Cephalus, His Story: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 7.661-865*

Hiroyuki Takahashi

1. Mystery about his Javelin

Towards the end of Book 7 of the *Metamorphoses*, Cephalus, an elderly Athenian hero, who is visiting Aeacus, the king of Aegina, to ask for a help for his country in preparation for the war against Minos, tells a story about how he unwittingly killed his beloved wife, Procris, with his javelin. The adverse fate the otherwise happily married couple suffered twice is the main subject of the tripartite story. The first misfortune was caused by Aurora, who, enamored with Cephalus hunting in the mountain, abducted him, and eventually let him go home, but not without planting in him a suspicion that his wife might also have had an affair in his absence. Cephalus disguised himself to put her fidelity to a test, never ceasing to seduce her until he barely finds her wavering a little. Humiliated, she ran away from home, but, she was so forgiving and loving that she not only accepted his apology but also gave him the fatal javelin and a hunting dog, both of which would never miss their prey, as tokens of their reunion, which seemed to be even happier than before the mishap (part one: 690-758). After a digression about the dog chasing a monster fox in the middle (part two: 759-93), Cephalus goes on to narrate his second misfortune. Again going to the mountain for hunting, he called on *aura/Aura* to come to him and relieve the fierce heat. Somebody overheard him and mistook it for a call to his mistress, then reported it to Procris. To make sure of the truth, she also went to the mountain, only to hear her husband calling to *aura/Aura*. Cephalus, assuming her groans and the rustling sound to be made by some beast, threw the javelin in her direction, and found only too late that he in fact hit Procris, who exhaled her last breath in his arms (part three: 796-862).

The scene for this story is set on the morning when Cephalus, with the brothers attending him, is going to set sail for home. He is now waiting for Aeacus to wake up, together with Phocus, the king's youngest son, in a beautiful room. There, the beauty of the javelin draws the attention of Phocus, and when he asked about it, one of the attendants says to him,

> excipit Actaeis e fratribus alter et "usum
> maiorem specie mirabere" dixit "in isto.

> consequitur, quodcumque petit, fortunaque missum
> non regit, et reuolat nullo referente cruentum." (681-84)
> One of the Athenian brothers replied, saying "you will marvel at its performance more than its beauty. It reaches whatever it zeroes in, not guided by chance. It flies back bloody with nobody going to bring back".

So, according to him, it spontaneously returns to the thrower like a boomerang after hitting the target. But, at the end of the story, Procris is depicted as trying to draw her gift weapon from her wound (*de uulnere dona trahentem* 846), so, the javelin remained stuck there and did not return to Cephalus.

Here is obviously an inconsistency. This has been certainly noted by scholars, but ignored or considered simply as a flaw on the poet's part.[1] However, it is unlikely that Ovid became so careless about this detail, because it is of essential importance for the whole episode which the poet constructed with such diligence. Since Pöschl's discussion this episode has been appreciated as one about the couple's mutual love (*mutua cura* 800) and their tragedy, and scholars have pointed out the inventiveness and ingenuity with which this theme is presented,[2] among

---

* This paper was originally written in Japanese and published in *Journal of Classical Studies* 44 (1996), 96-108, then, with necessary modifications provided, included in my D. Litt. thesis on Ovid's narratology, 『手違いの詩歌』(*Poetry of Errors* 2010).

[1] Cf. Anderson (1990), 133f., Rohde, 50, Segal, 183, n. 13.

[2] The following are the particular features of the episode that scholars have pointed out: (1) different details from other traditions: (1-1) not using the motif of "swear" (Hyg. *Fab*. 189, Serv. *Aen*. 6.445), with emphasis on the willingness of love, not on the obligation; (1-2) highlighting Procris' purity, not using traditions involving Minos (Anton. Lib. 41, Apollod. 3.15.1) and the motif of "vengeance" (Anton. Lib. ibid., Hyg. ibid., Serv. ibid.); (1-3) human aspect given prominence while divine framework recedes into the background; (2) Cephalus as the first person narrator to produce a deep pathos, telling the tragedy as he witnessed it; (3) an orderly and symmetrical structure: (3-1) a contrast between the old (Cephalus, Aeacus) and the young (Phocus and the other brothers) in the narrative creating the sense of the passing of time; (3-2) a tripartite structure, as seen above; (3-3) a contrast with Aeacus' story; (4) images taken from the epic poetry: (4-1) parallels to the *Odyssey* for enhancing the image of mutual love: common motifs and similar phrases in the Calypso scene in Book 5 (such as a contrast between the gods and men, a prediction, hardship and remorse), and in Book 19, where Odysseus in disguise sees Penelope for the first time in twenty years (such as sympathy towards his wife, a test carried out with the urge to reveal himself restrained); (4-2) parallels to the *Aeneid* for enhancing the image of tragedy of love: *Met.* 7.688-89 < *Aen*. 2.1-3, 6-8; *Met*. 7.694-95 < *Aen*. 2.81-82; *Met.* 7.698-99 < *Aen.* 2.426-28; *Met.* 7.797-98 < *Aen.* 1.203; *Met.* 7.816-17 < *Aen*. 2.32-34; *Met.* 7.749 < *Aen*. 4.19; *Met.* 7.842 < *Aen*. 4.689; *Met*. 7.830 < *Aen.* 2.558; (5) reflections of the Roman view of marriage and love to express the tension between the marital bond and the strong passion: (5-1) a frequent use of particular terms about marriage (e.g., *sacra iugalia* (700), *sacra tori, thalamos* (709), *prima foedera lecti* (710), *iura iugalia* (715), *amor socialis* (800); (5-2) conventional motifs of love poetry (such as anxiety, suspicion, passion).

which particularly noteworthy is the orderly and symmetrical structure.[3] In this regard, the inconsistency about the javelin between the beginning and the end of the episode seems very curious. Also, as far as Cephalus' story goes, the introduction (689-99) corresponds to the ending (842-63): just as the former presents the javelin as a fateful gift inexorably leading to a tragic end which never ceases to force him to shed his tears as long as he lives:

> lacrimis ita fatur obortis
> "hoc me, nate dea, (quis possit credere?) telum
> flere facit facietque diu, si uiuere nobis
> fata diu dederint; hoc me cum coniuge cara
> perdidit: hoc utinam caruissem munere semper!" (689-93)

so in the latter the hero tells his story in tears, which is the image of him that stays long in the minds of the audience (and probably the readers of the poem):

> flentibus haec lacrimans heros memorabat: (863)

And, the same expression used at the head of the line both at the beginning and the end of the story (*Procris erat* 694, 842) emphatically marks his wife as a tragic heroine, who herself gave Cephalus the javelin, the cause of her death. In addition, what makes us more curious is that this detail about the javelin appears nowhere else, neither in Ovid's another version of this episode, *AA* 3.687-746. Now, to consider the inconsistency let us begin by looking at the narrative patterns noticeable in the episode which seem to have some relations to the mystery about the javelin.

2. Narrative Pattern (P1)

The first pattern to be noticed is that of "somebody/something lost (or gone away) eventually coming back"(P1). This pattern has already appeared in Aeacus' story (517-657); due to the pestilence he loses numberless people, but the birth of the Myrmidons restores to him his people (P1-1). In part one of Cephalus' story, he goes away from home to go hunting, is detained by Aurora for a while, then comes back to Procris (P1-2). As the result of his testing her fidelity, Procris goes away from home, but after accepting Cephalus' apology, returns to him (P1-3). In part

[3] Cf. Otis, 181f., Pöschl, 334f., 338, Segal, esp., 178-80, 183-86, 195, 203. See note 2, (3).

three, Cephalus again leaves home to go hunting, rousing a suspicion about *Aura*, but eventually he comes home (P1-4).

So far, we see the pattern repeated four times, but at the end of the episode it is incomplete; Procris, following her husband, goes to the mountain, and gets hit by the javelin, gone for ever, never to come back. This recurrence and failure of the pattern seems to run curiously parallel with the inconsistency about the javelin: the words of the attendant, "it, after (being thrown out of the hand and) hitting the target, spontaneously comes back", exactly match the pattern, while the javelin stuck in Procris' chest and not returning to Cephalus leaves the pattern incomplete in the same way as the death of Procris, which is final and unretractable.

If this parallelism is genuine, it will suggest a correlation between (P1) and the inconsistency, and the following two aspects about the episode might be helpful for its consideration. The first is that it is one of the few stories in the whole poem in which no apparent metamorphosis happens to the main characters (except the dog and the fox in part two). The second is that Procris could be almost identified with the javelin. It is not merely her gift, but just as it is spoken of in terms of dictating the couple's fate, and just as it is going to dictate Cephalus' fate (690-93; quoted above), so Procris is said to be the woman of destiny for Cephalus:

> Procris erat, si forte magis peruenit ad aures
> Orithyia tuas, raptae soror Orithyiae,
> si faciem moresque uelis conferre duarum,
> dignior ipsa rapi. pater hanc mihi iunxit Erechtheus,
> hanc mihi iunxit amor: felix dicebar eramque;
> non ita dis uisum est, aut nunc quoque forsitan essem. (694-99)

Both the javelin and Procris are beautiful, with similar phrases used about both (*non formosius isto* 679; *nulla formosior illa* 730). When Procris returned to Cephalus bringing the javelin as a gift to him, it is said as if she herself were also a gift (*tamquam se parua dedisset dona* 753f.; cf. *sua dona* 846). In *Fasti*, Ovid draws an etymology of Quirinus from *curis*, the Sabine word for 'javelin' (*siue quod hasta 'curis' priscis dicta Sabinis F*. 2.477), which can be rather easily located in the name of Pro-c(u)ris, which could mean 'for the javelin'. Also noteworthy is that the head of the javelin was golden (*aurea cuspis* 673), and this is assonant with *Aurora* and *aura*,[4] the rivals of Procris.

[4] Cf. Ahl, 206-08.

Considering this close association of Procris with the javelin, it might not be too far-fetched to suppose an alternative ending implicitly suggested here: a kind of her transformation involving the javelin.

For an ending with a metamorphosis, the words of the attendant are suggestive: 'you will marvel (*mirabere* 682)'. It has been pointed out that *mirus* and its related vocabulary are used as a key for metamorphoses in the poem.[5] In fact, at the beginning of part two, where Laelaps, the hunting dog, and the monster fox are transformed into stones, Cephalus says, 'hear the marvelous story (*accipe mirandum* 758)'. Therefore, as far as the words of the attendant are concerned, it looks as if they are hinting at a metamorphosis regarding the javelin.

Contrary to this, Cephalus tells of no transformation at the end of his story, but he describes the moment of his wife's death, saying,

> in me
> infelicem animam nostroque exhalat in ore;" (860-61)
> "she exhales her unhappy spirit in me and in my mouth"

If it is not in Cephalus nor in his mouth, but on the javelin that she breathes out her last breath, then, it would not be too difficult to assume an implication of her soul infused into the javelin, making it capable of coming back to the thrower after hitting the target spontaneously. With an ending like this there would have been no inconsistency about the javelin, as it acquires the capability in question after her death. Also, (P1) would have been complete at the end, as the javelin comes back to Cephalus, just as Procris did in her life, and will for ever, so that a lasting union of the couple's souls will be achieved. This ending seems fitting for the entire episode, which is about mutual love.

So far, we have looked at the recurrence of (P1), the close connection between Procris and the javelin, the words of the attendant suggestive of a metamorphosis, and a potential opportunity of a metamorphosis to be told at the ending. What has been observed seems to point to a metamorphosis at the end: Procris' soul into the javelin. And, this ending would have had no inconsistency. What makes the difference is where Procris exhales her last breath, whether in her husband's mouth or onto the javelin.[6]

---

[5] Anderson (1963), 4; cf. also ibid., 10-14.

[6] It is not that this paper assumes a version of the Cephalus-Procris myth, which is now lost, but used to be available in Ovid's time (assumptions of that kind would be futile, as has been shown by Fontenrose refuting Green's argument). The question is why he left such an obvious inconsistency. It

Therefore, it seems that Ovid subtly placed hints at a metamorphosis up to the very end, when, somehow, the poet chose to change the course of the narrative: no transformation is happening. Why? The answer will be sought shortly in terms of Cephalus' aim and motive as a narrator,[7] but before getting to that it would be helpful to look at two more narrative patterns, which will show the significance of the discrepancy regarding the words of the characters in the episode.

3. Narrative Patterns (P2) and (P3)

(P2) concerns a person having heard something from another; as he tries to seek its proofs confirming the story, the rumor, once believed true, eventually turns out to be false. In part one, Aurora plants in Cephalus a suspicion about his wife's faithfulness, which he puts to proof. He never ceases his test until she is finally forced to waver just a little, when he claims that her perfidy has been detected, but he soon realizes that he was wrong. In part three, an informer's report about *Aura* rouses a doubt in Procris, and she, following her husband, finds him calling to *aura*, but it all turns out to have been a misunderstanding.

The inconsistency about the javelin seems to match (P2). One of the attendants made Phocus curious about the javelin by mentioning its marvelous performance, and his words prompted Cephalus' story. It was expected that something marvelous about the javelin would be told, but there was nothing of the sort at the end of the story.

In terms of this pattern, one of the attendants is in parallel with Aurora in part one and the informer in part three. Since both the goddess' suggestion and the informer's report were false, the pattern seems to suggest that the words of the attendant also might be false. If this is what is meant by implication in Cephalus' story, its ending seems not merely to dispense with a metamorphosis, but to reject what the attendant has said, claiming that his is the true story.

---

should not have been too difficult for a poet like Ovid to create a coherent story, for example, one in which the moment Procris breathes out her last, Diana, feeling sorry for her (cf. 754ff., Hyg. *Fab*. 189.5), raises her soul to the heaven, and gives the javelin the capability reminiscent of her virtue. Also, as far as the motif of one's last breath accepted in the other's mouth is concerned, a parallel will be found in Anna collecting that of Dido (*extremus si quis super halitus errat, ore legam* Verg. *Aen*. 4.684-85), and it is interesting to see in Seneca the notion of one's last breath gaining a new life in those people into whom it is transferred (*non iudicabam me, cum illos superstites relinquerem, mori. Putabam, inquam, me uicturum non cum illis, sed per illos ... non effudere mihi spiritum uidebar, sed tradere*. Sen. *Ep*. 78.4).

[7] Peek has recently considered the episode from this point of view, arguing that Cephalus' version of the story is quite skewed, but, many questions raised by him about the narrator and the story remain unanswered. Cf. also Ahl, esp., 208-11.

(P3) concerns a reversal for the better: happiness follows a disaster, shifting the viewpoint of (P1) 'somebody lost comes back'. We see this explicitly formulated in Aeacus' story: when Cephalus missed many of those whom he had met before and asked the king about them, Aeacus said,

> "flebile principium melior fortuna secuta est:" (518)
> "better fortune followed a sad beginning."

In general, Cephalus' story is regarded as a tragic one, moving from happiness to sadness,[8] in contrast with Aeacus' story, but in Cephalus' story also there is a happy time mentioned, when they were reunited after the first misfortune of the couple. Noteworthy is that while at the beginning of part one he just said,

> "felix dicebar eramque;" (698)
> "I was called happy, and happy I was;"

at the start of part three he adds to the words:

> "iuuat o meminisse beati
> temporis, Aeacida, quo primos rite per annos
> coniuge eram felix, felix erat illa marito:" (797-99)
> "it is a joy to remember the blessed time, son of Aeacus, when during those first years I was happy with my wife, as I should be, and she was happy with her husband:"

It is as if he was much happier then than at the time of their marriage.[9] Still, from the episode as a whole we have the impression of 'happiness turning to sadness', which is, needless to say, due to the ending.

Suppose, however, that the metamorphosis said above be there. Then, it would be a totally different story. The javelin, with Procris' soul guiding it, would come back to Cephalus every time he launches it. Although her death is unchangeable, a spiritual union of the couple would be achieved, because Cephalus would be able to feel as if it returns to him in order to forgive his wrongdoing, as she once accepted his apology and came home. He must have been deeply consoled, embracing his

[8] Otis, 181f.
[9] Cf. Segal, 179.

wife's great love, which could transcend the boundary of death.[10] This ending would be considered matching with (P3). With no metamorphosis, on the contrary, the javelin is the cause of their tragedy, forever reminding Cephalus of the fate that took his loving wife's life away from him, and making him lament for her as long as he lives.

Now, we can see that (P3) has a link with (P2). The couple's happiness is referred to in the beginnings of part one and part three using almost identical expressions 'he (as well as she) was happy with his/her wife/husband' (698, 799; quoted above). And in part one, just after mentioning his wife's name Cephalus presumes that more likely Phocus has heard of Orithyia:

> si forte magis peruenit aures
> Orityia tuas (694-95)

and makes a comparison of the sisters:

> si faciem moresque uelis conferre duarum,
> dignior ipsa rapi (696-97).

Curiously, the Orithyia episode has been told in Book 6, and there also the beauty of the sisters is compared and Cephalus is said to have been happy in his wife:

> erat par forma duarum;
> e quibus Aeolides Cephalus te coniuge felix,
> Procri, fuit; (6.680-82)

Considering the striking similarity of the expressions, we may infer that the words of Cephalus about the sisters and his marriage presuppose what has been said in the Orithyia episode as a rumor well-known to everybody, that is, all the characters in (and probably the readers of) the poem, including Phocus. In fact, he says "I was said (*dicebar* 698)". If the reason why he says so is because it is what the Orithya episode has told, it will be understandable. Here it might be helpful to cite a parallel from the *Aeneid*. Sinon begins his story with "*fando aliquod si forte tuas peruenit ad auris Belidae nomen Palamedis et incluta fama gloria* (*Aen.* 2.81-83)", intending to

[10] It is a conventional motif of love poetry, as in Prop. 1.19.12 (*traicit et fati litora magnus amor*), and fitting for this episode (cf. Labate, 122f., 126ff., and note 2 (5) above).

catch the attention of the Trojans and enhance his credibility by establishing a common ground of their knowledge. Similarly, by appealing to their common knowledge Cephalus seems to imply that what the world talked about him and his wife is the starting point of his story.

Still, there are two differences notable between Book 6 and 7. Firstly, while in Book 6 the beauty of the two sisters is equal (*erat par forma duarum* 6.680), Cephalus says that Procris surpasses Orithyia in her fine form and character (696-97). Secondly, while in Book 6 it is definite that Cephalus was happy, while Cephalus seems to try to deny it as a false rumor when he says "the gods decided differently (*non ita dis uisum est* 699)". Of the two, the second difference is the more remarkable in connection with (P2) and (P3), because Cephalus' story ends in tragedy, negating what was said about him – that he was happy.

Therefore, it seems that Cephalus, while presupposing his happy marriage as has been told in Book 6 as common understanding among those present there, eventually denies it by presenting the tragedy at the end on the one hand, and on the other, up to the very end, particularly with (P3) 'happiness following a misfortune' noted at the beginning of part three, recalling the parallel passage in Book 6 as well, he guides his story following what 'was said' about him. Thus, the denial at the end matches (P2).

So far, we have discussed (P1), (P2) and (P3). Now, based on this discussion let us reconsider the inconsistency about the javelin. While the attendant hints at an ending of Procris' transformation involving the javelin, which would have testified to the happiness of the couple's marriage, proving that what has been talked about them is true, Cephalus seems to be attempting to reject the common talk by not touching upon a transformation at the ending, but bringing up a tragedy instead. If he really is, what aim and intent is there behind the attempt? To consider that, we have to look at the characterization of Cephalus as a hero.

4. Characterization of Cephalus

Cephalus is characterized (1) as a hero 'worth looking at (*spectabilis heros* 496)' at his first appearance and one 'in tears (*lacrimans heros* 863)' at the end of the episode, (2) with focus and emphasis on his story-telling and, (3) with reference to the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid*.

For (1) it should be noted first of all that *spectabilis* and *lacrimans* are peculiar adjectives for a *heros* in the *Metamorphoses*.[11] In addition, the position of these words, enclosing the entire passage, seems to suggest their importance.

When the hero arrives at Aegina, he is certainly still *spectabilis*, but to the extent of reminding us of how beautiful he was in his youth:

spectabilis heros
et ueteris retinens etiamnum pignora formae (496-97)

At the ending, when Procris is dying, she is looking at Cephalus as long as she can:

dumque aliquid spectare potest, me spectat (860)

Considering the emphasis on 'looking' with '*spectare – spectat*,' Cephalus seems to present himself at this moment as a *spectabilis heros*. Three lines later, however, with his tragic story coming to the end he is a hero in tears:

flentibus haec lacrimans heros memorabat: (863)

Between the change from *spectabilis* to *lacrimans* he narrated his wife breathing out her spirit in him and his mouth (*in me infelicemqe animam nostroque exhalat in ore* 860-61), dying with a sense of security radiating from her face (*uultu meliore mori secura uidetur* 862), which must have caused him to shed tears then, and it still moves him and his audience to tears now. As has been discussed, if Procris had been said to have exhaled her spirit on the javelin, not in Cephalus' mouth, then it would have created a metamorphosis of Procris involving the javelin. In this respect, it seems that the ending of Cephalus' story does not tell of a metamorphosis concerning his wife, but, as if to make up for it, depicts him changing from *spectabilis heros* to *lacrimans heros*.

For (2), scholars have agreed that the first person narrative by Cephalus is one of the main elements of the episode.[12] Not only at the narratological level, but also inside the story Cephalus' act of speaking plays a significant role.

[11] Most cases are of the hero's birth or an attribute representing him. Exceptional are the cases of Hercules (*inscius* 9.157) and Achilles (simply *heros* with no adjective attached in 11.264, 12.98, and 13.166; to mean "the hero"?).
[12] Cf. note 2 (2) and (3) above.

While he was detained by Aurora, though the goddess was beautiful (*roseo spectabilis ore* 705), his love for Procris kept him talking about her and their marriage, until Aurora gave up:

> ego Procrin amabam:
> pectore Procris erat, Procris mihi semper in ore.
> sacra tori coitusque nouos thalamosque recentes
> primaque deserti referebam foedera lecti;
> mota dea est et "siste tuas, ingrate, querellas:
> Procrin habe!" dixit, (707-12)

Here the repetition of her name vividly represents how insistently Cephalus had it on his lips (*mihi semper in ore* 708, *referebam* 710). With these complaints he was able to go home, tiring out the goddess.

When he repeatedly called out to *aura* (*nomen aurae tam saepe uocatum* 822), he was singing (*cantare solebam* 813). Ever saying enthusiastic endearments was what his fates led him to do:

> forsitan addiderim (sic me mea fata trahebant)
> blanditias plures et "tu mihi magna uoluptas"
> dicere sim solitus, (816-18)

The words were so ambiguous that somebody believed it was a nymph, with whom he was in love:

> nescio quis nomenque aurae tam saepe uocatum
> esse putat nymphae: nympham me credit amare. (822-23)

and this is where the tragedy began.

For (3), it has been pointed out that references to the *Odyssey* contribute to the imagery of the couple's mutual love, and those to the *Aeneid* to their tragedy.[13] Besides these contributions, however, as far as the stories by Odysseus, Aeneas and Cephalus are concerned, we can see that they have three features and two settings in common: (A) experience of hardships, (B) craft to tell his own stories, (C) tears shed

[13] Labate, 110-16, 119, Segal, 186-89, 200, and note 3 (4).

for the stories by the hero himself and the audience, (S1) at a royal court in a foreign country, (S2) hero in need of help in order to return home.

Odysseus wandered and suffered so much (A), as pointedly presented in the proem of the *Odyssey*:

> ὃς μάλα πολλὰ
> πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσεν:
> πολλῶν δ᾽ ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω,
> πολλὰ δ᾽ ὅ γ᾽ ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν, (Hom. *Od*. 1.1-4)

and his toils and pains are told by Demodocus and the hero himself. When the singer's song comes to the parts in which Odysseus was involved, he could not hold his tears (C):

> ταῦτ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός: αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
> πορφύρεον μέγα φᾶρος ἑλὼν χερσὶ στιβαρῇσι
> κὰκ κεφαλῆς εἴρυσσε, κάλυψε δὲ καλὰ πρόσωπα:
> αἴδετο γὰρ Φαίηκας ὑπ᾽ ὀφρύσι δάκρυα λείβων.
> ἦ τοι ὅτε λήξειεν ἀείδων θεῖος ἀοιδός,
> δάκρυ ὀμορξάμενος κεφαλῆς ἄπο φᾶρος ἔλεσκε
> καὶ δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον ἑλὼν σπείσασκε θεοῖσιν:
>
> ταῦτ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός: αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
> τήκετο, δάκρυ δ᾽ ἔδευεν ὑπὸ βλεφάροισι παρειάς.
> ὡς δὲ γυνὴ κλαίῃσι φίλον πόσιν ἀμφιπεσοῦσα,
> ...
> ὣς Ὀδυσεὺς ἐλεεινὸν ὑπ᾽ ὀφρύσι δάκρυον εἶβεν.
> (Hom. *Od*. 8.83-89, 521-23, 531)

The hero's stories are, although fictitious when told to Athena (*Od*. 13.250-86), Eumaeus (*Od*. 14.191-359), and Penelope (*Od*. 19.164-202), based on his hard experience (A). His skillful narration is admiringly approved by Athena, the goddess of wisdom (B):

> οὐδ᾽ ἐν σῇ περ ἐὼν γαίῃ, λήξειν ἀπατάων
> μύθων τε κλοπίων, οἵ τοι πεδόθεν φίλοι εἰσίν. (Hom. *Od*. 13.294-95)

and demonstrated in full at Alcinous' palace (S1, S2). His tale there is so attractive as to keep all those present there in utter silence and mesmerized with fascination (B):

ὣς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ,
κηληθμῷ δ' ἔσχοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκιόεντα. (Hom. *Od*. 11.333-34 = 13.1-2)

Aeneas no less wandered and suffered (A), which is again presented in the proem of the *Aeneid*:

tot uoluere casus
insignem pietate uirum, tot adire labores (*Aen*. 1.9-10)

When the hero saw his (and his countrymen's) sufferings on the battle field of Troy depicted on the doors of the Juno temple, he could not hold his tears (C):

constitit et lacrimans "quis iam locus", inquit, 'Achate,
quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?'
…
… animum pictura pascit inani
multa gemens, largoque umectat flumine uultum.
…
nec procul hinc Rhesi niueis tentoria uelis
agnoscit lacrimans, (*Aen*. 1.459-60, 464-65, 469-70)

The hero himself says that he was in tears when he left Troy:

litora cum patriae lacrimans portusque relinquo
et campos ubi Troia fuit. (*Aen*. 3.10-11)

and when he tells the story about the fall of Troy, he relives the pain he has suffered, which is said to render even the enemies to be unable to refrain from tears (A+C):

infandum, regina, iubes renouare dolorem,
Troianas ut opes et lamentabile regnum

eruerint Danai, quaeque ipse miserrima uidi
et quorum pars magna fui. quis talia fando
Myrmidonum Dolopumue aut duri mile Ulixi
temperet a lacrimis? (*Aen*. 2.3-8),

at the palace of Dido, who has promised to offer full support to the hero (S1, S2). His story provoked so much expectation that the audience's attention is squarely on him when he begins:

conticuere omnes intentique ora tenebant.
inde toro pater Aeneas sic orsus ab alto: (*Aen*. 2.1-2)

and his story was so touching as to keep the audience attentive and speechless throughout (B):

sic pater Aeneas intentis omnibus unus
fata renarrabat diuum cursusque docebat.
conticuit tandem factoque hic fine quieuit. (*Aen*. 3.716-18)

Interesting about his story in connection with Cephalus' is that Aeneas also tells how he lost his wife. When he found her alone missing from all the rest at the meeting point assigned ahead of their escape, there was, he says, nothing crueler he saw in the fallen city:

quid in euersa uidi crudelius urbe? (*Aen*. 2.746).[14]

The wording reminds us that the hero had said at the beginning of his story that it was about the most sorrowful things he had ever seen:

quaeque ipse miserrima uidi (*Aen*. 2.5)

Certainly his wife's death is among them. For this Aeneas could not help shedding tears(C). Her ghost appeared before him and said, "repel the tears for beloved Creusa", while Aeneas was in tears as she left him:

[14] Interesting to see is the comment by Serv. ad loc. (*bene se futurus commendat maritus, qui apud feminam sic ostendit priorem se amasse uxorem*), as it shows that the commentator was keen to the intent of a narrator.

"lacrimas dilectae pelle Creusae."
…
lacrimantem et multa uolentem
dicere deseruit, tenuisque recessit in auras. (*Aen*. 2.784, 790-91)

Here we see a hero tearful for his wife's death.

5. The Aim and Motive of the Hero

Considering the characterization of Cephalus, we have examined (1) *spectabilis* and *lacrimans*, (2) skillful story-telling, and (3) references to the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid*. From the results we may deduce that Cephalus' story likens him to the epic heroes in regard to *lacrimans heros* in (1) and a skilled narrator in (2). Concerning *spectabilis heros* in (1), noteworthy is that Odysseus looks down on the outer appearance, favoring inner excellence demonstrated by beautiful words:

'ξεῖν', οὐ καλὸν ἔειπες: ἀτασθάλῳ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικας.
οὕτως οὐ πάντεσσι θεοὶ χαρίεντα διδοῦσιν
ἀνδράσιν, οὔτε φυὴν οὔτ' ἂρ φρένας οὔτ' ἀγορητύν.
ἄλλος μὲν γάρ τ' εἶδος ἀκιδνότερος πέλει ἀνήρ,
ἀλλὰ θεὸς μορφὴν ἔπεσι στέφει, οἱ δέ τ' ἐς αὐτὸν
τερπόμενοι λεύσσουσιν: ὁ δ' ἀσφαλέως ἀγορεύει
αἰδοῖ μειλιχίῃ, μετὰ δὲ πρέπει ἀγρομένοισιν,
ἐρχόμενον δ' ἀνὰ ἄστυ θεὸν ὣς εἰσορόωσιν.' (Hom. *Od*. 8.166-73)

Therefore, if Cephalus had remained a *spectabilis heros*, he could not have stood the comparison with the epic heroes. In other words, he could make it, it seems, by transforming into *lacrimans heros* with his story.

Here it should be noted that by telling a tragic tale he rejects the rumor about his marriage, i.e., that he was happy with his wife, as discussed above. Why, then, does he have to make the negation concerning his marriage, in the first place? What is his motive? In Book 6, the focus is clearly on Procris, as the apostrophe to her and the word order placing her between Cephalus and 'happy' give a strong clue; as if he owed his happiness to Procris being his wife (*Cephalus te coniuge felix, Procri, fuit* 6.681-82). Also, the ending with her metamorphosis involving the javelin would have thrown spotlight on her, as the transformation marks her as a protagonist,

indicating that it was because of her mercy and sweetness that she could exonerate her husband from the burden of his guilt. This way, she would have been the heroine.

It is Cephalus, on the contrary, that stands in the center of his story, with his wife's metamorphosis passed over in silence at the end, instead of which he changes from *spectabilis heros* to *lacrimans heros*, comparing himself to the epic heroes. Therefore, he himself is the hero in and of his story. Here we may locate his motive: he wanted to be a hero, real and great. According to the reference in Book 6, he is merely a by-player serving as a foil to his wife. It would not be quite strange for him, at least as a character in Ovid's poem, to think that just a *spectabilis heros* is not good enough to cut it as *the* hero. In this regard, it might be helpful to remind that Aurora was also called *spectabilis* (705), when she tried to seduce Cephalus. He did not give in to the goddess' beauty. If so, he should not be content that he is a beautiful hero.

6. Inconsistency about the Javelin and Story-telling

Now, let us take a closer look at the inconsistency. One of the attendants says that the javelin flies back bloody with nobody going to bring it back:

reuolat nullo referente cruentum. (684)

At the ending Procris exhales her last breath in Cephalus and his mouth:

in me
infelicem animam nostroque exhalat in ore; (860-61)

Attention should be paid to *referre* and *in ore*, which are used to mean 'to speak' and 'spoken' respectively in the episode: the former in 687, 704, 710, 734, 797, 825, with all but in 825 having Cephalus as its agent, and the latter in 708, used for his calling his wife: *Procris mihi semper in ore*.

Considering the importance of story-telling in the episode, what if we read those meanings in 684 and 861? The words of the attendant would be: the javelin flies back bloody 'with nobody speaking so'. At the ending: she exhales her last breath 'as I say so'. As discussed above, if it had been the javelin, not Cephalus' mouth, that Procris' last breath was breathed into, then the ending would have been of her metamorphosis. Cephalus, however, tells us that it was his mouth, and the mouth suggests his story-telling. Here we may see it implied that the ending is as it is

because Cephalus did say so (*nostro in ore*). In contrast, the words of the attendant only implicitly suggested a metamorphosis at the end. Although it would have been fitting for a story of mutual love, it went unnoticed by everybody, even by scholars, and it is because nobody says so (*nullo referente*). Thus, it seems that while the unspoken tale the attendant hinted at steps back behind the scene, Cephalus' story, spoken out with craft, has prevailed at its end, winning him a place of its hero, as he transforms himself from *spectabilis* into *lacrimans*. Here we may see the metamorphosis of a character and that of a story going side by side, and the inconsistency about the javelin serving as the key, pointing to the difference between the story told in full and with craft by Cephalus as opposed to that only implied in the words of the attendant.

As far as transformations of stories are concerned, it may be worth noting a link of this episode with the proem and the sphragis. In the proem, the poet asks for the inspiration of the gods, who are said to have changed not only forms of things, but his undertakings as well:

> di, coeptis (nam uos mutastis et illa)
> adspirate meis (1.2-3)

With the reading *illa* in line 2, scholars have agreed that it implies the change of literary genre, from elegiac to epic, an inversed case of *Amores*1.1.[15] Thus, the gods' plan for the poem was different from what Ovid had had in mind, and it appears that the poet, putting away the original song which was never sung, started his poem according to the way the gods want it to be told. In the Cephalus-Procris episode, word was that Cephalus was happy, but the gods decided differently:

> felix dicebar eramque;
> non ita dis uisum est, (7.698-99)

and Cephalus began his tragic story, discarding the tale suggested by the words of the attendant, which was never told in full. What made the difference, whether told or untold, was his mouth (*nostro in ore* 861). In the sphragis, it is the mouth again, of the people this time, which will keep the poet and the poem living as long as the Roman Empire stands firm:

[15] For a survey of the arguments see Wheeler, 8ff.

quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris,
ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama,
siquid habent ueri uatum praesagia, uiuam. (15.877-79)

References

Ahl: F. Ahl, *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca, NY 1985.

Albrecht: M. von Albrecht, *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion*. Spudasmata 7. Hildesheim 1964.

Anderson(1963): W. S. Anderson, Multiple Change in the *Metamorphoses*. *TAPA* 94, 1-27.

Id.(1972): *Ovid's Metamorphoses Books 6-10*. Norman, Okla.

Id.(1990): The Example of Procris in the *Ars Amatoria*. In *Cabinet of the Muses.* Edd. M. Griffith and D. J. Mastronarde. Atlanta, 131-45.

Bömer: F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso Metamorphosen Buch VI-VII*. Heidelberg 1976.

Davis: G. Davis, *The Death of Procris*. Roma 1983.

Fontenrose: J. Fontenrose, Ovid's Procris. *Classical Journal* 75 (1979-80), 289-94.

Galinsky: G. K. Galinsky, *Ovid's* Metamorphoses: *An Introduction to the Basic Aspects*. Oxford 1975.

Gibson: R. K. Gibson, *Ovid:* Ars Amatoria *Book 3*. Cambridge 2003.

Green: P. Green, The Innocence of Procris: Ovid *A.A*.3.687-746. *Classical Journal* 75 (1979-80), 15-24.

Hejduk: J. D. Hejduk, Death by Elegy: Ovid's Cephalus and Procris. *TAPA* 141 (2011), 285-314.

Hardie: P. H. Hardie, *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge 2002.

Johnson: W. R. Johnson, Confabulating Cephalus: Self-Narration in Ovid's Metamorphoses (7.672-865). In *Literary Imagination, Ancient & Modern*. Ed. T. Breyfogle. Chicago 1999, 127-38.

Labate: M. Labate, Amore coniugale e amore 'elegiaco' nell'episodio di Cefalo e Procri (Ov., *Met*., 7, 661-865). *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, Ser.III, 5 (1975), 103-28.

Laigneau-Fontaine: S. Laigneau-Fontaine, Procris et Céphale dans les *Métamorphoses*: un Episode Epique entre Tragédie et Comédie. In *La Théatralité de L'Oeuvre ovidienne.* Paris 2009, 157-72.

Lenz: F. W. Lenz, Kephalos und Prokris in Ovids Ars Amatoria. *Maia* 14 (1962), 177-86.

Otis: B. Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. Cambridge 1970[2].

Pechillo: M. Pechillo, Ovid's Framing Technique: The Aeacus and Cephalus Epyllion (*Met.* 7.490-8.5). *Classical Journal* 86 (1990), 35-44

Peek: P. Peek, Cephalus' Incredible Narration: 《Metamorphoses》 7, 661-865. *Latomus* 63 (2004), 605-14.

Pöschl: V. Pöschl, Kephalos und Prokris in Ovids Metamorphosen. *Hermes* 87 (1959), 328-43.

Rohde: A. Rohde, *De Ovidi arte epica*. Berlin 1929

Sabot: A. Sabot, Heur et malheur d'un amour conjugal: Céphale et Procris (Ovide, *Métamorphoses*, VII, 661-862). In *Journées Ovidiennes de Parménie*. Edd. J. M. Frécaut et D. Porte. (Collection Latomus 189) Bruxelles 1985, 199-214.

Segal: C. Segal, Ovid's Cephalus and Procris: Myth and Tragedy. *Grazer Beiträge* 7 (1978), 175-205.

Tissol: G. Tissol, *The Face of Nature*. Princeton 1999.

Wheeler: S. M. Wheeler, *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Philadelphia 1999.

Kyoto University
takahashi.hiroyuki.7m@kyoto-u.ac.jp