transformed from a white bird into a black bird. One day the Raven witnesses Apollo's lover, Coronis, having an affair and flies off to tell the god of her infidelity (2.535-47). While the Raven is en route, the Crow warns him not to reveal the secret (2.547-50) and provides a cautionary tale from her own experience. She divulges that she was once Minerva's favorite bird, but was demoted in favor of the owl as punishment for tattling on Aglauros (2.551-65). After this first story, she then proceeds to explain how she became Minerva's favorite bird in the first place. Previously Cornix was not a bird, but the beautiful and heavily courted daughter of a king. As she strolled along the beach one day, the god Neptune caught sight of her and was filled with a strong desire for the princess. She fled the god's advances, but grew tired from running in the sand and in desperation called upon the gods and men

[136] Knox (1990: 200) notes that the reference to the river Ladon may be a nod to the more widely attested genealogy of Daphne that Ovid had earlier rejected. It is interesting to note that if Syrinx had followed Daphne's example more closely, and prayed to the nearby river, she might have enjoyed a different type of success, since Ladon perhaps would have had a more equal status with Pan.

for deliverance. Minerva heard her cry and rescued her from Neptune by transforming her into a crow (2.569-87).

Cornix's story follows the same basic pattern as other women discussed in this chapter: Neptune catches sight of her, desires her, and chases her. As she is on the verge of being captured, she prays and is transformed. Commentators often note that this attempted rape connects Cornix to other stories of rape or attempted rape in the poem.[137] In addition to following the basic sequence of events, Cornix's comment that her beauty (*forma*) was her bane resembles Ovid's similar remark about Daphne (*forma mihi nocuit* 2.572; *sed te decor iste quod optas/ esse vetat, votoque tuo tua forma repugnat* 1.488-89).[138] Her exhaustion from running also recalls other victims of pursuit (*lassor* 2.577; Daphne *victa labore* 1.544; Arethusa *fessa labore* 5.618).

Cornix resembles other victims of pursuit in fundamental respects, but how does her prayer compare? Ironically, although we have Cornix's own words to describe her story, we do not have the exact words of her prayer. Instead of quoting her own prayer, Cornix summarizes it as follows (2.578-80):

> inde deos hominesque voco; nec contigit ullum
> vox mea mortalem: mota est pro virgine virgo

---

[137] Bömer Vol. 1, 1969: on 2.572; Segal 1969: 43; Otis 1970: 379-89; Anderson 1997: on 2.566-95; Keith 1992: 57.
[138] Cf. Segal 1969: 42, 44, 56.

auxiliumque tulit.

Then I called upon gods and men; and my voice did not reach any mortal, but the virgin goddess was moved on behalf of a virgin and brought help.

Despite lacking the precise wording of Cornix's plea, her description is reminiscent of other entreaties discussed in this chapter. Because we do not know the exact formulation of Cornix's prayer (as also with Syrinx) it is difficult to know whether the formulation of Cornix's petition was ambiguous, and how closely Minerva's response corresponded to Cornix's intention. Cornix's description of Minerva's response, however, aligns precisely with the language of other victims of attempted rape. In particular, the assertion that Minerva brought help (*auxilium tulit*) resembles the request that recurs in the two appeals in direct speech in this chapter—*fer opem.* In terms of the intent of Cornix's plea, it is unlikely that Minerva's response mirrored Cornix's desires.

There may be an indication of the difference between Cornix's intentions and Minerva's interpretation of her plea in the transition between her first and second stories. The text of the transition is somewhat difficult to follow and merits a reconsideration of exactly what Cornix is expressing. After Cornix has explained how she was demoted from Minerva's top bird to a position lower than the owl, she remarks that her punishment should be a warning to all birds (2.562-65); then she exclaims (2.566-72):

at, puto, non ultro nec quicquam tale rogantem
me petiit!—ipsa licet hoc a Pallade quaeras:

> quamvis irata est, non hoc irata negabit.

Keith translates this passage as follows (1992: 22):

> But, I suppose, she did not seek me of her own accord, when I asked no such thing! You can ask Pallas herself about this: though she was angered, she will not deny it out of anger.

Keith's translation implies that the Crow doubts that the Raven believes her tale and as a result provokes the Crow to tell another story, which reveals how she became a bird. I agree that this passage prompts the next story (cf. *nam* 2.569). But Keith seems to interpret the passage as expressing disbelief about the previous story (about how she lost Minerva's favor). In contrast, I would like to suggest that these lines refer to the story which is about to follow (about how Cornix was transformed), as Barchiesi also indicates.[139] I propose the following alternative translation:

> But, no doubt, she sought me, when I was not asking (her) on my own initiative, nor for any such thing.

This reading argues that *at* indicates a change in subject (*OLD* 2a) and that *ultro* is taken with *rogantem* rather than *petiit*. Bömer notes a number of parallels for the combination of *ultro* and *rogo*, and McKeown and Myers cite this passage as parallels for the grouping as well.[140] *nec* may be interpreted as joining *ultro* and *quicquam tale*, which both work closely with the participle *rogantem*. To summarize the sentiment, Cornix is saying that

---

[139] 2005: on 2.569.

[140] McKeown (1998: on *Am*. 2.5.49) and Myers (2009: on 14.30) translate *ultro* as "spontaneously."

she did not ask to be Minerva's favorite anyway. This idea then prompts the story about how Cornix became Minerva's favorite in the first place. If this interpretation is correct, then Cornix says she did not ask for what she receives from Minerva. This is particularly interesting because Cornix becomes Minerva's bird as the result of her prayer for assistance, perhaps suggesting (as in the case of Daphne) a difference between mortal intention and divine interpretation of her prayer.

Anderson characterizes Cornix's incident as a rare example of the gods responding advantageously to a prayer,[141] but the categorization of Cornix's transformation as uniformly beneficial is questionable. While Cornix describes Minerva's action as help, at the end of her tale she says (2.589-90):

> quid tamen hoc prodest, si diro facta volucris
> crimine Nyctimene nostro successit honori?
>
> But what use is this, if Nyctimene, who was transformed into a bird because of an awful crime, has taken over my honor?

As in the story of Daphne, the text draws attention to the ambiguous nature of the transformation.[142] Here Cornix questions whether the transformation into Minerva's companion was beneficial (*prodest* 2.589), and also complains about the logical disconnect between considering a transformation a punishment in one case and an honor

---

[141] Anderson 1997: on 2.578-81.

[142] In Daphne's story, the ambiguity was expressed by the rivers not knowing whether or not to console her father, Peneus (1.577-82).

in another.[143] We are therefore left wondering how metamorphosed Cornix differs from other characters in the poem and whether her prayer is actually more beneficial than those of other victims like Daphne and Syrinx.

One aspect of Cornix's transformation that distinguishes her from Daphne and Syrinx is that she continues to speak in her new form. Themes of speech and silence feature prominently throughout Ovid's epic, and speech loss in particular receives extensive treatment as the product of bodily metamorphosis.[144] Cornix's narrative displays one of the most interesting and complex variations on this theme of voice and voicelessness, since her transformation does not impede her ability to narrate. Generally in the *Metamorphoses* when a character becomes an animal not only do they lose their ability to speak, but Ovid highlights their voicelessness. As de Luce discusses, the use of language generally separates human beings from animals in ancient thought.[145] She

---

[143] See Keith (1992: 25-26) for a discussion of how Cornix distances herself from Nyctimene, despite possible similarities between their stories.

[144] Forbis (1997: 245) produces the following list of characters silenced by transformation: Lycaon (1.232-33) Io (1.637-38); Heliades (2.363): Cygnus (2.369-73); Callisto (2.476-88); Ocyrhoe (2.657-69); Actaeon (3.229-39); Echo (3.356-69); Minyeides (4.412-14); Cadmus (4.586-89); Pierides (5.677-78); Rude Youth (5.451-61); Cyane (5.465-70); Ascalaphus (5.549-50); Niobe (6.306-7); Lycians (6.374-78); Philomela (6.551-60); Galanthis (9.322-23); Dryope (9.388-92); Myrrha (10.506); Orpheus (11.50-53); Chione (11.324-27); Hecuba (13.567-69); Cercopians (14.91-100); Acmon (14.497-98); Apulian Shepherd (14.523-26).

[145] On birds and communication in ancient thought see Natoli (2017: 78).

convincingly argues that loss of voice which results from a bodily metamorphosis is therefore part of a character's dehumanization. She focuses mostly on female stories and in particular instances of completed rape (Io, Callisto, and Philomela), but notes the more general importance of voicelessness in the poem.[146] She does not, however, address the story of Cornix, who appears to complicate this distinction between human and animal, since she retains the power of speech after her bodily transformation. Indeed, the bird's chattiness is one of her most defining features (*garrula cornix* 2.547-48) and both her narrative and the embedding narrative focus on proper use of voice. If any animal can be thought to talk, surely it is birds, but their speech is still fundamentally not the same as human speech. For instance, the Pierides, who are transformed into magpies as punishment, maintain a certain type of voice, but they can only imitate speech (*imitantes omnia* 5.299), even though Minerva registers their sounds as human voices (*vox…linguae…loquentes* 5.295-97). The apparent uniqueness of the crow's ability to speak is complicated by two factors. First, the passage relies on the model of Callimachus' *Hecale*, in which a crow and raven speak.[147] Second, the Crow addresses

---

[146] She finds that approximately 40 of 250 stories in the *Metamorphoses* bear directly on issues of speech and silence (1993: 306-7).

[147] For the relationship between Ovid's passage and Callimachus' see especially Keith (1992: 9-37).

another animal, the Raven, and there is a tradition that regards animals as able to communicate with each other.[148] The Crow therefore may retain her voice, but it is no longer her *human* voice.

The importance of speech and the proper use of voice in this section is apparent from its opening and has long been noted.[149] The frame narrative about the Raven begins by summarizing his transformation as the result of his speech (2.540-41):

> lingua fuit damno: lingua faciente loquaci
> qui color albus erat, nunc est contrarius albo.
>
> His tongue caused him harm: because the tongue acted so talkatively, the one who was the color white is now the opposite of white.

The polyptoton of *lingua* especially accentuates the importance of speech and voice for the subsequent narrative. The Crow's first words also echo these opening lines as she commands the Raven not to ignore her advice (2.550):

> ne sperne meae praesagia linguae!
>
> Don't reject the forewarning of my tongue!

The word *linguae* here has an ironic double meaning as both a subjective and objective genitive—she says to follow both the warning that her tongue is currently producing and not to follow the example that her tongue has set by talking too much. The Crow's own story will soon indicate that her speech was responsible for her punishment, just as the

[148] Plato, *Politicus* 272c.
[149] Cf. Keith 1992: 28-31, 47-50.

Raven's was. Yet the Crow describes her *fides*, not her *lingua* as the source of her harm (*invenies nocuisse fidem* 2.552).[150] This discrepancy in how to describe the cause of Cornix's injury reflects the incongruity between the way humans and gods perceive the world, a concept which Ovid also explores in the way gods respond to human prayer.

The way Cornix describes her appeal also reveals a complex and ironic relationship between Cornix's voice in the different stories she relates. After she tells her first story, Cornix warns other birds about the dangers of using their voice, since this is what led to her demotion (*voce* 2.565). In her second story, however, her *vox* is the feature that rescues her from rape, since it reaches a goddess, despite not reaching any mortals (*voco* 2.578; *vox* 2.578). If we consider the chronological sequence of Cornix's stories, rather than the narratological sequence, we see that Cornix's voice first saves her, but later is responsible for her ruin.

IV. ARETHUSA

The final episode to include a prayer during an attempted rape is the strikingly elaborate tale of Arethusa. The story of her pursuit (5.577-641) is recounted in a notoriously complex layering of narratives that results from an encounter between

---

[150] At the end of her tale, Cornix warns other birds *ne voce pericula quaerant* (2.565), but this seems to be an admission of the danger of speaking rather than an admission that she transgressed in any way.

Minerva and the Muses (5.251-678).[151] Minerva visits Mount Helicon after hearing about the miraculous origin of the spring Hippocrene (5.251-59). Here she meets the Muses, who show her the famous waters, flowing amid a beautiful landscape filled with grottoes, woods, and flowers. When Minerva admires how happy the Muses must be in such a setting, they lament that although it is beautiful, they feel unsafe and proceed to describe their awful encounter with Pyreneus, his attempt to rape them, and his eventual death (5.269-93). When the grim tale is interrupted by nearby chirping magpies, a Muse explains how the magpies were previously a group of nine women, the Pierides, who challenged the Muses to a singing contest with the nymphs as judges. When the Pierides lost the contest, they insulted the Muses and were transformed into magpies as punishment (5.294-317). This unnamed Muse summarizes the content of the Pierides' song (5.318-31) and then, at Minerva's request, recounts (word for word) the song Calliope sang on behalf of the Muses (5.335-661). The primary focus of Calliope's song is the rape of Proserpina, but in yet another level of narrative layering Arethusa also tells Ceres the story of how she became a spring in Ortygia (5.572-641).

Tired after a day of hunting, Arethusa stops to bathe in the river Alpheus on her

[151] On the complexity of embedded narratives in this episode see Rosati 1981; Hinds 1987b; Johnson and Malamud 1988; Nagle 1988a, 1989; Johnson 1996; and Zissos 1999.

way home (5.585-95). As she is swimming naked in the waters, the river begins to speak and she leaps ashore in fright (5.595-98). The river Alpheus is enflamed by a desire for the nymph, assumes human form, and begins to chase Arethusa (5.599-615). As he is on the verge of catching her (5.616-17), she prays to Diana for help (5.618-20). Diana responds and makes her invisible by enshrouding her in mist (5.621-24), but Alpheus knows she is still there and does not leave (5.625-31). Terrified by the looming, persistent pursuer, Arethusa begins sweating with fear so profusely that she soon dissolves entirely into liquid (5.632-36). As a body of water himself, Alpheus recognizes Arethusa in her new form and returns to his liquid figure in order to mix his water with hers (6.636-38). Diana promptly intervenes by cleaving the earth to create a path for Arethusa's escape, and the nymph travels through the underworld to emerge as a spring in Sicily (5.639-41).

Arethusa's narrow and dramatic escape from her aggressor ultimately depends on her desperate appeal to Diana for help, as with other victims of attempted rape. The nymph recounts her prayer to Diana as follows (5.618-20):

> fessa labore fugae 'fer opem, deprendimur,' inquam
> 'armigerae, Diana, tuae, cui saepe dedisti
> ferre tuos arcus inclusaque tela pharetra!'

> Tired by the work of fleeing, I said, "Help, I'm caught, Diana, help your weapon bearer, to whom you often have given your bow and your quiver full of arrows to carry."

This prayer and the surrounding narrative resemble those of other women in scenes of attempted rape, especially Daphne's, both in general ways and through more specific verbal echoes. Arethusa's petition employs the same basic appeal as Daphne's, *fer opem*, but the verbal and situational similarities between the stories of Daphne and Arethusa extend well beyond the entreaties they offer, and scholars have often connected the two pursuits.[152] For instance, just before each woman prays, her pursuer is so close that his breath is scattering the hair on her neck (*crinem sparsum cervicibus adflat* 1.541; *ingens/ crinales vittas adflabat anhelitus oris* 5.616-17).[153] Similarly, 1.544a-6, which describes Daphne as *victa labore fugae* is nearly identical to 5.618, which describes Arethusa as *fessa labore fugae*.[154] In both instances, the description directly precedes the plea for help. More generally, Arethusa's episode fits into the pattern of attempted rape established at the beginning of this chapter for Daphne, Syrinx, and Cornix involving pursuit, prayer, and transformation. Flight is a crucial component to each episode (Daphne *fugit* 1.502; Syrinx *fugisse* 1.701; Cornix *fugio* 2.576; Arethusa *fugio* 5.601).

---

[152] E.g. Ludwig 1965: 35 and n. 40. See also Salzman-Mitchell (2005a: 178-82) for the ways in which Arethusa's description of herself resembles the objective male gaze in Daphne's episode, and how her narrative eventually differs from Daphne's and claims a subjective stance.
[153] Barchiesi 2005: on 1.541; Rosati 2009: on 5.616-17.
[154] Rosati 2009: on 5.618.

Additionally, the narrative function of all the appeals is the same—they mark the climax of the chase, offered when those pursued are on the verge of capture. Finally, all women are metamorphosed—Daphne into laurel, Syrinx into reeds, Cornix into a crow, and Arethusa into a spring.

Because of these correspondences between the situations and prayers of other women in scenes of attempted rape, we might expect all prayers to share the same success. The outcome of Arethusa's prayer, however, appears more successful when compared to other prayers by pursued females. Foremost, Arethusa is one of the few women in the *Metamorphoses* who is not silenced by an attempted rape.[155] She not only retains her ability to speak, but even narrates the terrifying experience herself. Cornix also describes her attempted rape and metamorphosis, but as discussed above, she loses her *human* voice and tells her story to a separate community, birds.

The uniqueness of Arethusa's ability to preserve her own voice after metamorphosis is especially evident within the context of the larger narrative of Calliope's song, where her story is presented as parallel in many ways to that of Cyane,

---

[155] Another notable exception is the Muses, who recount the tale of Pyreneus' attempted rape of them directly before the report of Calliope's song (5.269-93). The Muses' attempted rapist is a mortal, however, and as goddesses they inherently possess greater power. Caenis and Mestra are additional exceptions, discussed in Chapter Two.

who loses her ability to speak upon transformation. The tales of Cyane and Arethusa share a number of similarities and clearly are meant to be read together.[156] The two women are joined from their first mention, when they serve as the geographical markers between which Pluto will descend to the underworld (5.409-11). Just as their names occur together on the same line (5.409), we should consider their stories together. When Pluto steals Proserpina, Cyane attempts to stop him by blocking his path and censures him by stating that the girl should have been asked for, not taken (*roganda/ non rapienda fuit* 5.415-16).[157] Cyane throws up her arms as a barrier and attempts to block Pluto with both her words and her physical body. Pluto, however, does not bother to respond verbally; instead, just as he used his physical force to capture Proserpina, likewise he forcibly overcomes Cyane's objection. He blasts her with his staff, making a path for his exit to the underworld through her pool (5.419-24).

Cyane experiences incredible sadness both at the loss of Proserpina and at her scorned authority (she should have power over her pool, but Pluto invalidates her *iura* with brute force).[158] The relevant passage states (5.425-29):

---

[156] Segal 1969: 56; Hinds 1987b: 92, 157-58 n. 46.

[157] This is another formulation of a contrast that is commonly set up in the *Metamorphoses* between seducing women with words versus exerting physical force (*preces* vs. *vis* 2.574-76, 6.684, 11.239-40).

[158] For this sense of *iura* see *OLD* 13. This is a formulation of the link that exists between

> At Cyane, raptamque deam contemptaque fontis
> iura sui maerens, inconsolabile vulnus
> mente gerit tacita lacrimisque absumitur omnis
> et, quarum fuerat magnum modo numen, in illas
> extenuatur aquas:
>
> But Cyane, lamenting that the goddess was raped and that the authority of her water was defied, carries an inconsolable wound in her silent heart and is entirely consumed by tears and melts into those waters whose great divinity she had recently been.

Cyane's physical body becomes the embodiment of her mental state.[159] She dissolves into the tears she produces as the result of her grief;[160] similarly as she nurses a wound in her silent mind, silence overtakes her entirely and she loses the ability to speak (5.465-66). Cyane's transformation results in her silence (*ea ni mutata fuisset/ omnia narrasset* "if she hadn't been transformed she would have told everything" 5.465-66). This taciturnity is further highlighted, as Salzman-Mitchell observes, by the similarity in sound between *mutata* and *muta*.[161] Ovid emphasizes that her loss of form (and specifically mouth) means that Cyane is unable to speak. Logically, Arethusa's transformation should have the same result. Just as in Cyane's case, Arethusa's transformation is the embodiment of

---

rape and power; rape is an expression of power. Although here the affected power technically belongs to Cyane (and not Proserpina who is the explicit victim of the abduction), it has been noted that there is a certain correspondence and blending between Cyane and Proserpina (and also Arethusa): see Segal (1969: 54-56), (1998: 22); Hinds (1987b: 92); Cahoon (1996: 54); Zissos (1999: 100-1); and Gentilcore (2010: 103).

[159] See Segal 1998: 22.

[160] See Gentilcore 2010.

[161] 2005a: 174.

her mental state. She dissolves into the sweat she produces as the result of her fear (5.632-36).[162] She too becomes water, and therefore theoretically loses her speaking apparatus. Instead, however, Arethusa does not lose her voice and emerges from the water in a human-like form (*Tum caput Eleis Alpheias extulit undis/ rorantesque comas a fronte removit ad aures* 5.487-88).

The odd incongruence between Cyane's silence and Arethusa's ability to speak is even more obvious when we consider each woman's interaction with Ceres. Cyane desperately wants to tell Ceres where Proserpina is located and what has happened to her, but is unable to do so because of her voicelessness. She still manages to communicate to Ceres that an abduction has taken place by showing her Proserpina's girdle which had fallen in her pool, but cannot tell the whole story (5.465-70).[163] Arethusa, on the other hand, tells Ceres that she has seen her daughter in the underworld acting as queen (5.504-8). Not only can she speak when Cyane cannot, but she gives Ceres the exact information that Cyane wanted to communicate but could not.[164] Arethusa's ability to retain her voice

---

[162] We have an added layer of divine presence, since Diana wraps her in a mist, but the transformation itself cannot be attributed to Diana. Note that the emotions of Cyane and Arethusa, sadness and fear, are the same two emotions that Arethusa reports observing in Proserpina when she glimpses her in the underworld (5.506).

[163] Cyane's effort to communicate even without a voice resembles the cases of Io (1.647-50) and Philomela (6.574-78).

[164] Arethusa has taken the role that Helios has in the traditional version of the story.

post-metamorphosis positions her prayer as particularly effective.

Still, not all scholars would agree that Arethusa's prayer is more successful than those of Daphne, Syrinx, and Cornix, since many maintain that Alpheus successfully raped Arethusa. Zissos' interpretation that the rape fails, however, is convincing.[165] The relevant passage is somewhat ambiguous and the case for Arethusa's escape deserves to be made again (5.636-40):

> in latices mutor. sed enim cognoscit amatas
> amnis aquas positoque viri, quod sumpserat, ore
> vertitur in proprias, ut mihi misceat, undas.
> Delia rupit humum, caecisque ego mersa cavernis
> advehor Ortygiam,

> I was changed into running water. But the river recognized his beloved waters, set aside the visage of a man he had assumed, and turned back into his own waves in order to mix with me. The Delian goddess burst the ground, and I plunged into the dark cavity and was borne to Ortygia.

Commonly, *misceat* (638) is cited as evidence of Alpheus' rape. The word has undoubtedly sexual connotations (*OLD* 4c, Adams 1982: 180-81, *TLL* 8.0.1087.43-69), and it seems likely we are to imagine that a mixing of waters would constitute a rape (metaphorical or otherwise). As Zissos argues, however, it is more likely that rape is

---

Zissos (1999: 103-5) interprets this as a feminine shift in the story that gives prominence to women in accordance with the female audience.

[165] Segal (1969: 55), Curran (1978: 235), Salzman-Mitchell (2005a: 181), and Johnson (2008: 70) characterize the rape as successful (even if metaphorical). Kenney (1986: 407) and Zissos (1999: 104) disagree; Hinds (1987b: 157 n. 46) also seems to suggest Arethusa escapes (cf. also his designation as an "attempted rape" at 92).

diverted at the last minute by Diana's intervention. *misceat* is part of a purpose clause that shows Alpheus' intention to rape Arethusa, but does not prove their waters *actually* mix. Instead, Arethusa is able to escape through the path Diana has created through the ground.

When Diana splits the earth, it is the second time in the song of Calliope that the ground has been cleft by a divinity. In the first instance, Cyane attempts to block Pluto from taking Proserpina to the underworld, but the god aggressively strikes Cyane, and penetrates the ground (with his scepter) directly through her pool (5.420-24). The imagery in this scene is undoubtedly sexual,[166] and suggests that Pluto performs physical violence. The second instance, however, Diana's severing of the earth, does not need to have the same outcome. Instead, the two scenes may be meant to draw a contrast—In the first instance, a male divinity ruptures the earth in order to complete his rape; in the second instance, a female divinity splits the earth in order to provide an escape from rape.

Because Arethusa both avoids rape and preserves her human voice, her prayer appears to have the most successful outcome among women who experience attempted rape. She seems to endorse her outcome when she begs Ceres to save Sicily, describing the land as more pleasing than any other and the site of her *penates* (*Sicaniam peregrina*

---

[166] Segal 1969: 54.

colo, sed gratior omni/ haec mihi terra colo est: hos nunc Arethusa penates,/ hanc habeo sedem; 5.495-97). At the end of her tale, she also describes her new home, Ortygia, as pleasing to her because it bears the name of her goddess (*cognomine divae grata meae* 5.640-41). Even so, we may wonder whether Arethusa's fate is really ideal, or whether her praise is partly tailored to flatter a powerful goddess. Elsewhere in Calliope's song (and the rest of the *Metamorphoses*) goddesses vent their wrath on those who misuse their speech (e.g. Stellio (5.446-61), Ascalaphus (5.534-50), Cornix (2.569-95). [167] Compare also Venus' punishment of Hippodamas for not offering her sufficient thanks at 10.681-85). Arethusa likely is genuinely grateful to Diana for rescuing her, but she may also know better than to voice any degree of discontent. While Arethusa fares better than other victims of attempted rape, she is displaced from her original home (*nec sum pro patria supplex: huc hospita veni. Pisa mihi patria est et ab Elide ducimus ortus* 5.493-94). Arethusa may be able to escape her rapist, but not without lasting consequences. Ortygia is praised not on its own merits, but as a place of refuge. Similarly, Arethusa is not introduced solely by her own name, but is described as *Alpheias* (5.487), her identity permanently linked to Alpheus; Arethusa's life is now forever framed in relation to this

---

[167] On Stellio and Ascalaphus see Myers 1992.

one pivotal, traumatic event.[168]

The interest in the long-lasting effects of trauma and the psychological state of victims throughout Calliope's song (shown, for instance, by the emotional cause of Cyane's and Arethusa's transformations) is foreshadowed in the introductory narrative. When Minerva first encounters the Muses, she comments upon the loveliness of the place—the scene described resembles the *loca amoena* that often presage a rape or attempted rape in the *Metamorphoses*.[169] The reader of the *Metamorphoses* has been conditioned to expect that women in a pleasant landscape are not safe, and this is in fact what the Muses themselves say to Minerva. They respond that the place would be nice if they were not worried for their safety (5.272). This launches them into the first story of attempted rape, and predicts the thematic prevalence of rape throughout the episode with the Muses. Unusually for the *Metamorphoses*, the Muses are able to avoid both rape and metamorphosis (likely because of their superior status as goddesses over the mortal Pyreneus). Even though the Muses avoid the negative effects which other victims of attempted rape experience, they are not able to avoid the psychological trauma of attempted rape—they complain that they do not feel safe in their home and that the image

---

[168] This possession over her identity resembles the claims Apollo and Pan make over Daphne and Syrinx (1.558; 1.710). Cf. Pg. 65.
[169] Cf. Parry 1964.

of Pyreneus is always before their eyes (5.273-75). They replay this image despite the fact that he has died after jumping from a cliff (5.292). The psychological effects of attempted rape form a leitmotif in this section of the *Metamorphoses*, perhaps because of the abundance of female narrators and audiences.

Because Arethusa continues to be defined by her trauma (as *Alpheias* 5.487) and loses her human form, Arethusa's prayer is not an unequivocal success, but because she retains her speech, Arethusa's result is more successful than other victims of attempted rape. Still, why should Arethusa's prayer be more successful than those of Daphne, Syrinx, and Cornix, if their narratives resemble each other so closely? One of the primary reasons for success may involve the speaker and audience both of the frame story and of the prayer itself.[170] Arethusa's tale contains multiple levels of narration, each with a female speaker addressing a female audience, if we exclude the overarching author, Ovid. At the primary level, a Muse is the speaker and Minerva is the audience. At the secondary level of narration, Calliope is the speaker and the nymphs are her audience. At the tertiary level, Arethusa is the speaker and Ceres is her audience. Even for Arethusa's quoted prayer, a quaternary level of narration, the speech is directed to Diana—another female

---

[170] See also Johnson and Malamud (1988: 30-33) for a discussion of how content and audience influence the success of the Muses over the Emathides.

audience. Zissos as well as Johnson and Malamud have argued that the audience of Calliope's song has influenced her narrative and that it portrays a particularly female perspective.[171] Here we see a goddess succeed in offering help to a victim of attempted rape more effectively than a male god.[172] Perhaps the narrators have tailored their stories to appeal to a female audience, or it may be that (regardless of the narrator) Diana is more capable than Peneus (Olympian vs. river deity), or that the virgin goddess empathizes more with a woman trying to retain her virginity, an idea to which I will return shortly.

An additional reason for Arethusa's success may be that she reminds Diana of her unwavering devotion to her and the assistance she offered in carrying Diana's weapons. One of the standard elements of a typical prayer is the enumeration of past services.[173] In ancient thought, the gods are more likely to reward you with favors if you have previously provided them with something, and so prayers often include a reminder to the gods of benefits they have received.[174] The repetition of the verb *fero* in Arethusa's

---

[171] Johnson and Malamud 1988; Zissos 1999.

[172] This contrast obviously presumes that Daphne's prayer was addressed to and answered by Peneus, not Tellus.

[173] See Introduction pgs. 38-39 and n. 90.

[174] Cf. Ogilvie 1969. No other prayer in the *Metamorphoses* specifically lists past services, but when Caenis wishes not to suffer rape again, it seems Neptune fulfills her prayer because he feels he owes her, a nod to the mentality that gods may answer prayers as a kind of *quid pro quo*.

prayer underscores this reciprocity (*fer…ferre* 5.618, 620). The act of including past services rendered may increase the effectiveness of Arethusa's prayer, but the specific service mentioned also effectively links this scene with other scenes in the *Metamorphoses.* Hinds, for instance, connects the imagery of the bow and arrows to the frame story that attributes Pluto's lust for Proserpina to the arrow shot by Cupid at his mother's request (5.365-84).[175] Venus targets Pluto because she desires to expand her empire into the underworld. The goddess selects Proserpina as the object of his desire because the girl has devoted herself to Diana and Venus interprets this commitment to virginity as a revolt against her own power.[176]

Arethusa's enumeration of services also connects her to the story of Diana and Actaeon, since her prayer greatly resembles a passage in that scene. Before Diana steps into the pool to bathe, she hands her accoutrements to various members of her band, and the narrator mentions (3.165-66):

> quo postquam subiit, nympharum tradidit uni
> armigerae iaculum pharetramque arcusque retentos,
>
> After she came to this place, she handed over to one of her nymphs, her armor-bearer, her spear and quiver and unstrung bow.

These two passages are the only instances of *armigera* (as a noun in the feminine) in

[175] Hinds 1987b: 157 n. 46.
[176] Cf. Johnson 2008.

extant Latin literature up to Ovid's time,[177] and the impressive quadrisyllabic occupies the same *sedes* in both examples.[178] Additionally, in both cases three pieces of gear are mentioned on one line, one of which is modified by a perfect passive participle (*arcus retentos*; *tela inclusa*).[179] Both passages also indicate that Diana handed over her weapons to her armor-bearer (*tradidit* 3.165; *dedisti* 5.619). Furthermore, Arethusa earlier identifies herself by the same language (*nympharum una*) with which the armor-bearer is identified in the Actaeon episode (3.165; 5.577-78).[180] The name of the nymph who takes Diana's weapons is not included, but as we read Arethusa's prayer, we may retroactively wonder whether Arethusa was present at the scene. Arethusa refers to herself as one of the nymphs in Achaia (5.577-78), and the Diana and Actaeon episode takes place in Gargaphie (which is near Plataea), so it is conceivable that Arethusa was with Diana when Actaeon accidentally stumbled upon Diana bathing and suffered his

---

[177] Cf. Kenney 2002: 62-65.

[178] After Ovid Pliny uses the word to describe an eagle *NH* 2.146.7 & 10.15.8 as does Silius Italicus 17.53.

[179] The image of nymphs acting as Diana's handmaidens is in Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis* (3.13-15; 40-43), but they are not responsible for holding her weapons (they tend to her boots and her hunting dogs). Cf. Larson 2001: 108 and 1997: 250-51. In Callimachus Hermes receives Artemis' weapons (3.142-43).

[180] *nympharum una* is a surprisingly uncommon phrase. It only occurs in these two places, Verg. *Aen.* 1.329 (when Aeneas takes Venus for Diana or one of her nymphs) and Statius *Theb*. 9.417 (of the nymph who informs Ismenus of Hippomedon's death).

harsh punishment.[181]

In her discussion comparing the Arethusa episode to that of Daphne, Salzman-Mitchell comments, "The picture that Arethusa presents of herself is not much different from other portraits of virgins in episodes narrated by male authorial figures, but Arethusa can escape, 'speak,' and give a female perspective. Arethusa has 'read' Ovid, but has learned how to—or has been lucky enough to—avoid the fate of the Ovidian virgin-victim."[182] If Arethusa was present for Actaeon's transformation, one of the things she may have "learned," is just how fiercely Diana protects against male intrusions. This reminiscence of the Actaeon episode in Arethusa's prayer may be an indication that Arethusa's appeal succeeds not just because she prays to a goddess to whom she has offered a previous service, but additionally because she prays to the *right* deity—namely, a goddess who is a virgin herself and an ardent protector against male invasion.[183] The two victims of attempted rape who manage to retain a voice and narrate their own story, Cornix and Arethusa, both receive answers to their prayers from Olympian, virginal goddesses.[184]

---

[181] The Roman province of Achaia included Gargaphie and the whole Peloponnese.
[182] 2005a: 181.
[183] Note especially *severa virginitate* at 3.254-55.
[184] The two goddesses, Minerva and Diana, are linked near the beginning of Calliope's song, when Venus singles them out for revolting against her by remaining virgins (5.375-

Finally, while all attempted rape victims undergo a transformation of body, Arethusa's metamorphosis is significantly *not* the direct result of her prayer—Diana does not transform the nymph. In contrast, Arethusa's transformation is the result of her emotional state and not the work of a divinity (5.632-36). In the other three scenes, especially Daphne's, the transformation occurs in part because of an incongruence between the speaker's intended meaning and a more literal interpretation of the prayer by the respondent. Arethusa's vague prayer (*fer opem*) similarly leaves open the possibility of another irreversible transformation by a divinity, but Diana does not transform Arethusa. Instead, she answers both the literal meaning of the words and the speaker's intentions. First, she attempts to hide Arethusa in a mist. After the prayer, Ovid explicitly mentions that the goddess heard it (*mota dea est* 5.620) and perhaps underscores the goddess' effort to answer favorably by echoing the vocabulary of Arethusa's own prayer in describing Diana's response (*ferens* 5.620; *fer opem…ferre* 5.618-19). When Alpheus later recognizes Arethusa, the goddess again intercedes by breaking a path through the earth for Arethusa to escape at the last possible moment (*Delia rupit humum* 5.639).

Arethusa's prayer is ultimately successful at avoiding rape, but it is noteworthy

---

76). The goddess' names emphatically frame the line, which creates congruence between them (*Pallada nonne vides iaculatricemque Dianam* 5.375).

that Diana must intervene *twice*. One possible explanation is that as a male, Alpheus' status is closer to Diana's, and therefore requires additional effort to overcome. Another reason, however, may be that Arethusa's emotional response to her pursuer interferes with Diana's first attempt to save her; fear overtakes Arethusa's body and transforms her into water, a form which Alpheus can recognize. Arethusa's metamorphosis may be a statement of and metaphor for the overwhelming and irreversible damage an attempted rape may have on a victim, even when penetration itself is prevented. Arethusa could not merely cast off the darkness Diana had shrouded her in and return to her previous life with her original form. Instead, the psychological damage of attempted rape is too great for a victim to remain unchanged.[185]

CONCLUSION

All four women (Daphne, Syrinx, Cornix, and Arethusa) share a similar sort of limited success in the outcome of their prayers for help. Divinities respond to their appeals and prevent them from being raped, but none of them is able to retain her original physical form or continue the life she led before. While they share this overall similarity, the

---

[185] There has been much debate over whether Ovid's text is sympathetic toward women, see Sharrock (2002b). Curran (1978) is the seminal work for the view that Ovid's depictions of rape reveal sympathy for rape victims. Richlin (1992) is one of the strongest proponents of the view that Ovid's text is inherently misogynistic. See also Murgatroyd (2005: 63-66).

relative advantages of these women's fate differ somewhat. Daphne and Syrinx seem to experience the worst results, since they lose their physical form, lose their voices, and ultimately belong to their aggressors. Cornix fares slightly better; she does not become a symbol of her aggressor and is able to retain a voice of sorts, albeit not a human one. She continues to communicate, but presumably only among her new community of birds. Arethusa seems to experience the best fate of the four women, since she is able to preserve her original voice even in her new form. Still, even though she is not claimed as a symbol for her aggressor in the same way as Daphne and Syrinx, she is described as *Alpheias*, and her identity seems to be forever linked to her attacker's. The extent to which a petition is advantageous seems to depend on the statuses of individuals in the episode. Daphne prays to a male, marginal deity who appears to both misinterpret her words and have limited agency against a more powerful deity (Apollo). Syrinx's respondents (her sister nymphs) similarly seem to have limited power against Syrinx's male assailent. The two women who fare comparatively better (Cornix and Arethusa) appeal to high-status, female divinities—the goddesses' gender and identity as virgins seems to make them sympathetic to Cornix and Arethusa, and their Olympian status (as compared to the nymphs, for instance) appears to afford them greater power to act against the threatening males. Nonetheless, all women experience ambivalent results. It is thus

clear that while prayer provides women a degree of agency, ultimately once a man (or god) decides he wants a woman, her choice is limited. The power of words may save her from rape, but it cannot leave her unchanged.

CHAPTER TWO: PERMUTATIONS OF A PATTERN

There is thematic continuity throughout all the prayers for help in the *Metamorphoses* (particularly in their emphasis on power hierarchies), but the prayers treated in this chapter gain additional depth when compared to the pattern of prayer in scenes of attempted rape discussed in Chapter One. The stories of Perimele (8.547-610), Mestra (8.848-54), Caenis (12.146-209), Anius' daughters (13.632-74), and Acis (13.738-897) all invite interpretation as permutations of a pattern established in the episodes of Daphne (1.452-567), Syrinx (1.689-712), Cornix (2.569-95), and Arethusa (5.572-641), where a woman is desired, pursued, makes a vague plea for help, and then undergoes a transformation to avoid capture and rape. Once this model of female flight, erotic pursuit, and prayer for deliverance has been established early in the poem, later episodes alter various aspects of the paradigm. The episodes discussed in this chapter all contain both verbal and narrative similarities to episodes that feature petitions for help to avoid rape, which mark them as permutations of that earlier pattern. An especially common way of signaling the connection is by repeating the distinctive appeal, *fer opem*.[186] In this chapter my basic framework is first to summarize the episode briefly, then to establish the connection with the pattern of prayer and attempted rape, to show

[186] Discussed more fully in the Introduction pgs. 18-19.

how the episode transforms the pattern, and finally to explore the meaning of the permutation, particularly as it relates to dynamics of power. The stories of Perimele, Mestra, Caenis, Anius' daughters, and Acis are variously enriched through evocation of the familiar model petitions to prevent rape.

I. PERIMELE

The first episode to modify the pattern of pursuit and prayer is the story of Perimele narrated by the river Achelous in Book Eight. Achelous hosts Theseus and his companions during their journey home from the Calydonian boar hunt (8.547-73). At dinner one of the comrades asks Achelous about islands he sees in the distance (8.574-76). Achelous explains that, when five nymphs excluded him from a feast, he angrily swept them into the sea in a huge flood where they became those islands, now called the Echinades (8.577-89). Beyond them Achelous then points out another island that sailors call Perimele (8.590-91) and explains its origin as well. Perimele was once a girl, but when Achelous stole her virginity, the girl's outraged father, Hippodamas, attempted to kill his daughter by hurling her off an enormous cliff into the ocean (8.592-94).[187]

---

[187] While cruel, the reaction of Perimele's father has precedent in some Roman practice and thought. Women's chastity was vital for legitimate reproduction of heirs, such that rape victims were sometimes considered deprived of their primary function. Additionally, a rape could be seen as a dangerous infiltration by a stranger into a family and home. Often victims were blamed and seen as shameful to their own family so that fathers (and

Achelous caught her, prayed to Neptune for help, and the Olympian god responded by transforming her into an island (8.595-610).[188] Achelous quotes his own plea to Neptune as follows (8.595-602):[189]

> "o proxima mundi
> regna vagae," dixi, "sortite, Tridentifer, undae,
> adfer opem, mersaeque, precor, feritate paterna
> da, Neptune, locum, vel sit locus ipsa licebit!"

> "O god apportioned the realm next to the Earth, the realm of the wandering water, o god who wields the trident, bring help, I pray, and to a daughter sunk by her father's cruelty give a place, Neptune, or let her become a place herself!"

Evaluating the success of this prayer under the framework of power differentials is more complicated than the episodes discussed thus far because Achelous offers it on Perimele's

---

husbands) themselves killed raped women (Nguyen 2006: 84). For similar thinking cf. Lucretia's given reasoning on her suicide in Livy (*nec ulla deinde impudica Lucretiae exemplo vivet*, no unchaste woman will live with the example of Lucretia 1.58.10).

[188] Callimachus (*Suda* Call. Test. 1) and other Hellenistic authors (e.g. Philostephanus of Cyrene's *Περὶ Νήσων*) commonly treated the origin of islands; cf. Kenney 2011: on 8.573-610; Myers 1994a: 90-91; Crabbe 1981: 2288-89; Pfeiffer 1949: 339. The river Achelous was especially known for its peculiar geography of islands formed by alluvial deposits: cf. Hdt. 2.10; Thuc. 2.102.3-4; Strabo 10.19; Paus. 8.38. Crabbe argues that Perimele's tale resembles Callimchus' Asteria in *Hymn* 4 particularly closely (1981: 2289). Van Tress (2004: 190) notes that the Echinades also allude to *Hymn* 4, as they flee Leto (*Hy.* 4.155). For the Hellenistic background of tales at Achelous' banquet see Van Tress (2004); Nishimura-Jensen (2000: 295-99); Myers (1994a: 90-94); and Crabbe (1981: 2289). The episode likely also alludes to Achelous' relationship with Perimede in the *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 10a M-W); cf. Ziogas 2013: 135.

[189] Above I have adopted Tarrant's text, which follows MSS E, F, L, M, N, S, and U (as does Anderson). Hollis argues for the possibility of double recension in this prayer (1970: x-xi and 103-4).

behalf. This means that the interests of the prayer's speaker and its beneficiary no longer necessarily align (i.e. what Achelous desires for Perimele may not be the same as what she desires for herself). Because of this potential discrepancy, I begin by discussing the appeal's success from Achelous' perspective (i.e. the speaker's), before turning to Perimele's seeming viewpoint (i.e. the beneficiary's). In Chapter One I argued that most of the prayers discussed exhibited limited success because the gods fulfilled them according to a literal interpretation of the wording, but not according to the intentions of the speaker. In contrast to those petitions, there seems to be no clear difference between Achelous' intention and the responding deity's interpretation of his prayer. Achelous first makes a general appeal for help (*adfer opem*) and then further refines this by requesting one of two responses from Neptune—that he either give Perimele a place (*da locum*) or make her a place (*sit locus ipsa licebit*).[190] When Neptune chooses the latter and turns Perimele into an island, there is no strong indication that Achelous expected Neptune to interpret his entreaty differently. For instance, he does not provide any markedly positive or negative evaluative language in his description of the metamorphosis (*dum loquor, amplexa est artus nova terra natantes/ et gravis increvit mutatis insula membris* 8.609-

---

[190] *dare locum* is a common phrase for "to make room for," "provide space to" *TLL* 7.2.1577.48.

10). If anything, his description continues his erotic gaze, describing the transformation as an embrace (*amplexa est*). Similarly, he is fond of the island in his initial description of it, rather than distressed or angry about Perimele's new form (*en procul una recessit/ insula, grata mihi* 8.590-91). Accordingly, from Achelous' standpoint, the prayer is rather successful. Additionally, wordplay on the verb *ferre* may provide continuity between Achelous and Neptune as it sets up the climactic plea. Hippodamas becomes angry (*aegre tulit* 8.593) about his daughter's destroyed chastity (likely seen as a violation of his home cf. n. 187) and casts her off a cliff. Achelous tries to help Perimele, at first by catching her and carrying her in his waters (*ferens* 8.595), then by making the request *adfer opem* to a greater power, the *Tridentifer*, in response to the father's *feritas*. This aural repetition is perhaps meant to align Achelous (*ferens*) with Neptune (*Tridentifer*) (who both *opem ferunt*) against Hippodamas (who *aegre tulit* and tried to drown his daughter *feritate*).

We can assess how this success for Achelous may be influenced by the same factors as other prayers for help—the power of words, status within the cosmological hierarchy, and gender—before considering the relative success of the entreaty for the beneficiary, Perimele. Like other appeals for help in the *Metamorphoses*, Achelous' petition contains a number of elements which comprise an ideal Roman prayer. As a

reminder, the components common to typical prayers are: 1) Invocation (which generally includes epithets and often further information to identify or praise the deity); 2) A verb of request; 3) Specific recipients of the request; 4) An argument for why the deity should respond (for instance because of services rendered to the deity in the past or because of future gifts promised). If we examine Achelous' prayer, it contains three of the four, and lacks only the final component. His invocation clearly names Neptune in the last line, and also contains further deferential designations *proxima mundi regna vagae sortite undae* and *Tridentifer* (8.595-96). Next, the prayer makes a request (*adfer opem*) that is further refined by two possible options for how to help (*da locum vel sit locus ipsa licebit*). Third, the beneficiary of the prayer is identified (albeit, not by name, but rather in relation to her father as *mersae feritate paterna*).

While these factors partially account for Achelous' success, they cannot be entirely responsible, since other petitions share the same extent of compliance to ideal prayer form, but experience more limited success.[191] Critically, Achelous' appeal lacks the argument portion of the formula, but this does not appear to have been detrimental to his success. In the case of Arethusa, we saw in Chapter One that providing an "argument"

---

[191] For instance, Daphne's (pgs. 52-62), Anius' daughters' (pgs. 136-48), and Acis' (pgs. 148-66).

appeared to afford her slightly greater success in her outcome. We might expect then the absence of this component to negatively impact Achelous' success. Instead, other factors appear to supply a counterbalance. One cause of this greater success for Achelous may be that he refines his vague plea for help with a more specific request. Despite the fact that Achelous neither presents extensive commentary on the transformation nor specifically asks that Perimele become an *island*, it is difficult to imagine how the request *sit locus ipsa licebit* could have been interpreted substantially differently (i.e. his language was not markedly ambiguous).

In addition to the greater clarity his request exhibits, the prayer may be more successful because the speaker and the recipient of the prayer hold more similar positions in the cosmological hierarchy—both are male and are gods. However, as an Olympian god Neptune occupies a higher position than does Achelous. Even though Achelous' appeal enjoys success, he apparently lacks the power to help Perimele on his own but requires the assistance of another divinity. While it is appropriate for Neptune to change Perimele into an island since the sea is his realm (emphasized in the invocation of Achelous' prayer *proxima mundi regna vagae sortite undae* 8.595-96),[192] the prayer by Achelous may undercut his own status to some degree, especially in the context in which

[192] Cf. Kenney's explanation (2011: on 8.595-96).

it occurs. In his first story, about the Echinades, Achelous' prestige is specifically at issue. He interprets the nymphs' forgetfulness as a slight to his standing and positions himself as more powerful by punishing them and effecting their transformation into islands. In his story about Perimele, however, he relies on a more powerful deity to take action.[193] The question of divine power is brought to the fore also in the frame narrative at the end Achelous' island stories. After Achelous describes Perimele's transformation, the external narrator remarks (8.611-19):

> Amnis ab his tacuit. factum mirabile cunctos
> moverat: inridet credentes, utque deorum
> spretor erat mentisque ferox, Ixione natus
> 'ficta refers nimiumque putas, Acheloe, potentes
> esse deos,' dixit 'si dant adimuntque figuras.'
> obstipuere omnes nec talia dicta probarunt,
> ante omnesque Lelex animo maturus et aevo,
> sic ait: 'inmensa est finemque potentia caeli
> non habet, et quicquid superi voluere, peractum est.'

> The river fell quiet. The miraculous deed had moved everyone: but the son of Ixion, laughed at the believers, since he was a spurner of the gods and fierce in mind. He said, "You are telling fictions, Achelous, and you think the gods are too powerful, if they give and take away figures." Everyone was shocked and did not approve of such words, and Lelex above all mature in mind and age spoke thus, "The power of heaven is immense and has no limit, and whatever the gods want is accomplished."

The competing views of Achelous' listeners (represented by the sceptical Pirithuous and the pious Lelex) have rightly been thought to present ways for the external audience to

[193] Cf. Feldherr 2010: 56.

read and interpret not just Achelous' stories, but the whole narrative of the poem. Boyd regards this interaction and the Achelous episode as an invitation for the reader to reflect upon the narrative and her journey through it.[194] Feeney argues that the differing reactions of Achelous' audience represent two ways of viewing Ovid's narrative that readers must employ simultaneously.[195] In his analysis, the ideal reader of Ovid's divine stories requires a sort of divided belief between external reality and the internal reality of the narrative. Feldherr provides a similar interpretation, but with a slight critique of Feeney's viewpoint, and argues that explicit references to differing viewpoints have a more destabilizing, not complementary, effect.[196] These studies certainly are right to focus on how this episode comments on ways of reading, but this passage also specifically invites us to focus on the power of the gods (*potentes* 614, *potentia* 618). As such it reaffirms the importance of power differentials both in divine responses to prayers (since these responses involve giving and taking aways forms, *dant adimuntque figuras* 615) and also power as a broader theme in the work, since, as Feldherr describes it, "the gods' giving and taking away, *figurae* is the self-proclaimed subject of the entire

---

[194] Boyd 2006.

[195] Feeney 1991: 229-32.

[196] Feldherr 2010: 54-59.

poem."[197] In the next chapter I will further develop and explore the possible programmatic and generic associations of Achelous' narrative, but for now let us return to an analysis of Achelous' prayer itself and its success.

While the petition succeeds from Achelous' vantage point, it cannot be deemed unequivocally successful without considering how positive it was for the beneficiary of the appeal, Perimele. Because she is granted no direct speech and the narrative is not presented from her perspective, assessing the success from her point of view is more difficult. On the one hand, Perimele loses her bodily form, her family, and presumably her ability to speak. On the other hand, her father had hurled her from a cliff, and it appears that without Achelous' help she might have drowned. Given the choice between transformation and death, it is possible to characterize her metamorphosis into an island as positive, but only in a limited sense. She in fact experiences the same fate as the Echinades, who become islands as a punishment. The similarity between their metamorphoses into islands is obvious, but is reinforced by the repetition of the word *locus* to define both. The word appears four times in the episode. First, it occurs in the question that prompts Achelous' narrative, *quis ille locus?* (8.573-74), referring to both the Echinades and Perimele. The second instance applies solely to the Echinades and

---

[197] 2010: 56.

describes how Achelous transforms the nymphs as punishment (*cumque loco nymphas, memores tum denique nostri,/ in freta pervolvi* 8.584-85). Finally, the third and fourth occurrences are in Achelous' petition on Perimele's behalf (*da locum vel sit locus ipsa licebit* 8.602). This verbal equivalence between the two transformations may hint at the potentially undesirable nature of Perimele's metamorphosis as identical to the Echinades.

We can gain additional perspective by comparing the outcome of another similar prayer addressed to Neptune, Venus' appeal on behalf of Ino and her child Melicerte (4.531-38).[198] Intent upon the destruction of the house of Cadmus, Juno enlists the help of the Fury Tisiphone to infect Athamas, Ino's husband, with madness. The delusional Athamas mistakes his family for lions and kills one of their sons, Learchus. Ino, also frenzied, seizes their remaining son, Melicerte, and jumps from a towering cliff into the

---

[198] At Venus, inmeritae neptis miserata labores,
sic patruo blandita suo est 'o numen aquarum,
proxima cui caelo cessit, Neptune, potestas,
magna quidem posco, sed tu miserere meorum,
iactari quos cernis in Ionio inmenso,
et dis adde tuis. aliqua et mihi gratia ponto est,
si tamen in medio quondam concreta profundo
spuma fui Graiumque manet mihi nomen ab illa.'

But Venus, pitying the undeserved sufferings of her granddaughter, addressed her uncle flatteringly, "Neptune, deity of waters, to whom the power next to the sky fell, I ask great things indeed, but pity my relatives, whom you see thrown into the vast Ionian, and add them to your gods. Some favor is owed to me from the sea, if once I was formed from foam in the middle of its depths and my name in Greek persists from that."

sea. Venus undertakes to rescue her granddaughter and prays to Neptune, asking him to transform the pair into sea deities. Neptune consents, and the mortals become divinities known as Leucothoë and Palaemon. Ino's story shares a number of resemblances with Perimele's. Both women are plunged into the ocean from a cliff and nearly drown, but a deity intervenes by appealing to Neptune on her behalf, an appeal which he answers. Additionally, Achelous' invocation to Neptune (*o proxima mundi regna vagae sortite, Tridentifer, undae* 8.595-96) resembles Venus' (*o numen aquarum, proxima cui caelo cessit, Neptune, potestas* 4.532-33), as both refer to the portion of the universe allotted to the god, mention his power over the ocean, and contain the word *proxima*. The outcomes of the two pleas, however, are rather different in terms of advantage to the petitions' beneficiaries—the attraction of becoming a divinity greatly surpasses that of becoming an island. This difference in what we might call "success" for the beneficiary arises from the speaker of the prayer's assessment of the beneficiary's needs—both Venus and Achelous receive what they request, but Venus makes a petitions that better serves the interests of her beneficiaries. She unambiguously implores Neptune to make Ino and Melicerte gods (*dis adde tuis*), something Achelous perhaps could have also requested.[199]

Perimele's fate does not seem like one she would have chosen for herself, so that

---

[199] She furthermore provides an argument in her prayer (4.536-38).

Achelous' request on her behalf reveals a difference between both human (especially female) and divine (especially male) desires. Many prayers in the poem exhibit this disconnection between human and divine, but Achelous' story differs from the rest of the *Metamorphoses* in that this miscommunication does not result directly from a difference between the literal meaning of a request and the speaker's intended meaning. Instead, in this episode Perimele has no voice to be misinterpreted—Achelous appropriates an entreaty for her which is ultimately of ambiguous benefit to her.

Achelous' supplanting of Perimele's voice is highlighted by the similarity between his plea and those in scenes of attempted rape. As in the episodes discussed in Chapter One, at a climactic moment a prayer for deliverance results in the transformation of an endangered woman. In addition to this general similarity, the language of the appeal in Perimele's story recalls the language of prayers in scenes of attempted rape. Specifically, *adfer opem* evokes three petitions which have employed the phrase *fer opem* previously in the poem: those spoken jointly by Deucalion and Pyrrha (1.377-80), by Daphne (1.452-567), and by Arethusa (5.572-641).[200] The relationship between Achelous' entreaty and that of Deucalion and Pyrrha will be discussed in greater detail in

---

[200] By this point in the poem, *fer opem* has also been used by Mercury disguised as a shepherd (2.699-701) and by Pentheus (3.719-20). In contrast to all other usages, both these pleas are addressed to a human rather than a deity; cf. Introduction pgs. 27-30.

the following chapter. The similarity to the other two appeals, both in repetition of language (*fer opem*)[201] and in narrative position (plea offered at climactic moment before transformation), functions to draw a comparison between Perimele's story and the established pattern of prayer and attempted rape, which in turn highlights female victimization by male aggressors.

Echoes of this pattern furthermore bring into question Achelous' own treatment of Perimele. Achelous does not reveal the details of his erotic pursuit of Perimele, but merely summarizes their interaction in a single line (8.592): *huic ego virgineum dilectae nomen ademi* (I took the name of virgin from this beloved girl). Even this short description, however, suggests Achelous raped an unwilling Perimele, a suspicion which is then reinforced via the repetition of an appeal used by women attempting to avoid rape.[202] Kenney remarks that *diligo* is a euphemism for "to use violence" elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses* and Anderson also notes that the word implies rape rather than seduction.[203] In particular, the succinct and memorable expression of Proserpina's

---

[201] This is the only use of *adfer opem* in the *Metamorphoses*. The prefix provides a certain verbal correspondence between Achelous' action towards Perimele (*ademi* 8.892) and the help he asks for from Neptune (*adfer* 8.601).

[202] See Bömer Vol. 4, 1977: on 8.592 for a number of parallels, all of which insinuate rape.

[203] Kenney 2011: on 8.592; Anderson 1972: on 8.592; Bömer Vol. 4, 1977: on 8.592. Cf. 5.395, 10.107, 10.153. Feldherr (2010: 55) also describes Achelous' action as rape.

abduction which was reported previously (*paene simul visa est dilectaque raptaque Diti* 5.395) seems to lend the otherwise relatively neutral term more sinister connotations in the erotic episodes of the *Metamorphoses.* An earlier description of Achelous' waters as rapacious (*rapacibus undis* 8.551) may also hint at his possible identity as a rapist.[204] The syntax of the sentence that describes Achelous' relation to Perimele (8.592) also reinforces Perimele's lack of agency in their dynamic; Achelous is the subject (*ego ademi*)[205] and Perimele is displaced into the dative (*huic dilectae*)—she does not *offer* her virginity to Achelous, nor do they share a mutual love (as, for instance, is emphasized in the case of Baucis and Philemon, which directly follows).[206] Achelous does not recognize or acknowledge any cruelty or wrongdoing in his action, but his male-privileged euphemism hints at a darker reality behind his story. Cyane's use of *diligo* in a description of her relationship with Anapis in contrast to Pluto's with Proserpina effectively demonstrates the range of possible connotations for the term *diligo* as encompassing both legitimate affection/love and unwanted affection/rape, and

---

[204] Cf. Murray 2004: 236.

[205] On *adimo* in reference to virginity *TLL* 1.684.21-24; *adimere* also can have the negative connotation of depriving someone of something (*TLL* 1.679-80.72-22).

[206] E.g. *concordes* (8.708). Cf. Blanco Mayor 2017: 243-338 on mutual love in the *Metamorphoses*.

furthermore supports that Achelous' relationship with Perimele is the latter.[207] When attempting to prevent Pluto's rape of Proserpina, Cyane chastises Pluto and provides her own marriage as a contrastive exemplum (5.415-18):

> 'non potes invitae Cereris gener esse: roganda,
> non rapienda fuit. quodsi conponere magnis
> parva mihi fas est, et me dilexit Anapis;
> exorata tamen, nec, ut haec, exterrita nupsi.'
>
> "You can't be the son in law of Ceres against her will: the girl should have been asked, not taken. But if it's right for me to compare small things to great, Anapis also loved me; but I married him after entreaty, not because I was terrified like this girl."

Here, *diligo* is used in reference to two relationships: one the nymph considers a rape, and one she does not—*et* in 5.417 shows Pluto loved Proserpina just as Anapis loved Cyane (*et me dilexit Anapis* 5.417), but then Cyane emphasizes a critical difference between Pluto's behavior and Anapis'—that Pluto did not request Proserpina (*exorata tamen* 5.418), and instead forcibly seized her (*dilexit* especially recalls the description of Proserpina's capture: *paene simul visa est dilectaque raptaque Diti* 5.395). The syntax of the sentence mirrors an important distinction in agency between Cyane and Proserpina. In

---

[207] In Roman law, what we would consider rape can be found under various charges: *raptus*, *vis*, *stuprum* (cf. Fantham 1991), and *iniuria* (Nguyen 2006: 83-84; Clark 1993: 36; Robinson 1995). *Raptus* covers abduction, rape, and seduction (sexual penetration was not a requirement, cf. Clark 1993: 36); *vis* was used for physical assault, including sexual assault; *stuprum* covered 'unacceptable' sexual penetration; and *iniuria* included attempts on virginity and generally inappropriate behavior (e.g. exposure, taunting). On fear as invalidating consent in the legal system see Prichard (1906: 322).

5.417 Cyane is the grammatical object, but then, in contrast with victims of rape and attempted rape, she becomes the grammatical subject of an active verb and also has agency in her relationship (*nupsi* 5.418). Although Achelous provides only minimal information, his behavior resembles Pluto's rather than Anapis'. He clearly does not ask Perimele's father for permission to take her as a bride, since Hippodamas is prepared to kill his daughter for the loss of her chastity. Nor does Perimele appear to have any agency in the matter. Perimele's lack of verbal and physical agency is additionally reinforced by an absence of grammatical agency. Nowhere in Achelous' telling is Perimele the grammatical subject of a sentence in her human form. She is only granted the position of subject when she is referred to as an inanimate object. In two sentences that bookend the episode and create ring composition, she is the subject as an island (*una recessit/ insula, grata mihi* 8.590-91; *gravis increvit mutatis insula membris* 610). She also occupies the nominative when Achelous prays that she be a location (*vel sit locus ipsa licebit*). In reference solely to her human form Perimele is never the subject: In the first sentence her name is in the accusative (*Perimelen navita dicit* 591); in sentence two she is a dative of separation (*huic ego virgineum dilectae nomen ademi* 592); in sentence three she occupies the genitive case (*quod pater Hippodamas aegre tulit inque profundum/ propulit*

e scopulo periturae corpora[208] *natae* 593-94); in the fourth sentence she is again accusative (*excepi nantemque ferens* 595); and in the fifth sentence she occurs in the dative (*adfer opem, mersaeque, precor, feritate paterna* 601). The syntax of the narration itself therefore highlights Perimele's silence and powerlessness.

The intimation of violence against Perimele is strengthened by the repetition of the prayer offered by women in scenes of attempted rape. Achelous' rape puts Perimele in a situation that leads him to pray for her deliverance with the distinctive plea *adfer opem*. Both Daphne and Arethusa cry out *fer opem* in a desperate entreaty for help in order to preserve their virginity and avoid unwanted sexual contact from a threatening pursuer (1.546-47, 5.618-20). This echo of the prayers of Daphne and Arethusa activates the memory of previous scenes of attempted rape, but with a striking difference—the prayer is spoken not by the woman attempting to avoid sexual aggression, but by the man who has already violated her. In this permutation of the pattern, the words of the victim thus have been co-opted by the original aggressor in his telling of events, and Perimele is afforded no direct speech at all. This is a literalization of a phenomenon that has been observed frequently in the poem—that rape robs women of their voices. Yet, echoes of the pattern of prayer and attempted rape, at the climactic moment of Achelous' call upon

---

[208] Note also her body here is in the accusative, the recipient of her father's action.

Neptune to help the victim of her father's wrath, create what Lyne on Vergil would call "further voices" emerging from the subtext.[209] In this case, the submerged voice of the threatened Perimele surfaces to remind us of her unspoken anguish.

Anderson's perspective on the success of Perimele's fate differs somewhat, however, since he seems to characterize the result of the prayer as unequivocally positive when he terms it a "reward."[210] His designation occurs as part of a larger point about Achelous' entire narrative where he asserts that Achelous' two island stories (the Echinades and Perimele) form a pair which contrasts metamorphosis as a punishment with metamorphosis as a reward. Crabbe espouses a more nuanced interpretation when she characterizes the two types of metamorphoses as punishment and "benevolence" or "mercy."[211] While this description is better, it is still problematic, since Achelous is both

---

[209] Lyne 1987.

[210] Anderson 1972: on 8.590.

[211] Crabbe 1981: 2290-91. This pairing of stories, with contrasting types of metamorphoses, exemplifies the ambiguous nature of metamorphosis throughout the larger poem—sometimes transformation appears to be a punishment, and sometimes it appears to be a salvation of dubious advantage, or perhaps more accurately a mitigation of harm. The episodes of Lycaon and Daphne form a nice parallel to the stories of the Echinades and Perimele. Both Lycaon and the Echinades invoke the wrath of a god and suffer transformation as a punishment. Daphne and Perimele are both desired by a god who either attempts or actually accomplishes rape, and then suffer transformations of dubious benefit as the result of a prayer for help. In this way Achelous' island narratives recapitulate aspects of both Book One and the poem as a whole. My discussion in the following chapter will explore additional ways that Achelous' narration resembles Book

the reason Perimele needs an act of benevolence and the figure to grant it. If he had not taken her virginity, she would not be in danger of dying. Not only is she the victim of rape, but in exchange for this rape she must undergo either transformation or death. There is then also a chilling parallelism between the violence enacted on Perimele by her father (which Achelous laments *feritate* 8.601) and Achelous' own offenses against the girl. By having Achelous echo the plea women employ in scenes of attempted rape, Ovid draws attention to this similarity and underscores Perimele's powerlessness.

While Anderson's characterization of Perimele's transformation as "reward" assigns an overly positive meaning, he rightly notices that Perimele's episode hints (albeit obliquely) at the idea that a woman is owed recompense for her lost virginity. The notion of compensation or consolation for taken virginity figures into Roman and Greek thought elsewhere, for instance in myths where a god's rape of a woman is mollified by her birth of a glorious son.[212] The *Metamorphoses* sometimes shares this approach,[213] but Ovid also fashions episodes that involve a particular form of compensation, in which the

---

One of the *Metamorphoses*.

[212] See Murgatroyd (2005: 63-73), who identifies three stages for rape narratives in the *Fasti*. The third stage, "aftermath," addresses the possibility of "recompense" for rape (either in the form of marriage or a gift). See also Fletcher (2004) and Sharrock (2002b: 106).

[213] E.g. Io's son, Epaphus, 1.748-50. For the possibility that metamorphosis replaces heroic offspring in the *Metamorphoses*, cf. Fletcher 2004: 311.

god who has raped a woman then grants her appeal. The description of Perimele's transformation may suggest that metamorphosis reflects the recompense of bearing a glorious child, since *amplexa est* implies erotic embrace and *gravis increvit* evokes the language of pregnancy (8.609-10),[214] even if *gravis* is commonly applied to *terra*.

II. MESTRA AND CAENIS/CAENEUS

In addition to this somewhat less obvious example of Perimele, petitions offered on the basis of obligation after rape can be seen in the stories of Mestra (8.848-54) and Caenis (12.146-209).[215] Where the plea for Perimele is uttered on her behalf by her rapist, and is answered by another deity (Neptune), the other two women voice their entreaties themselves, and their petitions are granted directly by their rapist (also Neptune). The stories of Mestra and Caenis thus resemble each other and engage with the pattern of prayer and attempted rape in much the same way. The language of Caenis' story more obviously echoes scenes of attempted rape, and so it will be fruitful to examine it first (even though it is narrated after Mestra's tale in the poem).

Nestor recounts Caenis' transformation into a man after being raped by Neptune to Achilles and the Greeks in Book Twelve (169-535). Following the great sea god's

---

[214] For *gravis* instead of the more usual *gravida TLL* 6.2.2276.73-2277.9.

[215] Fletcher 2004: 310-11. These three women are additionally connected because of their presence in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*; cf. Fletcher 2004: 310 n. 58.

violence against the young maiden (*vim passa dei est* 12.197), he offers to fulfill any wish (*vota* 12.199-200) as compensation for her virginity. Caenis asks not to be a woman anymore, so that she cannot be raped again (*tale pati iam posse nihil; da, femina ne sim* 12.202). In response, Neptune transforms her into a man who is impenetrable by swords (12.203-7).

The scene introduces Caenis in terms that evoke women who are victims of attempted rape. Caenis' description parallels Cornix's introduction in Book Two especially closely—both women are presented in relation to their fathers (*Coroneus genuit* 2.569-70; *Elateia* 12.189) and their locations (*Phocaiaca clarus tellure* 2.569; *Thessalidum virgo pulcherrima* 12.190). The first line of each introduction also contains a form of *clarus* (2.569; 12.189). Each woman is called *virgo* (2.570; 12.190) and described as beautiful (*forma mihi nocuit* 2.572; *Thessalidum virgo pulcherrima*[216] 12.190). Additionally, each woman is said to rebuff many suitors (*divitibus procis petebar* 2.571; *multorum frustra votis optata procorum* 12.192).[217] Both women encounter Neptune as they stroll the beach (*cum per litora lentis/ passibus, ut soleo,*

---

[216] For the possible etymological play on Caenis from Greek καίνυμαι, to surpass, cf. Ziogas 2013: 206-7.

[217] This step is part of a common, well-established motif in erotic narratives; cf. Tissol 1992: 265-66. On its prevalence in Ovid *idem* n. 9. For the view that it is a generic marker for *ehoie*-poetry cf. Ziogas 2013: 207.

summa per litora harena 2.572-73; *carpens litora secreta* 12.196). Moreover, the two passages are linked by the narrator's insistence that the story is well known (*nota loquor* 2.570; *ita fama ferebat* 12.197).[218]

Beyond these initial similarities, however, Caenis' narrative exhibits important differences. Neptune first attempts to seduce Cornix with pleas and flattering words, but is rebuffed (*ut precando/ tempora blandis absumpsit inania verbis* 2.574-75).[219] Cornix then flees and prays for help, whereupon Minerva transforms her into a bird to aid her escape from the threatening god, one type of entreaty counteracting another. Neptune's desires are therefore foiled by prayers in Cornix's story, but with Caenis, Neptune succeeds in his rape. The allusion to the story of Cornix shows how the god has learned from his previous experience. Instead of trying *preces* on his love-interest, he uses force immediately to avoid her using *preces* to escape him.[220] Note especially that in the story of Cornix, Neptune prepares force (*vim parat* 2.576), but Cornix flees, whereas in

---

[218] Nestor repeats the phrase *fama ferebat* a few lines later (12.200). Cf. Ziogas 2013: 209-10.

[219] This *topos* begins in the paradigmatic Apollo and Daphne episode (*sed enim non sustinet ultra/ perdere blanditias iuvenis deus* 1.530-31) Cf. Gauly 2009: 71.

[220] This is similar to how Jupiter seems to have learned from his pursuit of Io that it will be easier to use a disguise when he approaches Callisto (cf. Heath 1992: 235), but Jupiter is successful at obtaining both women. See also Boreas' assessments of using words versus force at 6.684-710.

Caenis' tale, she suffers violence without a chance to run or pray for help (*vim passa est* 12.197). Caenis' episode also exploits the dual meaning of Latin words for prayer (*preces*, *vota*), which can refer to both erotic pleading and formal prayers to a divinity. Instead of using prayers to his love-interest, as he vainly attempted to do in the case of Cornix (2.574, quoted above), Neptune uses force and then grants the woman's petition. In the Caenis episode this reversal revolves not around *prex*, but the related word *votum*. The term is clearly central to Caenis' story, since in a 20-line episode it occurs five times (12.192, 199, 200, 201, 205). At the beginning *votum* refers to erotic wooing, similar to uses of *prex* elsewhere: *multorum frustra votis optata procorum* (she was hoped for in vain with pleas from many suitors 12.192). Neptune rapes Caenis rather than attempting to woo her *votis*, but offers *vota* to her in exchange, and assures they will not be rejected (*'sint tua vota licet' dixit 'secura repulsae:/ elige, quid voveas!'* 12.199-200), perhaps alluding to her refusal of other men's *vota* (*frustra votis optata* 12.192).[221]

While Caenis does not make the appeal for help that commonly accompanies attempted rapes (*fer opem*), the episode plays with this pattern of prayer in the poem by allotting Caenis a petition that leads to metamorphosis subsequent to her rape, rather than

---

[221] The use of *repulsa* is also similar to Phoebus' promise to Phaethon (*nullam patiere repulsam* 2.97) and Jupiter's promise to Semele (*elige! nullam patiere repulsam* 3.289).

before. Neptune immediately offers to fulfill any request as compensation for her virginity (*'sint tua vota licet' dixit 'secura repulsae:/ elige, quid voveas!'* "It's permitted that your prayers be safe from refusal: choose what you wish!" 12.199-200). Caenis asks not to be a woman anymore, so that she never suffers similarly again (12.201-3):

> 'magnum' Caenis ait 'facit haec iniuria votum,
> tale pati iam posse nihil; da, femina ne sim:
> omnia praestiteris.'
>
> Caenis said, "This violence prompts a great prayer, that I not be able to suffer such a thing again; grant that I not be a woman: you will have offered everything."

In response, Neptune transforms her into a man and additionally grants that she not be susceptible to sword wounds (*graviore novissima dixit/ verba sono poteratque viri vox illa videri,/ sicut erat; nam iam voto deus aequoris alti/ adnuerat dederatque super, nec saucius ullis/ vulneribus fieri ferrove occumbere posset* 12.203-7). This change in order of events (i.e. prayer subsequent rather than prior to rape) reworks the typical pattern of women who are pursued, but even after suffering sexual violence, the intent of Caenis' prayer resembles women in scenes of attempted rape—she is essentially asking not to be raped (again) (*tale pati iam posse nihil* 12.202).

A comparison with the surviving summary of Caenis' story in Phlegon (fr. 87 M-W) helps illuminate the particular narrative choices Ovid has made in telling this story

and the effects of positioning it as a variation of the pattern of entreaties employed to prevent rape:

> οἱ αὐτοὶ ἱστοροῦσιν κατὰ τὴν Λαπιθῶν χώραν γενέσθαι Ἐλάτῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ θυγατέρα ὀνομαζομένην Καινίδα. ταύτῃ δὲ Ποσειδῶνα μιγέντα ἐπαγγείλασθαι ποιήσειν αὐτῇ ὃ ἂν ἐθέλῃ, τὴν δὲ ἀξιῶσαι μεταλλάξαι αὐτὴν εἰς ἄνδρα ποιῆσαί τε ἄτρωτον. τοῦ δὲ Ποσειδῶνος κατὰ τὸ ἀξιωθὲν ποιήσαντος μετονομασθῆναι Καινέα.
>
> The same men record that in the land of the Lapiths a daughter was born to king Elatus named Caenis, and that Poseidon, after he had sex with her, promised to do for her whatever she wanted, and she asked him to change her into a man and to make her invulnerable. And when Poseidon acted in accordance with the request, [Caenis] received the new name Caeneus.

For our current purposes, we may note two key differences between Ovid's version and Phlegon's summary. First, in the *Metamorphoses* Caenis does not request to become a man, she appeals not to be a woman (*da, femina ne sim*). In Phlegon, on the other hand, she specifically asks to be transformed into a man (τὴν δὲ ἀξιῶσαι μεταλλάξαι αὐτὴν εἰς ἄνδρα). The first difference illustrates how Ovid introduces the potential for ambiguity in Caenis' request. Previous divine responses to ambiguous pleas for help have exploited imprecise language and enacted transformations contrary to the speaker's intent. By leaving open a number of possible responses that would technically fulfill Caenis' entreaty (i.e. by transforming her into a plant, bird, or fountain, similarly to the metamorphoses of Daphne, Cornix, and Arethusa), Ovid shows her transformation into a

man to be specifically the result of Neptune's choice (due to either his greater sympathy, understanding, or benevolence). Caenis' request seems to enjoy greater success than most women who pray for help in scenes of attempted rape in the sense that she avoids further sexual violence and retains both a voice and human form (at least initially). Neptune also appears to respond more sympathetically to Caenis (by advancing her up, rather than down, the cosmological hierarchy) and seems to interpret the intended meaning of her words, rather than simply fulfilling the literal meaning. Through comparison with the pattern of prayer and attempted rape we additionally see that this more beneficial transformation is dependent on first suffering rape. The second difference between the two stories is that in Ovid's version the gift of impenetrability is specifically attributed to Neptune's will (*dederatque super* 12.206), whereas in Phlegon Caenis directly asks to be invulnerable herself (ποιῆσαί τε ἄτρωτον). This dissimilarity again highlights how Neptune chooses to respond sympathetically; Caenis' invulnerability becomes Neptune's choice, rather than Caenis'. While Neptune is explicitly said to have granted Caenis invulnerability in addition to granting her prayer (*dederat super* 12.206), it is also true that his answer (*nec saucius ullis/ vulneribus fieri ferrove occumbere posset* 12.206-7) implies an understanding of Caenis' first petition not to suffer such a thing again (*tale pati iam posse nihil* 12.202). In addition to the metaphorical correspondence between

rape and suffering sword wounds, Nestor's initial introduction compares Caenis' invulnerability to Cycnus' impenetrability with vocabulary that echoes his later portrayal of both Caenis' request and Neptune's reply (12.169-72):

> cum sic Nestor ait: "vestro fuit unicus aevo
> contemptor ferri nulloque forabilis ictu
> Cycnus. At ipse olim patientem vulnera mille
> corpore non laeso Perrhaebum Caenea vidi
>
> Nestor spoke thus: "There was a single man in your generation who scorned the sword and was penetrable by no blow, Cycnus. But I myself saw the Perrhaebian Caeneus suffering a thousand wounds without harm to his body.

The description of Neptune's response (*nec saucius ullis/ vulneribus fieri ferrove occumbere posset* 12.206-7) does not explicitly repeat Caenis' use of *pati* in her request (*tale pati iam posse nihil* 12.202), but Nestor's earlier narrative reveals the conflation between suffering sexual and martial wounds (12.171, 12.197, 12.202), both conceptually and through the combination of forms of *ferrum*, *pati*, and *vulnera* in close succession in both passages.[222] Neptune's response metaphorically extends Caenis' request not to suffer rape again (*tale pati iam posse nihil* 12.202) to the inability to be penetrated at all (*dederatque super, nec saucius ullis/ vulneribus fieri ferrove occumbere posset* 12.206-7) and sustains the notion that females are by definition penetrable.[223] While Neptune

---

[222] Keith (2000: 82-85) notes the connection between the three uses of *pati* in Caenis' narrative (12.171, 12.197, 12.202).

[223] Cf. Reed 2013: on 12.201-7; Ormand 2005: 102 n. 5.; Pintabone 2002: 275-76;

appears to act generously with his second offering, that Caenis be invulnerable to swords, it will ultimately have consequences that complicate evaluating her prayer's success. When it is first fulfilled, however, Caenis is immediately happy (*munere laetus abit* 12.208).

Neptune's favorable response to Caenis' appeal comes as no surprise, since he invited the petition himself, but we may be encouraged to consider the difference between Caenis' beneficial outcome and the results in scenes of attempted rape (Daphne, Syrinx, Cornix, Arethusa) both by the similarity to Cornix's tale (noted above), and by a verbal gesture to the paradigmatic story of Daphne. Caenis' episode ends with him wandering the *Peneia arva* (12.209), a potential reference to Daphne's father and the recipient of her prayer for help, Peneus.[224] Whereas the benefit of Daphne's appeal is explicitly ambiguous ([*flumina*] *nescia, gratentur consolenturne parentum* 1.578), we are specifically told that Caeneus leaves happy with the result of his transformation (*munere laetus abit* 12.208).[225] Caeneus is not silenced by her transformation as many other victims of rape or attempted rape are in the poem. Yet, while she retains her ability to

---

Sharrock 2002b: 97; Keith 2000: 82-85.

[224] For the possibility that this line is a pun on *penis* cf. Ziogas 2013: 210.

[225] This initial clarity will become ambiguous at the end of Nestor's narrative, when there is doubt about Caeneus' death/transformation, as discussed below (*exitus in dubio est* 12.522).

speak, the voice must be transformed. As the narrator emphasizes, Caenis' voice becomes a new, male voice (*graviore novissima dixit/ verba sono poteratque viri vox illa videri,/ sicut erat* 12.203-5). Unlike victims of attempted rape, Caenis' transformation increases her status as she changes from female to male. Nonetheless, this success is at the initial cost of rape (described by her as *iniuria*, a legal term for rape that could result in a victim's compensation),[226] and is further complicated by Caeneus' subsequent fate in the battle of the Lapiths and Centaurs (12.459-535).[227]

It appears Nestor's treatment of Caenis has concluded when he describes the newly-transformed man as spending the rest of his life in virile pursuits (*munere laetus abit studiisque virilibus aevum/ exigit Atracides Peneiaque arva pererrat* 12.208-9), whereupon the elderly narrator abruptly proceeds to recount the Centauromachy (12.210-535). Although the subject apparently shifts, Caeneus in fact resurfaces many lines later in an impressive *aristeia* (12.459-97).[228] In accordance with Neptune's promise, none of

---

[226] Cf. Treggiari 1991: 309 n. 9; Nguyen 2006: 84.

[227] See Ziogas (2013: 191-215) on gender and genre in Caenis' story.

[228] Ziogas (2013: 215) summarizes the generic tension in this framing as follows: "Nestor embeds the Centauromachy in a Caenis-*ehoie*, following a salient structural pattern of the *Ehoiai*. But Ovid transforms the tension between structure and narrative function into a clash of epic genres. Immediately after Caenis' sex-inversion, Nestor's narrative undergoes a simultaneous generic shift from the Catalogue to the battles of men. Still, just as Caeneus' female birth haunts him until the end of his life, the generic shift to heroic epic produces a travesty of an epic dealing with the gory battle of hyper-virile and

the Centaurs are able to harm Caeneus with their weapons, and the hero endures attack after attack unscathed. Finally, Monychus exhorts his fellow centaurs to assail Caeneus by heaping stones and tree-trunks on him (12.498-509). After Caeneus is buried in a massive mound, Nestor relates that there is uncertainty about Caeneus' ultimate outcome (*exitus in dubio est* 12.522). Some reported that the weight of the mound pushed Caeneus into Tartarus, but Mopsus claimed that he emerged as a bird from the pile, and Nestor confirms he saw the bird himself (12.522-31). The first of these options conforms to the story found in Apollonius' catalogue of the Argonauts (*Arg*. 1.57-64),[229] which describes how the Centaurs were not strong enough to kill Caeneus, but instead Caeneus, unbroken (ἄρρηκτος) and unbending (ἄκαμπτος), was hammered down beneath the earth by the force of pine trees. In the Apollonius passage as well as in the *Iliad* (1.262-68) and the *Shield* (178-83), there is no mention of Caeneus' sex change or divinely granted invulnerability; even if ἄρρηκτος and ἄκαμπτος in Apollonius allude to Poseidon's gift, the lack of explicit mention gives the impression that Caeneus' invulnerability is due to his own prowess.[230] In Ovid, however, his impenetrability is explicitly the result of

---

semi-virile monsters."

[229] Apparently taken from Pindar (*fr.* 128f, Plut. *de absurd. Stoic. opin*. 1.1057D). This is also probably the version found in Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* (cf. Ziogas 2013: 197-98).

[230] Cf. Ziogas 2013: 195-97.

Poseidon's offering, and therefore directly relevant to how positive the result of Caenis' prayer is. Being driven into the Underworld miraculously could be regarded a success, since Caeneus gains the heroic ideal of glory in battle.[231] At the same time, Nestor, at least, rejects this version in favor of the other possibility, that Caenis' prayer ultimately leads to transformation into a unique bird (12.522-31).[232] It seems Nestor may try to portray this metamorphosis as a positive marvel while perpetuating Caeneus' manly glory (*maxime vir quondam, sed nunc avis unica, Caeneu!* 12.531), but it also grammatically returns Caeneus to a female (*avis unica*), in a line that clearly recalls Caenis' return to female form in Vergil's Underworld (*iuuenis quondam, nunc femina, Caeneus…* Verg. *Aen.* 6.548).[233] The metamorphosis furthermore aligns Caenis' ultimate fate with that of Cornix, who also is changed into a bird, and with whom Caenis' introduction shared a number of similarities. This transformation would mean that Caenis ultimately fares no

---

[231] Also, presumably, Caeneus would retain his male identity in the Underworld (unlike Vergil's unusual version at 6.448-49; cf. Ziogas 2013: 198-200. For the possibility that this burial leads to suffocation, a particularly female death, see Keith (1999b: 232, 238). Ziogas (2013: n. 66) notes that Caeneus' fate is an interesting play on the punishment of the Vestal virgins, who were buried alive for losing their virginity; similarly Caenis is buried alive as the result of losing her virginity, but with the added irony that as a man, Caeneus is buried because he cannot be penetrated.

[232] The story of Caeneus' metamorphosis into a bird is first attested in the *Metamorphoses.* Reed (2013: on 12.168-535) attributes the story to an earlier Greek model. Ziogas (2013: n. 67) believes it is Ovid's invention.

[233] Cf. Reed 2013: on 12.527.

better than Cornix, and in addition suffers rape. Regardless, the primary result of Nestor presenting two options is that there is ambiguity about how to judge Caenis' fate.

Mestra's tale modifies the pattern of prayer and attempted rape in much the same way as Caenis' story, and in this regard especially resembles the episodes of Perimele and Caenis. Mestra's story is another narrated by Achelous at his banquet for Theseus in Book Eight. While the episode is first introduced via (the unnamed) Mestra (*nec minus Autolyci coniunx, Erysicthone nata,/ iuris habet* 8.738-39),[234] the narrative soon shifts focus to her father, Erysicthon, and his insatiable hunger (8.739-878).[235] Erysicthon violates a sacred grove of Ceres and, as punishment, is plagued with an inexhaustible hunger. The focus returns to Mestra when Erysicthon sells her into slavery after depleting every physical and monetary resource he has to gratify his needs. Just as the girl is about to be transferred to her new master, however, she prays to Neptune for help, citing his previous rape of her as grounds for assistance (8.850-51):

> 'eripe me domino, qui raptae praemia nobis
> virginitatis habes!'

---

[234] On this introduction's allusion to Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* see Ziogas (2013: 136-47).

[235] The story of Erysicthon was treated widely (cf. Hopkinson 1984: 18-31; Kenney 2011: on 8.738-878). Callimachus and Apollonius are particularly important for Ovid (cf. Murray 2004). For a summary of themes and bibliography see Kenney (2011: on 8.738-878).

"Steal me away from my master, you who have the prize of my stolen virginity!" Neptune answers Mestra's prayer by transforming her into a fisherman (8.852-54). After a comical exchange between Mestra's prospective master and the newly metamorphosed fisherman, the master is fooled and departs without her (8.855-69). Mestra is then changed back into her original form, but when Erysicthon realizes she has the ability to change her shape, he forces her to repeat the trick over and over. The girl's voracious father continuously sells her to new masters and compels her to transform into various animals to escape slavery, until at the tale's end Erysicthon becomes so hungry he consumes his own body (8.871-78).

While Mestra's plea does not contain the key phrase *fer opem*, it clearly offers yet another variation on the pattern of prayer and attempted rape. Here the appeal is uttered to the rapist god, but sometime after the violation, and the idea of compensation is hinted at in the request itself (*qui raptae praemia nobis/ virginitatis habes* 8.850-51). Moreover, it interacts with the stories of Perimele and Caenis. Mestra's emphasis on her stolen virginity (*raptae virginitatis* 8.850-51) recalls Achelous' statement of Perimele's stolen virginity (*virgineum nomen ademi* 8.592). Additionally, as Crabbe astutely observes, both women are endangered by their fathers and rely on a prayer to Neptune for help. The entreaty for Perimele, however, is spoken by Achelous, whereas Mestra makes an appeal

herself.[236] The parallel is especially noticeable because the petition is an Ovidian innovation to Mestra's story in Hesiod. In the *Catalogue of Women*, Mestra already possesses the ability to transform before Poseidon rapes her, and she does not make an appeal to him afterwards.[237] This crucial change both underscores the correlation to Perimele's episode and encourages us to consider the role of the prayer in Mestra's episode more closely. The circumstances of Caenis' and Mestra's petitions also greatly resemble each other—both women make requests to Neptune after he has raped them, citing his violation as a reason for him to intervene (*'qui raptae praemia nobis/ virginitatis habes'* 8.850-51; *'magnum' Caenis ait 'facit haec iniuria votum'* 12.201), and in both cases Neptune responds by transforming the woman into a man (*vultumque*

---

[236] Cf. Crabbe 1981: 2292. Still, while Mestra's plea is related in direct speech, it is embedded in a story narrated by Achelous, such that to some extent Achelous is the author and speaker of Mestra's prayer. Insofar as Achelous' narratives invite comparison with the rest of the poem (cf. Feldherr 2010: 110), we may consider how similar this relationship is to instances of female prayer offered in direct speech throughout the poem—Ovid gives voice to distressed women, but at some level also takes over their speech. This problem lies at the heart of debates on how to interpret female speech in Ovid's work, and the *Heroides* in particular (Spentzou 2003; Fulkerson 2005, with further bibliography especially at 5 n. 14;). While this is not the place to fully address such a significant and interesting question, Achelous' appropriation of Perimele's prayer may indicate that Ovid himself was aware of the co-option of the female voice. By drawing attention to an instance in which a male narrator takes over a speech act usually performed by a woman on her own behalf, Ovid may be pointing a finger at his own practice.

[237] fr. 43a M-W; Kenney 2011: on 8.850-51; Ziogas 2013: 141-45.

virilem/ induit 8.853-54; *poteratque viri vox illa videri,/ sicut erat* 12.204-5). In all three cases (Perimele, Caenis, Mestra), the women are not shown praying in defense of their virginity, but after suffering rape, a petition is fulfilled on the woman's behalf. Mestra's story is thus an additional permutation on the pattern of attempted rape and prayer, this time exchanging the preventative entreaty for a compensatory one, where the god's previous violence is cited as grounds for him to assist Mestra. In an added layer of variation, Mestra calls upon her rapist to help her escape slavery—a condition which very likely also would have entailed rape.[238]

The way that Neptune's response to Mestra's prayer is described further emphasizes that the episode modifies the pattern of prayer and pursuit. After her appeal, the text says *prece non spreta* (8.852), which especially recalls and reverses a phrase in Syrinx's story, *precibus spretis* (1.701). This expression in Syrinx's episode is part of a larger *topos* in erotic scenes where a god first attempts to seduce a woman with *preces,* and then turns to force when she refuses them.[239] Mestra, however, has already been raped by the god; she is then presented with a *prex*, which is *not* rejected. Similar engagement with this *topos* can be seen when Caenis is first described as rejecting suitors

---

[238] Cf. Fantham 1991: 270 n. 23; Nguyen 2006: 85; Feldherr 2010: 109.
[239] Gauly 2009: 71.

prayers (*multorum frustra votis optata procorum* 12.192) and then Neptune offers her a prayer and promises it will not be rebuffed ('*sint tua vota licet' dixit 'secura repulsae'* 12.199).

Likewise, the outcome of Mestra's plea bears resemblance to Caenis', and shares a comparable degree of success (at least before the Centauromachy), as Neptune changes both women into men (*vultumque virilem/ induit* 8.853-54; *poteratque viri vox illa videri,/ sicut erat* 12.204-5). While Mestra's episode also shares a number of parallels with Perimele's story and resonances with the pattern of petition and attempted rape, the outcome of both her entreaty and Caenis' (again, before the Centauromachy) is more beneficial. Both Caenis and Mestra retain a human form and voice, but unlike Caenis, Mestra eventually takes many non-human forms. Even when forced to become an animal, however, it is implied she can transform back into her original shape (*illi sua reddita forma est* 8.870; *ast ubi habere suam transformia corpora sensit,/ saepe pater dominis Triopeida tradit, at illa/ nunc equa, nunc ales, modo bos, modo cervus abibat* 8.871-73).[240] To the extent that she can return to her original form and that she retains her voice, Mestra fares better than many women in the poem. While her ultimate fate is not exactly

---

[240] On the generic and social ambiguity of Mestra's transformations see Feldherr (2010: 108-9).

desirable, as she is at the mercy of her father's insatiability, nonetheless, Mestra's prayer appears to be one of the more successful communications between human and divine figures. Neptune's response to Mestra's prayer does not exploit ambiguity in her language by responding to the literal meaning of her words in opposition to her desires, as divinities do in scenes of attempted rape. She asks for Neptune to snatch her away from her master (*eripe me domino*), but Neptune does not literally remove her from her master; she remains in his presence and converses with him. The formulation of her request allows for a variety of responses that would technically fulfill it. For instance, Neptune could have physically moved her to another location. Depending on the location (i.e. whether it was somewhere she wanted to be or not), this response might have been more or less desirable than what transpired. Instead of removing Mestra from the place, Neptune transforms her into a fisherman, and she is able to trick her master into departing without her (*credidit et verso dominus pede pressit harenam/ elususque abiit* 8.869-70). The narrative suggests she is pleased with the result, at least initially (*gaudens* 8.863*).* In this way Neptune attempts to answer her prayer's intent, since she is able to escape slavery. Alternatively, he could have transformed her into an inanimate object (such as a tree or rock) and this would still have fulfilled the appeal. Such a response would more closely resemble the transformations women who pray to avoid rape experience, and

would exhibit the same degree of limited success.

There are a number of possible reasons for this relative success. First of all, the more positive outcome of Mestra's plea seems to be dependent upon her having already experienced violence. Elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses,* when women pray to avoid rape, they are able to elude violence only through metamorphoses of ambiguous benefit (though Arethusa succeeds more than others). Mestra's and Caenis' prayers against future violence seem to succeed primarily because they have already endured rape. In Mestra's story, however, Neptune does not outright offer a petition after his rape (as he does for Caenis), and Mestra must remind him of her "favor" to him. This reminder constitutes the "argument" portion of her prayer, elsewhere one of the most crucial elements for a successful outcome in the poem. As we saw in the case of Arethusa, a reminder of past services to a divinity can influence the god's favorability. The inclusion of this component means Mestra's appeal, though it is brief, employs all the constituents of an ideal cultic prayer. In this succinct plea, the relative clause serves as both the address and the argument. Mestra does not explicitly name Neptune, but identifies him by specifying that he is the god who stole her virginity. Reminding him of this "service" identifies him and also makes a case for why he should respond favorably to her request. Furthermore, her prayer seemingly evokes religious style by repeating the main clause's verb of

request (*eripe*) in a different form in a relative clause (*raptae*).[241] She additionally performs the ritual action of stretching her arms out to the divinity she is addressing (*et vicina suas tendens super aequora palmas* 8.849). This ritual action combined with the argument in her prayer may make Neptune particularly favorable to her desires. It may also be that Neptune is especially sympathetic to fulfilling petitions according to the speaker's intentions, since in every prayer offered to him in the poem (Achelous', Mestra's, Caenis', and Venus') he satisfies the speaker's (if not the beneficiary's) intentions relatively well.[242]

Yet, while Neptune appears more sympathetic to the requests of Mestra and Caenis, it is clear his positive response is dependent chiefly on the women having already endured sexual violence. Appeals offered to prevent rape are transmuted into prayers granted because of rape, with results that reinforce the precarious position of women. Ultimately, the traumatic experience of attempted rape or completed rape is transformative—whether metamorphoses occur up or down the cosmological hierarchy.

---

[241] Arethusa's appeal displays this same mode of repetition (*fer opem,…cui saepe dedisti ferre tuos arcus* 5.618-20). While repetition is a common feature of prayer, this particular method of repetition is not widely employed in the *Metamorphoses*, and may be an additional indication that Mestra's prayer alludes to the pattern of attempted rape and prayer from earlier in the poem.

[242] Venus asks Neptune to make Ino and her son sea deities and he obliges (4.532-38), see 107-8.

The women who succeed in avoiding rape largely fail to retain a human form and voice, whereas Caenis and Mestra fail to avoid rape, but potentially succeed in preserving their human shape and voice. This success is qualified, however; Caenis may eventually become a bird and Mestra is forced to transform into a multitude of creatures. This reveals that even the compensatory, apparently positive outcomes for women are unstable.

III. THE DAUGHTERS OF ANIUS

The story of Anius' daughters related in Book Thirteen (13.640-74) is a particularly interesting permutation of the pattern of prayer and attempted rape. While the episode lacks amatory elements on the surface, it evokes an erotic context and recalls previous scenes of attempted rape through repetition of the prayer *fer opem*, a connection noted by Bömer.[243] This reminder of attempted rape narratives activates an alternative version of the story of Anius' daughters, known through Servius, in which Aeneas rapes a daughter of Anius named Lavinia.

In Ovid's so-called "*Aeneid*" (13.623-14.573), Aeneas and his company stop at Delos where they are hosted by Anius, just as they do in Book Three of Vergil's *Aeneid*. Over dinner, at the request of Anchises, Anius regales the crew with a tale about his four

---

[243] Vol. 1, 1969: on 1.545.

daughters during the Trojan War (13.543-74). Bacchus had granted the girls the ability to turn anything into grain, oil, and wine.[244] Eager to feed the Greek army, Agamemnon stole them against Anius' will, but the daughters were able to escape. Two of them fled to Euboea and the other two sought refuge with their brother in Andros. The Greek army followed the latter pair, and their brother turned them over to the Greeks under duress. Just as the army was about to take Anius' daughters into custody, however, the girls prayed to Bacchus for help, and the god responded by transforming them into doves.

This desperate plea for help resembles previous appeals in scenes of attempted rape and echoes Daphne's prayer for help against Apollo especially closely. Anius describes his daughters' appeal as follows (13.668-72):

> illae tollentes etiamnum libera caelo
> bracchia 'Bacche pater, fer opem!' dixere, tulitque
> muneris auctor opem,—si miro perdere more
> ferre vocatur opem, nec qua ratione figuram
> perdiderint, potui scire aut nunc dicere possum.

> They, lifting their still free arms to heaven said, "Father Bacchus, help!" And the creator of their gift helped—if to destroy miraculously is called helping; I was not able to know nor am I able to describe how they lost their figure.

We can compare this to the plea Daphne makes to her father, Peneus (1.546-47):

---

[244] No reason is supplied for this gift, but sources suggest the god gave it freely (ἐχαρίσατο in the scholia on Lycophron's *Alexandra* 570 (197 Scheer) and Apollodorus' *Epitome* 3.10).

> 'fer, pater,' inquit 'opem! si flumina numen habetis,
> qua nimium placui, mutando perde figuram!'
>
> "Help, father! If your waters have divine power, destroy the appearance that made me too pleasing by changing it!"

Both prayers (despite being intended for different deities and employing slightly different word order) use the phrase *pater, fer opem*.[245] Additionally, both passages contain a form of the phrase *figuram perdere* (1.547; 13.672). In Daphne's petition she asks for destruction of her appearance (*perde figuram*). The same language is then repeated in the narrative spoken by Anius when he questions whether destroying his daughters' appearance can be considered giving help (*figuram perdiderint*). While these two prayers are most similar, the repetition of *fer opem* additionally recalls Arethusa's plea to Diana to save her from Alpheus' advances at 5.618-20:

> fessa labore fugae 'fer opem, deprendimur,' inquam
> 'armigerae, Diana, tuae, cui saepe dedisti
> ferre tuos arcus inclusaque tela pharetra!'
>
> Tired by the effort of fleeing, I said, "Help, I'm caught, Diana, (help) your weapon bearer, to whom you often have given your bow and your quiver full of arrows to carry."

These verbal links connect the prayer of Anius' daughters to those of both Daphne and Arethusa, even though the reason the women are pursued ostensibly differs.

---

[245] *Pater* is a common title for Bacchus, whereas Daphne addresses her actual father. For *pater* as a cultic term see Skutsch 1985: 185-86. *Liber pater* was a common invocation *TLL* 10.1.685.68ff. Cf. Serv. on *Geo*. 2.4.

Moreover, when Apollo's capture of Daphne is imminent, directly before her prayer, the fleeing nymph is described as *victa labore* (1.544a). Similarly, shortly before the petition by Anius' daughters, their brother, or rather his *pietas*, is characterized as *victa metu* (13.663). The choice to make *pietas* the subject of the sentence rather than the brother himself encourages the verbal parallel between the two episodes by allowing *victa* to remain feminine in the second instance. While *victa* is common in the poem, the parallel between these specific passages is strengthened by the identical *sedes* followed by an instrumental ablative.[246] The choice of the word *pietas* has further thematic significance, to which I will return.

In addition to these specific allusions to Daphne's episode, the daughters' tale shares general similarities with the scenes that comprise the pattern of prayer in stories of attempted rape. First, like Daphne, Syrinx, Cornix, and Arethusa, Anius' daughters pray after fleeing, and flight is a crucial component to each episode (Daphne *fugit* 1.502; Syrinx *fugisse* 1.701; Cornix *fugio* 2.576; Arethusa *fugio* 5.601; Anius' daughters *effugiunt* 13.660). Second, the narrative function of all the appeals is the same—they

---

[246] Similar phrasing is also applied to Leucothoe during her seduction by Sol (*victa nitore* 4.233). This additional parallel further strengthens the association between the story of Anius' daughters and erotic narratives in the poem. Cf. also *fessa labore fugae* of Arethusa at 5.618.

mark the climax of the chase, offered when those pursued are on the verge of capture. The imminence of the threat is frequently emphasized (e.g. 1.542-44, 5.616-18, 13.667-69, 13.884-85).[247] Finally, all prayers result in the speaker's metamorphosis—Daphne is transformed into laurel, Syrinx into reeds, Cornix into a crow, Arethusa into a spring, and Anius' daughters become doves.

The metamorphosis of Anius' daughters into doves is attested elsewhere, but is not the most common version of the story.[248] As the birds of Venus, doves have an erotic connotation that suits the allusion to the Apollo and Daphne episode; this connection to Venus is explicitly mentioned to Anchises by Anius (*tuaeque coniugis in volucres* 13.673-74). Since the transformation of Anius' daughters follows the close verbal parallel to the episode of Daphne, we may also recall the simile that compares Daphne to doves fleeing an eagle (1.506). Insofar as the daughters are analogous to Daphne, their transformation could be considered a literalization of this metaphor.[249]

---

[247] The imminence of seizure is especially important thematically in the tale of Anius' daughters. As the god Liber, Bacchus has a special role in keeping chains off the women. Note especially that the daughters lift their arms which are *etiamnum libera*. At the moment they are about to become *non liberae*, the god Liber intervenes.

[248] Cf. Casali 2007: 198-202; Hopkinson 2000: 31. The earliest surviving reference to the daughters' transformation seems to be when Lycophron calls them doves (580). Servius (3.80) states that the daughters' transformation is the reason doves could not be harmed on Delos.

[249] C.f. Putnam (2004/5) for a discussion of possible political and generic implications of

After the transformation, the episodes of Daphne, Cornix, and Anius' daughters share the motif of openly expressing doubt about how to judge the metamorphosis in the text. Anius' aside*, si miro perdere more/ ferre vocatur opem* (if to destroy miraculously is called 'helping' 13.670-71), explicitly asks whether metamorphosis can be considered beneficial. This is similar to the ambiguity expressed in Daphne's story when the other rivers do not know whether to congratulate or console Peneus after his daughter's transformation (1.577-82) and Cornix's question about the usefulness of Minerva's response to her plea (2.589-90).

To summarize, we have seen that the tale of Anius' daughters resembles scenes of attempted rape in the first third of the epic. The connection between them is established foremost through verbal repetition, especially of Daphne's prayer in her paradigmatic episode. The correlation is reinforced by more general shared elements including flight, imminent capture, prayer, transformation, and ambiguity about how to evaluate metamorphosis. Through this strong association, I suggest, the tales of attempted rape confer an erotic context on the story of Anius' daughters.

The evocation of an erotic subtext through allusion to stories of attempted rape helps to stimulate recall of another, more troubling version of Anius' story. In so doing, it

---

the eagle-dove analogy in *Met.* 1.506, Verg. *Ecl.* 9.11-13 and Hor. *C.* 1.37.17-18.

supports Sergio Casali's insightful interpretation of Ovid's "correction" of *Aeneid* 3 in *Metamorphoses* 13. Regarding Anius' daughters in particular, Casali argues that Ovid's insertion of the tale into Aeneas' sojourn illuminates details unfavorable to Vergil's representation of the meeting between Aeneas and Anius in *Aeneid* 3. Specifically, in surviving versions Anius and his gifted daughters, referred to as the Oinotropoi, voluntarily assist the Greek army. This detail is discordant with the tradition of Aeneas' stopover in Delos, which portrays Anius as favorable to the Trojans, not the Greeks. While Vergil's poem is the oldest attestation of Aeneas' stay in Delos, the tradition is likely earlier, and is unconnected to the story of the daughters feeding the Greek army.[250]

The idea that Anius might be pro-Greek is unsettling for Vergil's narrative because he is the priest of Delian Apollo, who offers a prophecy about the future greatness of Rome (3.94-98), which Anchises misinterprets with dire consequences. In Casali's own words, a reminder of the Oinotropoi, "…might even raise some malicious suspicions about the real authenticity of Anius's pro-Trojan loyalty in Vergil, and even about the real attitude of his Delian Apollo, to whom Anius is both son and priest (after all, it might not be so strange that the Apollo of Anius gives such an ambiguous

[250] Cf. Casali 2007: 200.

response—a response that brings no advantage to the Trojans, but only misfortune)."[251]

By combining the story of Aeneas' stop in Delos with the Oinotropoi, Ovid fuses formerly incompatible traditions. Of course, the version of the Oinotropoi that Ovid offers addresses this incompatibility by changing Anius' loyalty from Greek to Trojan. In his own telling, Anius insists that Agamemnon stole his daughters against his will. This is the first of two significant ways Ovid's story differs from other accounts of Anius' daughters.

The second difference—more directly relevant to the erotic subtext—is in the number of daughters;[252] Ovid records the number of Anius' daughters as four, whereas other sources list either three daughters or one. The story of Anius' daughters was treated widely in the literary tradition, mostly naming three daughters: Oino, Spermo, and Elais. The scholia on Lycophron 570 and 580 attest to versions in Pherecydes, the *Kypria*, and Callimachus' *Aitia*. Eustathius, a fragment of Simonides, Dictys Cretenensis, and Dares also reference the story of the three Oinotropoi. The tradition of a single daughter, named Lavinia, from whom Lavinium takes its name, is attested in three sources: Dionysius of

---

[251] 2007: 202.

[252] Cf. Bömer Vol. 6, 1982: on 13.645; Hopkinson 2000: 31-32. See Bömer on *fer opem* (Vol. 1, 1969: on 1.544) and *perde figuram* (Vol. 1, 1969: on 1.547); Hardie on *fer opem* and *perde figuram* (2015: on 13.669-72) and comparisons to Cornix's transformation (2015: on 13.667-69, 13.673-74).

Halicarnassus, Servius, and the *Origo gentis Romanae* (a work that likely dates to the fourth century AD). In Dionysius[253] and the *Origo*[254] Lavinia is given to Aeneas lawfully, but in Servius' annotation Aeneas rapes her (*ab Aenea stupratam*) and produces a child whose name is lost in the manuscript.[255]

In Ovid's unique version Anius' daughters remain unnamed, but the insistence by Anius that he has four daughters has been identified as a nod to competing traditions about their number.[256] In one strand, Anius has three daughters, whereas in the other, he has only one. The assertion that there are four daughters acknowledges both traditions by combining their number (3 + 1 = 4). As suggested by Casali and Hopkinson, this detail alone may bring to mind various versions, but allusion to the pattern of prayers for help

---

[253] συμπλεῦσαι δ᾽ αὐτὴν τοῖς Τρωσὶ λέγεται δοθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς Αἰνείᾳ δεηθέντι μαντικὴν οὖσαν καὶ σοφήν, It is said that [Lavinia] sailed with the Trojans after she was given by her father to Aeneas who wanted her as a prophetess and a wise woman (*Ant. Rom.* 1.59.3).

[254] *Dein cognita Polymestoris perfidia ex Polydori nece inde digressum pervectumque ad insulam Delum atque illinc ab eo Laviniam, Anii sacerdotis Apollonis filiam in matrimonium ascitam, ex cuius nomine Lavinia litora appellata*, Then when the treachery of Polymestor became known through the murder of Polydorus, [Aeneas] departed from there and sailed to the island of Delos and thence Lavinia, the daughter of Anius, the priest of Apollo, was received in marriage by him, from whose name Lavinian shores were named (9.5).

[255] *alii dicunt huius Anii filiam occulte ab Aenea stupratam edidisse filium nomine †an.,* Some say that after being secretly raped by Aeneas, the daughter of this Anius produced a son named † (Serv. *ad Aen*. 3.80).

[256] Casali 2007; Hopkinson 2000: 31.

in scenes of attempted rape underscores that the tale of Lavinia's rape by Aeneas, rather than simply their marriage, is especially significant here.

Of course, the version Anius offers in the *Metamorphoses* is not strictly compatible with the story that Aeneas rapes one of his daughters; Anius' daughters are already gone by the time Aeneas visits in the poem and their father vehemently asserts that Aeneas wasn't present when their brother gave them up (13.665-66). Still, Casali notes that Anius' insistence seems like an *excusatio non petita*.[257] And, via its allusivity, the prayer by Anius' daughters reveals a conspicuous suppression of Lavinia's rape, included in Servius' commentary. By confirming that a reminiscence of the Servian version in particular is meant here, the allusion to the pattern of prayer strengthens Casali's argument that Ovid acts as both a corrector of Vergil and draws attention to an alternative, more sinister Aeneas.[258]

A negative characterization of Aeneas perhaps is insinuated further by the phrase *victa metu pietas* (13.663), discussed earlier. The mention of *pietas* embedded within this larger Vergilian context may evoke Aeneas and his frequent characterization as *pius* in Vergil's epic. Hardie, for instance, comments that Andros' conquered *pietas* contrasts

---

[257] 2007: 202.

[258] 2007: 208.

both with *pius Anchises*, as he is termed at *Metamorphoses* 13.640, and with the Vergilian story of *pius Aeneas* rescuing his family from the Greeks; but at the same time, he notes that the mention of fear may bring to mind the fear which caused Aeneas to lose another part of his family, namely Creusa (2.735-36).[259] This reference to defeated *pietas* in the context of an allusion to Lavinia's rape may additionally suggest that Aeneas' quintessential attribute in the *Aeneid*, namely *pietas*, has failed in his relationship with Anius' daughter. This would then support a negative depiction of Aeneas, who is never described as *pius* in Ovid's epic. Clearly, this interpretation is not a strict reading of what the text actually says, but rather a suggestive association that might be evoked by the broader context.

The allusion to Lavinia's suppressed rape also fits well into Sharon James' argument that, while rape and attempted rape are abundant in the beginning of Ovid's epic, the poet noticeably omits a number of famous, foundational Roman rapes that might be expected. James contends that after such a profusion of rape stories in the epic, the exclusion of ubiquitous Roman rapes "amounts to a conspicuous presence,"[260] and in fact hints at Rome's "foundation in raped female bodies."[261]

---

[259] Hardie 2015: on 13.663.
[260] 2016: 165.
[261] 2016: 169.

Through allusion to the story of Lavinia's rape, Anius' tale similarly confronts Rome's problematic beginning, even more so because of where it appears in the narrative. Sara Myers observes that in Ovid's narration of the sojourn at Delos, the story of Anius' daughters replaces Apollo's prophecy to the Trojans in Vergil's account.[262] That prophecy predicts the future greatness of Rome and Aeneas' heirs (*hic domus Aeneae cunctis dominabitur oris,/ et nati natorum et qui nascentur ab illis;* Here the house of Aeneas will rule over all shores and the the sons of his sons, and those who are born from them *Aen*. 3.97-98). Ovid therefore replaces the vision of a glorious Roman future and illustrious progeny with a story that alludes to a rather less admirable past. This shift in focus not only conforms to Ovid's "anti-teleological"[263] approach to Vergil's *Aeneid* (i.e. by looking to a fraught beginning rather than an eminent endpoint), but also participates in his more generally tendentious reading of Vergil's epic.[264]

The repetition of the distinctive plea *fer opem* ultimately connects the tale of

---

[262] 2009: 14. She also includes the story of the Coroni in this replacement, and notes that prophecy is later mentioned at 13.677-79. She places this within the following larger tendency in the *Metamorphoses* (13): "Famously, prophetic elements central to the Virgilian plot and to its teleological thrust towards Augustus and Rome are omitted throughout Ovid's '*Aeneid*', while personal histories and backgrounds dominate. Rome is nowhere mentioned by name and Ovid's episodes have notoriously little to do with Aeneas or public Augustan themes."
[263] Myers 2009: 17.
[264] Cf. Myers 2009: 17-18; Hinds 1998: 104-22.

Anius' daughters to narratives of rape. Accordingly, this activates an alternative tradition that maintains Aeneas raped Anius' daughter, Lavinia. Ovid simultaneously suppresses this version in his own narrative and points to Vergil's censorship of the story, thereby positioning himself as a critical reader of the *Aeneid* and Rome's problematic foundation.

While this Vergilian correction appears to be the primary purpose of the petition for divine assistance in its immediate context, we may note that the passage also fits into broader observations about power differentials and divine response to prayer in the *Metamorphoses*. Anius' daughters belong in the category of beneficiaries of divine assistance who fare worst, since they experience a corporeal transformation and lose their voices. Largely, this seems to be because of the different cosmological statuses between Anius' daughters and Bacchus. The deity's understanding of the meaning of "help" differs from the mortal definition, as Anius verbalizes at 13.670-71. Unlike the episodes of attempted rape in the first third of the epic, the responding deity, Bacchus, is in no way limited by the status of the men pursuing Anius' daughters, since they are lower on the cosmological hierarchy. The ambivalence of Anius' daughters' outcome arises solely from the power difference between the speakers and recipient.

IV. ACIS AND GALATEA

The complex episode involving the love triangle between Galatea, Polyphemus,

and Acis abounds in literary allusions (to Theocritus, Vergil, Homer, et al.) and interacts with an impressive array of genres (bucolic, epic, comedy, elegy).[265] Within the rich matrix of literary references, Ovid also adapts earlier episodes in the *Metamorphoses* itself. In particular, he casts Galatea's story as another permutation of the pattern of entreaty and attempted rape established early in the epic. In the story of Galatea, Polyphemus, and Acis, Ovid frustrates the expected pattern of pursuit and prayer by transferring the role of powerless fleeing victim to a man, Acis, and by having him repeat the same appeal, *fer opem*, which is employed by two victims of attempted rape, Daphne and Arethusa.

Importantly, this gender reversal is narrated by a female speaker, the nymph Galatea herself. She is motivated to report the traumatic story of her pursuit to a group of fellow sea-nymphs after one of them, Scylla, brags about evading numerous admirers (*elusos amores* 13.737). Galatea, in turn, retorts that Scylla must have been pursued by a rather weak class of men (*genus haud inmite virorum* 13.740), since in her own case, she escaped the Cyclops only through grief (*non nisi per luctus* 13.745). She continues to tell how she scorned Polyphemus' desire for her, and instead took a beautiful, young lover

---

[265] Hardie 2015: on 13.740-897. See also bibliography on literary models in Creese (2009: 562 n. 1), especially Tissol (1997: 105-24).

named Acis.[266] The brutish Cyclops still often attempted to woo Galatea, but always without success. Then one day while Polyphemus was singing a long lament for his unrequited love, he discovered Galatea and Acis lying together and, consumed by jealous rage, threatened to annihilate them (13.780-877). Galatea dove into the ocean to escape, while Acis attempted to run away and prayed for help (13.878-81). Polyphemus hurled a massive boulder at the youth and struck him, but as Acis was on the verge of death, Galatea intervened and responded to his entreaty by transforming him and his streaming blood into a river (13.882-97).

The frame narrative involving the interaction between Galatea, Scylla, and other nymphs helps to position Galatea's tale as a repetition, or variation, of previous stories of erotic pursuit in the poem through verbal references to love and flight (*amorem effugere* 13.844-45).[267] Similar language elsewhere signals scenes of attempted rape; for instance, in the Daphne and Apollo episode, the effects of Cupid's arrows are summarized: *fugat hoc, facit illud amorem* (1.470). Likewise, Arethusa's story is introduced in related terms (*Exigit alma Ceres nata secura recepta,/ quae tibi causa fugae, cur sis, Arethusa, sacer fons./ conticuere undae, quarum dea sustulit alto/ fonte caput viridesque manu siccata*

[266] See Tissol (1997: 114 n. 47) on Acis and potential sources.

[267] For a discussion of embedded narratives of erotic pursuit in the *Metamorphoses* see Nagle (1988a).

capillos/ fluminis Elei veteres narravit amores. 5.572-76). This framing helps to create the expectation that Galatea will recount a story that resembles the existing pattern of erotic pursuit.

The inset narrative then strengthens this anticipation by recapitulating common features in tales of attempted rape, especially the poem's exemplary story of Apollo and Daphne. Just as Daphne does not reciprocate Apollo's love, so too Galatea shuns Polyphemus' desire. Similarly, like Apollo (1.504-24), Polyphemus sings his own praises in an attempt to woo his beloved (13.808-856).[268] This correspondence, as well as the Cyclops' assertion that Galatea has fled in the past (*fugisse* 13.808), primes the audience to expect Polyphemus to chase the nymph (cf. Daphne *fugit* 1.502; Syrinx *fugisse* 1.701; Cornix *fugio* 2.576; Arethusa *fugio* 5.601). Galatea seems poised for flight when Polyphemus finally glimpses her. This visual recogntion is particularly significant, since sight is a central component in scenes of pursuit, as flight is typically initiated after the pursuer explicitly catches sight of the woman he desires (*videt igne micantes/ sideribus similes oculos, videt oscula…* (Apollo and Daphne 1.498-99); *Pan videt hanc* (Pan and Syrinx 1.700); *vidit et incaluit pelagi deus* (Neptune and Cornix 2.574)).[269] Therefore

---

[268] On Polyphemus' song (13.789-869) see Barchiesi (2006: 416); Hardie (2015: on 789-807); and, as parody of prayer, Yardley (1978: 33).

[269] On the role of the male gaze in scenes of rape in the poem see Salzman-Mitchell

when the Cyclops spots Galatea, we expect *her* flight (*me videt*... 13.874). Instead, the rest of the line reveals that Polyphemus spies not just Galatea, but Acis who will be the one to flee (*me videt atque Acin* 13.874). The emphatic delay of *Acin* dramatizes the unexpected shift in the storyline. Instead of becoming inflamed with desire for Galatea, the Cyclops becomes inflamed with anger at the couple (13.873-77). When Galatea disappears by diving into the sea, Acis runs away (*ast ego vicino pavefacta sub aequore mergor;/ terga fugae dederat conversa Symaethius heros* 13.878-79). This flight casts him into a role generally played by women throughout the *Metamorphoses*. This gender reversal is continued when Acis' prayer conspicuously echoes those of earlier maidens in flight (13.880-81):

> Et 'fer opem, Galatea, precor, mihi! ferte, parentes,'
> Dixerat 'et vestris periturum admittite regnis!'
>
> "Help me, Galatea! Parents, help and allow me, about to perish, into your kingdom!"

The phrase *fer opem* recalls Daphne's and Arethusa's requests for deliverance (Daphne 1.546; Arethusa 5.618). Moreover, Acis' call upon his parents at 13.880 (Faunus and the nymph Symaethis, cf. 13.750) may evoke Daphne's use of *pater* in her prayer.[270] The outcome of Acis' plea also resembles the fate of attempted rape victims, whose fraught

---

(2005a: 23-42).

[270] Anius' daughters also use the term *pater*, but as a cultic title common in prayers (pg. 138 n. 245).

entreaties result in the transformation of their form at a climactic moment. His metamorphosis is especially similar to that of Arethusa, who likewise becomes flowing water (*in latices mutor* 5.636, *in amnem versus* 13.895-96).[271] Perhaps unsurprisingly given the work's theme, entreaties often result in metamorphoses, but corporeal transformations resulting from prayers are particularly associated with women—Acis is the only male in the poem whose use of the appeal *fer opem* changes his own body rather than something external.[272] When we include the outcomes of all prayers (not just those for help), the only other men physically transformed because of prayer are Hermaphroditus (whose metamorphosis results from someone else's prayer (4.370-72) and occurs in a scene which also exhibits substantial gender instability) and Cadmus, who unambiguously requests to become a serpent (4.571-75).[273] In their similarity to female victims of attempted rape, both Acis' prayer itself and his resultant liquefaction feminize him.

Acis' feminization through this similarity contributes to the intricate interplay of

---

[271] *Latex* is defined by Paulus–Festus as *profluens aqua* (105.23-24 L.); *TLL* 7.2.1003.23-24.

[272] Daphne, Syrinx, Perimele, Caenis, Anius' daughters, and Iphis are transformed because of a prayer for assistance. In contrast, Deucalion (1.377-80) and Myscelus (15.39-40) do not experience transformation after their prayers for help, as will be expanded upon in the next chapter.

[273] Cf. Gentilcore 2010: 105.

gender and power throughout the episode, which appears to be influenced especially by the gender of the narrator, Galatea.[274] This variation on the typical narrative sequence of pursuit and prayer may result partially from having a female narrator and audience, to whom it seems that narratives of women escaping their pursuers without silencing transformations are limited.[275] Galatea's preoccupation with power and gender dynamics is signaled early, in the frame narrative, when she claims that her pursuer is more powerful than the admirers of a fellow-nymph. After Scylla brags about her ability to evade many suitors, Galatea remarks that those men must have been rather weak for Scylla to be able to reject them without consequence (*te tamen, o virgo, genus haud inmite virorum/ expetit, utque facis, potes his inpune negare* 13.740-41). Galatea draws this conclusion especially because Scylla's situation contrasts with her own experience, where the only way for her to escape the Cyclops was through grief (*nisi per luctus* 13.744), as I will explore more fully below. For now, I will merely note that her statement appears to confirm that the success of prayers depends on the particular intersection of participants' power. By claiming that Scylla's pursuers must have been

---

[274] This is not the sole factor, since the stories of Cornix and Arethusa also have female internal narrators, but Galatea's identity plays a significant role in the way her story is told. Cf. Nagle 1988a.

[275] The other two being the Muses and Arethusa, see pgs. 75-93.

weak, she asserts that the Cyclops is stronger than Scylla's pursuers. Additionally, her supposition rests on establishing herself as more powerful than Scylla. To prove this she not only provides her eminent lineage (*at mihi, cui pater est Nereus, quam caerula Doris/ enixa est* 13.742-43), but also attributes her expected ability to stay safe to the shared company of her sisters (*quae sum turba quoque tuta sororum* 13.743). Throughout the rest of the narrative, Galatea continues her attempt to claim a powerful position for herself, which creates numerous examples of gender inversions.[276] For our present discussion, however, it will be most relevant to restrict our focus primarily to Acis' plea and resulting transformation.

I noted above that Acis' prayer, followed by his corporeal transformation, aligns him with female victims of attempted rape, thereby feminizing him. Salzman-Mitchell has astutely observed that Acis' transformation may also be read as an achievement of masculinity, since Galatea herself characterizes it as "a return to his ancestral strength" (*vires adsumeret avitas* 13.886) and calls Acis *maior* in his new form (13.895). If we turn to the description of the metamorphosis itself, there are again both masculine and feminine components. Galatea reports at 13.890-96:

tum moles iacta dehiscit,

---

[276] Salzman-Mitchell (2005a: 184-93) explores the complicated interaction of gaze, gender, and power of the whole episode particularly adeptly.

vivaque per rimas proceraque surgit harundo,
osque cavum saxi sonat exsultantibus undis,
miraque res, subito media tenus exstitit alvo
incinctus iuvenis flexis nova cornua cannis,
qui nisi quod maior, quod toto caerulus ore,
Acis erat.

> Then the mass that had been thrown split open, and a tall, living reed surged through the fissures and the hollow mouth of the rock resounded with leaping waters, and, miraculous! suddenly a young man stood up from the water waist deep, his new horns wreathed with bent reeds, it was Acis, except he was bigger and his face was entirely sea-blue.

Salzman-Mitchell remarks about this passage: "This gender struggle is well illustrated in the partition of his body, his flowing water symbolizing the feminine and the half-body with its new horns his masculine part. The solid element, the body that does not disintegrate, embodies the masculine, while the female dissolves."[277] In addition to these observations, we can add that the portrayal of the fissure in the rock Polyphemus had thrown to crush Acis is simultaneously masculinizing and feminizing. The hard mass (*moles*) is fractured by a tall reed and Acis' rushing water—penetrative imagery that is clearly masculine,[278] while on the other hand the reference to *harundo* in conjunction with *sonat* particularly recalls the nymph Syrinx, and her transformation into panpipes to escape Pan's rape in Book One (*Panaque cum prensam sibi iam Syringa putaret*,/

---

[277] Salzman-Mitchell 2005a: 192.

[278] Creese (2009: 575) notes that the piercing of the rock is a display of Galatea's power, since she transforms Acis, and furthermore notices the etymological play on Acis' name (ἀκίς) in relation to a sharp object.

corpore pro nymphae calamos tenuisse palustres,/ dumque ibi suspirat, motos in harundine ventos/ effecisse sonum tenuem similemque querenti 1.705-8).[279] There is perhaps also an embodiment of gender ambiguity in the two types of reeds mentioned in the passage. On the one hand the *harundo* is *procera* and presumably hard and straight, since it grows through the rock's opening (*per rimas surgit*), the possible innuendo strengthened by *rima*'s use in other contexts to refer to female genitalia.[280] On the other hand, the reeds around Acis' head are described as *flexae*—bent and soft. The juxtaposition of these two reed forms contributes to an ambiguous depiction of Acis. The overwhelming impression that emerges of him is one of gender instability.

This disruption of established gender paradigms and departure from the expected pattern of prayer and pursuit in this episode are especially influenced by the gender of the narrator. As Galatea attempts to claim a more powerful position for herself, expected

---

[279] Hardie 2015: on 13.893. On the significance of musical elements in this episode see Creese (2009). Hardie (2015: on 13.893) remarks that the image of emerging from the water, waist-deep, is a conventional image for sea-deities, but the similarity of expression here is strikingly similar to that of Cyane when she attempts to thwart Pluto's rape of Proserpina at 5.413 (*gurgite quae medio summa tenus exstitit alvo*; *subito media tenus exstitit alvo* 13.893). These are the only two instances of *tenus* and *exstitit* together. Otherwise the most similar expressions include Manilius *Astronomica* 3.377 (*mediaque tenus distenditur alvo*); *Met.* 14.59 (*Scylla venit mediaque tenus descenderat alvo*); and *Fast.* 2.145 (*Iam puer Idaeus media tenus eminet alvo*).

[280] Adams 1982: 95.

gender roles become unsettled. Salzman-Mitchell posits that an ambiguous view of Acis develops because Galatea presents a feminized view of Acis and Polyphemus in order to establish a powerful gaze for herself, but cannot enjoy complete success because of Polyphemus' hypermasculinity.[281] I agree that Polyphemus' "hypermasculinity" results in an inconsistent picture of Acis, but in the case of Acis, it is not clear Galatea intentionally feminizes him. For instance, she appears to be striving to aggrandize him and her story when she characterizes Acis as *heros*[282] and employs a phrase often used in martial contexts, *terga fugae dederat*, for his flight.[283] Similarly, she attempts to portray Acis' transformation as an augmentation (through the key words *vires* and *maior* and by creating an appearance that resembles conventional descriptions of maritime deities 13.886, 13.890-96).[284] This effort to make Acis appear more masculine does not conflict with her goal of assuming an elevated standing. The more formidable Acis is, the stronger the Cyclops must be to crush him, and the more impressive Galatea becomes when Acis needs her help. Additionally, by trying to color Acis' transformation as an

---

[281] 2005a: 192-93.
[282] Hardie (2015: on 13.879) notes the ironic contrast between *heros* and the heroic ideal of not taking flight in *Aen*. 3.666. Anderson (1972: on 7.496-97) also remarks that Ovid commonly uses *heros* ironically in the poem. Cf. Tissol 1997: 123.
[283] Cf. *terga dare TLL* 5.1.1668.62-64.
[284] Cf. Hardie (2015: on 13.893) for similarity to conventional descriptions of deities.

ascendance to divinity, she may aspire to portray herself as benevolent and powerful. A virile depiction of Acis is ultimately undermined, however, by the subtext that emerges from comparison with other episodes in the poem—particularly Acis' parallels to women in previous scenes of attempted rape.

The ambivalence observed concerning Acis' gender also fosters ambiguity about the relative success of his prayer. Much of what Galatea portrays seems to indicate a positive transformation for Acis. He was on the verge of death (*periturum* 13.881), bleeding profusely (*puniceus de mole cruor manabat* 13.887) before his transformation. Instead of death, his metamorphosis seems to have granted him a sort of immortality. As noted above, his description aligns him with maritime and fluvial divinities and he is described as assuming *vires* and becoming *maior*. These positive changes are partially undermined, however, by feminizing features in his transformation, so that it is not entirely clear whether Acis concludes the episode better or worse than he started. Galatea herself appears to acknowledge a limited sort of success for her response when she laments that it was *quod fieri solum per fata licebat* (the only thing permitted by fate) (13.885). Still, under the framework used to evaluate success in other episodes, Acis' prayer appears relatively successful because Galatea's response corresponds to Acis' desires and not simply a literal interpretation of Acis' words. Acis refines his more

general plea for help (*fer opem* 13.880) with a more specific appeal for his parents to allow him into their kingdom (*admittite regnis* 13.881). Galatea emphasizes her response's correspondence to this request when she describes it as follows (13.886): *fecimus, ut vires adsumeret Acis avitas* (We caused Acis to assume his ancestral strength). The adjective *avitus* in particular parallels Acis' reference to his family in the plea, and the prefix of *adsumeret* mirrors the prefix in his request *admittite*.

If we think about the typical silencing effects of metamorphosis, there is again a great deal of ambiguity concerning Acis. Very little narrative space is granted to Acis' perspective; it is primarily restricted to the two short lines that comprise his prayer for help (13.880-81). After his metamorphosis, Galatea does not permit him further speech nor does she elaborate on his evaluation of the situation. This again assimilates Acis to female victims of attempted rape, whose perspectives we must often guess. The lack of voice provided to Acis makes it difficult to judge whether he retains the faculties of speech. If we turn again to the description of his transformation, it is interesting that he does not speak, but rather *osque cavum saxi sonat exsultantibus undis* (the hollow mouth of the rock resounds with leaping waters 13.892). Acis' human voice has been replaced by the musical sound of water moving through the "mouth" of the rock. So at first it seems Acis has lost his mouth and his voice, but as the description continues, Galatea

remarks that he is *toto caerulus ore* (13.895). While *os* refers to the whole face, it is associated with speaking in particular; Bettini observes the word "evokes a capacity that chiefly distinguishes human beings from other animate creatures: language."[285] If we think about silence as occasioning a removal from community, again the result is ambivalent. On the one hand, Acis' transformation appears to have separated him from Galatea (although exactly why is not entirely clear, since it seems they are now both aqueous and divine or semi-divine—why can their waters not "mix"?[286] Perhaps because Galatea is a sea-nymph and Acis is fluvial?). On the other hand, it appears Acis has received his request to be admitted to his familial realms, and presumably now shares in their community. Salzman-Mitchell astutely recognizes the adjective *dubia* in Acis' first description (*pulcher et octonis iterum natalibus actis/ signarat teneras dubia languine malas* 13.753-54) as especially important for his character, and virtually every attempt at analysis confirms this observation—Acis' fate is ambiguous.

Again we may consider this outcome according to three major influences: cosmological status, language, and gender. In this episode the cosmological status of all three characters is relatively equal, since they all have divine or semi-divine parentage,

---

[285] 2011: 135.
[286] Cf. 5.638, 13.866.

but their particular lineage is still stressed and potentially influential. Galatea brags that she is born from Nereus and Doris to establish that she should be more powerful than Scylla (13.742-43); Polyphemus tries to win over Galatea by reminding her that his father (Neptune) is the ruler of her waters (13.854-55); and Acis is described as the descendant of Faunus and the nymph Symaethis (13.750; *Symaethius* 13.880) and said to gain his ancestral strength in his metamorphosis (*vires avitas* 13.886). Thus while Polyphemus, Galatea, and Acis may all belong in the "semi-divine" category, their parentage is not all equal. Polyphemus has the most powerful father, and therefore not only his "hypermasculinity," but also his superior lineage may be a factor in how difficult he is to overcome (and why Galatea's intervention to help Acis is mostly successful, but with certain restraints).

In terms of language, like many appeals for help, Acis' prayer lacks an "argument," but otherwise observes all the features of a typical Roman prayer. It makes a clear invocation (this time to both Galatea and his parents), a verb of request (in this case *fer opem* twice, as well as *admittite*), specifies the recipient (*mihi*, (*me*) *periturum*), and displays characteristic repetition (*fer*, *ferte*). The lack of argument does not appear to damage the success of Acis' petition in any way. He successfully garners Galatea's sympathy, and she answers his request as closely as she can. Galatea describes her

limitation in how she responds to Acis' appeal as resulting from fate (*quod fieri solum per fata licebat* 13.885). By attributing her only restraint to fate, Galatea again manipulates the narrative to position herself as more powerful, since fate is similarly the only limitation on Olympian gods. When Venus prays to avoid Caesar's murder (15.761-78), the gods are moved (*superos movet* 15.780), but are unable to prevent the assassination, because it is already fated (*qui rumpere quamquam/ ferrea non possunt veterum decreta sororum* 15.780-81). While Galatea tries to attribute her only constraint to fate, the particular intersection of different powers, particularly the Cyclops' hypermasculinity, appears to be the most compelling cause for the appeal's partial success. Even as Galatea destabilizes many of the expectations about gender and power in this episode (particularly by escaping the typical outcome of victims of attempted rape, and instead transferring them to a male, Acis), she cannot completely upend them. The Cyclops' masculinity persists and results in damage to Galatea and her lover.

Galatea's fate is better than many women in the poem, as she avoids male violence without a silencing transformation, but, her narrative notably also does not accomplish complete gender reversal—she does not, for example, physically overpower the Cyclops. Indeed, when she admits that she only evades her admirer through grief (*nisi per luctus* 13.744), Galatea draws a contrast between Scylla's experience (or her

experiences up to this point, at least),[287] in which the woman escapes her pursuers without consequence, and the story she tells herself.[288] The particular psychological effect of Galatea's experience, *luctus*, is especially interesting. Elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses*, female grief frequently results in spontaneous, silencing transformations.[289] Unlike such characters as Niobe, the Heliades, and Cyane, however, Galatea does not undergo any sort of permanent, corporeal metamorphosis in her grief. Gentilcore attributes this retention of form and voice to Galatea's ability to narrate her story to a like-minded audience.[290] She identifies the trend in the poem thus: "Significantly, four of the five characters who retell the causes of their sorrows are not physically transformed after they do so; they form exceptions to the rule of metamorphosed grievers. This is due to the reciprocal relationship established between narrator and audience. Obviously these individuals have survived to tell the tale, but through the first-person narratives of their sufferings, Ovid reveals their ability to communicate successfully and thus to establish the healthy connections with society that

---

[287] Scylla will soon be the victim of transformation in her own unfortunate erotic story (13.900-14.74), see Nagle 1988b; Mack 1999; Hopkinson 2000: 34-35, 41-43; Myers 2009: on 14.1-74.
[288] Salzman-Mitchell (2005a: 192) argues that Galatea is attempting to show her suffering worse than Scylla's and hopes to gain sympathy from the audience.
[289] Cf. Natoli 2017; Gentilcore 2010; de Luce 1982.
[290] 2010: 111.

mitigate transformation."[291] Still, Galatea's emotion temporarily silences her at 13.745 when her tears keep her from speaking (*et lacrimae vocem inpediere loquentis*). Alcmene describes her emotions in similar terms when she begins to tell the story of Dryope (*quamquam lacrimaeque dolorque/ impediunt, prohibentque loqui* 9.328-29), though there is an irony to Alcmene herself saying that she cannot speak. Thus while both women escape permanent transformation and voicelessness, in both cases there is a nod to the traditional schemata, discussed by Natoli, of emotion-induced silencing.[292] After her community's encouragement and assurance (13.746-48), however, Galatea resumes her voice and relates her story and the cause of her emotional distress. Once her tale has concluded, Gentilcore describes Galatea as departing "unharmed,"[293] and to a certain extent this is true. Galatea is not permanently transformed and is presented as swimming away with her fellow Nereids into *placidis undis* (13.899). Nonetheless, while Galatea may escape permanent silencing and transformation, she emphasizes that she evades her pursuer *per luctus*. Even if she eventually overcomes her grief, women in the poem never flee from men without ultimate physical or psychological suffering.[294]

---

[291] 2010: 108.
[292] 2017: 20-32.
[293] 2010: 111.
[294] This is similar to Salzman-Mitchell's conclusion that "change is only possible way out of rape" (2005a: 181).

CHAPTER THREE: EFFECTIVE ENTREATIES—BENEVOLENT RESPONSES FROM NON-OLYMPIAN DEITIES

Chapter Three focuses on the prayers for help that result in the most positive outcomes for the beneficiaries. The joint prayer of Deucalion and Pyrrha (1.377-80), Telethusa's prayer to Isis on behalf of Iphis (9.773-81), and Myscelus' petition to Hercules (15.39-40) offer examples of successful *fer opem* prayers. These beneficial results reinforce the importance of factors that have been observed as influencing the success of other prayers in the poem (i.e. adherence to typical prayer form, cosmological status, and gender), but they also reveal a somewhat unexpected feature—all the most successful prayers for help are answered by divinities outside the main Olympian order. While not all gods outside the Olympian order provide unambiguously positive results for petitioners (e.g. Peneus, Syrinx's sisters), the most sympathetic deities (i.e. the ones most likely to deliver help corresponding to the beneficiary's desires) are not those at the top of the cosmological hierarchy.[295] It is remarkable that no Olympian gods provide unambiguously beneficial results, especially since in all three episodes with the most effective entreaties for help Ovid changes the identity of the responding deity from the

---

[295] In most circumstances, a responding deity's position vis-à-vis another deity appears to be a major limiting factor in a prayer's success. In the three most effective prayers, the responding deities are not acting against other deities, and so it is difficult to guess whether their power could be curbed if a god of higher status were present.

god found in the traditional version of the story: Themis replaces Jupiter, Isis replaces Leto, and Hercules is substituted for Apollo. Rather than serving simply as variation, these narrative edits may be a way to comment on Olympian, and perhaps even Augustan, deities.

I. DEUCALION AND PYRRHA

The first prayer of the poem's narrative[296] is a joint plea by Deucalion and Pyrrha in Book One. While it resembles the prayers for help discussed so far in several ways, the entreaty also has a number of unique features that set it apart from other appeals: it is spoken jointly, and the response is an oracle. Furthermore, its opening position marks it as exemplary. Indeed, it exhibits certain programmatic and generic concerns, for instance announcing the relationship between human and divine as central to the work and highlighting the tension between epic and amatory themes. Furthermore, it anticipates some aspects of subsequent petitions for help, such as the disconnect between human and divine understanding and the ambiguity of language. It will therefore be fruitful to examine the prayer by the framework applied to other prayers first (examining relative success and interaction of power hierarchies), and then to turn to some of the further

---

[296] I.e. this excludes Ovid's request to the gods to inspire his work (*di, coeptis (nam mutastis et illa)/ adspirate meis* 1.2-3).

characteristics particular to this prayer in its specific context (i.e. its programmatic function).

When Jupiter floods the entire world as punishment for Lycaon's wickedness, only two humans survive, Deucalion and Pyrrha (1.182-323). Upon grounding on Mount Parnassus, the couple displays such reverence to the local gods—among them the oracular Themis—that Jupiter's wrath subsides and he orders the storm to calm (1.324-29). After the squall abates, Deucalion and Pyrrha see how destitute the earth is, lament the disappearance of the human race, and resolve to pray and seek help through the nearby oracle (*placuit caeleste precari/ numen et auxilium per sacras quaerere sortes* 1.367-68). Together they piously prostrate themselves (1.375-76) and appeal to Themis as follows (1.377-80):

> atque ita 'si precibus' dixerunt 'numina iustis
> victa remollescunt, si flectitur ira deorum,
> dic, Themi, qua generis damnum reparabile nostri
> arte sit, et mersis fer opem, mitissima, rebus!'
>
> And thus they said, "if divine will grows mild, won over by just prayers, if the anger of the gods is swayed, tell, Themis, how the loss of our race may be capable of repair, and, most gentle one, bring help to our sunken affairs!"

Themis grants the couple's request by bidding them to veil their heads,[297] uncinch their

[297] A ritual action that rests on the religious belief that man should not see certain processes occurring behind his back; cf. Bömer Vol. 1, 1969: on 1.399.

robes,[298] and throw the bones of their great mother behind them ("*discedite templo/ et velate caput cinctasque resolvite vestes/ ossaque post tergum magnae iactate parentis*" 1.381-83). After some consternation, Deucalion is able to properly interpret the "great mother" as Earth and her "bones" as rocks (*magna parens terra est: lapides in corpore terrae/ ossa reor dici; iacere hos post terga iubemur* 1.393-94). They follow Themis' instructions to cover their heads and ungird their clothes, and then toss rocks over their shoulders (1.398-99). Those rocks consequently soften into men and women who repopulate the barren world (1.401-15).

The outcome of Deucalion and Pyrrha's prayer appears successful, especially when compared to those discussed in previous chapters, since the human race is regenerated, as the couple desires (i.e. the deity responds to the intentions of the speakers and does not exploit any ambiguity in their language). In terms of features typically shown to affect a prayer's success (gender, language, and cosmological status), the unusual condition of a prayer spoken jointly by a woman and a man invalidates the importance of a speaker's gender here. Certainly Deucalion and Pyrrha's genders are emphasized insofar as each serves as the representative of the male and female sex respectively (1.322-26, 1.412-13), but more important for this episode is the status of

---

[298] Another ritual action: Serv. *ad Aen.* 4.518 *in sacris nihil solet esse religatum*.

both as human, rather than divine.

If we turn to the prayer's form, part of Deucalion and Pyrrha's success may stem from the fact that they include all the requisite components of an ideal petition. The couple makes a clear invocation (*Themi* 1.379) and includes a flattering epithet (*mitissima* 1.380).[299] They also voice two requests, first a more specific one (*dic qua generis damnum reparabile nostri arte sit* 1.379), followed by a more general plea for help (*mersis fer opem rebus* 1.380). This is the opposite of the order we have seen in other prayers, where a speaker first requests the more general *fer opem* and then refines it with a more specific request (e.g. Daphne, *fer opem…perde figuram* 1.546-47; Achelous, *adfer opem … da locum vel sit locus ipsa licebit* 8.602; Acis, *fer opem … vestris periturum admittite regnis* 13.880-81). The double requests are preceded by two *si* clauses (*si precibus numina iustis victa remollescunt, si flectitur ira deorum* 1.377-78), another common feature of prayers.[300] The twofold form of both the conditionals and the requests suits the context, where two voices (unusually for the *Metamorphoses*) join in unison (*dixerunt* 1.377).[301] Furthermore, this continues the doubling used elsewhere to

[299] On *mitis/mitissima* see Appel 1909: 99.
[300] Particularly in vows; cf. Hickson 1993: 98-100.
[301] This is the only prayer given in direct speech spoken by two people. In the most similar situation Baucis and Philemon are described as praying together (*concipiunt Baucisque preces timidusque Philemon/ et veniam dapibus nullisque paratibus orant*

emphasize the couple's unity.[302] The first conditional also contains the argument portion of their prayer (albeit a less direct argument than in some prayers), through the words *precibus iustis* (1.377). The expression *si precibus numina iustis victa remollescunt* (1.377-78) implies that their piety is an incentive for the divinity to assist. This devoutness appears to be the primary reason for the couple's success, and the reference to their just prayers serves as a reminder of previous descriptions of their virtuous behavior (*cultores numinis* 1.327; *Corycidas nymphas et numina montis adorant/ fatidicamque Themin, quae tunc oracla tenebat* 1.320-21).[303] Their actions furthermore contrast with Lycaon, who impiously laughs at prayers (*vulgusque precari/ coeperat: inridet primo vota Lycaon* 1.220-21). The reverence of Deucalion and Pyrrha is able to reverse the destruction caused by Lycaon's lack of piety, and their entreaty ultimately reverses the damages caused in part by his scoffing at prayers.

More specifically, Deucalion and Pyrrha ask how (*qua arte*) mankind can be

---

8.682-83), but their prayer is not given in direct speech. When they are later granted a wish, Philemon consults Baucis, but he makes the request alone on behalf of the pair (*cum Baucide pauca locutus/ iudicium superis aperit commune Philemon* 8.705-6).

[302] E.g. 1.325-27; 1.361-62; *deinde torus iunxit, nunc ipsa pericula iungunt* 1.353, *pariter* 1.369.

[303] There may also be a hint here of Themis' association with justice, although Themis is associated especially with Latin *fas* rather than *ius*, cf. Phillipson 1911: 87-88; Ausonius *Technopaegnion* 8: *prima deum Fas, quae Themis est Grais*.

repaired, and then give a more general plea for help (*fer opem*). Themis responds to both these requests—providing instructions for *how* the couple can themselves restore humanity (i.e. she does not repopulate the earth herself immediately, without fulfillment of her instructions), and understands that "help" in this context constitutes regenerating fellow humans, even if the couple states it more ambiguously as helping their "sunken affairs" (*mersis rebus* 1.380), that is, the post-diluvian world. In this way, Themis responds to the intent of the speakers, even thouh they do not explicitly state what they want. Yet, if we think about how it illuminates our understanding of the relationship between gods and men, the episode is rather complex. Themis' oracle still points to a disconnect in divine/ human communication, since Deucalion and Pyrrha initially do not understand Themis' oracle. The literal meaning of the oracle does not align obviously with its intended meaning. Although Deucalion and Pyrrha eventually interpret the oracle correctly and understand the gods' meaning, they do so only with difficulty. Therefore, while the gods appear to understand human concerns in this first prayer of the poem, communication between gods and mortals is still portrayed as imperfect, and Ovid plays with the discrepancy between human and divine interpretation of speech from a different perspective than the one explored in the previous chapters. Oracles typically have riddling responses, so the abstruse nature of Themis' response is not itself particularly

surprising, but it is worth noting that Ovid did not need to make this episode include an oracle. Other extant versions of the story, in fact, do not require Deucalion and Pyrrha to solve the cryptic words of the oracle.

In both Apollodorus and Hyginus, Jupiter gives unambiguous instructions directly to the couple. In Apollodorus' version, Deucalion makes a sacrifice to Zeus, who sends Hermes as a messenger to offer Deucalion anything he wishes. Deucalion asks for humans (ὁ δὲ αἱρεῖται ἀνθρώπους αὐτῷ γενέσθαι 1.7.2). Zeus responds by telling him to throw stones over his shoulder, and the ones he throws turn into men, while Pyrrha's stones turn into women (καὶ Διὸς εἰπόντος ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἔβαλλεν αἴρων λίθους, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἔβαλε Δευκαλίων, ἄνδρες ἐγένοντο, οὓς δὲ Πύρρα, γυναῖκες 1.7.2). In Hyginus' version, Deucalion and Pyrrha beg Jupiter to give them more people, or to kill them also (*petierunt ab Iove, ut aut homines daret aut eos pari calamitate afficeret*, *Fab.* 153). Jupiter orders them to throw rocks behind them (*Tum Iovis iussit eos lapides post se iactare*, *Fab.* 153), and again Deucalion's rocks become men and Pyrrha's become women (*quos Deucalion iactavit, viros esse iussit, quos Pyrrha, mulieres*, *Fab.* 153). These narratives highlight how unspecific Deucalion and Pyrrha's primary requests are in the *Metamorphoses*. Whereas in other narratives they ask for fellow humans specifically, in Ovid's version Deucalion and Pyrrha ask how their race's loss can be mended and

make a general plea for help (*dic, Themi, qua generis damnum reparabile nostri/ arte sit, et mersis fer opem, mitissima, rebus*! 1.379-80). By leaving the actual phrasing of the prayer rather vague, as opposed to having Deucalion and Pyrrha directly ask for more people, Ovid not only intensifies the extent to which the couple appears overwhelmed, but also shows the goddess as able to interpret the unexpressed meaning of the mortals' words and as understanding enough to respond to the intentions of the speakers.[304] Similarly, the versions in Apollodorus and Hyginus reveal the notable ambiguity in Themis' response, since in those versions Deucalion and Pyrrha are told directly to toss rocks. No other *fer opem* episode treats ambiguity in quite the same way (i.e. in other episodes deities will misinterpret or exploit vague language in prayers, rather than humans misunderstanding the divine response). Themis' oracle nonetheless prefigures the prominence of ambivalent language in petitions throughout the work.

In addition to highlighting ambiguity of language in both the human request and divine response, a comparison with other accounts underscores Ovid's unique choice to have Themis answer the appeal, rather than Jupiter. To these versions we may add also

---

[304] Griffin (1992: 47) notes that after Deucalion and Pyrrha human beings no longer have something divine in them and that the fourth anthropogeny marks the end of human/divine kinship. Perhaps gods do not respond to a speaker's intention as obviously after Deucalion and Pyrrha because of the loss of this kinship.

Pindar's brief mention of the tale (*Ol.* 9.41-46), again citing Zeus as providing instructions (Διὸς αἴσᾳ *Ol.* 9.43). Having Themis communicate with Deucalion and Pyrrha in Ovid's narrative removes Jupiter from the prayerful exchange. At the same time, however, some responsibility for the regeneration of the human race seems to be attributed to Jupiter, since the king of the gods earlier calms other deities' concerns about the disappearance of mankind by promising a new people from miraculous origin (*rex superum trepidare vetat subolemque priori/ dissimilem populo promittit origine mira* 1.250-51).[305] When read this way, Themis' involvement in the regeneration of mankind may be seen as an extension of Jupiter's will. The king of the gods begins the benevolent behavior to Deucalion and Pyrrha by ending the storm and parting the clouds (1.328-29) when he sees that only the pious, blameless couple remains (1.324-27). Neptune's anger then also abates (*nec maris ira manet* 1.330) and he orders all waters to retreat (1.330-42).[306] In this light, Themis may be viewed as a part of a continuum of divine response inspired by Deucalion and Pyrrha's piety, which Jupiter inaugurates. Jupiter is not explicitly credited with the regeneration of mankind, but the impression that Themis is

---

[305] Segal (2001: 86) asserts that only the latter half of this avowal comes to fruition, since the second race of men is not entirely dissimilar to the first.

[306] Wheeler (2000: 32) describes the ending of the flood as occurring from the "double motivation" of these two divinities.

not solely responsible for the miraculous event is strengthened by the narrator's comment that the transformation occurred by collective divine will (*superorum numine* 1.411). Even so, excluding Jupiter from being the direct recipient of Deucalion and Pyrrha's entreaty distances him from the appeal's immediate success.[307] Attributing the prayer's benevolent answer to Themis (*mota dea* 1.381) rather than Jupiter may foster a greater degree of ambiguity about how to characterize Jupiter. Whether the god acted justly in destroying mankind in the first place is itself debatable; O'Hara, for instance, explores how inconsistencies in Jupiter's narrative about Lycaon undermine his claim to justice.[308] Especially troubling is the god's assertion that mankind must be destroyed (*perdendum est mortale genus* 1.188), despite his claim that everyone besides Lycaon acted piously (*signa dedi venisse deum, vulgusque precari/ coeperat* 1.220-21). Even if Jupiter initiates the sympathetic treatment of Deucalion and Pyrrha in some sense, he also, perhaps unjustly, instigates the circumstances that require the couple's desperate appeal. Jupiter's distance from the successful prayer, in turn, may contribute to the impression in the work that Olympian gods are not sympathetic—or at any rate less sympathetic—to mortals.[309]

---

[307] Six prayers are addressed to Jupiter in the *Metamorphoses*: Terra 2.279-300; Semele 3.293-95; Aeacus 7.615-18, 7.627-28; Aurora 13.586-99; and Venus 14.586-91.
[308] 2007: 116-18.
[309] Galinsky 1975: 162-73; Solodow 1988: 89-94; Feeney 1991: 188-249; O'Hara 2007: 108-14.

All of the most successful outcomes to prayers for help are granted by deities peripheral to the Olympian order.

Themis' involvement in particular sets up an interesting contrast between the first occupant of what comes to be the Delphic oracle (*Parnassus* 1.317, *fatidicamque Themin, quae tunc oracla tenebat* 321) and her successor, Apollo (*mihi Delphica tellus* 1.515).[310] After the episode of Deucalion and Pyrrha, the narrative shifts to Apollo's conquering of Pytho and establishment of the Pythian games (1.438-51). From there the scene transitions into Ovid's famous representation of Apollo and Daphne, which I have explored more thoroughly in Chapter One. The god's pursuit of Daphne provokes her plea for rescue from him with the same entreaty, *fer opem*, which Deucalion and Pyrrha employed a mere 165 lines before (1.380, 1.546). The prayers are further linked by shared vocabulary and similar sentence structure.[311] They both employ present general conditionals involving a form of *numen* (*si precibus numina iustis victa remollescunt* 1.377-78; *si flumina numen habetis* 1.546).[312] These formal similarities in the two appeals

---

[310] See Miller 2009: 169 n. 4. In Hyginus' version the couple lands on Mount Etna in Sicily, rather than Delphi.

[311] For a discussion of the textual issues in Daphne's prayer see pg. 53 n. 116. I have adopted Tarrant's reading of 1.546-47: *'fer, pater,' inquit 'opem! si flumina numen habetis,/ qua nimium placui, mutando perde figuram!'*

[312] The inclusion of conditionals is not uncommon in prayers, but they are generally employed in a slightly different way than either of these examples. One common use of

point to an ironic difference between the two Delphic deities—one rescues her petitioners whereas the other endangers his (here it may be worth noting Jupiter's similar lust after various women, even if none of his victims has an opportunity to pray for help before being raped). Beyond this contrast with a specific Olympian, though, we may observe that, like other beneficent deities in this chapter (Isis, Hercules), Themis lies outside the Olympian order. In this way, the status of the responding deity appears to influence a prayer's success in a slightly unexpected fashion, as the gods presumed to be the most powerful (Olympians) are not the ones to grant the most beneficial outcomes.

Now that we have considered the appeal by Deucalion and Pyrrha according to the same framework as the poem's other prayers for help, and seen especially how the

---

conditionals is some variation of the formula *si divus si diva*. This protasis is employed when a speaker does not know the identity of a divinity so that the god or goddess does not ignore the request simply because it is addressed to the wrong recipient (cf. Hickson 1993: 41-43). While Daphne's protasis resembles this formulation, the purpose cannot be the same, since Daphne has no uncertainty about the identity of her river father, Peneus, whom she explicitly names. Conditionals are also commonly used for vows, where the speaker promises something to a divinity if certain requests are fulfilled (cf. Hahn 2007: 240-41). In the case of Deucalion and Pyrrha's prayer, however, nothing is promised to the gods in exchange for the fulfillment of the prayer. A third use of conditionals is employed to ensure a speaker's truth in an oath by establishing a self-curse if the speaker fails to fulfill his promised obligation. An example of a set formula of this type is *si sciens fallo*, which is then followed by some sort of promised punishment (cf. Hickson 1993: 126-27). Neither the petition of Deucalion and Pyrrha nor the plea of Daphne employs its conditional in one of these three ways which conditionals are commonly used in prayer.

episode contributes to understanding factors that influence an effective prayer, we may examine additional aspects of this entreaty, in the light of its evident inaugural function. This analysis may appear to entail a rather lengthy digression from the primary themes of power explored elsewhere in my study, but in doing so I hope to illuminate its programmatic dimension, as well as its connections with a later, likewise strategically placed prayer, namely that of Achelous in Book Eight.[313] As the first prayer of the work's narrative, Deucalion and Pyrrha's appeal establishes our expectations for subsequent entreaties and contains programmatic undertones. The first protasis of the present general conditional in the prayer raises a central question about the relationship between gods and humans—Do the gods answer human prayers? The answer presented in this episode to the question of whether the gods are amenable to righteous human prayers (*si precibus numina iustis victa remollescunt* 1.377-78) therefore influences how effective we anticipate future prayers will be. The narrative that follows Deucalion and Pyrrha's plea implies that the gods will assent to human requests. Because Themis grants Deucalion and Pyrrha's appeal, we form an expectation that prayers are effective. As we continue to examine prayers for help throughout the work, we can continually reevaluate how true this initial expectation is. I argue throughout that prayers are indeed effective, but to

[313] For programmatics in Book One cf. Davis 1983; Harrison 2002: 87-89; Miller 2009.

varying degrees depending on the interaction of different power structures. Deucalion and Pyrrha's first conditional implies that evaluating the effectiveness of entreaties is an important concern.

The second protasis of the prayer, *si flectitur ira deorum* (1.378), similarly establishes the subject of assuaging divine wrath as significant to the work. Because the prayer is successfully answered, it seems the anger of the gods can be quelled. Divine anger motivates much of the action in the *Metamorphoses,* and is especially prominent as an opening motif. The first mention of *ira* in the poem occurs at the beginning of the Lycaon episode, when Jupiter is described as conceiving wrath worthy of himself (*dignas Iove concipit iras* 1.166). In typically Ovidian fashion this expression both announces and deflates epic grandeur simultaneously. The application of the formula 'worthy of Jove' to Jove himself is humorous, but the sentence also emphatically announces the epic theme of wrath.[314] This anger with Lycaon not only leads to his transformation into a wolf, but also culminates in the deluge from which Deucalion and Pyrrha seek reprieve in their prayer. The origin of wrath as an epic theme, of course, originates with the *Iliad,* and while the primary wrath there belongs to Achilles, the opening scene of the *Iliad* also exhibits the divine wrath of Apollo. The epic nature of divine wrath is eventually

---

[314] Cf. Feeney 1991: 198-204; Barchiesi 2005: on 1.166.

bolstered and solidified by the programmatic nature of Juno's wrath in Vergil's *Aeneid* (1.4).[315]

The variation in theme and tone of the *Metamorphoses* has caused much debate about how to classify the genre of Ovid's work. Heinze's early consideration of the generic differences between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* portrayed the *Metamorphoses* as thoroughly epic and the *Fasti* as thoroughly elegiac.[316] Soon after, Kroll presented the famous idea of "Kreuzung der Gattungen" which proposed the origin of new genres from generic cross-breeding.[317] Much more recently, Knox's influential discussion of genre explored the abundance of elegiac elements and questioned the ability to categorize the genre of the *Metamorphoses*.[318] In response to Knox, Hinds has acknowledged and confirmed Knox's stress on the importance of elegiac elements, but reestablished the importance of an epic framework.[319] Myers has then refined this epic characterization and revealed the importance of the tradition of cosmological epic to the

---

[315] *Met*. 1.167 contains the Vergilian allusion *conciliumque vocat*; cf. Barchiesi 2005: on 1.167. Hera's jealousy also drives the action in Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*; for its connection to the *Metamorphoses* see Wills 1990.
[316] Heinze 1919.
[317] Kroll 1924.
[318] Knox 1986.
[319] Hinds 1987b: 99-134.

poem, discussing many of the ways in which Ovid conforms to and defies epic norms.[320] The *Metamorphoses* is now broadly recognized as an epic that incorporates myriad genres and manipulates tensions among them.[321] While the poem contains many generic resonances, Ovid commonly exploits the familiar tension between epic and elegy. The representative forces of each genre, *ira* and *amor* respectively, have been identified as driving most of the poem's action.[322] After divine anger propels the early narrative in the scenes of Lycaon and the flood, the mention of Apollo's *primus amor*, Daphne, programmatically marks the beginning of elegiac themes.[323] The story of Deucalion and

---

[320] Myers 1994a.

[321] Harrison (2002: 87-89) succinctly summarizes the current and most accepted understanding of genre and the *Metamorphoses*, and emphasizes the complexity of how the text positions itself within the tradition of hexametric epic. While he stresses the importance of genres besides elegy and the tradition of neoteric erotic narrative, the tension between epic and elegy remains one of the most salient. See also Myers (1999); Barchiesi (2001b); Farrell (2004), (2009); and O'Hara (2007: 104-108, 118-21).

[322] Wilkinson 1955: 148-49; Otis 1970: 122-24; Nagle 1984; Knox 1986; Feeney 1991: 198-204; Wheeler 2000: 48-49.

[323] Miller (2009: 168-69 n. 4) deftly preempts the criticism that amatory themes are already present in the story of Deucalion and Pyrrha as follows: "One might object that a motif of love has already appeared with the story of Deucalion and Pyrrha (1.318–415), but their tale of mutual devotion—all of a piece with their *pietas* toward the gods—is a world away from the stories of sexual passion inaugurated by the 'Daphne'—*amor* destructive of humans, which beguiles both gods and mortals. In fact, one may read Apollo's passionate pursuit of Daphne as revising the poem's initial presentation of relations between the sexes. Conjugal devotion of the human pair to one another, promised even unto death (1.361–62), is replaced by the Olympian deity's aggressive chase of the defenseless nymph: although both Phoebus and the narrator talk in terms of

Pyrrha stands between the tale of Lycaon, driven by epic *ira*, and the story of Apollo and Daphne, driven by elegiac *amor*.[324] This binary opposition between *ira* and *amor* is, of course, overly simplistic, especially given the importance of cosmogonic epic,[325] but it is one of the chief tensions Ovid exploits in the opening of his poem, and the one most relevant to the prayer uttered by Deucalion and Pyrrha.

When read in light of this generic transition from epic to amatory, the prayer made by Deucalion and Pyrrha appears to reflect metapoetically on the generic shift between episodes. As Ovid approaches amatory themes, the couple asks if *ira* (i.e. epic) is quelled and divine will becomes gentle again (*remollescunt*; i.e. becomes elegiac),

---

marriage to Daphne (1.490 *conubia*; 557 *coniunx*), the accent throughout is on Apollo threatening violence to the distraught nymph." Most recently Blanco Mayor (2017: 268-69) remarks that the "*fides* model" of mutual love exhibited by Deucalion and Pyrrha (and later Cadmus and Harmonia as well as Pyramus and Thisbe) prefigures "Daphne patterned" tales of unrequited, "vertical" love.

[324] For relatively recent work on Apollo's *primus amor* cf. Nicoll 1980; Knox 1986: 14-17; Myers 1994a: 61-63; Holzberg 1999; Keith 2002; Hardie 2002: 45-50, 128-30; Barchiesi 1999, 2005; Martindale 2005: 203-17; Miller 2009; Battistella 2010; Ziogas 2013: 66-69. Wheeler (2000: 54-57) discusses the beginning of the Apollo and Daphne episode as a transition from cosmological narrative to erotic narrative. I do not think my emphasis on the transition from epic anger to elegiac love needs to be opposed to this interpretation, but rather the mention of Apollo's *primus amor* introduces a move away from both cosmological and wrath-driven epic and Ovid exploits both of these oppositions.

[325] Cf. Myers 1994a: 1-21.

since *mollis* is a term associated with love elegy.[326] The fulfillment of Deucalion and Pyrrha's prayer indicates that divine anger can be quelled, and if we extend the generic metaphor, also that epic themes can transition into elegiac. Additionally, the appeal prefigures the softening of the rocks of the earth into the flesh of mankind (*remollescunt* 1.378; *molliri…mollita* 1.402). Likewise, the particular epithet chosen for Themis in the couple's prayer, *mitissima* (1.380), anticipates the description of a softer nature affecting the stones (*natura mitior illis contigit* 1.403-4).[327] This transformation, in turn, symbolically foreshadows the generic shift from hard, epic *ira* to soft, elegiac *amor* that will occur in the subsequent scene as the epic telling of Apollo's victory over Pytho develops into the elegiac pursuit of Daphne by Apollo. The ritual action that accompanies Deucalion and Pyrrha's request (*procumbit uterque/ pronus humi gelidoque pavens dedit oscula saxo*, they both fell prostrate on the ground and trembling, kissed the icy cold rock 1.375-76) may also prefigure the rocks' transformation and generic shift towards the amatory. Deucalion and Pyrrha's appeal is thus shown to interact with proximal narratives to explore programmatic and generic concerns.

---

[326] Cf. Wimmel 1960: 13-42, 193-265; Fedeli 1985: 69-70; DeBrohun 1994; Keith 1999a: 53.

[327] The epithet *mitis* is used in prayers to various gods in Tibullus, Ovid, and Statius. The superlative is found only in Ovid, cf. Appel 1909: 99.

These generic interests are comparatively negligible in most subsequent prayers for help, but roughly halfway through the epic Achelous' prayer for Perimele seems to echo Deucalion and Pyrrha's entreaty and likewise reactivates its generic associations. The location of Achelous' two island narratives, at the close of Book Eight, may help explain why programmatic concerns reemerge, since the middle of a work is a common place for a second proem.[328] In Chapter Two I thoroughly explore how Achelous' request for help positions the story as a variation on the pattern of pursuit, but Achelous' prayer additionally points to the plea by Deucalion and Pyrrha. Prayer serves as a locus for the intratextual connection between Achelous' island stories and the episode of Deucalion and Pyrrha. As a reminder, when Perimele is on the brink of drowning, Achelous makes the following appeal to Neptune for help (8.595-602):

> "o proxima mundi
> regna vagae," dixi, "sortite, Tridentifer, undae,
> adfer opem, mersaeque, precor, feritate paterna
> da, Neptune, locum, vel sit locus ipsa licebit!"

> "Oh god apportioned the realm next to the Earth, the realm of the wandering water, oh god who wields the trident, bring help, I pray, and to a daughter sunk by her father's cruelty give a place, Neptune, or let her become a place herself!"

Achelous' and Deucalion and Pyrrha's prayer share a dative form of the perfect passive

---

[328] Cf. Conte 1992. A tripartite structure to the work has been recognized as the dominant organizing feature (Holzberg 1998), but the middle of the epic is also structurally significant, cf. Crabbe 1981; Boyd 2006. On the poem's chronology see Feeney (1999); Zissos and Gildenhard (1999); Hinds (1999); and Rosati (2002).

participle of *mergo* in close association with the phrase *fer opem* (*mersis fer opem rebus*1.380; *adfer opem mersaeque*…8.601). Deucalion and Pyrrha ask Themis to bring help to their sunken affairs, and Achelous asks Neptune to bring help and give a place to the sunken girl. Although in Achelous' prayer *mersae* is not a part of the request *fer opem* grammatically, the close juxtaposition of the words facilitates the echo.

The passages are also connected because in each case the fulfillment of the prayer is followed by an expression of skepticism. Graf notes that the disbelieving sentiment of 1.400 after the stones become human is repeated at 8.614-15 when Achelous finishes describing Perimele's transformation into an island (*quis hoc credit nisi sit pro teste vetustas?* 1.400; '*ficta refers nimium putas, Acheloe, potentes/ esse deos' dixit, 'si dant adimuntque figuras.* 8.614-15).[329] Here Graf is concerned with the narrator's problematization of traditional stories and does not link the *content* of the two preceding narratives. But it is noteworthy that the outcomes of the respective prayers form mirror images (earth turns to flesh and flesh turns to earth) and then the passages are additionally linked through the skeptical remarks that follow both stories.

The allusion to Deucalion and Pyrrha's prayer reveals a more in depth dialogue

---

[329] 2002: 120. On Pirithous' statement of disbelief see Feeney (1991: 230-31) and Feldherr (2010: 51-59).

between the two scenes. The result of Deucalion and Pyrrha's prayer is that the earth is transformed into human bodies. In Ovid's description, it is technically stones that are transformed into mankind (1.400-15), but the distinction between rocks and earth is blurred both in the description of the transformation (*et terrena fuit, versa est in corporis usum* 1.408), and insofar as the concept of regeneration from *terra* is vital for the interpretation of the oracle (*magna parens terra est*: *lapides in corpore terrae/ ossa reor dici* 1.393). The outcome of Achelous' prayer is the opposite; a human body is transformed into earth (*amplexa est artus nova terra natantes/ et gravis increvit mutatis insula membris* 8.609-10).

This is especially relevant to the poetic concerns that, I argue, are expressed in the prayer by Deucalion and Pyrrha. The couple's hope for the softening of divine anger signals a transition from epic style and content to elegiac. This transition is prefigured by the fulfillment of their prayer in the description of hard rocks of the earth softening into human bodies. The result of Achelous' prayer is the reversal of this softening, narrated by a character who seems to embody bombastic, epic poetics.[330] Achelous is described as a flooding river in terms that are commonly noted to be metapoetic (*tumens* 8.550).[331] As

---

[330] Cf. Hinds 1987a; Barchiesi 2001a: 51-55, 173 n. 10. In particular, numerous Vergilian echoes have been identified (cf. Galinsky 1972: 93-116; Pavlock 2009: 84-88).

[331] Hinds (1987a) remarks on the irony of a symbol of anti-Callimachean poetics

Barchiesi observes, Achelous' swelling and therefore profession of anti-Callimachean poetics continues through the end of the episode. Achelous' own portrayal of his nature is not as straightforward as it first appears, however, and deserves further comment. He initially remarks on the power of his currently swollen waters, but the passage subsequently becomes more complex as he instructs (8.558-59):

> tutior est requies, solito dum flumina currant
> limite, dum tenues capiat suus alveus undas.
>
> It is safer that you rest until the streams run within their accustomed limit, until their own channels hold the slender waters.

The reference to his own waters as usually slender is particularly noteworthy, since *tenuis* is especially associated with Callimachean aesthetics of the type opposed to Achelous' tumid, epic style.[332] Achelous, therefore, describes himself in terms that suggest he alternates between conflicting stylistic modes, at least in theory. In practice, within the text of the poem it is generally agreed that Achelous's storytelling (especially in the Erysicthon episode) demonstrates lofty epic diction. This accords with his own description of his river in flood, and indeed throughout the time we encounter Achelous'

---

narrating Callimachean subjects. Barchiesi (2001a: 51-52) also notes that "Achelous' violent sweeping force is also reminiscent of an important predecessor of Callimachus' Euphrates: Cratinus the poet is in Aristophanes figured as a torrent that swept away every obstacle and carried away logs and boulders in its path (Ar. *Eq*. 536ff.)."

[332] Barchiesi (2001a: 52) remarks that the description of Erysicthon's hunger as *inattenuata* (8.844) seems to play on the literary associations of *tenuis* poetry.

storytelling his waters remain in flood, since Theseus and his companions depart before his waters become peaceful again (9.93-97).[333] While our entire experience with Achelous' narration consists of the flooded (and therefore epic) river, lines 8.558-59 also hint at the lack of permanence in this style. Achelous' profession of usually slender waters may hint at the type of narrative variation we see throughout the poem. The epicisms do not end with Achelous' narration, however, but spill into the description by the primary narrator, as 9.93 (*lux subit; et primo feriente cacumina sole*) is an epic way to announce morning[334] and Achelous' exit by plunging into the waves (*caput abdidit undis* 9.97) resembles aqueous Homeric figures (e.g. Proteus 4.570, Ino 5.352-53). It is possible that Achelous is epicizing aetiological and amatory stories, as Ovid himself does in the *Metamorphoses*. This similarity introduces an interesting question: Does Achelous serve as a negative foil for the rest of the poem, or a reflection of it? Perhaps it is a reversal of the concerns Ovid professes at the opening of the poem, when he describes his work as both *deductum* and *perpetuum*, whereas Achelous' narrative is neither *perpetuum* nor

---

[333] It is ironic that the group departs without any trouble from the flooding waters. This may be relevant to our understanding of credulity in the poem. Only Pirithous explicitly denies the veracity of Achelous' stories, but at the end of the episode, Theseus' band decides to ignore Achelous' warning that they will be safer if they stay while he is in flood. Achelous' original warning proves to be false, as they cross his stream and continue on their journey without difficulty.

[334] Anderson 1972: on 9.93.

deductum.[335] Variation is likewise reflected in Deucalion and Pyrrha's prayer and its fulfillment as divine anger, hard rocks, and epic poetics soften. Achelous' prayer and its fulfillment therefore not only recall Deucalion and Pyrrha's plea and outcome, but also remind us of the stylistic concerns and generic tension present in that scene, which are recapitulated in the figure of Achelous. These two scenes are, of course, not the only scenes that comment metapoetically on the generic tensions in the *Metamorphoses*, nor is the story of Perimele the only episode that seems to reverse the fourth anthropogeny by transforming people back into earth or stone.[336] Nonetheless, the two narratives share strong ties.

In addition to the connections outlined above, other aspects of Achelous' island narratives seem to resemble content and themes from Book One. For instance, in the story of the Echinades, Achelous' flood is reminiscent of Jupiter's earlier flood.[337] In Book One Lycaon provokes Jupiter's wrath though his impiety and failure to offer the god the proper respect. When Jupiter comes to earth in disguise, the majority of inhabitants offers him prayers, but Lycaon laughs and devises a plan to murder Jupiter

---

[335] Pavlock (2009: 83-88) contends that Achelous represents a negative model for narration. She argues that Achelous shows lack of narrative control and displays excess.
[336] e.g. Niobe becomes stone.
[337] Crabbe (1981: 2316) connects the flood in the Baucis and Philemon story with both of these floods.

and prove his mortality. Jupiter reprimands Lycaon by turning him into a wolf, and furthermore punishes humanity in general with a giant flood meant to wipe out the entire race. Achelous' first story shares some similar elements—he becomes enraged when he is slighted and creates a flood as punishment.[338]

In part, such repetition reinforces an impression that history and events repeat themselves, but also undergo constant change. The theme of the instability of elements and the continual process of creation and destruction in Ovid's world permeate Book One, as Myers articulates especially well in her discussion of cosmogony and natural philosophy.[339] Achelous' aetiology of the Echinades also recapitulates some of the cosmogonic imagery of division of the elements. Lelex first asks Achelous the name of an island in the distance, and then modifies his question, stating that it does not seem to be a single island (*quamquam non una videtur* 8.576). Achelous responds (8.577-78):

> "non est" inquit "quod cernitis unam:
> quinque iacent terrae; spatium discrimina fallit."

> What you see is not one island. Five lands lie there; the distance conceals the divisions.

In this sequence what appears to be a single mass is later revealed to contain different

---

338 The association rests primarily on a general similarity of content and themes rather than any specific verbal parallels, but this is not particularly troubling since Ovid may be showcasing his ability to describe similar phenomena in different ways.

339 1994: 43-49. See also O'Hara (2007: 108-14).

divisions. This is reminiscent of the opening of the poem in which the undivided mass, chaos, exists before later dividing into various elements (*Ante mare et terras et quod tegit omnia caelum/ unus erat toto naturae vultus in orbe/ quem dixere chaos* 1.5-7). When Achelous narrates the creation of the islands, the imagery of separation appears again. After describing his swollen flood, Achelous says (8.587-89):

> fluctus nosterque marisque
> continuam diduxit humum partesque resolvit
> in totidem, mediis quot cernis Echinades undis.

> My flood and the sea split the undivided ground and separated it into as many parts as you see Echinades amid the waves.

Again, an undivided mass (*continuam*) is separated (*diduxit; resolvit*), and repeats the process of creation through separation prevalent in Book One.[340] Yet, while Achelous' narrative describes the creation of divisions, it also hints at the instability of firm boundaries, since he describes the number of islands as equal to the number Lelex can see. As discussed above, Lelex cannot clearly see how many islands there are, and Achelous himself says that the distance obscures their division. This creates a degree of uncertainty about delineation of categories. Throughout Book One a similar kind of

---

[340] In addition to the initial description of division from Chaos, Jupiter's flooding of the world destroys elemental boundaries, especially between sea and land, which are then restored (1.262-347; esp. *iamque mare et tellus nullum discrimen habebant* 291; *iam mare litus habet, plenos capit alveus amnes,/ flumina subsidunt collesque exire videntur* 343-44). There may also be a nod to the poem's proem in the similarity between *continuam* (8.588) and *perpetuum* (1.4) and *diduxit* (8.588) *deducite* (1.4).

uncertainty is created through the continual process of creation and destruction.

Achelous' two island stories contain the two primary driving forces of action within the larger poem, *ira* and *amor*. In the first story, the nymphs are transformed as a result of Achelous' *ira* when he feels slighted. In the second story, Perimele is transformed because of Achelous' *amor* for Perimele (and to break down the causation further, because of her father's *ira* that results from Achelous' *amor*). This resembles the dual role of *ira* and *amor* as driving forces, as shown especially clearly in the opening episodes of Lycaon and Daphne and Apollo. Just as the first book showcases the *ira* and *amor* of the gods, Achelous showcases his own *ira* and *amor.* While these general thematic similarities are relatively evident of their own accord, Achelous' prayer helps direct us back to the appeal by Deucalion and Pyrrha in Book One, thereby facilitating the comparisons.

II. TELETHUSA AND IPHIS

The story of the young girl Iphis' sexual transformation into a boy has a strikingly happy ending, and contains one of the most clearly beneficial responses to prayer in the entire epic.[341] Iphis' tale begins before her actual birth, while her mother, Telethusa, is still

---

[341] For a survey of scholarship on this episode and Roman sexuality see Kamen (2012: 21-22).

pregnant. Iphis' father, Ligdus, laments he does not have the resources for a daughter, and so orders his wife to kill the child if it is female (9.669-79). On the night before Telethusa is to give birth, Isis appears to her in a dream and commands the mother not to follow her husband's instructions, and assures her she will help Telethusa (9.684-701). When Telethusa gives birth to a girl, she follows the goddess' instruction and disguises the infant Iphis as a male (9.704-6). The disguise so effectively deceives Ligdus that when Iphis reaches marriageable age, her father betroths her to the maiden Ianthe (9.715-17). Iphis desperately longs to marry Ianthe, but laments that such a marriage would be "unnatural" and unconsummated (9.724-64). Telethusa postpones the marriage as long as possible, but when further delay is impossible, she visits the temple of Isis to pray for help (9.766-81). The goddess responds to her petition by transforming Iphis into a man, and the newly male Iphis happily marries his beloved Ianthe (9.782-97).

This result is unambiguously positive for both the speaker and the beneficiary of the appeal. The responding deity, Isis, grants Telethusa and Iphis exactly what they desire, and unlike most other metamorphoses that result from prayers, Iphis' transformation into a man gains the youth a position of greater power after the transformation.[342] As with a number of prayers previously discussed, the actual request

---

[342] Caenis and Mestra (at least in her initial transformation into a fisherman) also become

portion of Telethusa's prayer is rather vague. At 9.773-81, while clutching Isis' statue, she says:

> "Isi Paraetonium Mareoticaque arva Pharonque
> quae colis, et septem digestum in cornua Nilum:
> fer, precor," inquit "opem, nostroque medere timori!
> te, dea, te quondam tuaque haec insignia vidi
> cunctaque cognovi, sonitum comitesque facesque[343]
> sistrorum, memorique anima tua iussa notavi.
> quod videt haec lucem, quod non ego punior, ecce
> consilium munusque tuum est. miserere duarum
> auxilioque iuva!"

> "Isis, you who inhabit Paraetonium, the Mareotic fields, and Pharos, and the Nile divided into seven branches: I pray, bring help," she said " and cure our fear! You, goddess, you and these symbols of yours I once saw and I recognized them all, the retinue, the torches, and the sound of the sistra, and I observed your commands with a mindful heart. The fact that this girl sees daylight, that I am not punished, look, is your counsel and your gift. Pity the two of us, and help with aid!"

Iphis certainly would like to become male (9.743-44), but that is not what Telethusa actually requests. Telethusa's prayer contains four requests: first, the general request *fer opem*, which is then refined by a more specific, but still rather vague plea to cure their fear (*nostro medere timori*). After providing arguments to convince Isis to help, Telethusa caps off the prayer with the twofold request to pity her and her daughter (*miserere*

---

men.

[343] This line is corrupt, perhaps from a line which has dropped out, cf. Kenney 2011: on 8.777-78. Regardless of the exact text, the sense is certainly that Telethusa is reminding Isis of the goddess' previous appearance to her.

duarum) and, again to help, this time with the phrase *auxilio iuva*. We can note further that there is a chiastic pattern in these requests—the first begs for help with two words (*fer opem*); the second request employs a verb beginning with "m" (*medere*) and references the two beneficiaries of the prayer (*nostro*); the third request again uses a verb beginning with "m" (*miserere*) and references the two beneficiaries (*duarum*); the sequence then closes with a two-word plea for help (*auxilio iuva*). And if we wish to be even more exact: imperative verb (*fer*); noun meaning help (*opem*); reference to the beneficiaries (*nostro*); verb beginning with "m" (*medere*); verb beginning with "m" (*miserere*); reference to the beneficiaries (*duarum*); noun meaning help (*auxilio*); imperative verb (*iuva*). While Telethusa's requests are more numerous than those in other prayers for help, they are not especially detailed, by which I mean she never directly asks for Iphis to become a man. Instead, she merely asks the goddess to bring help, to cure their fear, and to pity them. Elsewhere in the poem, deities often respond to the words spoken in a petition in a way that does not fulfill the speaker's intention. The opposite is true in the case of Telethusa's prayer, however. Her unspecific plea for help might provide an opportunity for Isis to respond in a way that would technically fulfill the request, but not Telethusa's desire. Imagining an alternative response by the goddess is slightly more strained in this instance than some others, but since Telethusa here

primarily seems to fear her husband's retribution and promise to kill a female child (9.779-80) (as opposed to Iphis whose primary desire is to marry Ianthe),[344] we could imagine Isis canceling the marriage. Instead, however, the goddess recognizes Telethusa's and Iphis's unvoiced desire and provides them with the optimal solution to their dilemma. The fear Telethusa requests to be cured (*nostro medere timori*) is explicitly resolved at the transformation as the narrator commands (9.792): *nec timida gaudete fide*!

While the actual request is unspecific, the success of Telethusa's prayer still may, in part, be attributed to the way it is constructed. Many prayers in the poem only employ a selection of the common components of cultic Roman prayer, whereas Telethusa's contains every element, especially the critical "argument" portion. Telethusa's petition invokes the deity, Isis, immediately (*Isi* 9.773), then distinguishes the goddess more specifically in a relative clause that includes her haunts (9.773-74), and makes a request that includes the recipients (*fer, precor, opem, <u>nostro</u>que medere timori!* 9.775). Telethusa then expands the prayer by listing further information that identifies Isis, and

---

[344] Iphis laments that not even the crafty Daedalus could save her, and asks about him (9.743-44): *quid faciet? num me puerum de virgine doctis/ artibus afficiet? num te mutabit, Ianthe?* These questions reveal Iphis would have been equally satisfied with her own transformation and Ianthe's.

also by stressing her personal connection to the goddess and her worship through the use of first-person verbs, which begins to create the "argument" portion of a prayer (*vidi, cognovi* 9.776-78). This argument continues as Telethusa reminds Isis of her obedience to the goddess and her past favors (9.778-80).[345] The prayer closes by repeating (in different words) the request and again identifying the specific recipients of the prayer as Telethusa and her daughter Iphis (*miserere duarum/ auxilioque iuva!* 9.780-81).

The particular phrasing of Telethusa's requests also echoes language of the promise Isis had earlier made to her in a dream, further reminding the goddess why she should help Telethusa. Before Iphis was born, the goddess appeared and instructed Telethusa not to obey her husband's command to kill their child if it was born a girl. She also assured Telethusa (9.699-701):

> "dea sum auxiliaris opemque
> exorata fero; nec te coluisse quereris
> ingratum numen."
>
> I am the goddess who assists, and when prayed to I bring help; nor will you complain that you have worshiped an unappreciative divinity.

Telethusa repeats a great deal of this vocabulary in her prayer to Isis, thereby reminding the goddess of her past promise to help and building a case for why the deity should

---

[345] Hickson (1993: 11) states that this type of argument, "based on past deeds of piety performed by the supplicant and previous favors granted by the divinity," is purely literary, not part of prayer in actual Roman practice.

respond favorably to her entreaty (*dea* 699, *dea* 776; *auxiliaris* 699, *auxilio* 781; *opem fero* 699-700, *fer opem* 775; *coluisse* 700, *colis* 774). Isis' assertion that she helps when prayed to (*opem exorata fero*) is especially notable and foreshadows Telethusa's subsequent plea. Additionally, the language may signal to the reader to concentrate on how Isis' response compares to other deities who answer *fer opem* prayers. Her use of the same terminology that mortals themselves use perhaps suggests her greater sympathy and understanding of mortal concerns.

In addition to including the key content elements of a cultic prayer, Telethusa also closely follows cultic practice in both the formulation of her language and her accompanying action. First, she employs the hymnic 'du-Stil' (*quae colis … te … te … tua*).[346] Furthermore, she combines her speech with ritual action as she grasps the goddess' altar (*passis aram complexa capillis* 9.772).[347] Iphis continues her ritually proper behavior upon the fulfillment of her prayer as well by offering a dedication to the responding deity, which ensures her future happiness and success (9.792-97). This can be contrasted with the behavior of Hippomenes, who fails to thank Venus properly for her

---

[346] On the 'du-Stil' in cultic hymns see Norden (1913: 143-63) and Bremer–Furley (2001).

[347] Lateiner (2009: 138) notes that Telethusa and Iphis perform gestures that indicate desperation when they take off their fillets, unbind their hair, and grasp the altar. See Appel (1909: 203) on the religious significance of unbound hair.

help, and is punished as a result (10.643-704). Iphis, on the other hand, thanks the goddess in a succinct dedication (9.793-94), affirming the newly transformed man's piety and suitability to receive the god's beneficence.

To return to the possible reasons for the success of Telethusa's prayer, the identity of the responding deity may also play a role. The choice of Isis as the responding deity is especially noticeable when compared to the story of Leucippus that survives in Antoninus Liberalis, where Leto is the goddess to transform Iphis (17).[348] Presumably, Ovid's story of Iphis reworks the same Hellenistic source that Antoninus summarizes, but Ovid's version contains a number of differences, including renaming all the characters and the substitution of Leto for Isis.[349] The purpose of assigning this role to Isis has been explained various ways. Anderson notes that the story in Antoninus Liberalis is an aetiology for a specific ritual at a shrine of Leto's on Crete (Leto Φυτίη), and implies that Ovid wanted to distance his story from the "un-Roman practice" described in Antoninus

---

[348] Ἡ δε Λητὼ συνεχῶς ὀδυρομένην καὶ ἱκετεύουσαν ᾤκτειρε τὴν Γαλατειαν καὶ μετέβαλε τὴν φύσιν τῆς παιδὸς εἰς κόρον; Leto took pity on Galataea because of her unremitting lamenting and supplicating and changed the sex of the child into a boy.

[349] See Wheeler (1997: 190-91) for an argument justifying the comparison of certain details in Antoninus Liberalis and Ovid. He also identifies various elements that differ in the two versions and explores in particular why Ovid changes the names of his characters (Leucippus becomes Iphis, Galataea becomes Telethusa, and Lamprus becomes Ligdus) (91-202).

Liberalis.[350] He furthermore claims that Ovid selected "a deity outside the Greco-Roman pantheon who was not tarnished by the usual sub-human associations he gives gods." Here Anderson hits upon an interesting point—that Ovid's choice of a foreign goddess provides an opportunity to compare her characterization with his depiction of the more traditional pantheon, a point to which I will return shortly.[351] Ahl (somewhat unconvincingly) argues that Iphis is transformed by Isis because she is the "horned goddess" and Iphis becomes "horned in a rather more phallic way."[352] Graf locates the source of Ovid's decision in actual Roman cultic practice and religious belief, noting that the cult of Leto Φυτίη was insignificant in the Roman world, whereas Isis was viewed as an important protector of women.[353]

This perception of Isis as particularly beneficial for women is surely operative here, and the success of the appeal is perhaps also intended to characterize Isis as a particularly sympathetic or beneficial goddess. As noted above, Isis is especially benevolent to Telethusa and Iphis, since she discerns their wish for Iphis to become male without them explicitly voicing it in their prayer. Additionally, it may be worth noting

---

[350] 1972: on 9.666-797.

[351] I would also contend that Ovid's depiction of the traditional pantheon is not as uniformly negative as Anderson's comment implies.

[352] 1985: 153.

[353] 1988: 60-61.

that unlike in the story of Achelous and Perimele, the desires of the speaker (Telethusa) and the beneficiary (Iphis) align. Their intimacy not only as family members but also as members of the same status (i.e. mortal, female) helps to account for their identical wishes.

Isis' ability to discern these specifically female, mortal wishes may additionally be influenced by her previous identity as Io within the poem.[354] When Isis first appears to Telethusa, she is described as the daughter of Inachus (*Inachis* 9.687). This nomenclature refers us back to the story of Io, narrated in Book One, which concludes with her transformation into the goddess Isis (*nunc dea linigera colitur celeberrima turba* 1.747). Isis' former lower statuses may enable her better to understand human concerns. While technically Io was never human, she occupied the status positions just above and just below humans, nymph and animal respectively. Nymphs, while distinct from humans, are transitional figures and difficult to locate within the cosmological hierarchy. In an excellent discussion of the obstacles to distinguishing Greek nymphs from heroines, Larson emphasizes the ambiguity of the Greek word νύμφη as applicable to both minor divinities and any nubile woman.[355] Ovid seems to capitalize on this ambiguity in a

---

[354] Newlands 2005: 488.
[355] Larson 2001: 3.

number of the rape narratives, and actions of pursued nymphs do not appear to differ in any substantial way from mortal women.[356] The status of nymphs is further complicated by the question of their immortality, since ancient authors are not consistent about whether or not nymphs are ultimately mortal.[357] Nonetheless, it is clear that nymphs occupied a status distinct from mortals, both in Greek thought and in Ovid's poem. Larson points to a fragment of Hesiod (Hes. fr. 304) that identifies nymphs' lifespan as many generations longer than humans, situating their mortality between humans and gods.[358] Similarly, Jupiter describes nymphs as among the *semidei* at the beginning of the *Metamorphoses* (*sunt mihi semidei, sunt rustica numina, nymphae/ faunique satyrique et monticolae silvani;* 1.192-95). In this way nymphs seem to occupy an intermediate status between mortal and divine. Isis' former identity as the nymph Io may, in turn, lend her a greater ability to mediate between the concerns of mortals and gods.

Newlands also argues that Ovid's positive depiction of Isis corrects Vergil's depiction of Egyptian gods as monstrous on Aeneas' shield in the *Aeneid* (8.698-700).[359]

---

[356] Curran (1978: 230-32) argues that nymphs in Ovid's narrative resemble the heroines of Roman history in their devotion to virginity. He contrasts this with their usual sexual nature, and claims that Ovid's reversal shows even the most sexualized women do not want to be raped.
[357] Larson 2001: 4.
[358] Larson 2001: 29-30.
[359] Newlands 2005: 488.

She notes that, like Vergil, Ovid at first emphasizes the foreignness of the goddess, and describes her companion, Anubis, with the same distinctive word (*latrator*) Vergil had used. This connects Ovid's scene to Vergil's, but then Ovid separates his depiction by characterizing Isis as especially beneficial. Newlands suggests that the positive portrayal of Isis not only dispels the bias against Egyptian deities, but also provocatively dissociates the compassionate deity from the Olympian pantheon.

This interpretation aligns well with Anderson's point that Isis' beneficence may be contrastive with other deities in the work. Throughout the work the frequent prayers constitute a motif that encourages us to compare and contrast both the prayers themselves and divine responses to them, such that there is an implicit comparison being drawn between Isis and all other deities who respond to prayers in the work. Through verbal reminiscences, the narrative also invites us to compare Isis' beneficence with the behavior of two gods who are not responding to prayers—Apollo and Jupiter. When Isis appears in a dream to Telethusa, she describes herself as *auxiliaris* and furthermore states *opem fero* (9.699-700). This is reminiscent of Apollo's description of himself to Daphne as *opifer* (1.521). In that episode, Apollo's epithet is shown to be ironic as Apollo endangers Daphne, and she therefore uses the phrase *fer opem* to request rescue from the god who is supposed to be *opifer*. In the Iphis episode, on the other hand, the goddess's

epithet is shown to be accurate, since she brings help to the speaker of the prayer. There may be another hint of this contrast between Apollo and Isis in the way Telethusa phrases her prayer. She requests not only that Isis bring help, but also that she heal their fear (*nostroque medere timori* 9.775). While Isis' own connection to healing is well attested,[360] this could also evoke Apollo's familiar role as healer, a task that he mentions in the same line that he identifies himself as *opifer* (*inventum medicinia meum est, opiferque per orbem/ dicor*; healing is my invention and I am called the one who brings help throughout the world 1.152-53). Apollo describes himself as inventing healing and bringing help, but instead induces fear and causes Daphne to seek help. This contrasts sharply with Isis, who heals fear and actually brings help to distressed women.

There may also be a contrast between Isis and Jupiter implied in Isis' promise to Telethusa that she will not complain to have worshiped a thankless deity (*nec te coluisse quereris/ ingratum numen* 9.700-1). When Callisto is transformed into a bear, she laments (*asiduoque suos gemitu testata dolores* 2.486) and considers Jupiter a thankless deity (*ingratumque Iovem, nequeat cum dicere, sensit* 2.488). *ingratum numen* in Isis' speech closely parallels the description *ingratum Iovem* in the Callisto episode, in both

---

[360] Diod. Sic. 1.25.3-5; Aelius Aristides *Or.* 26.105, 27.39, 36.124; Alvar 2008: 328-29; Dunand 2006; Frankfurter 1998: 46-52; Malaise 1980: 108-9; Griffiths 1975: 166.

cases employed at the verse-opening. Callisto is not technically able to voice her complaint, since she has lost the ability to speak, but her groans indicate lamentation (*adsiduoque suos gemitu testata dolores* 2.486, corresponding to Isis' mention of complaint with *quereris* at 9.700), and the narrator provides insight into Callisto's grievances. It is furthermore salient that immediately before the narrator describes Callisto's perception of Jupiter's thanklessness, Callisto has lifted her arms to the sky in a gesture of prayer (*qualescumque manus ad caelum et sidera tollit* 2.487). Although unable to voice her prayer, Callisto nonetheless perceives Jupiter as *ingratus*. When Telethusa beseeches Isis, on the other hand, the goddess is shown not to be *ingrata*, just as she had promised.

Contrasting Apollo and Jupiter's behavior towards women with Isis' treatment reveals the goddess to be far more beneficial. The characterization of the two Olympian gods throughout the epic in relation to humanity generally, rather than to women specifically, is a more complicated question, but there can be no doubt that Isis' behavior towards Iphis is more sympathetic than Apollo's towards Daphne (which results in Daphne's appeal for help to another god) or Jupiter's towards Callisto (and notably also Io). The contrast is not as simple as a negative characterization of Apollo and Jupiter on the one hand, and a positive characterization of Isis on the other. The question of how

both Apollo and Jupiter are characterized throughout the poem has evoked varied responses, especially because the way in which these gods are portrayed has potential political implications.[361] Regardless of Apollo and Jupiter's overall characterization, the particular overlapping vocabulary in both the Daphne episode and the Callisto episode emphasizes the gods' lack of helpfulness in contradistinction to Isis. Additionally, if any sort of positive characterization of either Apollo or Jupiter can be gleaned, it cannot be straightforward. In the Apollo and Daphne episode, for instance, the text explicitly encourages us to consider how ambivalent Daphne's eventual fate is when it is noted that other rivers are unsure whether to congratulate or console her father (1.577-82). Similarly, in the Callisto episode, Juno seems to interpret Callisto's catasterism as a sign of honor (*honoratas* 2.515), but Jupiter seems to be trying to prevent the pollution of Arcas killing his mother (*pariterque ipsosque nefasque/ sustulit* 2.505-6) rather than specifically honoring the woman (who remains in the form of a bear, eternally on the verge of being shot by her son's arrow). As with Daphne's transformation, it is unclear exactly how beneficial Callisto's catasterism can be from her own point of view, especially since Juno exacts a further 'punishment' of keeping Callisto from ever dipping

---

[361] For a survey of political readings see Myers (1999); Habinek (2002); Miller (2009); Feldherr (2010). See also Conclusion pgs. 232-35.

into the ocean (2.527-31). The contrast between Apollo/Jupiter and Isis is therefore not merely negative versus positive, but complex versus simple. The implications of this contrast are potentially subversive, since the established order of male Olympian gods is shown to be more detrimental to humans (or at least to women) than is a female, Egyptian deity, whose foreignness is clearly marked in the text (9.689-94, 9.773-74, 9.777-78).[362] Isis' behavior highlights the potential for an alternative model of divine/ human interaction that is more unambiguously positive from a human perspective.

The episode additionally invites an interesting comparison between the mortal, male figure Ligdus and the female, divine figure Isis, as Telethusa must decide whose commands to follow. The two mutually exclusive commands are described with the same word (*monuit* of Ligdus 9.674; *monuit* of Isis 9.701), emphasizing the difficult choice Telethusa must make between executing her duty to her husband and obeying the goddess. Telethusa's successful prayer to Isis may also be contrasted with her

---

[362] Ramsby (2007: 137-39) argues that Isis is the responding deity in order to show that the newly emerging Roman political and social elite under Augustus may come from sectors of society that have traditionally had less power (foreigners and women). She supports Raval's view that elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses* male transvestitism is a metaphor for political agency, because men are emasculated in comparison to Augustus' overwhelming political power (Raval 2000: 170). Ramsby therefore concludes that female transvestitism (and transformation into a position of greater power) must show acquisition of political agency. This possibility is certainly intriguing, but the allegory seems too specific to be fully convincing.

unsuccessful pleas to her husband at 9.682-83 (*sed tamen usque suum vanis Telethusa maritum/ sollicitat precibus*). Telethusa's "correct" choice to follow the goddess' commands and the subsequent positive outcome of her prayer to Isis reinforce the proper order within the cosmological hierarchy (i.e. female mortal, male mortal, divinity).

III. MYSCELUS

The final instance of the plea *fer opem* in the *Metamorphoses* occurs in a prayer by Myscelus to Hercules near the beginning of Book Fifteen in a story that answers Numa's question of who founded the city of Croton, "a Grecian city on Italian soil" (*Graia quis Italicis auctor posuisset in oris* 15.9).[363] One day while Myscelus of Argos is asleep, Hercules visits him in a dream and commands him to leave Argos and seek the river Aesar (15.20-22b). He also makes a number of fearful threats should Myscelus not obey him (15.24). Argos' laws punish anyone who changes his citizenship with death, and so when Myscelus awakes he is unsure whether to follow Hercules' instructions or the laws of his city (15.27-29). The next night, Hercules appears again and gives the same commands, but with even greater threats (15.30-33). Now thoroughly afraid of the god,

[363] See Knox (1986: 66-67); Barchiesi (1989: 76) on anachronism in this episode; Myers (1994a: 136-37); Feeney (1999: 22-24); Wheeler (1999: 127-28, 2000: 114); Barchiesi (2001a: 63, 71); O'Hara (2007: 123). See also Wheeler (1999: 196-97) and Hardie (1997: 195-98) on cultural translation and the implications of relating this Greek foundation story in the "Roman" portion of the epic.

Myscelus prepares to leave and found a new city, but the citizens of Argos bring him to trial for his crime (15.34-36). After the prosecution makes its case and shows Myscelus is clearly guilty (15.36-37), the defendant prays to Hercules for help as follows (15.39-40):

> "o cui ius caeli bis sex fecere labores,
> fer, precor," inquit "opem! nam tu mihi criminis auctor."
>
> "You to whom twice six labors gave the power of heaven, help, I pray! For you are the one responsible for my crime."

The citizens of Argos are to vote by placing either a black or white pebble into an urn; black pebbles indicate guilty, whereas white indicate innocent. The citizens unanimously vote that Myscelus is guilty, but Hercules transforms all the black pebbles into white ones, and so Myscelus is acquitted (15.41-48). After thanking Hercules, he sets sail and successfully founds the city of Croton on the banks of the Aesar (15.48-57).

As we have seen, the non-specific plea for help *fer opem* has the potential to be interpreted differently by the speaker and recipient of the prayer, but for Myscelus, Hercules effectively perceives the intention of his plea, and enacts a beneficial transformation. Myscelus does not specifically request that the pebbles be turned white (or that he be voted innocent), but merely asks Hercules to bring help, and Hercules offers a type of help that corresponds to Myscelus' own definition of help. Given that Hercules wants Myscelus to found Croton, it seems inevitable that Myscelus' prayer

would be successful, but the prayer is still an important narrative choice on Ovid's part. He easily could have narrated this same story without a prayer at all, for instance portraying Hercules intervening of his own volition rather than because of a prayer. Ovid not only makes Myscelus' acquittal the result of his request, but also provides the formulation of the prayer in direct speech, repeating the key phrase *fer opem*. This encourages us to compare the outcome of Myscelus' prayer to pleas for help throughout the work, which in turn allows us to observe that Myscelus' prayer is particularly successful.

One possible reason for Myscelus' success may be the form of the prayer itself, as it contains all of the requisite components of cultic prayer, especially an "argument," which is lacking in all the poem's least beneficial prayers. First, Myscelus identifies the god (in solemn, weighty spondees) with a relative clause providing specific identifying information (*o cui ius caeli bis sex fecere labores* 15.39). Next, he makes his request (*fer opem* 15.40), and finally provides the "argument" for why Hercules should help him, namely that Hercules is responsible for Myscelus' trouble (*nam tu mihi criminis auctor* 15.40).

Another factor that may influence the success of the prayer may be the identity of

the recipient, Hercules. Like Isis, Hercules was deified rather than born as a god.[364] His former status as a human (even if a rather exceptional human) may decrease the disjunction between divine and human interpretation seen elsewhere and give him a better understanding of Myscelus' request. Myscelus' address explicitly reminds Hercules of his former mortal status by describing how he gained entry into heaven (*o cui ius caeli bis sex fecere labores* 15.40). Similarly, after Hercules fulfills the prayer, the description of Myscelus' offering of thanks to him points to Hercules' human parentage (*grates agit ille parenti/ Amphitryonidae* 15.49), rather than the divine parentage that had characterized him in earlier in the episode (*Iove natus* 15.12).

The choice to make Hercules responsible for Myscelus' journey to Croton is an Ovidian innovation. The foundation of the city Croton is most commonly attributed to Myscelus, but Croton and Hercules are also attested as founding figures.[365] Berman has discussed how Ovid's version of the story manages to incorporate all three of these competing founding figures into a cohesive narrative.[366] Hercules visits the hero Croton on his journey back to Greece with Geryon's cattle and predicts a famous city of Croton's

---

[364] His deification is narrated at 9.239-72.

[365] Croton in Heraclides Lembos 68 and *Schol.* Theocr. *Idylls* 4.32; Hercules in Iamblichus *Vita Pythagorae* 50. The hero also predicts Croton's future greatness at Diod. Sic. 4.24. Cf. Hall 2008: 399.

[366] 2017: 42-46.

descendants. The deified Hercules then later commands Myscelus to found the city, which he does at the site of Croton's bones, such that all three figures are integrated into the foundation story. Ovid furthermore points to these competing versions through the particular wording of Myscelus' prayer, which describes Hercules as *auctor* (15.40). Knox notes that when Numa is described as seeking the identity of Croton's founder (*Graia quis Italicis auctor posuisset in oris/ moenia* 15.9-10), the word *auctor* translates the Greek term κτιστής.[367] The repetition of the same word, *auctor*, applied to Hercules 31 lines later highlights Ovid's use of and reference to multiple foundation stories. In Diodorus Siculus' account of Hercules' visit to Croton,[368] Hercules accidentally kills Croton, whereupon he holds a funeral and erects a tomb for him. He subsequently prophesies a future famous city bearing the slain man's name. This prophecy is similar to Ovid's story, but in Ovid's narrative any violence is notably absent. In other versions where Myscelus is oikist, he founds the city because of a Delphic oracle, not at Hercules' command.[369] The most comprehensive version is found at Diodorus Siculus 8.17.

---

[367] 1986: 67; *TLL* 2.1204.66-05.4.

[368] 4.24.

[369] Cf. Hardie 2015: on 15.12-59. Hippys 554 *FGrHist* 1; Antiochus 555 *FGrHist* 10; Skymnos 323-25; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae* 2.59.3; Strabo 6.1.12; *Schol.* Aristophanes *Nubes* 371; *Equites* 1091; Herodian 188.26; Arcadius 54.13; Stephanus of Byzantium *s.v.* Syracuse; *Suda s.v.* Archias, Myskellos; Ps.-Lactantius Placidus *Fab. Ov.* 15.1; Eustathius *ad* Dionysius the Periegete 369; Solinus 2.10.

Myscelus consults the oracle about bearing children, and the priestess affirms that he is dear to Apollo and will bear children, but first must found Croton (τόδε δὲ πρότερόν σε κελεύει,οἰκῆσαί σε Κρότωνα μέγαν καλαῖς ἐν ἀρούραις). When he does not understand the reference to Croton, Myscelus asks the oracle again, and this time receives a response directly from Apollo, who gives him directions to Croton. Myscelus instead wishes to found a city at Sybaris, but receives yet another oracle commanding him to establish Croton (παρὲκ θεοῦ ἄλλα ματεύων κλαύματα μαστεύεις· δῶρον δ᾽ ὃ διδῷ θεὸς αἴνει). Ovid engages with this historical tradition in a number of respects (for instance, by the insistence that Myscelus passes by Sybaris (*praeterit Sybarin* 15.51)),[370] but most relevant for our purposes is his substitution of the Delphic oracle for Hercules' commands. In Ovid's version the Delphic oracle is replaced by a direct appeal to a deity. This creates a sort of ring composition with the first plea for help in the poem, which replaces a direct appeal to a deity with a Delphic oracle. In the first *fer opem* prayer of the poem, Deucalion and Pyrrha seek the advice of the (future) Delphic oracle (then held by Themis), whereas traditionally they appeal to Zeus; then in the last *fer opem* prayer of the

---

[370] Hardie (2015: on 15.12-59) draws attention to the intriguing correspondence between Hercules' reception by Croton in Ovid, his reception by Molorchus in Callimachus, and by Evander in Vergil, cf. Schmitzer (1990: 252-53); Hardie (1997: 184, 196). On various other influences on this episode see Knox (1986: 68-70). See also Myers (1994a: 136-37) on Ovid's engagement with anachronism and poetic fiction.

poem Myscelus makes a direct appeal to Hercules, whereas traditionally he receives advice from the Delphic oracle. The first and last appeals for help therefore both manipulate the tradition, first by adding an oracle where one is *not* expected and then by omitting an oracle where one *is* expected. Wheeler speculates that Myscelus' piety (*illius dis acceptissimus aevi* 15.20) may be an echo of Deucalion.[371] If so, this may reinforce the connection between the two episodes, and support the view that Myscelus' prayer acts as a sort of closural device, repeating the first narrative appeal. Additionally, the description of Myscelus as favorable to the gods generalizes the more specific reference to Myscelus' dearness to Apollo in particular found in Diodorus Siculus (φιλεῖ σ' ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων). I do not mean to say that Ovid directly alludes to Diodorus Siculus, rather just to note that Ovid elides any connection between Myscelus and Apollo specifically. He thus makes a figure outside the Olympian order responsible for a favorable response to the mortal's prayer, while avoiding any direct mention of the Olympian god typically associated with the episode.

Finally, Myscelus' gender seems to influence the outcome of his prayer, since women are more commonly the victims of bodily transformation. Perhaps unsurprisingly given the poem's theme, all instances of the prayer *fer opem* addressed to gods result in a

---

[371] 2000: 115.

metamorphosis (Deucalion and Pyrrha = rocks into humans, Daphne into laurel, Arethusa into a spring, Anius' daughters into doves, Acis into water, Perimele into an island, Telethusa = female Iphis into male Iphis, Myscelus = black pebbles into white pebbles), but only Myscelus and Deucalion and Pyrrha escape with their own bodies. This suggests that gender influences how prayers for help are answered—women undergo corporeal transformations, whereas men are allowed changes to their external circumstances. Although Pyrrha is female, her prayer is spoken jointly with her husband, and therefore may be treated as male speech to some degree. Acis is a male whose body is transformed, but the entire episode consciously manipulates and destabilizes gender expectations, and may therefore be seen as an exception.[372] The similarity in other respects between the episodes of Iphis and Myscelus is especially instructive concerning the gendered nature of even favorable responses to petitions. The basic plot of Myscelus' story shares a number of resemblances to the story of Iphis, discussed above. A god (Isis and Hercules, respectively) appears in a dream and commands a human (Telethusa and Myscelus) to disobey someone else's orders (Ligdus and Argos) and follow divine orders instead. When the mortals obey the divinities, this brings them into peril and so they request help with the general plea *fer opem*. Finally, both deities are given thanks for their

---

[372] See pgs. 148-65.

beneficence. These numerous points of contact spotlight one particular way in which the two stories are patently different—Iphis experiences a physical metamorphosis, whereas Myscelus does not. Even when a divinely enacted transformation is unambiguously beneficial, a woman's body is transformed, while a male can receive a change to his surroundings or circumstances.

These two stories, along with that of Deucalion and Pyrrha, contribute evidence that an appeal's effectiveness is influenced especially by the three factors which we have examined throughout: the formal construction of the prayer, the gender of involved members, and their cosmological status. The comparison of these unambiguously successful appeals to other prayers for help with less clearly beneficial results supports the conclusion that Ovid portrays a plea's particular wording and formal construction (especially including an "argument" component) as relevant to its outcome. Furthermore, such a comparison shows the gendered nature of responses to prayers—female beneficiaries typically fare less well than male ones; and even in positive overall circumstances, women experience corporeal transformations, which implies a certain inherent danger or disadvantage for female bodies. Interestingly, despite their "inferior" gender, goddesses are portrayed as more sympathetic than male divinities to understanding mortal demands (particularly those of mortal women), but may still

experience limited success in granting appeals depending on their position vis-à-vis other actors in the episode. Finally, the cosmological status of all members present in an interaction may impact a prayer's result. For instance, a lesser divinity's response may be restrained by the involvement of a more powerful deity. The unambiguously positive responses to prayer in this chapter reveal a further qualification about cosmological status—that non-Olympian deities produce the most successful results. The possible broader implications of these conclusions, both thematically and politically, will be addressed in greater detail in the following chapter.

CONCLUSION

Throughout the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid establishes a network of interconnected episodes involving prayers. We are invited to compare and contrast these, and especially to appreciate the links within a subset of appeals—those for aid. These pleas for help serve as a locus to highlight and explore the consequences of power inequalities. As petitions result in varying degrees of success for their beneficiaries based on the status differential between individuals involved in the episode, they draw attention to systems of power, especially gender and position within the cosmological hierarchy. In addition to these two influences on a prayer's success, the formal construction of an appeal and the way language is employed in the prayer itself can have an impact on its relative benefit. When we view pleas for help and their results in terms of these three bases of power—gender, cosmological status, and language—a number of broader thematic and political implications come to the fore. The cosmogony in Book One sets up power inequality both as a defining feature of the universe and as an important theme of the *Metamorphoses*. As the initial chaos of the fledgling universe is brought to order, entities are separated according to a decidedly hierarchical scheme (1.5-88).[373] As Pintabone

[373] Pintabone (1998: 20-28) details the observations on hierarchy and the cosmogony which follow.

describes, "It is from this beginning that Ovid shows a constant imposition of order through the demonstration of the hierarchy of powers in the universe."[374] At first elements struggle against each other (*obstabatque aliis aliud, quia corpore in uno/ frigida pugnabat calidis, umentia siccis,/ mollia cum duris, sine pondere, habentia pondus* 1.18-20) in an undistinguished mass (*indigesta moles* 1.7), until land, sea, and sky are split into categories, as are the heavens and atmosphere (1.21-23).[375] Once things are separated, they are bound in their individual places (*dissociata locis concordi pace ligavit* 1.25). This spatial designation (*locis*) is important for the concept of a hierarchy, since everything and everyone is assigned to a separate place; these allocations are presented as tiered (1.26-31, e.g. *summa, proximus, ultima*), a hierarchical model that continues when Jupiter discusses the spatial separation of gods of different ranks (*plebs habitat diversa locis* 1.173). The language of the cosmogony is charged with the exercise of authority, as

---

[374] 1998: 20. O'Hara (2007: 105) also notes that the first four lines of the poem reveal "the kinds of questions of power and authority that will recur throughout the poem." He especially considers the inconsistency about whether the motivation for Ovid's poetic theme stems from his own mind or divine will (105-7). Feeney (1991: 189-90, 194-95) likewise addresses the importance of control and categorization in the opening of the epic, for instance observing at 189, "It is highly significant that there is a good measure of control and direction behind Ovid's evolving universe," and at 190, "the element of control (however qualified) is indispensable to Ovid's conception of the nature of metamorphosis."

[375] On the *deus et melior natura* (1.21) who delineates categories, see Feeney (1991: 189-90); Myers (1994a: 43, 43 n. 53); O'Hara (2007: 108-9).

the deity responsible for the ordering of the universe (*quisquis fuit ille deorum* 1.32) specifically commands both elements of the natural world and man to assume their known forms (*iussit* 1.37, 43, 86), a verb that implies unequal power relations. Similarly, spatial distinction, power, and status are central to the language describing living beings (1.72-88). The stars and forms of gods hold the heavens, the sea is occupied by fish, the land by beasts, and the air by birds (1.73-75); the syntax of these lines reflects the status differential, as the occupants of higher status are the subject of their clause (*tenent…formae deorum* 1.73), whereas lesser beings are dative and accusative (*piscibus* 1.74, *feras*, *volucres* 1.75). When humans enter the picture, they are defined precisely by their control over animals (*dominari* 1.77). At the same time, they are marked as lesser than gods through receiving orders (*iussit* 1.86), and through the gods' even greater status as ruler of everything (*moderantum cuncta deorum* 1.83).[376] The attention paid to power inequality in the ordering of the universe persists throughout the epic, and the "uses and abuses of power," as Newlands describes it, are a central theme in the work.[377]

The alleged separation of the categories established in the first cosmogony is

---

[376] For an alternate view, that metamorphosis into an animal is not degradation and apotheosis is not an ascension in status in the poem, see Solodow (1988: 190-92). On the intermediary position of humans see Feeney (1991: 194): "Being human is living in suspension between the divine and the inanimate or animal."
[377] 2005: 480.

immediately and continually problematized, however.[378] Classifications are challenged not only by frequent metamorphoses that change an individual's or object's category,[379] but also by the cataclysmic destruction of the earth, first in flood (1.253-347), then in fire (2.201-313), and in subsequent recreations (1.348-437, 2.401-8).[380] Even more immediately, in the introduction of mankind, the narrator introduces the problematic question of whether the first humans shared in the divine substance of their creator or were made from the earth, which still retained an ethereal element (1.78-88).[381] This early discrepancy about the extent to which divinity and humanity are separate anticipates Ovid's concern with, as Feeney terms it, "the problem of how divine humanity is," and "the corollary…problem of how human divinity is." His analysis leads to the conclusion, "Gods are touched by 'human' emotions, but, in the end, they remain … for ever themselves, for ever exempt from the human standards of suffering and the mutability of suffering."[382] We shall return to the characterization of the gods, and the perception of

---

[378] Myers 1994a: 43-49; Wheeler 2000: 26, 29-47; Newlands 2005: 485-86; O'Hara 2007: 109; Feldherr 2010: 37-39.

[379] Cf. Segal 19978. On the tension between fixity and flux in metamorphoses see Feeney (1991: 190).

[380] Cf. Wheeler 2000: 23-47. Also Wheeler 1999: 32-33; Feeney 1991: 194-95.

[381] Feeney 1991: 194.

[382] Feeney 1991: 202.

their behavior as "human," or even "worse than human,"[383] but at present let us focus on the idea that the gods are exempt from human suffering. An analysis of appeals for help corroborates Feeney's interpretation with further nuance—gods are not just themselves exempt from human suffering, but appear rarely to understand it. Prayers for help show mortals at their most desperate moments, when they are without any other resource but to appeal to a higher power for assistance. Rather than either answering mortal petitions for help beneficially or ignoring them entirely, most divinities provide responses of ambiguous benefit. As we have seen in Chapters One and Two, Daphne, Syrinx, Cornix, Arethusa, Perimele, Anius' daughters, and Acis experience transformations of their bodies, which divert immediate physical harm or death, but are of otherwise dubious advantage. Frequently, gods technically fulfill a request, but not in the way the beneficiary desires. Divine response to mortal appeals therefore reveals a disconnect in the understanding between mortals and gods. Feeney has observed, "The depth of the gap between the two species is shown in a flash by an Ovidian example of their different languages. One of the divine dream-creatures in the House of Sleep has the job of imitating wild beasts, birds, and snakes (11.369). Humans, naturally, call him *Phobetor*, 'Terrifier'. To the gods, he is just something that looks like something else: they call him

[383] Hejduk 2009: 51.

Icelos, 'Resembler' (640)."[384] Divine responses to prayers often reinforce this sense that deities have different definitions than mortals, especially of "help," as they seem to interpret *fer opem* in ways the beneficiaries themselves would not choose.

This disparity between human and divine, or lack of divine sympathy, is not uniform, however. While gods may be exempt from human suffering themselves and also often oblivious to it, Ovid offers examples of communication from mortals to gods that succeed to varying degrees—divine incomprehension of mortal desires and divine lack of sympathy are not inevitable. Some of the factors that influence a petition's outcome are uncontrollable (the beneficiary's gender and cosmological status), but others can be controlled by the speaker (construction of the prayer, identity of the recipient). The way these various influences intersect creates a spectrum of results. The outcomes mostly lie outside the speaker's control, but the way she employs her language provides a degree of negotiating power and agency. The formal construction of the petition especially emphasizes the importance of the "argument" portion of an appeal for its success. Speakers who articulate clear reasons for a deity to respond favorably, namely Deucalion and Pyrrha, Arethusa, Mestra, Caenis, Telethusa, and Myscelus, experience comparatively more beneficial responses. Additionally, unspecific language in a request

---

[384] 1991: 202.

often results in misinterpretation by a divinity (the archetypal example being Daphne's request to *figuram perdere* (1.547) – see Chapter One), which highlights both the power of language and its potential for ambiguity. Ovidian gods evidently must answer prayers, but only according to the technical meaning of the words, not according to the speaker's intentions. This belief in the inherent power of words agrees with common Roman religious belief (see Introduction), but may gain additional significance in the context of poetry. Ovid shows language and the proper formulation of language as a means to negotiate with higher powers, a viewpoint that is particularly appropriate for an author. Additionally, the fact that prayers are so commonly misinterpreted, or interpreted differently than the speaker intends, may be another manifestation of the emphasis on multiple viewpoints/ interpretations that has been observed elsewhere in the text.[385] For instance, Diana's treatment of Actaeon (3.253-55) creates split opinion, and Pirithous and Lelex display differing reactions to Achelous' tale (8.611-19).[386] The frequency with which *fer opem* is interpreted differently from how a speaker intends also may lie within the purview of Tissol's conclusions about the function of witticism and wordplay, "After

---

[385] See O'Hara (2007: 113 n. 28) for bibliography on variously termed similar ideas (e.g. ambiguity, inconsistency, indeterminacy).
[386] Cf. Feeney 1991: 229-32; Feldherr 2002: 178; Newlands 2005: 480; Feldherr 2010, esp. 51-59 on Pirithous and182-83, 197-98 on multiple audiences (internal and external) in Actaeon's episode.

the sense of a word or phrase seems stable and complete, Ovidian wit introduces unexpected semantic perspectives, demanding a re-understanding of the expression, a new mental grasp on a text that demands interpretation, yet always suggests that our interpretations will never be stable or complete—a perfect figure of eternal change."[387] Ovid's appeals for aid highlight how the same words may elicit multiple interpretations, in effect repeating in miniature form what the poem as a whole does.

As regards the choice of an addressee, this controllable factor in a prayer's success displays even more surprising patterns than do the uncontrollable influences of the beneficiary's gender and cosmological status, which highlight (and perhaps critique) expected, existing power structures. One might assume that the most effective deities to address in a prayer are those at the top of the hierarchy, i.e. male, Olympian gods. Instead, the most successful prayers are answered by non-Olympian deities, a point to which I shall return in greater detail below; and it appears female beneficiaries are served better by female respondents. Most prayers for help result in the beneficiary's loss of voice, but Arethusa and Cornix, whose prayers are answered by goddesses (the Olympians Diana and Minerva), retain a voice (with the additional qualification that

---

[387] 1997: 215. Ovid's attention to language meaning different things to different groups may contribute to destabilizing the idea of an authoritative or definitive meaning.

Cornix's voice is avian, not human). Gender cannot be the sole differentiating factor, since Syrinx appeals to her sisters for help, and still undergoes a silencing transformation. In that case, the outcome appears to be influenced by the status of Syrinx's sisters as nymphs (as opposed to the higher-status Olympian deities Diana and Minerva). The other two female addressees are Galatea and Isis. Galatea's transformation of Acis into a spring is of somewhat ambiguous benefit, but most closely resembles Arethusa's transformation and has positive elements (See Chapter Two). Isis' transformation of Iphis is unambiguously beneficial (See Chapter Three). This greater understanding between female beneficiaries and respondents is just one of the ways in which Ovid draws attention to gender differences.

A number of discussions on gender politics have offered illuminating ways of thinking about the *Metamorphoses* and shown the way Ovid's text "clearly provokes a gendered reading."[388] Appeals for aid offer an additional avenue for contemplating the

---

[388] Quote from Sharrock (2002b: 95): "More than any other non-dramatic ancient poetry, male-authored as it overwhelmingly is, Ovid's work gives space to a female voice, in however problematic a manner, and to both male and female voices which reflect explicitly on their own gendered identity. It is also driven by a troubled relationship with the purveyors of Roman masculinity – the army, politics, Augustus, epic, and so on. Moreover, the poet par excellence of fluid identity clearly provokes a gendered reading." Cf. Myers 1999: 200-1. Various gendered readings of the *Metamorphoses* include: Cahoon 1990; Gamel 1990; Keuls 1990; Richlin 1990; Richlin 1992; C. Segal 1998; Raval 1998; Keith 1999b; Liveley 1999; Enterline 2000; Keith 2000; Fellner 2002;

politics of gender in the work, as prayers are clearly gendered—women not only require petitions for assistance from divinities more frequently, but receive different types of responses from men. Of the eleven prayers for help addressed to divinities in the work, one is spoken jointly by a man and woman (Deucalion and Pyrrha, 1.377-80); nine are made on behalf of women (Daphne, 1.546-47; Syrinx, 1.704; Cornix, 2.577; Arethusa, 5.618-20; Achelous' prayer for Perimele, 8.595-602; Mestra 8.850-51; Caenis, 12.201-3; Anius' daughters, 13.669; and Telethusa's prayer for Iphis, 9.773-81), eight of which have female speakers; and finally only two appeals belong solely to men on their own behalf (Acis 13.880-81 and Myscelus 15.39-40). Even including the two pleas for help directed to mortals, which are spoken by men (Mercury disguised as a shepherd, 2.699-701 and Pentheus, 3.719-20), women vastly outnumber men. Thus, while pleas for help are not exclusively a female phenomenon, they are a predominantly female one. Furthermore, the types of responses women receive differ from those which men receive. All female beneficiaries of prayer for help undergo corporeal transformations. In this way Ovid draws particular attention to women's difficult plight as a result of their inferior

---

Pintabone 2002; Raval 2002; Sharrock 2002a, Sharrock 2002b; Sharrock 2002c; Bischoff 2003; Menke 2003; Ormand 2005; Salzmann-Mitchell 2005a; Salzmann-Mitchell 2005b; Salzmann-Mitchell 2007; Keith 2008/09; Keith 2009; McAuley 2016, 114-66; James 2016.

status.[389] Women in the *Metamorphoses* are portrayed as occupying an inherently precarious position (Caenis' episode, for instance corroborates the intrinsic nature of the danger women face),[390] reinforced by their repeated need for divine assistance. Transformations of women's bodies work in tandem with the notion that the female is fluid and penetrable; an escape from danger for a woman must involve a change to the body itself.[391] Segal, for instance, discusses the association of the female body with passivity and the ideal male body with impenetrability. He finds in Ovid a subjection of both male and female bodies to arbitrary violence, and this is certainly true. Segal goes on to argue that anxiety about maintaining integrity of the body is played out through more frequent and gruesome violations of the male body (e.g. Actaeon, Pentheus, Marsyas).[392] But, I argue, change to the physical body *as a result of a petition for deliverance* is particularly associated with women (with the notable exception of Acis, who I argue is feminized by his transformation). The impression of women's inherent vulnerability is further strengthened by the frequency of rape in the poem. The

---

[389] See Myers (1999: 200-1) for a summary of the shift from assessing Ovid's sympathy towards women to the "symbolic function of women as sites of violence and violation" with attendant bibliography.
[390] Cf. Keith 2000: 82-85; Reed 2013: on 12.201-7; Sharrock 2002b: 97; Pintabone 2002: 275-76; Ormand 2005: 102 n. 5.
[391] Segal 1998.
[392] Segal 1998: 25-27.

prominence of rape and attempted rape in the poem is widely recognized,[393] as is the role of gods as aggressors in many of these scenes.[394] What has not been recognized, however, is the importance of prayer as a means of preventing rape—prayer is the feature that separates attempted rape from completed rape—it is the sole means of defense for women against aggressive male pursuit. Transformation has sometimes been observed as providing that protection,[395] and metamorphosis certainly constitutes a vital component of avoidance, but, significantly, these transformations are the result of prayer—focusing exclusively on metamorphosis elides an important step. Notably, women rely on their voices to gain a degree of agency, but never attain unmitigated success. When gods ultimately respond to their words, and offer assistance, their aid takes the form of corporeal changes to the women themselves.

Women's reliance on their voices to seek help against sexual violence gains additional relevance within the context of Roman ideas about female complicity in the crime of rape, both legally and in the social imagination. Brescia explores the interesting paradox that while Roman women were traditionally required to remain silent, in situations of sexual assault, women were expected to shout out for help, or were in

---

[393] Cf. Curran 1978; Richlin 1992; James 2016.
[394] James 2016: 156-57.
[395] James 2016: 160.

danger of being considered complicit in the crime.[396] She explains that in legal terms a woman's innocence rests primarily on whether or not there was use of *vis*, but declamatory texts "address the problem of carnal violence on the basis of a cultural model that takes for granted, and views as almost inevitable, the woman's willing participation (*vis grata puellis*) … Presumption of complicity can only be avoided if she has overtly demonstrated such conduct as propriety dictates. If she did not take sufficient measures to rebuff the attention of her 'suitor,' she risks being considered immodest. The presumed victim's failure to speak up also functions as a *discrimen* of her *innocence* or complicity, as silence betrays weak (or totally lacking) opposition to – and thus willing participation in – *stuprum*."[397] On one level, Ovid seems to reinforce this cultural model (the underlying assumption of which is that women would not be raped if they shouted, because those nearby would hear their protests and save them), since the only women to avoid rape are those who appeal for assistance. On another level, however, Ovid seems to challenge, or problematize, this notion of assumed complicity by portraying the results of these female petitions as limited in their benefit and inevitably destructive of the female body. Ovid's representation of women's inability to escape from male desire without

---

[396] Brescia 2015: 75-93.
[397] Brescia 2015: 76.

some degree of damage perhaps suggests a critique of existing power structures, even as in other ways it reinforces them. At the same time, female reliance on prayer to avoid rape, rather than (or in addition to) reinforcing cultural perceptions about female complicity in rape without verbal protest, may be a statement about the power of language to negotiate the detriment of abuse of power.

Analyzing prayers for help according to this framework not only provides insights into gender politics, but also suggests a number of further intriguing political implications. The notion of what constitutes a political reading has been expanded beyond solely determining Ovid's view of the emperor to incorporate the broader social and cultural contexts of gender and social hierarchies, as well as Roman imperialism.[398] Still, the relationship of the *Metamorphoses* to Augustus and Augustan ideology remains a critical question. Myers, Habinek, and Williams summarize the shift in political scholarship particularly well. Early arguments about whether Ovid was 'pro-Augustan,' 'anti-Augustan,' or politically indifferent have been reformulated into more complex and nuanced examinations. In particular, there is greater recognition of the emperor's own ideological changes over the course of his reign, internal inconsistencies in his ideology, and the active role those who participate in Augustan discourse (including Ovid) have in

---

[398] Cf. Myers 1999: 197; Habinek 2002: 55-57, 61; Williams 2009: 154.

both shaping it and legitimizing Augustus' preeminent status.[399] In Williams' formulation, the current goal of scholarship is "to monitor how the text wrestles with the multivalent phenomenon that *was* Augustus."[400] Reconceptualizing the politics of the text in this way may lead to a more nuanced understanding, but Myers' cautionary message is surely also important: "If, however, it has been shown that it is impossible to be 'anti-Augustan' while participating in a form of Augustan discourse, we surely do not wish to deny literature the power to voice criticism of the dominant culture. We seem to need new terms. Ovid's challenge to Augustus is embodied precisely in his profound engagement with the regime's whole programme, his insistent probings of the very underpinnings of its authority. This approach is grounded in his deep understanding of the transformative nature of Augustus' manipulations of culture, power, and identity, his appropriation of the discourses of religion and antiquarianism in the service of the dissemination of his new values."[401] Feldherr's subsequent complex study of the politics of fiction follows the trends outlined by Myers and shifts focus to the ways Ovid's text

---

[399] Cf. Hinds 1987a; Feeney 1991, 1992; Kennedy 1992; Hardie 1992; Barchiesi 1997; Habinek and Schiesaro 1997; Myers 1999: 196-98; Habinek 2002; Miller 2009; Williams 2009; Feldherr 2010.

[400] 2009: 166.

[401] 1999: 197.

encourages meaning to be found in an audience's response.[402] He describes his project as follows, "[M]y goal is to expand our understanding of the modes by which the work facilitates the audience's reflection on and redefinition of the hierarchies operative in Roman society. (If relatively few episodes in the poem refer directly to or transparently to Augustus, it is surprising how many hinge on inequalities in power relations more generally, as superiors and inferiors alternately punish, exploit, confer benefits on, and deceive one another.)"[403] Prayers for help constitute another means by which the *Metamorphoses* encourages both contemplation and problematization of power hierarchies, including the contemporary socio-political structure which featured Augustus as the dominant figure, since divine response to petitions contributes to a characterization of the gods. Ovid's portrayal of the gods, especially the Olympian gods, may be seen to resonate politically because of Augustus' relationship to gods in three primary ways: 1) through his instigation of religious reform and revitalization;[404] 2) through the explicit connections made between Augustus and Jupiter (1.168-76, 199-208, 15.858-60) and

---

[402] Feldherr also points to Hinds (1987a), Feeney (1991), Kennedy (1992), and Barchiesi (1997) as precursors in this audience-based approach.

[403] 2010: 7.

[404] See Liebeschuetz (1979: 55-100) and Kienast (1982: 185-214) and attendant bibliography. A helpful summary and bibliography are also offered by Galinsky (2007).

Augustus and Apollo (1.557-65) within the text of the poem;[405] 3) and through Augustus' role in deifying Caesar (15.746-51) and his own predicted apotheosis (15.868-70) at the end of the poem.[406]

Scholars have overwhelmingly emphasized Ovid's "human" portrayal of the gods[407] and/or their excessive or arbitrary abuses of power.[408] I do not dispute either of these characterizations, but considering prayer and response to prayer can add further qualifications and observations. At the same time that Ovid characterizes the gods as indulging in excessive abuses of power, he divests deities of completely unmitigated power. There appear to be two checks on divine power: language and fate. Because the gods are never shown to willingly reject a prayer, Ovid affirms the traditional Roman belief that words hold inherent power.[409] To this we can add the interactions between Apollo and Phaethon (2.51-53) and Jupiter and Semele (3.295-98), where the gods' own words bind them to fulfill promises which they subsequently desire to avoid. The other limiting factor, fate, prohibits the gods from preventing the murder of Caesar (15.780-

---

[405] See Miller 2009: 332-73.
[406] Cf. Feeney 1991: 206-19.
[407] Bernbeck 1967: 80-94; Little 1970: 86-105; Otis 1970; Galinsky 1975: 162-73; Solodow 1988: 89-97; Kenney 1973: 145; Feeney 1991: 232-33; Segal 2001.
[408] Feeney 1991: 223; Myers 1994a: 25-26; Segal 2001; Newlands 2005: 485-90; Hejduk 2009; Kenney 2009: 151; cf. Miller 2009: 333.
[409] Cf. Introduction 33-35.

81).[410] While these two forces provide some restraints on divine power, the majority of responses to entreaties for help highlight the negative impact of power differentials for those of lower statuses, as figures are repeatedly metamorphosed and/or silenced as the result of their prayers.[411]

While divine responses to petitions typically display a difference in understanding between humans and gods to the detriment of mortals, there are a few exceptions. The gods who act most beneficially towards mortals are not the Olympians with whom Augustus is so closely linked, but Themis, Isis, and Hercules. Newlands draws a contrast between Isis and the Olympian gods in the poem, characterizing the Egyptian goddess alone as compassionate towards mortals.[412] She positions this episode in a political context, especially exploring how Ovid's depiction of Isis reverses Vergil's monstrous

---

[410] Cf. Feldherr 2010: 69-70.
[411] Here we may note that if the gods appear in certain scenes to be unsympathetic to human prayer or oblivious to human desires, mortals come across even worse. The first mortal recipient of a prayer for help, Battus, answers Mercury's petition for assistance (2.699-701), but in this particular instance (a scene filled with comic reversals) his response in fact constitutes a violation of piety as he breaks his former promise to the god, and even worse, betrays his word because of greed (2.702-7). The other petition for aid delivered to a mortal, Pentheus' request to Autonoe (3.719-20), is denied altogether to horrifying effect (3.721-31). In a similar vein, when Cornix calls on both gods and men for help (*deos hominesque voco* 2.578), only Minerva responds, since no mortals heard her distressed cry (*nec contigit ullum/ vox mea mortalem* 2.578-79).
[412] Newlands 2005: 488.

depiction of Cleopatra's Egyptian deities (who differ from Augustus' Graeco-Roman pantheon) on the shield of Aeneas (*Aen.* 8.671-713). The other half of her argument rests on contrasting Isis' compassionate behavior with Jupiter's intemperate actions throughout the poem; bound up in this distinction is Isis' identity as non-Olympian and female. In addition to examining this contrast between Isis and Jupiter, my discussion in Chapter Three also explores how the text may set up an implied contrast between Isis and Apollo (another Augustan deity). Newlands furthermore notes that at 15.858-60 Ovid equates Augustus and Jupiter and praises their paternal guidance—a characterization of Jupiter that Ovid's previous narrative contradicts. She emphasizes the "disjunction between the official rhetoric of imperial encomium and the mythical construction of the gods within Ovid's poem" and additionally contends that even if the end of the poem must not necessarily be read as an Augustan critique, this discrepancy "at the very least reveals deep unease and anxiety about the emperor's new arrogation of authority through the imperial cult of divinity."[413]

Newlands' analysis is largely convincing, but we can modify her assertion that Isis is the sole beneficent deity in the poem. As discussed in Chapter Three, Themis and Hercules also deserve this designation for their favorable responses to the petitions of

---

[413] Newlands 2005: 489.

Deucalion and Pyrrha and Myscelus. If the case of Isis seems to offer a relatively unambiguous political stance, the other two scenes of beneficial responses to prayer involve further complexities that make a particular political position less clear. As discussed in Chapter Three, Themis may be working at the behest of Jupiter, or at least as a beneficent agent who operates within the realm of Jupiter's omniscience and ordered cosmos. Jupiter's earlier prediction that there will be a new race of miraculous origin (1.250-51) allows the possibility for him to be read as setting in motion the chain of events that leads to mankind's restoration. Nonetheless, Ovid has removed Jupiter from being the direct recipient of Deucalion and Pyrrha's prayer (as he is in other versions), which distances him from the positive response. Ovid also introduces ambiguity through creating an oracle rather than employing a direct command from Jupiter, which reinforces the inequality and gap in understanding between humans and gods. Jupiter's initial instigation of the storm which destroys mankind similarly elicits ambiguities that allow it to be read in multiple ways.[414] This added complexity, even if it does not mandate a negative view of Jupiter, does not provide a straightforwardly positive depiction.

The case of Hercules and Myscelus (15.9-59) is similarly complex. As previously

---

[414] On the Lycaon episode see Feeney (1991: 199-200); Wheeler (2000: 26-32); Segal (2001: 80-85); Felderr (2002: 169-72); Habinek (2002: 51-52); O'Hara (2007: 116-18); and Williams (2009: 157, 163-64).

discussed, Ovid refashions the story of Croton's foundation to exclude a Delphic oracle and removes the god Apollo from the storyline. Upon one reading this exclusion of another Augustan deity from a beneficial response to a prayer may be seen to reflect critically on the emperor. At the same time, however, Hercules is himself potentially associated with Augustus. Hercules' apotheosis describes him as physically increasing and *augusta gravitate verendus* (9.269-70), terms that clearly evoke the emperor.[415] Hercules may additionally be relevant to an interpretation of Augustus' portrayal because of his connection to Roman state cult and potential as a model for future Augustan deification.[416] The somewhat comic portrayal of Hercules' apotheosis at *Met*. 9. 262-73 has been seen to deflate his process of deification[417] and possibly reveal anxieties about the "privatization of communal cult and communalization of private cult."[418] Much less attention has been paid to the characterization of Hercules in the final book, but when we compare Hercules' response to Myscelus' plea with other deities' responses to petitions for help, a relatively positive depiction emerges. Of course, if we widen the lens beyond

---

[415] Cf. Miller 2009: 362 n. 84; Williams 2009: 166; Feeney 1991: 207.
[416] Cf. Feeney 1991: 207 (though he does not include Hercules as part of state cult); Barchiesi 1997: 97-98 (on the *Fasti*); Wheeler 2000: 139; Newlands 2005: 488; Kenney 2009: 150; Williams 2009: 166-69.
[417] Due 1974: 82-83; Galinsky 1975: 257-58; Wheeler 2000: 101-3; Miller 2009: 362 n. 84; Williams 2009: 166.
[418] Feeney 1991: 206.

the immediate response, we see that Hercules is responsible for the dilemma that requires his assistance in the first place (*nam tu mihi criminis auctor* 15.40) and the god's threats (15.24, 33) do not necessarily complement a compassionate characterization. On the other hand, the distress caused to Myscelus (*pugnat secum* 15.27, *pertimuit* 15.34, *squalidus* 15.38) may eventually be seen as favorable, since it grants him the honorific designation of founder. Even if Hercules is acting beneficially and may be interpreted as reflecting positively on the emperor, the story may point to the way Augustus is able to shift terms of discourse. Hardie argues that Myscelus' story highlights the way Augustus employs the rhetoric of tradition when in fact his rule instigates a cultural revolution.[419] He sees Hercules' response to change the voting pebbles from black to white as pointing to Augustus' practice of manipulation and dissimulation, of making something black appear white.[420] In his view the tale "comments on the status of a cultural revolution that pretends to be no revolution."[421] Even if we accept this interpretation, a number of perplexing questions about the response to Myscelus' prayer remain. For instance, in revising the traditional story why replace one Augustan deity (Apollo) with another deity

---

[419] Hardie 1997: 195.
[420] Though his argument requires some conflation between the figures of Myscelus and Hercules: "The Hercules–Myscelos team is skillful at dissimulation…" (1997: 198).
[421] 1997: 198.

connected to the emperor (Hercules)? One answer may lie in Hercules' status. Hercules' beneficence in part seems to be the product of his former mortal status; perhaps the larger the power differential between parties, the greater the potential for abuse of power. Or we may wish to apply to this episode the idea that the encomium can frequently be protreptic.[422] This is perhaps a subtle suggestion to the emperor to interpret, like Hercules, what constitutes help beneficially for those with less power. This idea would look forward to Ovid's own closing prayer that predicts Augustus' apotheosis and conceives of the divine Augustus as favorably responding to those who pray (*faveat precantibus* 15.870).

Regardless of how we interpret this particular Augustan reference, we can observe that Ovid dissociates traditional sites of supreme power from beneficial responses to prayer by selecting non-Olympian deities to be the most sympathetic. This, in turn, seems to problematize traditional power hierarchies, question the foundations of authority, and contribute to a larger movement of destabilization. Here, Miller's insightful observations about the politics of the *Metamorphoses* are instructive: "[W]e are … often uncertain about the political significance of particular episodes, motifs, or characters—especially the gods. Likewise, when we are fairly sure that the text is triggering reflection on the

---

[422] Cf. Newlands 2005: 489.

imperial agenda, it is often difficult to pin down a uniform point of view. The lack of clarity on both accounts is designed, but it is not so much motivated by Ovid's desire to veil criticism of Augustus behind ambiguity as it is a strategy in his more broadly destabilizing aesthetic."[423]

Finally, it is difficult not to consider at least cursorily the position of prayer within the *Metamorphoses* through the lens of Ovid's exile.[424] Ovid himself instigates this process as his exile poetry encourages reinterpretation of his former work and activates new readings of the *Metamorphoses*.[425] *Tristia* 2 most famously engages with the *Metamorphoses* in its reminiscence of the story of Actaeon in *Met.* 3 (*Tr.* 2.103-10; *Met.* 3.173-255)[426] and panegyric of the emperor,[427] but also encourages reflection on prayer in Ovid's epic poem. Prayer appears as a leitmotif in *Tristia* 2 (19-28, 201-6, 181-86, 573-78), as it is punctuated with a number of appeals and also appears to engage with various petitions in the *Metamorphoses* (for instance *Tr.* 2.53-57 and *Met.* 15.868-70). When prayer first appears in *Tristia* 2, Ovid employs it in such a way as to foster the conflation

---

[423] 2009: 333-34. See also Hinds on the hermeneutic alibi (1987a: 26).

[424] For bibliography on the possibility that Ovid revised parts of the *Metamorphoses* from Tomi cf. Kenney 1982: 444 n. 1; Knox 2016: 193 n. 21 (who rejects the theory at 182).

[425] See Hinds 1985; Myers 2014; Knox 2016.

[426] Cf. Forbis 1997; Inglehart 2006: 71-76; Knox 2016: 181.

[427] Cf. Gibson 1999; Hinds 1999; Myers 2014.

of the multiple meanings of *carmen* as poem and hymn (*Tr*. 2.19-22):

> Forsitan ut quondam Teuthrantia regna tenenti,
> sic mihi res eadem uulnus opemque feret,
> Musaque, quam mouit, motam quoque leniet iram:
> exorant magnos carmina saepe deos.
>
> Perhaps as once for the man holding the Theurantian kingdom, so too the same thing will both wound and aid me, and the Muse will also alleviate the wrath which she provoked: songs often persuade the great gods by entreaty.

He casts his *carmen* (implying both poem and entreaty) as a possible means for eliciting the emperor to provide help. Ovid repeats the terminology used so commonly throughout the *Metamorphoses* by characters appealing to deities for assistance, *opem ferre*, to describe the action he desires from the emperor. This use of *opem ferre* in isolation is likely not enough to activate reference to the prayers in the *Metamorphoses*,[428] but Ovid's subsequent appeals in *Tristia* 2 may remind the reader of the phrase's distinctive use in the *Metamorphoses*. The first prayer in *Tristia* 2 (27-28) seems to reverberate with the prayer offered by Deucalion and Pyrrha in the *Metamorphoses* (1. 377-80):

> His precor exemplis tua nunc, mitissime Caesar,
> fiat ab ingenio mollior ira meo.
>
> From these examples I pray now, most gentle Caesar, that your anger may become milder because of my talent.
>
> atque ita 'si precibus' dixerunt 'numina iustis
> victa remollescunt, si flectitur ira deorum,

[428] Cf. Knox (2016: 79, 192-93 n. 14) for context and "memorability" as keys to decide relevance of repetition.

> dic, Themi, qua generis damnum reparabile nostri
> arte sit, et mersis fer opem, mitissima, rebus!'
>
> And thus they said, "if divine will grows mild, won over by just prayers, if the anger of the gods is swayed, tell, Themis, how the loss of our race may be capable of repair, and, most gentle one, bring help to our sunken affairs!"

In particular, the idea of divine anger becoming milder (*mollior ira*; *remollescunt numina, ira*) is similar in both passages and then additionally coupled with the vocative, superlative form of *mitis* (*mitissime*, *mitissima*). While *mitis* is relatively common in prayers, the superlative is distinctive.[429] As Ovid closes the poem, he seems again to return to the language of Deucalion and Pyrrha's prayer requesting *possint tua numina flecti* (573). We can see that Ovid not only repeats forms of *numen* and *flecto*, but additionally can note how Ovid divides the repeated words in *Tristia* 2 between two prayers. In the *Metamorphoses* Deucalion and Pyrrha ask that *numina* grow mild and *ira* be assuaged. In the *Tristia* he asks that *ira* become milder and *numina* be assuaged. Ovid's request in the *Tristia* is made within the context of comparing Augustus to Jupiter and Ovid's exile to Jupiter's *ira*. Ingleheart notes the broader generic connotations of Ovid's prayer, remarking, "Ovid hopes his elegies will soften Augustus' epic anger, so that he no longer behaves like a vengeful epic deity/hero."[430] This interpretation lends additional credence to a metapoetic reading of Deucalion and Pyrrha's prayer. Ovid's

---

[429] Appel 1909: 99.
[430] 2010: 28.

tactic of relying on prayer furthermore seems to affirm that in the *Metamorphoses* the poet casts language and poetry as a primary means for negotiation with higher powers. By addressing the emperor in the *Tristia* as a deity within the *Metamorphoses*, he offers him the opportunity to authorize a particular reading of Ovid's former text, an opportunity to prove that the Jupiter in Rome and the Jupiter in poem are compassionate deities. Ovid sets up a correspondence between Jupiter and Augustus that has the potential to retroactively endorse a sort of 'pro-Augustan' reading of the gods, if Augustus should revoke Ovid's exile.[431] However, unlike the gods of the *Metamorphoses*, who at least respond to the multitude of desperate mortal petitions, Augustus in the end completely ignores the poet's pleas and leaves a deeply ambiguous and destabilizing vision intact.

[431] Cf. Hinds 1999: 50; Myers 2014.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, E. T. 2003. "Gods and Humans in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Constructions of Identity and the Politics of Status." PhD Dissertation, University of Washington.

Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore.

Ahl, F. M. 1985. *Metaformations. Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca.

Alvar, J. 2008. *Romanising Oriental Gods: Myth, Salvation and Ethics in the Cults of Cybele, Isis and Mithras*." Leiden.

Anderson, W. S. 1972. *Ovid's* Metamorphoses. *Books 6-10*. Norman.

—1993. "The Suppliant's Voice and Gesture in Vergil and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *ICS* 18: 165-77.

—1995. "Aspects of Love in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *CJ* 90.3: 265-69.

—1997. *Ovid's* Metamorphoses. *Books 1-5*. Norman.

Appel, G. 1909. *De Romanorum Precationibus.* Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 7.2. Giessen (Reprinted New York, 1975).

Austin, J. L. 1975. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford.

Barchiesi, A. 1989. "Voci e istanze narrative nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio." *MD* 23: 55-97.

—1997. *The Poet and the Prince*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

—1999. "Venus' Masterplot: Ovid and the Homeric Hymns." In P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, and S. E. Hinds, eds. *Ovidian Transformations. Essays on Ovid's* Metamorphoses *and its Reception*, 214-39. Cambridge.

—2001a. *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets.* London.

—2001b. "The Crossing." In S. J. Harrison, ed. *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature*. Oxford.

—2002. "Narrative Technique and Narratology in the *Metamorphoses*." In P. Hardie, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 180-99. Cambridge.

—2006. "Music for Monsters: Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Bucolic Evolution, and Bucolic Criticism." In M. Fantuzzi and T. D. Papanghelis, eds. *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*, 403-26. Leiden.

Barchiesi, A., ed. 2005. *Ovidio Metamorfosi Volume I (Libri I-II)*. Milan.

Barchiesi, A. and G. Rosati, eds. 2007. *Ovidio Metamorfosi Volume II (Libri III-IV).* Milan.

Battistella, C. 2010. "Un modello epico per il primo amore di Apollo (Ov. *Met*. 1.441-567 e Verg. *Aen*. 9.590-663). *Vergilius* 56: 19-25.

Beckmann, J. T. 1932. "Das Gebet bei Homer." Dissertation, Würzburg.

Berman, D. W. 2017. "Cities–Before–Cities. 'Prefoundational' Myth and the Construction of Greek Civic Space." In Hawes, G., ed. *Myths on the Map: The Storied Landscapes of Ancient Greece*, 32-51. Oxford.

Bettini, M. 2011. *The Ears of Hermes: Communication, Images, and Identity in the Classical World*. Columbus.

Bischoff, D. 2003. "Die schöne Stimme und der versehrte Körper. Ovids Philomela und die *eloquentia corporis* im Diskurs der Empfindsamkeit." In D. Bischoff and M. Wagner-Egelhaaf, eds. *Weibliche Rede – Rhetorik der Weiblichkeit: Studien zum Verhältnis von Rhetorik und Geschlechterdifferenz*, 249-81. Freiburg i. Br. (Rombach Wissenschaften. Reihe Litterae 93).

Blanco Mayor, J. M. 2017. *Power Play in Latin Love Elegy and Its Multiple Forms of Continuity in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Vol. 42. Berlin.

Blänsdorf, J. 1980. "Entstehung und Kontamination der Doppelfassung Ovid, *Metam*. I,544-547a." *RhM* 123: 138-51.

Bloch, N. 2014. "Patterns of Rape in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." Undergraduate Honors Thesis, University of Colorado at Boulder.

Bömer, F., ed. 1969-86. *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen*. 7 vols. Heidelberg.

Boyd, B. W. 2006, "Two Rivers and the Reader in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8." *TAPA* 136: 171-206.

Braund, S. M. 1997. "Virgil and the Cosmos: Religious and Philosophical Ideas." In C. Martindale, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, 204-21. Cambridge.

Bremer, J. M. 1981. "Greek Hymns." In H. S. Versnel, ed. *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, 193-215. Leiden.

Bremer–Furley. 2001. *Greek Hymns*. Tübingen.

Brescia, G. 2015. "Ambiguous Silence: *Stuprum* and *Pudicitia* in Latin Declamation." In E. Amato, F. Citti, and B. Huelsenbeck, eds. *Law and Ethics in Roman Declamation*, 75-94. Berlin.

Cahoon, L. 1990. "Let the Muse Sing On: Poetry, Criticism, Feminism, and the Case of Ovid." *Helios* 17: 197-211.

—1996. "Calliope's Song: Shifting Narrators in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 5." *Helios* 23.1: 43-66.

Casali, S. 2007. "Censoring Aeneas's Voyage: Ovid's Commentary on *Aeneid* 3." *Arethusa* 137.1: 181-210.

Celoria, F. 1992. *The Metamorphoses of Antoninus Liberalis: A Translation With Commentary*. London.

Clark, G. 1993. *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Lifestyles*. Oxford.

Clauss, J. J. 1989. “The Episode of the Lycian Farmers in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.” *HSCP* 92: 297-314.

Conte, G. B. 1992. “Proems in the Middle.” Reprinted in G. B. Conte and S. J. Harrison, eds. *Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Virgilian Epic.* 2007. Oxford. 219-31.

Courtney, E. 1999. *Archaic Latin Prose*. American Classical Studies No. 42. Atlanta.

Crabbe, A. 1981. “Structure and Content in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses.” ANRW* II 31.4: 2274-327.

Creese, D. 2009. “Erogenous Organs: The Metamorphosis of Polyphemus’ Syrinx in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 13.784.” *CQ* 59.2: 562-77.

Culham, P. 1990. “Decentering the Text: The Case of Ovid.” *Helios* 17.2: 161-70.

Curley, D. 2013. *Tragedy in Ovid: Theater, Metatheater, and the Transformation of a Genre.* Cambridge.

Curran, L. 1978. “Rape and Rape Victims in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.” *Arethusa* 11: 213-41.

Davis, G. 1983. *The Death of Procris: “Amor” and the Hunt in Ovid’s* Metamorphoses. *Instrumentum Literarum*. Vol 2. Rome.

DeBrohun, J. B. 1994. “Redressing Elegy’s Puella: Propertius IV and the Rhetoric of

Fashion." *JRS* 84: 41-63.

Depew, M. 1997. "Reading Greek Prayers." *ClAnt* 16.2: 229-58.

Dingel, J. 2000. "*Non petit inpossibile*: Gebete und ihr Erfolg in der Aeneis." *Gymnasium* 107: 281-93.

Due, O. S. 1974. *Changing Forms: Studies in the* Metamorphoses *of Ovid.* Copenhagen.

Dunand, F. 2006. "La guérison dans les temples (Égypte, époque tardive)." *ARG* 8: 4-24.

Emonds, H. 1941. *Zweite Auflage im Altertum: Kulturgeschichtliche Studien zur Überlieferung der antiken Literatur*. *KPS* 14. Leipzig.

Enterline, L. 2000. *The Rhetoric of the Body from Ovid to Shakespeare*. Cambridge.

Fantham, E. 1991. "*Stuprum*: Public Attitudes and Penalties for Sexual Offences in Republican Rome." *EMC* 35: 267-91.

—1993. "*Sunt quibus in plures ius est transire figuras*: Ovid's Self-Transformers in the *Metamorphoses.*" *CW* 87.2: 21-36.

—1998. *Ovid Fasti IV*. Cambridge.

Farrell, J. 2004. "Ovid's Virgilian career." *MD* 52: 1000-15.

—2009. "Ovid's Generic Transformations." In P. E. Knox, ed. *A Companion to Ovid*, 370-80. Malden.

Fedeli, P. 1985. *Properzio. Il terzo libro delle Elegie*. Bari.

Feeney, D. C. 1991. *The Gods in Epic.* Oxford.

—1992. “Si licet et fas est.” In A. Powell, ed. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, 1-25. London.

—1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome.* Cambridge.

—1999. “*Mea Tempora*: Patterning of Time in the *Metamorphoses*.” In P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, and S. E. Hinds, eds. *Ovidian Transformations. Essays on Ovid’s* Metamorphoses *and its Reception*, 214-39. Cambridge.

—2007. “The History of Roman Religion in Roman Historiography and Epic.” In J. Rüpke, ed. *A Companion to Roman Religion*, 129-42. Malden.

Feldherr, A. 2002. “Metamorphosis in the *Metamorphoses*.” In P. Hardie, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 163-79. Cambridge.

—2010. *Playing Gods: Ovid’s* Metamorphoses *and the Politics of Fiction.* Princeton.

Fellner, K. 2002. “Frauenbilder in den *Metamorphosen*. Eine kritische Annäherung an die Autorperspektive in Ovids Daphne-Mythos.” *AU* 45.2: 64-71.

Fletcher, R. 2004. “Or Such as Ovid’s *Metamorphoses…*” In R. Hunter, ed. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions.*

Forbis, E. P. 1997. “Voice and Voicelessness in Ovid’s Exile Poetry.” *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 8: 245-67.

Frankfurter, D. 1998. *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance*. Princeton.

Fuhrer, T. 1999. "Der Götterhymnus als Prahlrede: Zum Spiel mit einer literarischen Form in Ovids *Metamorphosen*." *Hermes* 127.3: 356-67.

Fulkerson, L. 2005. *The Ovidian Heroine as Author: Reading, Writing, and Community in the* Heroides. Cambridge.

—2016. *Ovid: A Poet on the Margins*. London.

Fulkerson, L. and T. Stover, eds. 2016. *Repeat Performances: Ovidian Repetition and the* Metamorphoses. Madison.

Fränkel, H. 1945. *Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Fyntikoglou, V. 2005. "Das römische Gebet." *ThesCRA* 3: 151-79.

Galasso, L., G. Paduano, and A. Perutelli. 2000. *Ovidio, opere II: le Metamorfosi*. Turin.

Galinsky, G. K. 1972. "Hercules Ovidianus (*Metamorphoses* 9.1- 272) *WS* 6: 93-116.

—1975. *Ovid's* Metamorphoses: *An Introduction to the Basic Aspects.* Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Gamel, M. K. 1990. "Reading Reality." *Helios* 17.2: 171-74.

Gauly, B. M. 2009. "*Verba imperfecta*: Tal and Talk and Silence in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *A&A* 55: 62-79.

Gentilcore, R. M. 2010. "The Transformation of Grief in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*."

SyllClass 21.1: 93-118.

Gibson, B. 1999. "Ovid on Reading: Reading Ovid. Reception in Ovid *Tristia* II." *JRS* 89: 19-37.

Gildenhard, I. and A. Zissos. 2004. "Ovid's 'Hecale': Deconstructing Athens in the *Metamorphoses*." *JRS* 94: 47-72.

Gladhill, B. 2012. "Gods, Caesars and Fate in *Aeneid* 1 and *Metamorphoses* 15." *Dictynna* 9.

Graf, F. 1988. "*Ovide, les Métamorphoses et la véracité du mythe*." In C. Calame, ed. *Métamorphoses du mythe en Grèce antique*, 57-70. Geneva.

—2002. "Myth in Ovid." In P. Hardie, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 108-21. Cambridge.

Green, S. J. 2004. *Ovid,* Fasti *I*. Leiden.

Griffin, H. F. A. 1991. "Philemon and Baucis in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *GR* 38.1: 62-74.

Griffiths, J. G., ed. 1975. *Apuleius of Madauros, The Isis Book* (Metamorphoses *Book XI*). Leiden.

Guittard, C. 1987. "Pline et la classification des prières dans la religion romaine (*NH* 28, 10-21)." *Helmantica* 38: 157-70.

Habinek, T. 2002. “Ovid and Empire.” In P. Hardie, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid.* Cambridge.

Habinek, T and A. Schiesaro, eds. *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.

Hahn, F. H. 2007. “Performing the Sacred: Prayers and Hymns.” In J. Rüpke, ed. *A Companion to Roman Religion*, 235-48. Malden.

Hall, J. M. 2008. “Foundation Stories.” In G. R. Tsetskhladze, ed. *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, 383-426. Leiden.

Hardie, P. 1986. *Virgil’s* Aeneid: *Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.

—1991. “The Janus Episode in Ovid’s *Fasti*.” *MD* 26: 47-64.

—1992. “Augustan Poets and the Mutability of Rome.” In A. Powell, ed. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. London.

—1997. “Questions of Authority: The Invention of Tradition in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* 15.” In T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro, eds. *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, 182-98. Cambridge.

—2002. *Ovid’s Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge.

Hardie, P., ed. 2015. *Ovidio Metamorfosi Volume VI (Libri XIII-XV)*. Milan.

Harrison, S. 2002. “Ovid and Genre: Evolutions of an Elegist.” In P. Hardie, ed. *The*

Cambridge Companion to Ovid, 79-94. Cambridge.

Heath, J. 1992. *Actaeon, the Unmannerly Intruder*. New York.

Heinze, R. 1919. *Ovids elegische Erzählung*. Berichte der Sächsischen Akademie zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Klasse. 71.7. Leipzig.

Hejduk, J. 2009. "Ovid and Religion." In P. E. Knox, ed. *A Companion to Ovid*, 45-58. Malden.

Helm, R. 1900. "De Metamorphoseon Ovidianarum locis duplici recensione servatis" *Festschrift J. Vahlen* 335-65. Berlin.

Hershkowitz, D. 1997. "*Parce Metu, Cytherea*: 'Failed' Intertext and Repetition in Statius' *Thebaid*, or, Don't Stop Me If You've Heard This One Before." *MD* 39: 35-52.

Hickson, F. V. 1993. *Roman Prayer Language: Livy and the Aeneid of Vergil*. Stuttgart.

Hinds, S. E. 1985. "Booking the Return Trip: Ovid and *Tristia* 1." *PCPhS* 31: 13-32.

—1987a. "Generalising about Ovid." *Ramus* 16: 4-31.

—1987b. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-conscious Muse.* Cambridge.

—1993. "Medea in Ovid: Scenes from the Life of an Intertextual Heroine." *MD* 30: 9-47.

—1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*.

Cambridge.

—1999. "After Exile: Time and Teleology from *Metamorphoses* to *Ibis*." In P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, and S. E. Hinds, eds. *Ovidian Transformations. Essays on Ovid's* Metamorphoses *and its Reception*, 48-67. Cambridge.

Hoefmans, M. 1994. "Myth into Reality: The Metamorphosis of Daedalus and Icarus (Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, VIII, 183-235)." *AC* 63: 137-60.

Hollis, A. S. 1970. *Ovid, Metamorphoses Book VIII*. Oxford.

Holzberg, N. 1998. *Ovid: Dichter und Werk*. Munich.

—1999. "Apollos erste Liebe und die Folgen. Ovids Daphne-Erzählung als Programm für Werk und Wirkung." *Gymnasium* 106.4: 317-34.

Hopkinson, N. 1984. *Callimachus: Hymn to Demeter. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge.

—2000. *Ovid Metamorphoses: Book XIII*. Cambridge.

Ingleheart, J. 2006. "What the Poet Saw: Ovid, the Error and the Theme of Sight in *Tristia* 2." *MD* 56: 63-86.

—2010. *A Commentary on Ovid, Tristia*, *Book 2*. Oxford.

Jakov, D., and Voutiras, E. 2005. "Gebet, Gebärden und Handlungen des Gebetes." *ThesCRA* 3: 104-41.

James, S. 2016. “Rape and Repetition in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*: Myth, History, Structure, Rome.” In L. Fulkerson and T. Stover, eds. *Repeat Performances: Ovidian Repetition and the* Metamorphoses, 154-75. Madison.

Janan, M. 2004. “The Snake Sheds Its Skin: Pentheus (Re) Imagines Thebes.” *CP* 99.2: 130-46.

—2009. *Reflections in a Serpent’s Eye: Thebes in Ovid’s* Metamorphoses. Oxford.

Johnson, P. J. 1996. “Constructions of Venus in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* V.” *Arethusa* 29.1: 125-49.

—2008. *Ovid Before Exile*. Madison.

Johnson, P. and M. Malamud. 1988. “Ovid’s ‘Musomachia’.” *Pacific Coast Philology* 23.1/2: 30-38.

Jong, de I. J. F. 2014. *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide*. Oxford.

Joplin, P. K. 1984. “The Voice of the Shuttle is Ours.” *Stanford Literary Review* 1: 25-53 [repr. in L. A. Higgins and B. R. Silver, eds. 1991. *Rape and Representations*, 35-64. New York.]

Kamen, D. 2012. “Naturalized Desires and the Metamorphosis of Iphis.” *Helios* 39.1: 21-36.

Keith, A. M. 1992. *The Play of Fictions: Studies in Ovid’s* Metamorphoses *Book 2.* Ann

Arbor.

—1999a. "Slender Verse: Roman Elegy and Ancient Rhetorical Theory." *Mnemosyne* 52.1: 41-62.

—1999b. "Versions of Epic Masculinity in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, and S. E. Hinds, eds. *Ovidian Transformations. Essays on Ovid's* Metamorphoses *and its Reception*, 214-39. Cambridge.

—2000. *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge.

—2002. "Sources and Genres in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1-5.' In B. W. Boyd, ed. *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden.

—2008/9. "The Lay of the Land in Ovid's "Perseid" (*Met*. 4.610-5.249)." *CW* 102: 259-72.

—2009. "Sexuality and Gender." In P. E. Knox, ed. *A Companion to Ovid*, 355-69. Malden.

Kennedy, D. F. 1992. "'Augustan' and 'anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference." In A. Powell, ed. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, 26-58. London.

Kenney, E. J. 1982. "Ovid." In W. V. Clausen and E. J. Kenney, eds. *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*: *Vol. 2*, *Latin Literature*, 420-57. Cambridge.

—1986. Notes to *Ovid: Metamorphoses*. Trans. A. D. Melville. Oxford.

—2002. “Ovid’s Language and Style.” In B. W. Boyd, ed. *Brill’s Companion to Ovid*. Leiden.

—2009. “The *Metamorphoses*. A Poet’s Poem.” In P. E. Knox, ed. *A Companion to Ovid*, 140-53. Malden.

Kenney, E. J., ed. 2011. *Ovidio Metamorfosi Volume IV (Libri VII-IX)*. Milan.

Keuls, E. C. 1990. “The Feminist View of the Past: A Comment on the Decentering of the Poems of Ovid.” *Helios* 17.2: 221-24.

Kienast, D. 1982. *Augustus: Prinzeps und Monarch*. Darmstadt.

Knox, P. E. 1986. *Ovid’s* Metamorphoses *and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry*. Cambridge.

—1990. “In Pursuit of Daphne.” *TAPA* 120: 183-202.

—2016. “Metamorphoses in a Cold Climate.” In L. Fulkerson and T. Stover, eds. *Repeat Performances: Ovidian Repetition and the Metamorphoses*, 176-95. Madison.

Knox, P. E., ed. 2009. *A Companion to Ovid*. Malden.

Kroll, W. 1924. “Kreuzung der Gattungen.” In *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*, 202-24. Stuttgart.

Krupp, J. 2009. *Distanz und Bedeutung: Ovids Metamorphosen und die Frage der*

Ironie. Heidelberg.

Lang, M. L. 1975. "Reason and Purpose in Homeric Prayers." *CW* 68: 309-14.

Larson, J. 2001. *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore.* Oxford.

—1997. "Handmaidens of Artemis?" *CJ* 92.3: 249-57.

Lateiner, D. 1996. "Nonverbal Behaviors in Ovid's Poetry, Primarily *Metamorphoses* 14." *CJ* 91.3: 225-53.

—1997. "Homeric Prayer." *Arethusa* 30.2: 241-72.

—2009. "Transsexuals and Transvestites in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In T. Fögen and M. M. Lee, eds. *Bodies and Boundaries in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*, 125-54. Berlin.

Latte, K. 1960. *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Munich.

Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. 1979. *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion.* Oxford.

Lindheim, S. H. 2010. "Pomona's *pomarium*: The 'Mapping Impulse' in *Metamorphoses* 14 (and 9)." *TAPA* 140.1: 163-94.

Liveley, G. *Ovid's* Metamorphoses: *A Reader's Guide*. London.

de Luce, J. 1993. "O for a Thousand Tongues to Sing: A Footnote on Metamorphosis, Silence, and Power." In M. De Forest, ed. *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy King*, 305-21. Wauconda.

—1982. "Metamorphosis as Mourning: Pathological Grief in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Helios* 9: 77-90.

Ludwig, W. 1965. *Struktur und Einheit der Metamorphosen Ovids*. Berlin.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's* Aeneid. Oxford.

Mack, S. 1988. *Ovid*. New Haven.

—1999. "Acis and Galatea or Metamorphosis of Tradition." *Arion* 6.3: 51-67.

Malaise, M. 1980. "La piété personnelle dans la religion isiaque." In H. Limet and J. Ries, eds. *L'expérience de la prière dans les grandes religions. Actes du colloque de Louvain-la-Neuve et Liège, 22-23 nov. 1978*, 83-117. Louvain-la-Neuve.

Martindale, C. 2005. *Latin Poetry and the Judgement of Taste: An Essay in Aesthetics*. Oxford.

McAuley, M. 2016. *Reproducing Rome: Motherhood in Virgil, Ovid, Seneca and Statius*. Oxford.

McKeown, J. C. 1998. *Ovid: Amores, Text, Prolegomena, and Commentary*. *Volume III. A Commentary on Book Two.* Leeds.

McNamara, J. 2010. "The Frustration of Pentheus: Narrative Momentum in Ovid's *Metamorphoses,* 3.511-731." *CQ* 60.1: 173-93.

Menke, B. 2003. "Rhetorik der Echo: Echo-Trope, Figur des Nachlebens." In D. Bischoff and M. Wagner-Egelhaaf, eds. *Weibliche Rede – Rhetorik der Weiblichkeit:*

Studien zum Verhältnis von Rhetorik und Geschlechterdifferenz, 135-59. Freiburg i. Br. (Rombach Wissenschaften. Reihe Litterae 93).

Meyer, H. 1993. "Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung." PhD Dissertation, Würzburg.

Mikalson, J. D. 1989. "Unanswered Prayers in Greek Tragedy." *JHS* 119: 89-98.

Miller, A. M. 1986. *From Delos to Delphi: A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. Leiden.

Miller, J. F. 1980. "Ritual Directions in Ovid's *Fasti*: Dramatic Hymns and Didactic Poetry." *CJ* 75.3: 204-14.

—2009. *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets.* Cambridge.

Morrison, J. V. 1991. "The Function and Context of Homeric Prayers: A Narrative Perspective." *Hermes* 119: 145-57.

Myers, K. S. 1992. "The Lizard and the Owl: An Etymological Pair in Ovid *Metamorphoses* Book 5." *AJPh* 113.1: 63-68.

—1994a. *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the* Metamorphoses. Ann Arbor.

—1994b. "*Ultimus Ardor*: Pomona and Vertumnus in Ovid's *Met*. 14.623-771." *CJ* 89.3: 225-50.

—1999. "The Metamorphosis of a Poet: Recent Work on Ovid." *JRS* 89: 190-204.

—2009. *Ovid Metamorphoses: Book XIV*. Cambridge.

—2014. "Ovid's Self-Reception in His Exile Poetry." In J. F. Miller and C. E. Newlands, eds. *A Handbook to the Reception of Ovid*, 8-21. Malden.

Murgatroyd, P. 2005. *Mythical and Legendary Narrative in Ovid's* Fasti. Leiden.

Murgia, C. E. 1984. "Ovid *Met*. 1.544-547 and the Theory of Double Recension." *ClAnt* 3.205-35.

Murray, J. 2004. "The Metamorphoses of Erysichthon: Callimachus, Apollonius, and Ovid." In M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and J. C. Wakker, eds. *Papers of the Groningen Workshop on Hellenistic Poetry*. Vol. 6., 207-42. Leuven.

Nagle, B. R. 1984. "*Amor, Ira,* and Sexual Identity in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *ClAnt* 3.2: 236-55.

—1988a. "Erotic Pursuit and Narrative Seduction in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Ramus* 17.1: 32-51.

—1988b. "A Trio of Love-Triangles in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Arethusa* 21: 75-98.

—1989. " Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: A Narratological Catalogue." *SyllClass* 1.1: 92-125.

Naiden, F. S. 2006. *Ancient Supplication*. Oxford.

Natoli, B. 2017. *Silenced Voices: The Poetics of Speech in Ovid*. Madison.

Newlands, C. E. 1995. *Playing with Time: Ovid and the* Fasti. Ithaca.

—2005. "Ovid." In M. Foley, ed. *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, 476-91. Malden.

Nicoll, W. S. M. 1980. "Cupid, Apollo, Daphne (Ovid, *Met*. 1. 452 ff.)." *CQ* 30.1: 174-82.

Nishimura-Jensen, J. 2000. "Unstable Geographies: The Moving Landscape in Apollonius' *Argonautica* and Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*." *TAPA* 130: 287-317.

Norden, E. 1913. *Agnostos Theos*. Leipzig.

—1939. *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern*. Leipzig. (Reprinted Leiden, 1995).

Nugent, G. 1990. "The Sex Which Is Not One: De-Constructing Ovid's Hermaphrodite." *Differences* 2.1: 160-85.

Nguyen, N. L. 2006. "Roman Rape: An Overview of Roman Rape Laws from the Republican Period to Justinian's Reign." *Michigan Journal of Gender & Law* 13.1: 75-112.

O'Hara, J. J. 2007. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan*. Cambridge.

Ogilvie, R. 1969. *The Romans and Their Gods in the Age of Augustus*. London.

Ormand, K. 2005. "Impossible Lesbians in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In R. Ancona and E. Greene, eds. *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*, 79-110. Baltimore.

Otis, B. 1970. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. Cambridge.

Parker, W. H., ed. 1988. *Priapea*. London.

Parry, H. 1964. "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Violence in a Pastoral Landscape." *TAPhA* 95: 268-82.

Pavlock, B. 2009. *The Image of the Poet in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Madison.

Pfeiffer, R., ed. 1949. *Callimachus*. Vol. 1. Oxford.

Phillipson, C. 1911. *The International Law and Custom of Ancient Greece and Rome*. Vol. 1. London.

Pintabone, D. T. 1998. "Women and the Unspeakable: Rape in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." PhD Dissertation, University of Southern California.

—2002. "Ovid's Iphis and Ianthe: When Girls Won't Be Girls." In N. S. Rabinowitz and L. Auanger, eds. In N. S. Rabinowitz and L. Auanger, eds. *Among Women: From the Homosocial to the Homoerotic in the Ancient World.* Vol. 92. Austin.

Prichard, A. M. 1906. *Leage's Roman Private Law*: *Founded on the Institutes of Gaius and Justinian*. New York.

Putnam, M. C. J. 2004/5. "Daphne's Roots: In memoriam Charles Segal." *Hermathena* 177/8: 71–89.

Ramsby, T. 2013. *Textual Permanence: Roman Elegists and Epigraphic Tradition*. London.

Raval, S. "*Pudibunda ora*: Gender, Sexuality, and Language in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." PhD Dissertation, Brown University.

—2002. "Cross-dressing and 'Gender Trouble' in the Ovidian Corpus." *Helios* 29.2: 149-72.

Reed, J. D., ed. 2013. *Ovidio Metamorfosi Volume V (Libri X-XII)*. Milan.

Reeson, J. 2001. *Ovid Heroides 11, 13, and 14: a Commentary*. Leiden.

Robinson, M. 1999. "Salmacis and Hermaphroditus: When Two Become One (Ovid, *Met*. 4.285-388)." *CQ* 49.1: 212-23.

—2011. *A Commentary on Ovid's* Fasti, *Book 2*. Oxford.

Robinson, O. F. *The Criminal Law of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore.

Robson, J. 1997. "Bestiality and Bestial Rape in Greek Myth." In: S. Deacy and K. Pearce, eds. *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds,* 65-96. London.

Rosati, G. 1981. "Il racconto dentro il racconto. Funzioni metanarrative nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio." Atti del convegno internazionale: "Letterature classiche e narratologia." *Materiali e contributi per la storia della narrativa greco-latina* 3: 297-309.

2002. “Narrative Techniques and Narrative Structures in the *Metamorphoses*.’ In B. W. Boyd, ed. *Brill’s Companion to Ovid*, 271-304. Leiden.

Rosati, G., ed. 2009. *Ovidio Metamorfosi Volume III (Libri V-VI)*. Milan.

Rothbaum, B. O., E. B. Foa, D. Riggs, T. Murdock, and W. Walsh. 1992. “A Prospective Examination of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder in Rape Victims.” *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 5: 455-75.

Rozée, P. D. 1993. “Forbidden or Forgiven?” *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 17.4: 499-514.

Richlin, A. 1990. “Hijacking the Palladion.” *Helios* 17.2: 175-85.

—1992. “Reading Ovid’s Rapes.” In A. Richlin, ed. *Pornography and Representation in the Ancient World*, 158-79. New York.

Rimell, V. 2006. *Ovid’s Lovers: Desire, Difference, and the Poetic Imagination*. Cambridge.

Salzman-Mitchell, P. 2005a. *A Web of Fantasies: Gaze, Image, and Gender in Ovid’s* Metamorphoses. Columbus.

—2005b. “The Fixing Gaze: Movement, Image, and Gender in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.” In R. Ancona and E. Greene, eds. *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*, 159-76. Baltimore.

—2007. “Reading Resistance in the Galatea Episode of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.” *Myrtia* 22: 117-37.

Scheid, J., P. Tassini, and J. Rüpke. 1998. *Recherches archéologiques à la Magliana: Commentarii Fratrum Arvalium qui supersunt: les copies épigraphiques des protocoles annuels de la confrérie arvale: 21 av.-304 ap. J.-C*. Rome.

Schmitzer, U. 1990. *Zeitgeschichte in Ovids* Metamorphosen. Stuttgart.

Searle, J. R. 1976. “A Classification of Illocutionary Acts.” *Language in Society* 5.1: 1-23.

Sebastian, B. 2013. “Apostrophe to the Gods in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Lucan’s *Pharsalia*, and Statius’ *Thebaid*.” PhD Dissertation, University of Florida.

Segal, C. P. 1969. *Landscape in Ovid’s* Metamorphoses. Wiesbaden.

—1998. “Ovid’s Metamorphic Bodies: Art, Gender, and Violence in the *Metamorphoses*.” *Arion* 5: 9-41.

—2001. “Jupiter in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.” *Arion* 9.1: 78-99.

Sharrock, A. 2002a. “An A-musing Tale: Gender, Genre, and Ovid’s Battles with Inspiration in the *Metamorphoses*.” In D. Fowler and E. Spentzou, eds. *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical*

Literature, 207-27. Oxford.

— 2002b. "Gender and Sexuality." In P. Hardie, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 95-107. Cambridge.

— 2002c. "Ovid and the Discourses of Love." In: P. Hardie, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 150-62. Cambridge.

Sherpe, A. J. 2011. "The Power of Prayer: Religious Dialogue in Vergil's *Aeneid*." PhD Dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder.

Skutsch, O. 1985. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford.

Smith, R. A. 1994. "Epic Recall and the Finale of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *MH* 51: 45-53.

Solodow, J. B. 1988. *The World of Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Chapel Hill.

Spentzou, E. 2003. *Readers and Writers in Ovid's* Heroides: *Transgressions of Genre and Gender*. Oxford.

Sommerstein, A. H. and I. C. Torrance. 2014. *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece.* Boston.

Stirrup, B. E. 1977. "Techniques of Rape: Variety of Wit in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *G&R* 24.2: 170-84.

Subias-Konofal, V. 2016. *Poétique de la prière dans les oeuvres d'Ovide*. Turnhout.

Sullivan, F. A. 1968. "*Tendere manus:* Gestures in the *Aeneid*." *CJ* 63.8: 358-62.

Tarrant, R. 1995. "Ovid and the Failure of Rhetoric." In D. Innes, H. Hine, and C. Pelling, eds. *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Oxford.

Thornton, A. 1976. *The Living Universe: Gods and Men in Virgil's* Aeneid. Leiden.

Tissol, G. 1992. "An Allusion to Callimachus' *Aetia* 3 in Vergil's *Aeneid* 11." *HSCP* 94: 263-68.

—1997. *The Face of Nature: Wit, Narrative, and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Princeton.

Treggiari, S. 1991. *Roman Marriage:* Iusti Coniuges *from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Oxford.

Van Tress, H. 2004. *Poetic Memory: Allusion in the Poetry of Callimachus and the* Metamorphoses *of Ovid*. Leiden.

Watson, L. 1991. *Arae: The Curse Poetry of Antiquity*. Leeds.

Wheeler, S. M. 1997. "Changing Names: The Miracle of Iphis in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 9." *Phoenix* 51.2: 190-202.

—1999. *A Discourse of Wonders*. *Audience and Performance in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Philadelphia.

—2000. *Narrative Dynamics in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Tübingen.

Wilkinson, L. P. 1955. *Ovid Recalled*. Cambridge.

Williams, G. D. 2009. "The *Metamorphoses*: Politics and Narrative." In P. E. Knox, ed. *A Companion to Ovid*, 154-69. Malden.

Wills, J. 1990. "Callimachean Models for Ovid's 'Apollo-Daphne.'" *MD* 24: 143-56.

—1996. *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion.* Oxford.

Wimmel, W. 1960. *Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*. Wiesbaden.

Wormell, D. E. W. 1979. "Ovid and the *Fasti*." *Hermathena* 127: 39-50.

Yardley, J. C. "The Elegiac Paraclausithyron." *Eranos* 76: 19-34.

Zissos, A. 1999. "The Rape of Proserpina in Ovid *Met*. 5.341-661: Internal Audience and Narrative Distortion." *Phoenix* 53.1: 97-113.

Zissos, A. and Gildenhard, I. 1999. "Problems of Time in *Metamorphoses* 2." In P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, and S. E. Hinds, eds. *Ovidian Transformations. Essays on Ovid's* Metamorphoses *and its Reception*, 214-39. Cambridge.

Ziogas, I. 2013. *Ovid and Hesiod: The Metamorphosis of the* Catalogue of Women. Cambridge.

Zumwalt, N. 1977. "*Fama Subversa*: Theme and Structure in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 12."

California Studies in Classical Antiquity 10: 209-22.

APPENDIX I: PRAYERS IN DIRECT SPEECH

	Speaker	Recipient	Lines	Request/content
1	Narrator	Gods	1.1-4	to inspire Ovid's work
2	Deucalion and Pyrrha	Themis	1.377-80	to help and tell how the human race might be restored
3	Apollo	Daphne	1.504-24	to stay
4	Daphne	Peneus	1.546-47	help and destroy her beauty
5	Jupiter	Juno	1.735-37	to set aside her fear and swears Io will never be her concern again
6	Phaethon's mother	Phaethon	1.768-75	swears that the sun is his father
7	Phaethon	Phoebus	2.35-39	tell him if he's his true son
8	Terra	Jupiter	2.279-300	save the world from fire
9	Heliades	Mother of the Heliades	2.361-63	to spare them (stop tearing the trees)
10	Mercury	Battus	2.692-94	not to tell anyone he has seen cattle
11	Mercury	Battus	2.699-701	to help and tell if he has seen any cattle
12	Jupiter	Semele	3.289-91	swears he will answer Semele's request
13	Semele	Jupiter	3.293-95	to behold Jupiter in the same form Juno beholds him
14	Scorned youth		3.405	that Narcissus loves and cannot obtain the thing he loves
15	Acetes	Bacchus	3.611-14	to be favorable
16	Pentheus	Autonoe	3.719-20	Help
17	Theban women	Bacchus	4.31	to be gentle
18	Thisbe	Parents and tree (answered by the gods)	4.155-61	to be laid in the same tomb and for the tree to always bear dark fruit
19	Salmacis	Gods	4.370-72	no day separate her from Hermaphroditus
20	Hermaphroditus	Hermes and Aphrodite	4.383-86	all men who enter the pool depart only half-man
21	Venus	Neptune	4.532-38	to make Ino a sea-god
22	Cadmus	Gods	4.575	to be a snake
23	Cadmus	Wife	4.583-85	to touch him and take his hand
24	Cadmus' wife	Gods	4.591-94	change her into a snake also
25	Man at banquet	Perseus	4.769-71	to tell how he won the gorgon's head

26	Phineus	Perseus	5.216-22	to grant his life
27	Pyreneus	Muses	5.280-83	take shelter in his house
28	Calliope	Ceres	5.341-45	hymn to Ceres
29	Venus	Cupid	5.365-79	to strike Pluto's heart with his arrow
30	Arethusa	Ceres	5.489-97	to save Sicily
31	Ilioneus	Diana	5.618-20	to help
32	Dione	Gods	6.262-64	to spare him
33	Niobe		6.299-300	to spare her smallest daughter
34	guide in Lycia	Latona	6.327	to be favorable
35	follower in Lycia	Latona	6.328	to be favorable
36	Latona	Lycians	6.349-59	to give her water
37	Latona		6.369	that the Lycians live forever in the pool
38	Father of Philomela	Tereus	6.496-503	guard Philomela with a father's love and return her
39	Jason	Medea	7.164-68	give some of his years to his father
40	Medea	Night, Hecate, Earth, et al.	7.192-219	youth for Aeson
41	Athenians	Theseus	7.433-50	hymn and prayer of thanks
42	Minos	Aeacus	7.482-83	to fight with him against Athenians
43	Aeacus	Jupiter	7.615-18	to restore his people
44	Aeacus	Jupiter	7.620-21	that Jupiter's signs be favorable
45	Aeacus	Jupiter	7.627-28	to grant him as many subjects as there are ants
46	Procris	Cephalus	7.852-56	not to let Aura take her place
47	Minos		8.97-100	that Scylla be banished and both land and sea be denied to her
48	Mospus	Phoebus	8.350-51	that his spear reach its mark
49	Altheus	Eumenides	8.481-85	that her house perish
50	Achelous	Neptune	8.595-602	help and either give Perimele a place or make her one
51	Philemon	Jupiter and Mercury	8.707-10	that he and Philemon be priests of their temple and that they die at the same time
52	Lelex		8.724	that Baucis and Philemon be dear to the gods and be worshipped
53	Mestra	Neptune	8.850-51	to save her from slavery
54	Mestra	Her "master"	8.864-68	swears that no one has stood on the shore besides her recently

55	Telethusa	Isis	9.773-81	help and pity her and Iphis
56	Orpheus	Pluto and Proserpina	10.17-39	to unravel Eurydice's fate
57	Pygmalion	Gods	10.274-76	to have a wife like his statue
58	Myrrha	Gods	10.321-23	to keep off her crime if it is a crime
59	Myrrha	Gods	10.483-87	refuse her both life and death
60	Hippomenes	Venus	10.640-41	assist him and smile on his love
61	Hippomenes	Venus	10.673	to be present
62	Midas	Bacchus	11.102-3	to grant that whatever he touches turns to gold
63	Midas	Bacchus	11.132-33	to forgive him and save him from his gift
64	Achilles		12.120-21	the same outcome for Cycnus as Menoetes
65	Caenis	Neptune	12.201-3	that she not be a woman
66	Neptune	Apollo	12.586-96	to kill Achilles
67	Polymnestor	Hecuba	13.556-58	swears an oath to give the treasure to her son
68	Aurora	Jupiter	13.587-99	to grant Memnon some honor
69	daughters of Anius	Bacchus	13.669	Help
70	Polyphemus	Galatea	13.789-869	not to runand to accept his pleas
71	Acis	Galatea and his parents	13.880-81	help him and take him into the sea
72	Glaucus	Circe	14.12-24	to make Scylla love him
73	Circe	Picus	14.372-76	not to reject her
74	Venus	Jupiter	14.586-91	to grant Aeneas divinity
75	Iphis	Gods	14.729-32	that he be remembered
76	Vertumnus (as old woman)	Pomona	14.761-64	to yield to her admirer
77	Myscelus	Hercules	15.39-40	Help
78	Cipus	Gods	15.571-73	good fortune for Rome
79	Narrator	Muses	15.622-25	to reveal from where Asclepius came
80	Priest	Asclepius	15.677-79	to bless the people who worship at his shrine
81	Venus	Gods	15.765-78	to prevent Caesar's death
82	Narrator	Gods	15.861-70	that Augustus' death be far away and that when he's gone he be favorable to those praying

APPENDIX II: PRAYERS FOR DIVINE HELP

Speaker	Deucalion and Pyrrha (1.377-80)
Text	atque ita ‘si precibus’ dixerunt ‘numina iustis victa remollescunt, si flectitur ira deorum, dic, Themi, qua generis damnum reparabile nostri arte sit, et mersis fer opem, mitissima, rebus!’
Addressee	Themis
Request	Tell how to repair the damage and bring help
Argument	Righteous prayers
Accompanying Action	Fall prone and kiss the rocks (*procumbit uterque/ pronus humi gelidoque pavens dedit oscula saxo* 1.375-76)
Speaker	Daphne (1.546-47)
Text	‘fer, pater,’ inquit ‘opem! si flumina numen habetis, qua nimium placui, mutando perde figuram!’
Addressee	Peneus (father)
Request	Help and destroy her appearance
Argument	None, but “father” = familial connection
Accompanying Action	None
Speaker	Narrator reports what Syrinx said in indirect speech (1.704)
Text	ut se mutarent liquidas orasse sorores
Addressee	Sisters
Request	To change her
Argument	None, but “sisters” = familial connection
Accompanying Action	None
Speaker	Cornix reports her own story in indirect speech (2.578-80)
Text	inde deos hominesque voco; nec contigit ullum vox mea mortalem: mota est pro virgine virgo auxiliumque tulit.
Addressee	Gods and men
Request	Not explicitly given
Argument	Not given, but we are told Minerva’s reason for involvement (a virgin helping a virgin)
Accompanying Action	Stretching arms to heaven when they are transformed (*tendebam bracchia caelo* 2.580)

Speaker	Arethusa (5.618-20)
Text	fessa labore fugae 'fer opem, deprendimur,' inquam 'armigerae, Diana, tuae, cui saepe dedisti ferre tuos arcus inclusaque tela pharetra!'
Addressee	Diana
Request	Help
Argument	Past service to the goddess
Accompanying Action	None

Speaker	Achelous/ Perimele (8.595-602)
Text	'o proxima mundi regna vagae,' dixi, 'sortite, Tridentifer, undae, adfer opem, mersaeque, precor, feritate paterna da, Neptune, locum, vel sit locus ipsa licebit!'
Addressee	Neptune
Request	Help and give Perimele a place or make her one
Argument	None
Accompanying Action	None

Speaker	Mestra (8.850-51):
Text	'eripe me domino, qui raptae praemia nobis virginitatis habes!'
Addressee	Neptune
Request	Remove her from her master
Argument	Reminder of taken virginity
Accompanying Action	Stretching hand over neighboring waves (*vicina suas tendens super aequora palmas* 8.849)

Speaker	Telethusa (9.773-81)
Text	'Isi Paraetonium Mareoticaque arva Pharonque quae colis, et septem digestum in cornua Nilum: fer, precor,' inquit 'opem, nostroque medere timori! te, dea, te quondam tuaque haec insignia vidi cunctaque cognovi, sonitum comitantiaque aera sistrorum, memorique anima tua iussa notavi. quod videt haec lucem, quod non ego punior, ecce consilium munusque tuum est. miserere duarum auxilioque iuva!'
Addressee	Isis
Request	Help, heal their (hers + Iphis') fear, pity them
Argument	Reminder of Isis' previous promise
Accompanying Action	Removed fillets and clung to altar (*at illa/ crinalem capiti vittam nataeque sibique/ detrahit, et passis aram complexa capillis* 9.770-72)

Speaker	Caenis (12.201-3)
Text	'magnum' Caenis ait 'facit haec iniurua votum, tale pati iam posse nihil; da, femina ne sim: omnia praestiteris.'
Addressee	Neptune
Request	Grant that she not be female
Argument	Reminds Neptune that he raped her
Accompanying Action	None
Speaker	Anius' daughters (13.669)
Text	illae tollentes etiamnum libera caelo bracchia 'Bacche pater, fer opem!' dixere, tulitque muneris auctor opem,—si miro perdere more ferre vocatur opem, nec qua ratione figuram perdiderint, potui scire aut nunc dicere possum.
Addressee	Bacchus
Request	Help
Argument	None
Accompanying Action	Stretching their arms to heaven (*illae tollentes etiamnum libera caelo/ bracchia* 13.669-70)
Speaker	Acis (13.880-81)
Text	Et 'fer opem, Galatea, precor, mihi! ferte, parentes,' dixerat 'et vestris periturum admittite regnis!'
Addressee	Galatea and his parents
Request	Help and bear him to his parents' underwater realm
Argument	None (for Galatea who responds), but "parents" = familial connection (they do not respond)
Accompanying Action	None
Speaker	Myscelus (15.39-40)
Text	'o cui ius caeli bis sex fecere labores, fer, precor, opem! nam tu mihi criminis auctor.'
Addressee	Hercules
Request	Help
Argument	Reminder of Hercules' past instructions
Accompanying Action	Raises hands and face to heaven (*squalidus ad superos tollens reus ora manusque* 15.38)