To what extent can Daedalus be seen as analogous with Ovid?

A study on how and why the poet poetologically presents the craftsman at Crete

Reuben Riepma

(s)2299704

r.w.riepma@umail.leidenuniv.nl / reubenriepma@gmail.com

Supervisor: Prof. dr. A.B. Wessels

Second Reader: Dr. S.T.M. de Beer

15 August 2019

Master Thesis Classics and Ancient Civilizations

Faculty of Humanities, Leiden University

Reuben Riepma
s2299704

1) **Introduction**
2) ***Status Quaestionis***
3) **Parallels: The artists are innovative; Hated exile; Oppression by Authority; They advise their 'children'; They grieve and repudiate their arts; 'Consolation' of celebrity**
4) **Why?**
5) **Conclusion**
6) **Bibliography**

Introduction

Daedalus, one of the most famous figures of mythology, is known today perhaps primarily for his flight, the fall of his son Icarus and more generally as an archetypal artist. In antiquity he was also widely renowned as a master craftsman and is noted by Homer, the Athenian dramatists, Plato, Pliny the Elder and Pausanias, as almost an equal to Hephaestus.[1] Yet Daedalus was also a "chameleon-like figure" who was adapted and changed by cultural context: was he to be an artistic maverick, hero of ingenuity, or on the other hand a negative archetype of hubris?[2] The Roman poet Ovid shares some of these general contrasting characteristics: at times being recognised by commentators for literary skill, at other times censured for going too far.[3]

It may therefore be read as highly suggestive that Ovid's poems include many references and treatments of Daedalus: this study shall focus on the *Metamorphoses* (mainly 8.183-235) and his exilic oeuvre (a selection), due to their contextual chronological proximity/overlap with exile.[4] In the former, that is in the context of Daedalus' Cretan exile, first making the labyrinth for the Minotaur, and then producing wings to escape; the exile poems also contain allusions to Daedalus, which though more fragmented are pertinent to presentation of the banished artist. Inspection reveals several thematic parallels between the character and his author.[5] Namely: both are pioneering artists, who suffer as exiles (in the sections for this study), thus finding a risky solution for which they

[1] *LIMC* (1986), (Daedalus) 313-314. For a concise overview of extant references to Daedalus and Icarus.
[2] *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (2012), 409-410.
[3] Tarrant 2002b, 27.
[4] All translations are my own.
[5] Martorana 2016, 191. Concludes after a thorough survey of the Daedalus-Icarus myth in Ovid (focusing on the similarities and differences between *Met*. 8 and *Ars am.* 2), that there is a great variety of representation. This is as a product of genre, poetic tone or purpose. Conceding that Ovidian self-reference is present, she cautions against blindly accepting the poet's inveterate playfulness.

must advise their offspring in moderation; with this failure they repudiate their arts, although it is implied that literary immortality is to be their consolation.

Considering these points more broadly, a portrait of the artist emerges – one who can both soar and suffer. But beyond this general reading it is worthwhile to highlight the more than superficial parallels between Daedalus and the situation of the poet himself. Indeed, this thesis shall explore their analogous relationship, eventually reflecting on its effects and asking why?[6] Such an approach is justified by the words of the exiled poet 'himself', who declares "I am the origin of my plot itself" (*Tr.* 5.1.10: *sumque argumenti conditor ipse mei*). True, this is in the context of exile, and must not be taken as pure historical veracity, but it nonetheless validates that lived experience directly inspires art, and thus strongly tempts the audience to interpret passages (or certain characters) as such.

Status Quaestionis

Is there even metamorphosis?

However, on several aspects of the Daedalus and Icarus myth in Ovid there is scholarly disagreement. Firstly, that surrounds its significance as a constituent part of the *Metamorphoses*: it lacks a 'true' metamorphosis (but instead a miraculous flight) in accordance with the thematic precedence of the epic (such as Daphne transforming into laurel). Some critics such as Bömer have argued that this inconsistency is subordinated to the necessity of including Daedalus and Icarus as part of the mythic cycle pertinent to the place and preceding characters (the Minotaur, Ariadne: the Cretan tradition).[7] Moreover, analysis of the episode shows an inconsistency with other Ovidian

[6]A modern novel inspires this inquiry: in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916), Joyce aligns himself with Dedalus the main protagonist (Spoo 1994, 39-62). The character self-consciously reflects on his namesake Daedalus: "[…] at the name of the fabulous artificer, he seemed to hear the noise of dim waves and to see a winged form flying above the waves and slowly climbing the air […] Was it a quaint device opening a page of some medieval book of prophecies and symbols, a hawk-like man flying sunward above the sea, a prophecy of the end he had been born to serve […]?" (4.3.16). Voiced at the sea-shore this evokes the themes of creativity, marine flight, liminality (literal and figurative), (adherence to) literary tradition and fate, thus evoking the myth of Daedalus and Icarus. Here, Joyce's protagonist (and perhaps the author himself) directly encourages the parallel to the former. Helpfully, Joyce's novel gives an explicit Ovidian link on the first page: the epigraph cites "*et ignotas animum dimittit in artes*" (*Met*. 8.118), referring to Daedalus fashioning the wings. This reading of Joyce's work has partially prompted this thesis, to identify a similar approach to 'self' mythological reference in Ovid's oeuvre. Although the literary 'self' must remain distinct from the historical figure, there should be little difficulty when one remembers that for Ovid, these are largely one and the same thing, since his 'historicity' (empirically true or not) stems from his own literary output in the first place (Myers 2014, 8: "Ovid encourages the reader to read his personal history into his poetic corpus"). The thornier issue of whether it is problematic to examine ancient texts for a device explicit in the modern novel is also easily resolved. On initial readings, the wealth of allusion in Ovid's texts (though more subtle than in Joyce) not only tempt but encourage analogy between the speaker and Daedalus.

[7] Bömer 1977, 69.

transformations: the change of Daedalus and Icarus into winged-beings is physically reversible, not made at the behest of some unfathomable super-natural power.[8] Indeed, Daedalus is the agent of his own transformation and can return to his original state. However, the analysis of Hoefmans reconciles this seeming 'lack' (of metamorphosis) with a rational identification of a transformation that maintains the thematic thread. She concedes that although there is "no metamorphosis literally speaking",[9] there is in fact a metaphorical metamorphosis, that is transforming myth into reality. i.e. there is no supernatural, uncontrollable change, but a development made by the power of the artist. This answer is significant because it will affect not only the figures in the passage, but also Ovid's other characters, and, perhaps, even 'himself' – actor of an artistic identity.

How guilty is Ovid's Daedalus?

Another significant area of disagreement is the extent to which Daedalus is 'blameworthy' or in contrast 'admirable'. Ovid's passage in the *Metamorphoses* describes the wondrous skill of the artist as he succeeds in inventing an extraordinary escape route.[10] It is ambiguous as to whether the audience is supposed to be impressed or concerned that Daedalus pushes the bounds of nature. Some scholars have argued that the artist is successful, insofar as he escapes the clutches of tyrannical Minos, and thus he is heroic.[11] On the other hand, perhaps as a slight majority, critics have focused on the newness of Daedalus' art, heavily emphasised by Ovid's poem, and therefore its problematic, transgressive nature. This line of reasoning often reads the death of Icarus as some sort of punishment.[12] The content that immediately follows the flight, the description of Perdix, puts a more unambiguously negative spin on Daedalus. Overall, the guilt or innocence of the character is subjective and a fruitful dichotomy. How Ovid negotiates this ambiguity will be of interest for this

[8] Hoefmans 1994, 137-140 briefly introduces the opposing voices to this debate and pronounces that the Daedalus episode innovates: "[…] metamorphosis offers a metaphor for another 'metamorphosis': that of myth into reality."
[9] Ibid. 140.
[10] Mühlethaler 2012, 3. Furthermore, medieval tradition (e.g. *L'Ovide moralisé*), shows that Daedalus' divine connection was extended to include the Christian God; his status as carpenter made him "également un double de Joseph, père du Christ"; his flight was seen to reflect the Ascension and a desire to be close to God.
[11] Barbanera 2013, 24-25 discusses the doubly elevating effect of Daedalus' creation: the man is raised quite literally to the heavens, and he transcends the achievements of mankind. Barbanera goes further, making the explicit contrast to Icarus who flies too high, therefore leading to his downfall, whereas Daedalus succeeds in "not pushing too far" (25).
[12] The extent to which Daedalus is truly 'punished' is controversial. Hoefmans 1994, 141 emphasises that Daedalus' lack of supplication (present in the beginning of *Ars am.* 2) to Jove, when he is about to enter "divine territory", precipitates the expectation of retribution. Davisson 1997, 277 further explores the negative tone to the portrayal of Daedalus; the fact that the loss of Icarus is witnessed by Perdix recalls the jealousy of the artist. The introduction of Daedalus' nephew encourages the audience to associate the two, and therefore see the fall of Icarus as divine punishment, ironically imitating the fall of Perdix.

study, as the poet can be seen to foreground or elide certain aspects, to individually characterise and tailor Daedalus as perhaps an alter-ego.

Identifying Daedalus as analogous

Ahern makes a thorough analysis of the link between Daedalus and Ovid in the context of the *Ars Amatoria*, where both employ ingenuity.[13] For instance the *praeceptor amoris* preaches the value of "innate qualities" (*Ars am.* 2.112: *ingenii*); equally for Daedalus the challenge stirs his own "talent" (*Ars am.* 2.43: *ingenium*). But more broadly, Sharrock is one of the clearest critics in identifying a link between Daedalus the character, and Ovid the poet/ic speaker.[14] Thematic parallels are present in the original *Metamorphoses* passage, then confirmed by the poet's own exile, and made explicit in the subsequent *Tristia* and *Epistulae Ex Ponto*: the craftsmen are oppressed by a monarch; both create art that 'flies', but that soars too high; this art somehow leads to/exacerbates downfall; by suffering this fall the artists 'regret' their artfulness. By identifying a link between Daedalus and Ovid, the critic is perhaps inclined to feel more sympathetic to this (at times transgressive) artist figure. Despite these parallels, other critics focus more on what they perceive to be a rather overwhelmingly negative representation of Daedalus. Faber analyses the craftsman as "deceitful and impious"; he picks up on the frequent allusions to the sense of transgression against nature – an admittedly present criticism in the text.[15] But nevertheless, his criticism is too harsh in suggesting that Daedalus is "punished" for his behaviour, by the death of his son, when this (as Hoefmans points out) is emphatically not the case – the gods are not present.[16] This omission is striking by their prevalence in other parts of the *Metamorphoses*. This therefore casts some ambiguity onto the link between Ovid and Daedalus: the latter who (in his exile poetry) represents himself as sometimes divinely punished, at others as a victim of chance.

A final consideration by which to check any analogy-identification is the potential ambiguity of discussing 'Ovid' the historical poet and his separate poetic self. This is not only sensible reasoning, or argument of scholars such as Peek or Lateiner, but explicitly stated by the poets themselves.[17] For instance, Ovid's poetic 'apology', *Tristia* 2, emphatically states that even if his books were to have

[13] Ahern 1989, 291. Just as Daedalus instructs Icarus how to fly safely, Ovid, or the *praeceptor amoris*, instructs the lover to love with finesse, self-possession, and caution against losing one's head in the game.
[14] Sharrock 1994, 107.
[15] Faber 1998, 86.
[16] Ibid. 89; Hoefmans 1994, 146: "In a god-less environment, hybris does not make sense. In consequence there is no condition for a metamorphosis through punishment."
[17] Peek 2001, 129. cf. Catull. 16.5-6: *nam castum esse decet pium poetam / ipsum, versiculos nihil necesse est* ("For it is fitting for a poet himself to be chaste, no such thing is necessary for verses"). Lateiner 1977, 16: "the earliest protest we have against the biographical fallacy, the confusion of the poet and his poetry's *persona*."

contained a little sauciness, the poet is essentially different from his poetry. We must accept a distinction between *persona* and 'true' personality.

Tr. 2.353-357 *crede mihi, distant mores a carmine nostri -*
vita verecunda est, Musa iocosa mea -
magnaque pars mendax operum est et ficta meorum:
plus sibi permisit compositore suo.
nec liber indicum est animi
"Trust me, my morals are far from those in my poetry –
My life is modest, my Muse playful –
And a great part of my works is untruthful and fictitious:
It allows more to itself than to its author.
A book is not indication of mind"

This encapsulates the caution on the wording of this thesis: it is emphatically the *persona* of Ovid, his literary self that shall be analysed in terms of analogy to Daedalus.

Parallels

These questions neither particularly validate nor negate the parallels between Ovid's character Daedalus, and the poetic speaker himself. Instead, they affect the 'value' of the comparison, therefore pertaining to the later question of whether such analogy could, hypothetically, have been intended, and perhaps more importantly what effects are produced? However, first it stands to set out the plentiful parallels between Ovid and Daedalus.

1) The artists are in*nova*tive

One of the most immediate and striking parallels between Ovid and his character Daedalus is inventiveness. Not only does the poetic voice ascribe innovation to the craftsman on Crete, and to himself the narrator, but he inevitably plays into a tradition for the creativity of Daedalus. The poet can therefore be seen as 'using' a paradigmatic inventor to buttress his 'own' creator status. This tradition of ingenuity is evident at the first attestation of Daedalus in *Iliad* 18: the divinely manufactured Shield of Achilles displays a dance floor resembling that which "he [Daedalus]

Reuben Riepma
s2299704

furnished" (ἤσκησεν, *Il*. 18.592) for Ariadne. The reference therefore ennobles Daedalus' talent, as it sets a standard which Hephaestus imitates.[18]

This skilful character is also portrayed by a more contemporaneous influence for Ovid, Diodorus Siculus, who wrote also in the first century. Rather than focusing on his fantastical flight, Diodorus richly describes Daedalus' other talents, such as sculpting. In the *Bibliotheca Historica*, Daedalus is marked as naturally "being superior" (ὑπεραίρων) to all others, in terms of his skill for "carpentry" (τεκτονικὴν), "making statues" (ἀγαλμάτων) and "stone working" (λιθουργίαν): a tricolon for sculptural prowess (Diod. Sic. 4.76.1). Diodorus goes on to specify that Daedalus' works were so impressive, they inspired later generations to "mythologise" (μυθολογῆσαι) about their naturalism: the statues could "walk around" (περιπατεῖν), and "they so accurately composed whole bodies" (τὴν τοῦ ὅλου σώματος διάθεσιν) that they were believed to be "living" (ζῷον) (Diod. Sic. 4.76.2) – thus testifying to an early instance of the theme of art imitating nature.

Discourses on sculpture and creativity in Greek references have their parallels in the Ovidian corpus. This is evident at Daedalus' first mention in the *Metamorphoses*; identified as the maker of the labyrinth, he is distinguished as "most famous in the craftsman's art" (*Met.* 8.159: *fabrae celeberrimus artis*). Seemingly the poet picks up on this celebrity and will align himself with almost equal renown. This recalls the statement in Diodorus that Daedalus' skill inspired the spreading of stories by word of mouth. The sense is perhaps somewhat similar when Ovid's meta-poetic coda to the *Met*. declares *ore legar populi* […] *vivam* (*Met.* 15.878-879: "I shall be spoken by men's mouths […] I shall live [on]"). The poet buys into the idea that literary genius is the key to immortality, which though not new,[19] is sought through poetic innovations. This is most obvious in a passing reference of the *Ars Amatoria,* where the speaker describes his own work as novelty. Speaking of the *Heroides,* he claims that the poet (himself the third person) *novavit* – either he "invented" outright, or at least "renewed" – a form that was before *ignotum* ("unknown") to all others (*Ars am.* 3.346). The justice behind Ovid's claim has been variously debated, and on the balance of surviving sources, we might agree that the *Heroides* represented innovation in that there are no other extant "collections of verse letters on the subject of love".[20]

[18] Frontisi-Ducroux 1975, 25. This first naming also links lexically to Homeric cognates of δαιδάλειος – the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* use verbs, adjective or substantives, all pertaining to the working of art/craft.
[19] Cf. Hor. *Odes* 3.30: *exegi monumentum aere perennius* ("I have set up a [literary] monument more lasting than bronze"); Catull. 1.10: *plus uno maneat perenne saeclo* ("more than one life-time may it [the book] remain forever").
[20] Conte 1994, 347. Despite the novelty of anthologising poetic letters, there is a precedent: Propertius 4.3 purports to be a letter from Arethusa who misses Lycotas as he campaigns with the Roman army. Ovid's innovation is to greatly expand into mythological themes.

However, Ovid's poetry is quite clearly inventive without him having to spell it out. This is partially a symptom of the time in which he lived – in the new Augustan age of imperial peace – thus Ovid had new challenges and values to discuss.[21] But more specifically, as the poet "persistently challenges the privileged status of Homer and Vergil" he is recognised for having renovated the epic genre.[22] Indeed, the *Metamorphoses* can be seen to subvert canonical precedents, stories, or generic rules, with the consequence that there are many moments of bathos and humour.[23] An example is the vignette that immediately follows Daedalus' story, in the "overtly epic material" of the hunt for the Calydonian Boar in book 8.[24] Having established the challenge of the fearsome beast, it is said that *Meleagros et una* / *lecta manus iuvenum coiere cupidine laudis* (*Met*. 8.299-300: "Meleager and a band of select youths united with desire of glory"). This sets the scene for a classic epic pursuit for *kléos.* Yet in the hunt that follows, none of the youthful heroes positively distinguish themselves: for instance Nestor, the traditional Homeric figure, "vaults" (*Met.* 8.367: *insiluit*) into a tree with his spear. And despite the assembly of macho grandees, it is Atalanta the female who draws first blood; her detractor, who arrogantly cries *discite femineis quid tela virilia praestent* (*Met.* 8.392: "Learn how far manly weapons surpass a woman's") is ingloriously emasculated by a tusk to the groin. The section therefore subverts the epic setting, its heroic characters and their chauvinistic bravado.[25] Therefore, however consciously or unconsciously, Ovid is perhaps reinventing the epic genre.[26] And by this means, the poet shows his propensity to *novare* ("to renew/invent") – the verb that as we shall see below is used with regards to the metapoetic proem and the creativity of Daedalus himself.

Turning to Ovid's Daedalus sections, we can see specific linguistic resonances in declarations about his own poetic project, and the creativity of the mythical Athenian. For a very first example of Ovid

[21] Ibid. 342.
[22] Pavlock 2009, 13.
[23] Peek 2001, 131 emphasises the parodic undercutting of canonical characters and events. Although this is not itself radical, the sheer extent and setting of Ovid's poetry has led Peek to conclude, perhaps overreachingly, that the comic undercutting of conservative Roman taste and epic genre is the "function of the entire work". This is perhaps too total a statement – the *Met.* cannot be assigned a function for its entirety, as Peek himself later concludes (2001, 146: "black humour creates such an inconsistent perspective […] The comic does not preclude the serious nor vice versa.") – but it is nonetheless apt to identify irreverence as one of its eminent tones.
[24] Pavlock 1998, 141.
[25] Tarrant 2002a, 354: on the prevalence of chaos in the *Met*.: violation of boundaries and confusion of order lurk throughout the poem. Though Ovid is not the first to discuss Chaos, he is perhaps innovative to propound the theory of such continual flux and inversion.
[26] For an example of this 'new' epic poetic in the story of Daedalus and Icarus itself, cf. Pavlock 2009, 66. It is argued that the simile of the Maeander for the Labyrinth is emblematic of Ovid's "playfulness": the river is described with greater varying detail and literal playfulness (*Met*. 8.162-163: *liquidis* […] *in undis* / *ludit*; "it plays in its clear waters") – than in the account of his epic predecessor Vergil.

Reuben Riepma
s2299704

and Daedalus directly paralleled, primary perhaps not only in significance, but also in its literal position, we can look to the beginning of the *Metamorphoses* and its programmatic claims:

Met. 1.1-2 *In **nova** fert **animus** mutatas dicere formas* / *Corpora*

"My **mind** impels me to speak of forms changed into **new** bodies"

The poet declares that his *animus* inspires him to describe forms changed into *nova* […] *Corpora*; he refers both to the fantastical content of the metamorphosed "new bodies", but also to the newness of the literary "body/collection".[27] Indeed, it ambitiously charts mythology spinning down from the dawn of time to the days of the poet: *mea* […] *tempora* (*Met*. 1.4: "my times"). Daedalus is equally famous for his pioneering arts:

Met. 8.188-189 *Dixit et **ignotas animum** dimittit in artes* / *Naturamque **novat***

"He spoke, and turns his **mind** to **unknown** arts, and he **renews** nature"

Just as with line 1.1, the idiom of application of the *animus* is used. There is a slight contrast as Daedalus is the subject, consciously applying his mental energy, whereas the poetic speaker evokes external inspiration for himself, the implied grammatical object (but this is perhaps a symptom of placement within an epic's proem). Irrespectively, there is a linguistic echo that equates the artists in terms of their mindfulness for creativity. Moreover, both focus on newness: Daedalus "renews" (*novat*) nature, and the poet promises "new" (*nova*) bodies. Although the verse declares that Daedalus follows nature's precedent – indeed, his wings 'copy' those of "real birds" (Met. 8.195: *veras* […] *aves*) – his creative approach is pioneering. He alone has the vision and technical skills to make humans fly like birds; it is inspired *mimesis*.[28] Ovid too could make this claim with respect to the *Heroides* (perhaps the *ignotas* of *Met*. 8.188 is reminiscent of *Ars am.* 3.346), but also for his ambitious epic that privileges subjectivity, unorthodoxy and change. The poet reinterprets epic and mythic characters (such as Daedalus) as part of his process of creation. This therefore parallels Ovid and Daedalus as both renew/invent by their interpretation and adaptation of their influences and materials.

Linguistic parallels also allude to an equivalence between the technical manufacturing/literary composition of the creative pair. In *Met*. 8 Daedalus' innovation is the production of wings, to enable flight from Crete. Taking inspiration from nature, the Athenian "places feathers in order" (*Met*. 8.189: *ponit in ordine pennas*) – i.e., in an effective aeronautic structure. Ovid's poetical creation also

[27] Davisson 1984, 113 points out that Ovid later refers to his "body" [of poetry] (*Tr.* 3.14.8: *corpus*).
[28] Wise 1977, 53.

involves the systematic arrangement of many little pieces – words to fit the metrical feet. The speaker is clearly conscious about the effects of these patterns on his verse, opening with the jocular reference to Cupid in his early work the *Amores*. In this context the winged-god actively steals a "foot" (*pedem*) thus diverting the tone from serious epic to playful elegiac (*Am*. 1.1.3-4). Moreover, this is mournfully recalled from exile as the poet describes waking to a vision of Cupid: addressed as the one who guided that "I put five feet after six" – forming the elegiac couplet (*Pont*. 3.3.30: *apposui senis* […] *quinque pedes*). Here we can again see the focus on careful arrangement shared with Daedalus. The verb *apposui* ("I put") picks up on the cognate of Daedalus' *ponit* ("he places"), and the uses of the building blocks, the *pennas* ("feathers") of the Athenian and the *pedes* ("feet") of the poet, are both equally crucial. Besides this, though etymologically disparate, the aural similarity of the things that are being arranged - the *pennas* and the *pedes* – may encourage the audience to hear some equivalence in their manufacturing.

Further to these parallels, there is perhaps a blurring of semantics for the technical physical bindings in both processes. Specifically, this is the use of "wax" by Daedalus (*Met*. 8.193: *ceris*) to stick the feathers together, later handled by Icarus (*Met.* 8.198: *ceram*) in his curiosity.[29] This contrasts to the noun used by Apollodorus, κόλλης (*Epit.* 1.12), which means more generally "something that binds/sticks together".[30] It may be a coincidence of tradition – Ovid's Daedalus using wax – but it is nevertheless highly suggestive that the material is also notably used for writing (tablets).[31] This is for instance particularly evident in the Byblis episode, where the smitten sister takes "wax" (*Met*. 9.521: *ceram*) to start her letter; "wax" (*Met*. 9.529: *ceris*) which she amends; her words make the "wax full" (*Met*. 9.564-565: *plena* […] *cera*); but later in despondency she regrets trusting "wax" to represent her (*Met*. 9.601: *cerae*). The speaker of Ovid's exile poetry is forced to rely on this detached medium, questioning whether Macer will recognise him by his words borne on *impressae* […] *cerae* (*Pont*. 2.10.1: "pressed wax"). The material can therefore be seen as symbolic for representing people, bringing them together and cultivating connections. The reference to the "linen bindings" (*Ars am*. 2.46: *lini vincula*), that are woven and held together with wax also perhaps evoke

[29] Pavlock 2009, 67. Points out the irony that "the image of Icarus softening the wax is later recalled when the wax on the wings softens naturally by proximity to the sun" – thus intensifying the pathos of his ignorant meddling.
[30] Apollodorus' noun is from the verb κολλάω ("to glue/bind"), origin of our "collagen". *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* (2015).
[31] Though wax, especially when mentioned by Ovid's women, has additional connotations. Hypsipyle accuses Medea of manipulating wax effigies (*Her*. 6.91: *simulacraque cerea figit*). Laodamia echoes this herself; she declares that she cherishes a wax (*Her*. 13.152: *cera*) model of Protesilaus, and urges his return with the exhortation "add a voice to the wax, it will be Protesilaus" (*Her*. 13.156: *adde sonum cerae, Protesilaus erit*). This latter use by Laodamia reflects a symbolic power of wax to communicate and bring together – as Ovid's wax tablets bear the voices of their authors.

the imagery of ancient book binding.[32] Thus by the basic similarity of the materials of their crafts, the audience might be encouraged to identify parallels, to the extent of analogy, between Daedalus and the poet.

By these various similarities in the descriptions of their arts – wing-making and writing poetry – Ovid's poetic voice and Daedalus are strongly paralleled. The insistence on innovation, creativity and its associated celebrity are tropes stressed in relation to both. Besides, the similarities of the production processes seem to also encourage this alignment. And so despite the differences of wings and poetry – they are made to seem similar, and so draw their representatives closer.

2) Hated exile

But despite their creative brilliance (perhaps as a consequence of it) both Daedalus and Ovid were also famous for being exiled: separation from their cities, Athens and Rome, is portrayed as loathsome to the artists. Here chronology of Ovid's life might contradict analogy – composition of the *Metamorphoses* mostly precedes exile in 8 AD (although parts may have been revised post-exile[33]), thus decreasing the possibility that this aspect of Daedalus is 'used'. Nevertheless, parallelism within the texts certainly reflects a diachronic aversion to exile, and chronology need not invalidate literary patterns, since analogy does not require authorial-intention (however problematic proved) to ultimately be present. Forthwith, it stands to sketch how Daedalus came to be an exile in Ovid (and his sources), and then to assess his response to it. We shall see that Ovid shares similar exilic sentiments in his later 'auto'-biographical poetry from the Black Sea.

Daedalus' origin in Athens is undisputed by surviving sources (Diod. Sic. 4.76.1), yet he is commonly associated with Crete and Sicily, places at which he stayed after his banishment.[34] Diodorus specifies a reason: motivated by artistic "jealousy" (Diod. Sic. 4.76.6: φθονήσας), Daedalus murdered his nephew Talos, was found guilty by the court on the Areopagus, and was thus forced to flee. Apollodorus adds the detail (*Bibl*. 3.15.8) that the nephew had been pushed from the Acropolis to fall fatally from a great height. This background is picked up by Ovid who immediately follows the flight and fall of Daedalus and Icarus with the reappearance of Talos/Perdix. He is here in his state as the "partridge" (*Perdix*), metamorphosed by Minerva thus preserving his life (*Met.* 8.252-253); this detail is not without irony after the failure of the human made 'bird-boy' Icarus. Ovid's Perdix gleefully relishes the poetic justice of the *schadenfreude*: announcing his presence with "joyful chirping" (*Met*. 8.238: *gaudia cantu*). The presence of Perdix has thus a twofold effect:

[32] Cowell 1974, 797.
[33] Anderson 1989, 11.
[34] *Brill's New Pauly* (2006), Daedalus.

(re)introducing general questions about justice/punishment, and reminding the audience of an artist's nuance. Despite his capacity for great innovation as explored earlier, Daedalus (and later, as we shall see, Ovid) is nevertheless human, inconsistent, and capable of making mistakes. But for the purpose of the point here, it is simply important to emphasise that Daedalus' exile was canonical – and caused by his own crime, thus perhaps making it more hateful.

This tradition of Daedalus' exile status is maintained in the poetry of Ovid. Of the craftsman, the Latin author specifies that it is the very exile that motivates the vignette of the flight, to be followed pointedly with the reminder of his crime. Yet his first mention is in relation to his utility to Minos, in that he designs the labyrinth to hide away the Minotaur, the King's embarrassment (*Met*. 8.157-160).[35] After briefly summarising the monster's defeat by Theseus, helped by Ariadne, whom he then abandons, the narrative returns to the architect. The poetic voice declares that meanwhile Daedalus' existence is simply "loathing Crete and the long exile" (*Met*. 8.183-184: *Creten longumque perosus* / *exilium*). This then leads to the conclusion that since the sea and earth are barred to him, escape is above as "the sky lies open" (*Met*. 8.186: *caelum certe patet*). By choosing this super-natural version of the myth, the poet emphasises the totality of Daedalus' imprisonment – there is no solution available on earth.[36]

The poetic speaker of exile is trapped in a more mundane world, without the possibility of such miraculous escape. We know extensive details, surely a mixture of fact and fiction, from the works of Ovid himself alone – primarily the *Tristia* ("Sad Things") and the *Epistulae Ex Ponto* ("Letters from Pontus"). These collections both discuss Ovid's exile as their central theme – indeed, they are known as his "exile poetry".[37] Their theme is immediate: in *Tr*. 1.1 Ovid addresses his poems as humble mourners of his legacy, travelling whither he is "not permitted" (*Tr.* 1.1.2: *non licet*) as an "exile" (*Tr.* 1.1.3: *exulis*). Likewise, the programmatic poem of the *Ex Ponto* announces missives from "abroad" (*Pont.* 1.1.3: *peregrinos*), the "offspring from an exile" (*Pont.* 1.1.21: *ortos exule*). Quite simply, the two collections are about the exile of the poetic speaker – Ovid.[38] The hatefulness of this

[35] i.e. the Minotaur, offspring of Pasiphae's infidelity. The *Bibliotheca Historica* (Diod. Sic. 4.77.5) adds that Daedalus' knowledge of this perversion (enabled by his artifice), coupled with knowledge of the labyrinth made Minos keen to keep him under lock and key. Herein perhaps lies another parallel forward to Ovid, the speaker who declares that he saw something he should not (explicitly likening himself to Actaeon): "why did I make my eyes guilty?" (*Tr*. 2.104ff: *cur noxia lumina feci*?). There is thus the hint that the creators are party to the secrets of their rulers, therefore making themselves threats.

[36] i.e. the *Bibliotheca Historica* includes an account in which Daedalus sails away from Crete (with Minos in hot pursuit); the death of Icarus was therefore not falling from the heavens, but falling on a slippery vessel (Diod. Sic. 4.77.6). If Ovid had chosen this account, Daedalus' situation would have perhaps seemed less severe – requiring no super-natural craft.

[37] Conte 1994, 357-358. Most scholars accept the auto-biographicality of Ovid's exile.

[38] Despite the trend to accept the historicity of Ovid's exile, occasional scholars such as Fitton Brown (1985) have attempted to disprove it. By Ovid's exaggerations that correspond imperfectly to the climate of the

banishment is emphasised by hyperbole of the barrenness of the Tomitan climate,[39] and the 'lose-lose' supernatural aspect. He is on the wrong side of Augustus, who is likened to omnipotent Jove, ruling more by "fear of punishment", but also with a "rare thunderbolt" (*Pont*. 1.2.125-126: *multa metu poenae* […] / […] *fulmina rara*). Yet the speaker's world is contrastingly devoid of 'positive' divine help as counterbalance, something attributed significantly to place – "the summoned Muse does not visit the harsh Getics" (*Pont*. 1.5.12: *nec venit ad duros Musa vocata Getas*). Moreover, since it is these deities, emblematic of his creativity and wit, the deadening of his main powers is emphasised.

This sense of deadening also invasively creeps into the speaker's physicality. Emotively addressing the wife from whom he is separated, the poet describes symptoms of anguish: "worry" (*Pont.* 1.4.8: *anxietas animi*) forces him to be an old man before his time (*Pont*. 1.4.20: *ante meum tempus cogit et esse senem*); wrinkles "furrow" (*Pont.* 1.4.2: *arat*) his face; his "shattered body" languishes (*Pont*. 1.4.3: *quasso* […] *corpore*). Simply the exertion and stress of exile render the speaker into a wreck, both physical and mental; he is a pitiful contrast to his former self in Rome.[40] The audience is thus emphatically encouraged to regard the exile as wholly detrimental and hateful.

But more gravely still, displacement has a metaphorical implication, causing the speaker to see himself as residing in a state of "living death".[41] This allusion is made explicitly with several references that locate "Stygian waters" nearby: (*Tr*. 5.9.19: *Stygia* […] *unda*); (*Pont*. 1.8.27: *Stygias* […] *oras*); (*Pont.* 2.3.44: *Stygia* […] *aqua*); (*Pont.* 3.5.56: *Styge*); (*Pont*. 4.9.74: *Stygiis* […] *aquis*).[42] Tomis is therefore coloured as the 'real' Hades of the poet's world. As for a reason, Grebe succinctly concludes that the parallel (exile as death) would have been natural for Ovid since it was reinforced by "[a]rchaic religious thinking and Roman legal practices", and besides the fact that Tomis represented to him the "unknown".[43] Thus by this theme of boundary transgressed – Rome to Tomis; known to unknown; life to death – the senses of wasteful destruction and therefore the

region, and a silence by later historians such as Tacitus, Fitton Brown concludes that exile must have been unreality – but instead a poetic exercise. These arguments are by no means case-closing and are immaterial to the present argument; this thesis sticks to 'reality' within the Ovidian corpus itself.

[39] Such as the emphasis on iciness: the area is "stiff with perpetual coldness" (*Pont*. 2.7.72: *frigore perpetuo* […] *riget*). This particularly triggered the refutations of Fitton Brown (1985, 19): the poet claims that wine consumed at Tomis is frozen in block form (*Tr*. 3.10.23-24).

[40] The theme of recognition opens the poem with the mournful hypothetical: "if you were to see me suddenly, you would not be able to recognise [me]" (*Pont*. 1.4.5: *nec si me subito videas agnoscere possis*). This shows the poet's decline of identity, and emphasises by the present subjunctives (rather than more definite indicatives) his increasing "remoteness" (Helzle 1989, 188).

[41] Grebe 2010, 508.

[42] Ibid. 502.

[43] Ibid. 509. For a more detailed discussion on "Exile as Crossing the Threshold of the Known World" (492-500); "The Archaic Religious Background of Exile" (500-503); "Exile and Death in Roman Legal Practice" (503-508).

hatefulness of the exile are buttressed. Nonetheless, returning to Daedalus we may also see a contrast despite the common suffering of a loathsome exile. This divides the 'mythic' Daedalus and the 'real' Ovid – for the latter exile is 'death', whereas for the former it provides the exigency for a marvellous creation, but crucially one that is unavailable in the poet's 'real' world.

This dichotomy, and, as mentioned before, the trope of divine distance, give a sense of cold painful realism for the poet in contrast to the characters of his previous work. For Ovid there is no levity of metamorphosis, as he is not unshackled from mortal bonds and turned into a bird: instead, he cannot even be petrified and thus saved from eternal suffering like Niobe. The poet apostrophises to the queen (*Pont*. 1.2.29: *felicem Nioben*) many times bereft, with piquant paradox – hailing her happiness (almost *makarismos*): the first person on the other hand laments "I am the one who wishes vainly to be stone" (*Pont*. 1.2.34: *ille ego sum, frustra qui lapis esse velim*). Moreover, he lugubriously suggests that should Medusa appear, even her petrifying power would be wasted on him (*Pont*. 1.2.36: *amittet vires ipsa Medusa suas*). These mentions of stone could perhaps be read as faint allusions to the original stonemason Daedalus, he who carved so dexterously that the difference between life and art was imperceptible; whereas the artist (Ovid) making the mournful reference has no such power. Instead, the poet lives on powerlessly in pain.

In response to this suffering Ovid makes one of his few direct comments to self-analogise with Daedalus. The opening of *Tristia* 3.8 is broadly a wish to fly from his troubles – but then the speaker self-excoriates: "Fool! Why wish in vain with childish prayers" (*Tr.* 3.8.11: *stulte, quid* […] *frustra votis puerilibus optas*). Instead, he returns to the crux of his very real dependence on Augustus. Nonetheless, the background to this is a list of mythical flight characters: *Triptolemi* […] *Medeae* […] *Perseu, Daedale* (*Tr*. 3.8.1-6).[44] It is striking that Daedalus, the man whose situation most closely resembles the speaker's is placed ('best till') last in this list – thus perhaps revalidating its eminence. Moreover, the poet details that he envies the craftsman's opportunity to fly back to his "sweet fatherland" (*Tr*. 3.8.8: *patriae dulce* […] *solum*). This sentiment is developed to include the people he misses, and morphs into an exemplary Odyssean longing that "most of all" he should look upon the "dear face" of his wife (*Tr*. 3.8.10: *caraque praecipue coniugis ora meae*). The lines again voiced as uncertain wishes dependent on the subjunctive (*Tr*. 3.8.8: *aspicerem,* "should I see") emphasise primarily a sense of the speaker's piety – for land and conjugal love he yearns – but also the pathos of his situation. Here, by the explicit contrast to mythic characters, prominently including Daedalus,

[44] Triptolemus disseminated Demeter's gifts from a winged chariot (*h. Hymn Dem.* 153; 474); Medea flew from her crimes in one exile to the next on Helios' chariot (Eur. *Med.* 1320); Perseus borrows the winged-sandals to defeat Medusa, and also inadvertently creates Pegasus (Apollod. *Bibl*. 2.4.1-3).

the poetic speaker seems most pitiable, suffering an invidious position. Several verses later this contrast is reasserted by the picture of inhospitable Tomitan landscape:

Tr. 3.8.23 *nec **caelum** nec aquae faciunt nec terra nec **aurae***

"neither the sky nor waters suit, nor the earth, nor the airs"

This strongly recalls the imagery of the escape route, worded as aforementioned in relation to Daedalus (*Met.* 8.186). For the craftsman on Crete and the other mythic characters of flight, their avenues of escape lie in the open sky. Instead, by taunting reality for the poetic speaker this path will not do. Moreover, it is denoted by the words emphasised above which encircle the line - perhaps adding to the sense that he (in contrast to them) is entrapped by his 'reality'. Therefore by outdoing the *exempla* in pitifulness – here Ovid glides over the destructive consequence for Daedalus/Icarus – focusing on their liberation, he underscores the massive hatefulness of his exile. This is further confirmed by the second half of *Tr.* 3.8 which resumes the tragic theme of physical and mental decline: "perpetual languor grips my body", etc. (*Tr.* 3.8.24: […] *perpetuus corpora languor habet*).

Therefore, though Daedalus and the poet both suffer exile, it is the power of the latter to make his seem worse. This is perhaps his only power (self-expression), as unlike the mythical characters he is constrained by his position in the 'real' world. With supernatural flight impossible and *deus ex machina* absent, the poet sticks to creating tableaux of pathos, penitence and pitifulness. This demonstrates his remorse, submissiveness, and thus lack of threat, thereby opening the possibility of being moved/recalled. Although it produces a self-characterisation as a 'weak' exile, it was perhaps a judicious approach for rehabilitation. Here of course is one of the clearest contrasts between Ovid and Daedalus: the latter is more proactive, but enabled by his mythic/magical setting.

3) Oppression by Authority

Linked to the contextual similarity of exile, both artists also live in subordination to authoritarian leaders. For Ovid, this is Augustus, but if we first return to the myth of Daedalus in the *Metamorphoses*, we see the looming figure of king Minos.

Immediately at first characterisation the Cretan king is righteous:

Met. 7.457-458 *patria tamen est firmissimus ira*
Androgeique necem iustis ulciscitur armis.
"however he is strongest in fatherly wrath
And he avenges the death of Androgeos with just arms."

The enallage of his "just" arms emphasises that although war is essentially destructive, Minos' stated reasons are 'right'. His characterisation is consistent in the episode preceding Daedalus and Icarus, which shows him honourably rejecting Scylla's treasonous love-declaration. Physically he "recoils" (*Met.* 8.95: *refugit*) and mentally he is "shaken" (*Met*. 8.96: *turbatus*): his natural reaction is disgust for Scylla's betrayal of her father(land) and household gods (*Met*. 8.91: *patriaeque meosque penates*). Minos is therefore a largely positive contrast to the passion driven girl, and he resembles his characterisation by Diodorus Siculus (Diod. Sic. 5.76.4), in embodying the conservative protector of traditional piety – perhaps even a slight resemblance to Augustus, the great 'moral' legislator.[45]

Furthermore, Minos exhorts that Scylla should be removed from the (peopled) world, denied access to "land and sea" (*Met*. 8.97-98: *tellusque* […] *pontusque*) – which foreshadows his very injunction against Daedalus. The craftsman declares "[though] he might rule over everything, Minos does not rule the sky" (*Met*. 8.187: *omnia possideat, non possidet aera Minos*), which thus leads him to literally take flight.[46] Such a motif, of passage restricted by an ostensibly honourable and justified dictator is also quite clearly evident in Ovid's exile poetry. Although in the case of the poetic speaker here, he has no wings, but winged-words instead, that he encourages, apostrophising, to travel where their creator may not (*Tr*. 1.1.2: *quo domino non licet ire*).

However, back in the Scylla episode Minos is made out to be an almost Jupiter-like figure who brings his hegemony, but also peace and laws. Having taken Nisus' city, and uttered the travel-ban he, the "most just creator", imposes laws on his conquered enemies (*Met*. 8.101-102: *dixit, et ut leges captis iustissimus auctor* / *hostibus inposuit*). The primary almost abrupt placement of *dixit* ("he said") effectively gives the impression that it is the first and last word on the situation – like the divine arbiter in epic (Verg. *Aen*. 4.238: *dixerat*. Jupiter emphatically sends the order for Aeneas to move on). Beyond this tone, there is a distinctively imperial Roman flavour to the language behind the description as a superlatively just "author" (*auctor*) of laws, legislating the vanquished. As Rowe points out, the term *iustissimus auctor* is identically applied to Augustus (*Met.* 15.833: "most just author") – the only two instances of the phrase in the entire *Metamorphoses*.[47] Moreover, the choice of the word *auctor* could be perhaps seen as a nod to the ambiguous term *auctoritas* used in Augustus' *Res Gestae* (*RG* 34.3).[48]

[45] McGinn 2008, 25-26: characterises Augustan moral legislation as the enforcement of "status-maintenance".
[46] Maier 1981, 13-14. Moreover, this line (187) heavily emphasises – by caesura, repetition and chiasmus – the antithesis that Daedalus seeks to exploit. Contrast of human power against the untameable heaven, reminds that Daedalus' exploit is exceptional.
[47] Rowe 2013, 7.
[48] Galinsky 2015, 247-249. Argues convincingly against the theory of Rowe (2013) which limits Augustan *auctoritas* to the corollaries of his official appointment as *princeps senatus*. Instead, Galinsky reasserts the

In addition to characterisation by his own speech/actions, and the words of the poetic speaker, Minos is coloured by the reactions to him by others, namely Scylla. It is immediately curious that she, the spurned lover, seems to accept his moral judgement. This is clear when she confesses guilt, declaring that she is worthy of death (*Met*. 8.127: *fateor* […] *sum digna perire*). Seemingly she acknowledges Minos' epithet *iustissimus* (*Met.* 8.101), in a way highly similar to the apology and self-abasement of the speaker in Ovid's later exile poetry. Indeed, the exilic persona is quite consistently repentant, arguing that his guilt is more painful than the punishment itself (*Pont*. 1.1.60-62: *paenitet o!* […] *quam meruisse minus*). By this acceptance and demonstration of sorrow, the speaker suggests that he is worthy of reassessment. In contrast, Scylla's sorrow is directed at her own people whom she has betrayed (*Met*. 8.126) – although she might recognise the justice of the authority figure (Minos/Augustus), she feels no compulsion to apologise to him. Instead, Scylla savagely ridicules Minos as hard-hearted, more obdurate than a bull, and therefore worthy of his bull-loving wife (*Met*. 8.136-137)! This is at least a stark contrast to exilic Ovid who more directly surrenders to authority, holding a position of ostensibly great respect and lauds Livia as equally divine to her husband Augustus.[49] The speaker states, with strong panegyric tones, that the imperial couple, "true gods" (*Pont*. 1.4.56: *dis veris*), are worthy of incense offerings. Although Minos is never himself so deified, and his wife is the object of shame, it is ultimately telling that Scylla accepts his justice: he represents the traditional marker of righteousness and piety.

Although Minos is largely absent from the Daedalus episode, it has been fruitful to examine his earlier appearances, thus giving an impression of the figure against whom the craftsman strives. Within the Daedalus and Icarus episode, the king of Crete is referenced primarily for commissioning the labyrinth, on the account of his "wife's disgrace" (*Met*. 8.155-156: *foedumque* […] *adulterium*). And this leads to the implied injunction against the departure of the maze's chief engineer, so the secret does not get out (*Met.* 8.185-186). However, since Minos is characterised as *iustissimus* and pious, a curious dichotomy with respect to the subordinated Daedalus is produced. One the one hand, the audience might pity the suffering of exile, whereas on the other, we may suspect there is some rationality, if not justice behind the dictat of Minos. Therefore, the design of Daedalus, to creatively disobey the 'just' king is arguably from the outset problematised, not only as invention against nature, but also against orthodoxy. This is perhaps not necessarily a dichotomy to express

broader and more conventional reading that *auctoritas* contrasted with *potestas* (power *de facto*) to encompass many aspects of Augustus' 'soft' power, such as influence and authority.

[49] McGowan 2009, 69. Although: "[g]iven the emperor's widespread reputation as a philanderer (Suet. *Aug*. 69.1–2; Dio. 54.16.3), the notion that Livia is the only possible complement to Augustus is surely ironic and may be meant as an insult rather than compliment." i.e. there may be a subtle jibe against Augustus through Livia.

moral value against Daedalus' approach, but it demonstrates how the pioneering artist must fly in the face of tradition.

In Ovid's exilic *oeuvre* the speaker seems to share this slightly uneasy, ambiguous relationship with a dictator, who represents traditional *pietas*. And, as mentioned before, there are subtle hints that Minos is quite like Augustus. Nevertheless, there is also a contrast in their reception by the two artists: the exilic speaker adopts ostentatious obsequiousness, appropriating a panegyric style.[50] Not only is Augustus praised in conjunction with his wife, as mentioned earlier, but he is singularly and directly paralleled to Jove.[51] Whereas the dominion of Minos is the Mediterranean, thereby imprisoning Daedalus, the influence of Augustus goes above and beyond human borders. Moreover, there is an implicit Daedalic parallel: whereas the fliers must be aware of the *sun* on high, the exilic speaker's world trembles all the way "from the rising to the setting of the sun" (*Pont*. 1.4.29-30: *solis ab ortu*/ *solis ad occasus*). Once again this emphasises that for him there is no such avenue of escape, nor a fixed-point to avoid, but ubiquitous subjugation. Although here the context is a comparison to Jason (*Pont.* 1.4.23-25), the demarcation of the sun motif perhaps also faintly evokes the fatal melting of Daedalus' invention (*Met*. 8.225-226). Beyond this solar imagery, Augustus is aligned to the thundering power of Jupiter. This is evident by the poetic speaker's immediate fear to be struck (*Tr*. 1.1.71-72 and 81-82) by the god, following Jove's epic precedent for smiting those who soar too ambitiously (*Met*. 2.304-313: Phaeton). Therefore, while Augustus may be equated to the justice figure of Minos, he is also the like the loftier potentate Jupiter. The effect of this is to subtly outdo the oppression suffered by Daedalus.

Furthermore, with Augustus as Jove, that is not particularly 'positive' praise after a work such as the *Metamorphoses,* in which gods are thoroughly problematic.[52] Indeed, the comparison makes Augustus seem harsh and vindictive: Syme aptly highlights the frequency of the word *ira* ("rage") applied to the emperor in Ovid's exile works – terming this "deliberate and ominous".[53] Undoubtedly this aspect of the dictator's poetic deification is problematic – while at face value seeming full of praise, the speaker shows a wariness for instantaneous destruction. Furthermore, it places his fall as a consequence of arbitrary condemnation, which returning to the exile status of the two artists

[50] McGowan 2009, 66-68.
[51] Ibid. 67: following the triumphal tradition of treating the general as 'Jupiter for a day', it was natural for the *princeps* to be thus elevated. However, the explicitness with which Ovid's exile poetry makes the parallel, jars with Augustus' reticence to be recognised as divine in his lifetime.
[52] Conte 1994, 354. In Ovid, "divinities are brought down to earth and operate under the force of completely human sentiments and passions, and not often the noblest of them. Love, jealousy, rancour, and revenge are the impulses that drive them and that overwhelm the human beings, *victims of their capricious power*." (My emphasis).
[53] Syme 1978, 223.

brings another contrast. Daedalus is sentenced by a court for murder, whereas the poet is tried by a more ambiguous power, emphatically "not by senatorial decree nor by select court" (*Tr*. 2.131-1323: *nec* […] *decreto* […] *senatus* / *nec* […] *selecto iudice*). The characterisation of Augustus as almost omnipotent is therefore perhaps a continuation of Ovid's 'outdoing' of Daedalus.[54]

But for the proposed analogy, we must remember that Daedalus is struck not by Jupiter's thunderbolt, but he suffers the loss of Icarus by the "sun" (*Met.* 8.225: *solis*). It might be tempting to explain this away as insignificant (natural consequence), given the precedent for distinction between Sol and Apollo in Latin Literature.[55] However, as Greek mythology (an influence for Ovid[56]) was more ambiguous in this distinction, often blending the roles of Helios and Apollo, and as indeed the epithet Phoebus denotes both deities, we may therefore recognise an allusion to Apollo.[57] If this identification is accepted, there are interesting historical implications that add another dimension to the Ovid-Daedalus analogy. On the one hand, there is a neat allusive wink that the lethal threat to Daedalus is Apollonian, as is the emperor who banishes Ovid. Moreover, the two Apollonians so destructive to Ovid and (indirectly) to Daedalus are inherently passive, rather than actively fulfilling the vindictive god *topos*.[58] This fits the guilt imagery of both circumstances, where for Ovid his 'own' indiscretion is to blame for his downfall, the "poem and mistake" (*Tr*. 2.207: *carmen et error*), for Icarus (Daedalus' loss) it is his own mindlessness to be "pulled by desire" (*Met*. 8.224: *cupidine tractus*).[59]

4) They advise their 'children'

It is thus in a vain attempt to curb this error that Daedalus advises Icarus – which gives a fourth parallel to Ovid the poetic speaker who advises his (poetic) off-spring. The wisdom preached by the artists is seemingly one of philosophically virtuous moderation, to remain in the 'middle'. Yet ultimately, because of the perspective – with the foreboding inevitability/painful reality of a fall – it

[54] i.e. The poet had a more invidious situation, as he was victim of a hypocritical tyrant: "[b]ypassing settled legal procedures, the *princeps* utterly contradicted his self-image as a ruler constrained by the rule of law" (Grebe 2010, 507).
[55] Williams 1974, 141.
[56] Conte 1994, 350.
[57] Miller 2009, 258-259.
[58] And yet in contrast, the *Metamorphoses* also casts Apollo displaying classic divine vindictiveness against Marsyas – whom he gruesomely flays for challenging him on the flute (*Met.* 6.383-400). This aspect of the god is perhaps an example of Ovid's suppleness and subversiveness, pushing the boundary of freedom for speech. Niżyńska 2001, 155 (Marsyas as a sympathetic character); 156 (Marsyas representing artists who transgress traditional authority).
[59] Bömer 1977, 66 picks up on "den rhetorischen Gegensatz *puer-senex*" – but one doomed for tragedy. This reflects badly on the father who fails to pay necessary care to his immature son.

comes across as perhaps an empty platitude. Although it is nonetheless crucial that the two instruct their offspring.

Other than visual representations of Icarus watching his father's work, Ovid's Daedalus seems to open the tradition of verbal advice-giving.[60] This is to care for Icarus, who is presented as "unaware" (*Met.* 8.196: *ignarus*; surely a play on 'Icarus'). The craftsman makes the specific admonition to take the "middle" (*Met.* 8.203: *medio*) path, lest by being too low the sea-spray dampens the wings or by being too high the sun melts them: "fly between them" he orders (*Met*. 8.206: *inter utrumque vola*). This, at face value, and emphasised by dramatic irony, is good advice; but deeper than this, it also gives a philosophical nobility, prizing moderation as a golden rule.[61] The lesson is pre-emptively validated (though foreshadowed to failure) by its similarity to another episode in the *Metamorphoses*. Namely, that is the father-son scene of Phoebus warning Phaeton to keep moderation in flight: "you will go most safely in the middle" he says (*Met*. 2.137: *medio tutissimus ibis*). This clearly parallels the *medio* advised by Daedalus. More to the point is the clear correspondence (to *Met*. 8.206) in the construction *inter utrumque tene* (*Met.* 2.140: "keep between them") – i.e. *inter utrumque* + an imperative. Therefore, by these scenes of similar paternal concern for security through moderation, Daedalus is ennobled as philosophically judicious – partially by the content of his message, and also by the fact that it aligns him with the Sun God (how ironic).

Moreover, the essential motivation for the advice is classically pious: paternal concern. In the *Metamorphoses* Daedalus is greatly moved at the point of take-off, agonising over the danger through which he is putting his son, a risk weighed against the hatefulness of exile. The gravity of the emotion is emphasised by details that his, an "old man's" cheeks are soaked with tears, and his, the "father's" hand trembles (*Met*. 8.210-211: *genae maduere seniles / et patriae tremuere manus*). The vivid physical indicators of worry therefore emphasise the pathos of love soon to be injured. This is then further heightened by a detail drawing attention to the fact that before departure, Daedalus' kiss for his son is something which he "would not do again" (*Met*. 8.212: *non iterum repetenda*). As an exquisite final touch of this piously emotive dynamic, Ovid employs a simile from nature. The craftsman is likened to a "mother bird who leads her tender offspring" from the nest (*Met*. 8.213-214: […] *velut ales* […] / *quae teneram prolem produxit*) – which is not only 'sweet', but follows nature in a traditional and therefore virtuous sense (rather than, as mentioned elsewhere, trying to

[60] *LIMC* (1986), (Daedalus) figs.23a-b. Daedalus represented fashioning the wings; Icarus looks on with great interest.
[61] Schmid 1983, 345. On the interpretation of Socratic Moderation – "philosophical humility" liberates one from overestimating or undervaluing one's ability, knowledge or needs; moderation naturally marks the behaviour and thoughts of one who knows oneself. The *medio* advised by Daedalus may therefore be partly ironic, as he plans to literally transcend his human bounds.

outdo it). The given advice therefore validates the righteousness of Daedalus – in its wisdom and motive – and thus, as shall be discussed further on, may be seen as an aspect that the poet appropriates for his 'own' self-analogy.

Nevertheless it is important to recall that Daedalus' score for the quality of righteousness is decidedly ambiguous in Ovid. As mentioned in the introductory remarks (How guilty is Ovid's Daedalus?) some scholars are more struck by his problematic aspects. That is significantly in the immediate connection with Perdix who watches Daedalus burying Icarus.[62] It undermines his paternal piety: Daedalus murdered the nephew entrusted to his care, Perdix whom he "envied" (*Met*. 8.250: *invidit*).

Moreover, the craftsman might be condemned as the classic negative *exemplum* of hubris[63] and overweening ambition – not content with moderation he preaches.[64] This is compounded by notable omissions in the *Metamorphoses* of the petitions to Minos and Jove – passages both included in the earlier account of the *Ars Amatoria*. Here Daedalus respectfully asks: "most just Minos […] may this be the end of exile" (*Ars am.* 2.25: *sit modus exilio* […] *iustissime Minos*) – perhaps foreshadowing the *iustissimus auctor* 'epithet' in the *Met.* Moreover Daedalus prays to "Jupiter on high" for permission to fly (*Ars am.* 2.38: *Iuppiter alte*). He seeks pardon for his undertaking, abasing himself as a mortal, motivated not by hubris but by exigency: he promises "I aspire not to strike [your] starry seat" (*Ars am.* 2.38-39: *non ego sidereas adfecto tangere sedes*).[65] He is pious and conscious to maintain the status-quo, which accords with the moderation he advises to Icarus (in both the *Met.* and *Ars am*.).[66] Though one might argue that these imprecations are unnecessary in the 'god-less' episode of the *Metamorphoses* – where Icarus is indeed singed by "sun" (*Met*. 8.225: *solis*) rather than the "god" of the *Ars* (*Ars am*. 2.85: *deo*) – the craftsman's flight is essentially transgressive.[67] Although Daedalus himself survives, arguably validating his advice,[68] any notion of pious restraint is hindered by the fact that witnesses believe them "to be gods" (*Met*. 8.220: *esse deos*) – and the

[62] Davisson 1997, 265: "there is no known precedent for having Perdix observe the burial" – thus heightening the significance of his attendance.
[63] Pavlock 1998, 151.
[64] This has stimulated scholars (Pavlock 1998, 141; Armstrong 2009, 80) to identify a resonance with the Daedalus of Ovid's near contemporary, Horace, who presents him as a hubristic artist archetype: *Odes* 1.3.34-35: *expertus vacuum Daedalus aera / pennis non homini datis* ("Daedalus tried the void on wings not given to mankind"). Armstrong 2009, 83 suggests that this is "implicit also in Virgil's phrase *ausus se credere caelo*" (*Aen*. 6.15, "he dared to trust himself to the sky").
[65] Maier 1981, 15.
[66] For which he would have been given top-marks by Augustus – cf. n.36.
[67] Cf. n.12.
[68] Cursaru 2012, 307 discusses a red-figure *skyphos* that contrasts Daedalus and Icarus together: "père/fils, maître/disciple, guide/guidé, la prudence de Dédale et l'ὕβρις d'Icare". This distinction is indeed important, Daedalus does not himself fall, though it underscores his consequent (neglected?) responsibility.

markers that artificial wings for humans are axiomatically unnatural (*Met*. 8. 209: *ignotas*, "unknown"). This undermines the validity of the advice for Icarus: would it have been more responsible to hold out for a less fantastic but less perilous escape-route?[69] Since Daedalus cannot fully control the consequences of his invention, Icarus is exposed to danger and perishes: his advice seems a flimsy and slightly paradoxical. Nonetheless, it is crucial is that it is given, and that the flight is presented as necessity (*Met.* 8.185-6: *terras* […] *et undas obstruat*; "he may block the earth and the seas"). Moreover, the fact that Daedalus is consistent (in *Met.* 8 and *Ars am.* 2), at least in his advice giving to Icarus (it is almost verbatim) perhaps goes some way to (re)balance his moral worth. It is not that Daedalus of the *Metamorphoses* suddenly represents naked hubris, rather he is outdone in piety by his earlier incarnation and therefore more ambiguous (again more so with Perdix).[70] It is therefore crucial that the Ovidian accounts focus on the emotive paternal concern for Icarus, thus adding a more unambiguously pious aspect of his character – in contrast to accusations of hubris, and the very real crime of murder.

The exilic speaker also addresses off-spring,[71] his very poems, advising temperance. But here ambiguity shrouds not the poet's ability to moderate himself, but rather more the point of his advising. Essentially this is because of the timing and nature of Ovid's fall: the advice is post-banishment ('it can't get much worse'), though he hopes that the poems shall represent him. It serves to characterise the speaker as a piously concerned parent like Daedalus, but one whose situation is already worse.

The equivalence between Daedalus and Ovid is evident as both (claim to) curb their ambition (by necessity/threat) to follow the 'mid-way', and thus set an example to their off-spring.[72] In the described experience of Ovid's exile poetry, this is suggested by the linguistic resonance from the Daedalus' advice: the direction to follow the "middle-way" (*medio*: spoken to Icarus, *Met*. 8.203). The exile poetry frequently uses the same word or cognates. One might be tempted to see it as simply a common word – for describing location, placement etc. – but the frequency, and bitterness with which it is employed may suggest greater significance. On a close search through the uses in the

[69] Pavlock 2009, 68 highlights the problematic ambition of Daedalus, who "does not even contemplate such limitations on mortals. His self-absorption distances him further from the pathos of Vergil's artist and father".
[70] Arachne is a more explicit example of hubris in the same poem: she denies debt to Minerva for her skill in weaving, believing herself superior (*Met.* 6.23-25) – the ensuing 'weave-off' brings predictably disastrous consequences for the mortal.
[71] Davisson 1984, 111. This is evident in *Tr*. 1.1 where the poet is *parentis* (114, "parent") of his works, who are all *fratres* (107, "brothers").
[72] Moreover, Daedalus demonstratively leads the way: *suo pennisque levatus* / *ante volat* (*Met*. 8.212-213: "and having taken off on his wings, he flies ahead").

Tristia,[73] occurrences of *medio* often emphasise the plight of the speaker: he may be in a "middle", but one that is hellish and threatened by external violence – thus negating the notion of a safe mean. A quintessential example lies in book 5, where the speaker panics that he is imperilled in the "middle" of domestic streets because hostile missiles hail from all sides (*Tr*. 5.10.22: *medias*). In the *Epistulae Ex Ponto*,[74] the usage of *medio* (and its variants) has a different but also broadly consonant note: that there is an ideal "mid-way/place", from which he is debarred. Tragically, this is the centre of his former better life, the "midst" in which his friends reside (*Pont*. 2.10.50: *media*). Therefore, although the 'intention' of allusion to Daedalus' advice is ambiguous (as is always the case), the exiled poet clearly adheres to his own brand of 'staying in the middle', as despite complaints, he stays put. He characterises himself as humbly shunning the heights of what came before; although it is with cruel irony that he portrays the world in which he 'middles' as *extreme* (*Pont*. 1.3.49: *orbis in extremi iaceo desertus harenis*; "I lie at the edge of the earth on deserted sand"). This perhaps reflects the poet's existential crisis: the desire to be (or appear) obedient and moderate is severely strained by the perceived harshness of the punishment. The implicit contrast might therefore encourage the audience to pity the poet: he who remains humbly in the *midst* of his world (the one decreed for him) – but one that is perilous rather than secure. Like Daedalus, though he may do what is best given the situation – he is always under threat, his example to the offspring undermined.

Besides the necessity for following his own caution (and thus 'leading the way'), Ovid actively advises his poems (the Icarus equivalence), anthropomorphised as offspring, to tread carefully. Firstly, he perceives the nervousness of the books should they approach the "lofty" Palatine (*Tr*. 1.1.69: *alta*). The seat of Augustus is made to seem toweringly high and fearsome, perhaps reflecting the solar destruction of Icarus, and thus laying on thick irony that this may have to be their perilous goal (to deliver a petition). Although he cannot literally lead the way (like Daedalus), the speaker intensifies the foreboding by his experience; he tells his books that he is scared by the authority at that place, thus amplifying the warning's urgency. This sentiment is conveyed by two similes from nature, thus

[73] *Tr.* 3.10.7, *medio*: location "inter"-posed by the Hister; *Tr.* 5.6.46, *medio*: worries to be abandoned in the "midst" of the sea; *Tr*. 5.7.14, *medias*: hordes of Sarmatian and Getic cavalry travel armed in the "middle" of the streets; *Tr*. 5.10.22, *medias*: enemy missiles threaten the "middle" of the street; *Tr.* 5.10.44, *medio*: swords brandished in the "middle" of the Getic forum.

[74] *Pont*. 1.7.30, *medio*: Ovid previously gave his verses in the "middle" of the Roman forum; *Pont*. 2.8.12, *media*: dreams as if he were in the "midst" of his old city; *Pont*. 2.10.50, *media*: imagines that his friend Macer visits from the "midst" of their shared native Rome; *Pont*. 4.7.10, *medias:* the cartman can drive over the "middle" of the Hister since it freezes; *Pont*. 4.9.32 and 47, *media* […] *medio*: locations denied to Ovid, held by Augustus in the "middle" of the Roman temple or the senate; *Pont*. 4.14.9, *medias* […] *mediam*: declares that he would sail through the "midst" of the Syrtes, and right down the "middle" through Charybdis if he could escape the hated shores.

perhaps a traditional and 'noble' medium. First, he is like the "dove", whom "the least rustle of feather terrifies" (*Tr*. 1.1.75: *terretur minimo pennae stridore columba*).[75] The speaker's timidity aligns him also with that which "does not dare to go far from the fold, the lamb saved from the teeth of the greedy wolf" (*Tr*. 1.1.77-78: *nec procul a stabulis audet discedere, siqua* / *excussa est avidi dentibus agna lupi*). These primeval images of prey fearing predator emphasise the psychological scar of his close shave with destruction.

Beyond this dynamic of 'Ovid the advisor (from bitter experience) to his offspring', mythological references heavily allude to and then fully realise the Daedalus and Icarus parallel. The first of these is the truism: "Phaeton would avoid the sky if he were alive" (*Tr*. 1.1.79: *vitaret caelum Phaeton, si viveret*). Although the youth is struck down by Jove's lightning (rather than the sun), as we have seen before, his story is thematically similar to Icarus'. And then to validate this, further down comes one of the most direct 'self-analogisations' between Ovid and Daedalus, as the poet warns his poems:

Tr. 1.1.89-90 *dum petit infirmis nimium sublimia pennis*
Icarus, aequoreis nomina fecit aquis.
"When he sought too great a height on weak wings
Icarus made a name for the waters of the sea."

The poet uses the loss of the Athenian craftsman as warning to his own offspring, and a reminder to himself of the danger through which he is putting them. Nonetheless, this also teases out a contrast between Ovid and Daedalus. This is perhaps encapsulated in the categorisation of the two perils: for Icarus the sun is predictable stable threat, whereas for Ovid's poems the Emperor is more ambiguous. Indeed, it plays on the mind of Ovid the 'father', as at one point he urges his progeny to content itself with the ear of the "common Romans" (*Tr*. 1.1.88: *plebe*), but then later suggests that they may have to judge for themselves – if the Emperor is perceived to be more merciful.[76] Truly, it is a matter of judgement which the father must entrust to his offspring – a decision all the more painful to make, given the violent tension riding upon it. In this sense, Ovid takes up the paternal concern of Daedalus, but one that is here not so damned by dramatic irony, but rather by simmering unresolved tension – how will the poems be received? Such expression of pious concern serves to redress the poet's image, evoking pity as he worries for the health of his creations.

[75] Neatly for a Daedalus-Ovid parallel, the Athenian craftsman would have also come to revile the sound of the feathers.
[76] Proliferation of "if […]" clauses in three lines (*Tr*. 1.1.93-95: *si* […] *si* […] *si* […] *siquis*) emphasises the uncertainty of reception.

Once again the parallel with Daedalus can be seen as edifying, displaying paternal concern (mindful of moderation), while also implicitly contrasting and outdoing the latter. Ultimately this is in the paradox that Ovid advises after an initial fall (non-fatal, though he may suggest otherwise!) against another, whereas Daedalus speaks before one that is known to be truly lethal. The unresolved tension of success/failure for the poet can therefore be seen as dramatically engaging – the outcome of the advised 'moderation' is unknown – thus eliciting sympathy for the implication that a fall, like Icarus', might be inevitable.

5) They grieve and repudiate their arts

In response to these failures – for Daedalus as a father, for Ovid the threat against his offspring, caused by his own fall – another parallel emerges. The artists come to regret their artfulness due to the loss it causes them. Nonetheless, here is perhaps the limit of the analogy as for Ovid his exile is the 'real' fall, whereas for Daedalus the fall is more literal and fatal for his son, as they escape exile. This section shall therefore focus on how the artists deal with their losses, though first briefly (re)turning to what this entails for each of them. This will lead onto the longer-term aspect of their sufferance: regret for the artistry that brought them there.

As has been discussed earlier, it is clear that separation from Rome is portrayed as an ultimate fall for the poet. Ovid equates it to a waking night-mare of terror and decay: indeed his living death. In light of this, one might be inclined to regard Ovid as more like Icarus than Daedalus – indeed he who has flown too high and therefore been brought down. Nevertheless, it is crucial that Ovid remains very much alive to compose the mournful poetry of his 'death' (i.e. exile), and also that 'blame' is shrouded by ambiguity rather than easily explained by naivete (although offending poems date from his junior career). Daedalus too lives on to suffer the pain of disfiguring loss brought about by his own creation.

This is immediately evident for Daedalus in the *Metamorphoses*, where the fall of Icarus is decorated with great pathos. Firstly, as the son drowns, the poet details that his lips "crying his father's name" are filled with water[77] (*Met*. 8. 229: *patrium clamantia nomen*), a frustrated speech mirrored by Daedalus' immediate "where are you?" (*Met*. 8.232: *ubi es?*). Their final words to one another are unheeded, thus making separation all the more abrupt and cruel. This is further heightened by the reference to Daedalus, looking in vain for his son, as an "unhappy father, but now longer a father"

[77] Ovid denotes the sea-water as *caerulea* (*Met*. 8.229: "dark-blue"). Might this be a pun on *caelum* ("sky" or "air"), indeed the "sky" (*Met.* 8.224: *caelique*) for which Icarus was so blinded by desire to explore? It is cruelly incongruous that the cerulean sea now fills the boy's lungs rather than the air: an example of black humour, or amplifying pathos?

(*Met.* 8. 231: *at pater infelix, nec iam pater*).[78] The repetition of *pater* ("father"), the second negating the first, intensifies the cruelty of loss, which is further compounded by the dramatic irony of his being on the edge of agony.[79] Direct speech, repeating thrice the vocative *Icare* (*Met*. 8.231-233) further emphasises the father's confused grief by its insistent immediacy. At this point, spotting the feathers on the waves, Daedalus consequently "cursed his arts" (*Met*. 8.234: […] *devotitque suas artes*). This disavowal is striking, given that his ingenuity has freed him from suffering in exile – but then, on the other hand, natural, since it has simply delivered him unto a new suffering: bereavement. Having unwittingly destroyed his progeny, it seems that he has lost joy in life, fracturing his identity, as he must bury his son. The loss is interrupted by Perdix who adds only guilty memories – all Daedalus has after this is to slip away world-weary and "exhausted" (*Met*. 8.260: *fatigatum*).

More deeply, the root to this failure, is portended from the very beginning of the Daedalus passage in the *Metamorphoses*. Essentially, the complexity of his production is too great, baffling and thus endangering their creator: the labyrinth was so successful that Daedalus "could scarcely himself return to the outer-edge" (*Met*. 8.167-168: […] *vixque ipse reverti* / *ad limen potuit*). Moreover, the description of the labyrinth evokes the Vergilian ecphrasis of the temple doors of Apollo: landing at Cumae after escaping Minos and losing Icarus, Daedalus dedicated his wings to Apollo, carving the famous Cretan events on the temple doors, including the intricate maze (Verg. *Aen*. 6.14-30). Significantly, Vergil details that Daedalus too tried to include a visual memorial to Icarus, but with paternal grief, his hands fail him twice:

Verg. *Aen*. 6.32-33. *bis conatus erat casus effingere in auro,*
bis patriae cecidere manus.
"Twice he tried to fashion your [Icarus] fall in gold,
Twice the hand of the father fell."

The two-part anaphora *bis* ("twice") emphasises a two-fold artistic failure: first, that Daedalus' creation cannot prevent his son's fall, second that he cannot overcome the fall of his spirit and complete the carving. This effectively colours the scene with both "genius and […] personal tragedy", i.e. the "fundamental epic concerns" that shall also affect Ovid's Daedalus.[80] By describing the

[78] Earlier interactions fore-ground this warm father-son dynamic: Icarus inspects his "father's" work (*Met*. 8.199: *patris*); the hands of the "father" shake as he kisses his "son" (*Met*. 8.211: *patriae* […] *nato*); in distress Icarus calls his "father's" name (*Met.* 8.229: *patrium*). The abrupt negation of *pater* denies and disfigures the identity of the surviving "father".
[79] Peek 2001, 136.
[80] Pavlock 2009, 61-62.

Cretan events the *Metamorphoses* evokes this Vergilian scene of pathos, undermining the flight to come. Furthermore, the danger is resoundingly foreshadowed with the description of flight itself as "ruinous" (*Met*. 8.215: *damnosasque*), already as it is being taught to Icarus. Therefore, the dramatic irony that the flight shall be fatal maximises the pain and guilt suffered by Daedalus at the loss of his son, and his own failure to guide him safely.

For Ovid the poetic speaker, this pain and subsequent regret are inextricably linked with the first parallel: exile. As already mentioned regarding subordination to Augustus, the poet declares that above anything else, "more painful to me is guilt" (*Pont*. 1.1.61: *magis est mihi culpa dolori*). This shows repentance and acceptance of blame – though it may be interpreted as a snap reaction to fall or a confession under duress. Perhaps more specifically telling of the artist's guilt and self-repudiation are allusions his own works. Continuing the theme of advising the offspring, he warns his (exile) poems that when they reach his book-case in Rome they will come across "three [scrolls] hiding apart in a dark spot" (*Tr.* 1.1.111: *tres procul obscura latitantes parte*). The *Ars Amatoria* are personified as shameful brothers of the exile poems, to emphasise their dangerous proximity to their creator and his new offspring. This is emphatically compounded by the description of the problematic poems as parricides (*Tr.* 1.1.114: *Oedipodas* […] *Telegonosque*). This conveys a sense of inner rupture and pained frustration with his literary past; it is a sorry thing for the poet to regret his jocular triumphs. In extension, Ovid therefore shares the misfortune of Daedalus: to regret the destruction caused by his own creations to himself.[81] Moreover, it may be hinted that like Daedalus, Ovid's fall is partially an effect of an artist's inability to totally explain universal truth, thus leading to (fatal) misunderstanding. This is most evident by the restrained allusion to the "poem" (*Tr*. 2.207: *carmen*) that brought downfall. As it has been mentioned (indeed later in *Tr.* 2), the poet suggests that he can invent scurrilities that are completely at odds with a pious personal character: it is perhaps implicit that the audience's failure to distinguish brings his punishment. The poet is therefore to suffer from the miscomprehension of his creations; Daedalus too suffers because his son misapprehends the limitations of his work. Ultimately, the paralleled regret of the artists evokes pity as it can be recognised as a denial of their identities as creators, repudiating parts of themselves.

[81] Although, Ovid can also implicitly blame the *ira* of Augustus (cf. n.51).

Reuben Riepma
s2299704

6) 'Consolation' of celebrity

Nonetheless a final metapoetic parallel between Ovid and his character is that both are elevated for their achievements. This is after the creative figures have suffered the rigours of exile, the pain of loss, and despite the consequent regret for their work.

Daedalus, as explored earlier, is by first mention "most famous" for his skill (*Met*. 8.159: *celeberrimus*). Indeed, his greatness is to be confirmed by the witnesses: the fisherman, the shepherd and ploughman who believe him and his son "to be gods" (*Met.* 8.220: *esse deos*). Moreover, despite his artistic 'failure' with regard to the vulnerable wings (compounded by recollection of the *Aeneid*), and his consequent self-vituperation, Daedalus not only survives himself, but lives on in verse. This is a crucial distinction, as it negates the notion that Daedalus' failures simply equate to a metaphorical death (as Ovid might portray an exile).[82] Indeed, Daedalus is preserved, as we may see today in visual arts, mythography and Augustan Latin poetry, all of which were preceded by a rich tradition of Greek drama which no longer survives, but underscores the fame of Daedalus in antiquity.[83] Obviously, this is no immediate consolation for the loss of a son, but in the highly literary context of Ovid's poetry, this is a significant honour.

For Ovid the poetic speaker, this celebrity is directly stated by his own work, and, as aforementioned, is evoked at the conclusion of the *Metamorphoses*. The coda proudly declares that neither the "wrath" of Jove nor the bounds of his "uncertain life" will diminish the monumentality of his work (*Met.* 15.871-874: *ira* […] *incerti* […] *aevi*).[84] Instead, the poet's better part shall be exalted "forever, above the stars on high" (*Met*. 15.875-876: *super alta perennis / astra*). The metaphor of soaring the heavens might quite naturally remind of Daedalus' flight or equally of the epic's *catasterisms* – though time has proven the Ovid to be more successful, as his verses are closely appreciated up-to this day, for instance to the extent that he has been (jocularly) termed: an "intertextual god".[85] Printing the final stanza of the *Metamorphoses* after a discussion on Daedalus' flight, Barbanera hints at the shared associations of fame and flight for the two artists, yet we may go further and recognise a final example of Ovid out-doing Daedalus.[86] The (literary) flight of the former is open-ended, immortalising and truly liberating, rather than perilously exposing in a limited earthly sense. Moreover, it survives the fall and anxious repudiations of an exile. He may claim that

[82] Horsfall 2013, 87. The preservation of Daedalus in *Aen*. 6 is "triumphant", immortalising his creations and his humanity, thus providing "in some sense his consolation."
[83] Frontisi-Ducroux 1975, 18. Lists dramatists such as Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes who produced works that dealt with Daedalus.
[84] Huskey 2006, 34.
[85] Bloch 2000, 207.
[86] Barbanera 2013, 25.

his help-seeking verses lack the beauty of his former style, adding nothing to his literary *gloria* (*Pont.* 3.9.55: "glory"), and seeming so dull that they obfuscate the identity of their author (*Pont*. 2.10), yet this can largely be contradicted. Firstly that is by other passages from the same exile, such as when the author apostrophises to his poetic offspring: "you are recognised by style itself" (*Tr.* 1.1.61: *ipso noscere colore*), thus showing that their Ovidian style is an indelible birth-mark. Moreover the survival of the Ovidian corpus and its renown suggest that his *gloria* is perhaps not so tarnished after all. Besides, though the declared sentiment of sterility may have been valid, and consequently rendering the slim thought of posthumous literary fame seem hollow – it might therefore prove analogue to the empty consolation of Daedalus.

Why?

Having explored significant similarities between Ovid's poetic speaker and his 'other' character Daedalus, it remains to postulate some reasons and thus open out the reading to potentially recognise other parallels.

In simplest terms, the analogy between the two artists might be seen as a sort of extended *exemplum*. This could seem typical of classical literature – to make and buttress a point by dropping a distinguished proper-noun, taken from a collective cultural memory, thus anointing the original point with greater authority.[87] However in the context of the Ovid-Daedalus parallel this seems too simple and low in scope: besides the poet does not make so many explicit references (though a couple of sharp pointers), rather more allowing the parallel to thrive by the exploration of themes that strongly echo Daedalus' story. The analogy is therefore not just effective by the naming, but by the overall shared characterisation: it seems more than 'just' *exemplum*.

Besides, if taken at this basic level, the parallel with Daedalus might be no more significant than Ovid's other mythological self-references, such as to Actaeon mentioned before, also guilty for seeing something forbidden (*Tr*. 2.104ff). Moreover, if it must be an artist to make a more 'meaningful' Ovid-parallel, the *Metamorphoses* has figures such as Pygmalion, or indeed the "paradigmatic poet of myth", Orpheus.[88] Indeed, what better self-comparison might there be than to the bard who could charm trees and the inmates of the underworld? This is nevertheless unsatisfactory as Ovid presents Orpheus as clearly too solipsistic – for instance he compares his own passionate love for Eurydice to Hades' rape of Persephone (*Met*. 10.28-29) – and he is too

[87] Gaertner 2007, 169: this could be one of the "standard motifs of ancient epistolography"; 172: besides the exilic theme comes with a "stock of literary roles". Therefore, any detail might be discounted as generic exigency; though it would be reductive to overstate.
[88] Anderson 1989, 2.

dogmatically self-absorbed, shunning all women and proceeding to sing lascivious songs of boys beloved by gods and girls struck by monstrous passions (*Met*. 10.152-154). Essentially, as Anderson points out, Orpheus embodies the criticism made *about* Ovid by later critics.[89] In contrast, Ovid the poetic speaker is more perceptive, varied and aware of alternate perspectives, subjectivity and receptive to change – to some extent all evidenced by the diversity and contradictions in his corpus, and the consciousness for an audience.

Furthermore, comparison with Daedalus seems particularly apt since it encompasses the many shared themes, the Parallels: creativity, exile, flight-fall, repudiation, etc. This might be seen partly as an artist's boast, just as an *exemplum* alludes to parity with a mythological great, the poet is *even* greater as he creates Daedalus' latest incarnation. In addition to this, the common contexts of exile might effectively evoke sympathy and, to some extent, be deliberately foregrounded for this reason. But then deeper than this is the parallel acceptance of a flawed nature. Being cynical, one might interpret this as a slightly 'false-modest' acceptance – he may have flaws, but they are cosily aligned with artistic pre-eminence – but being more charitable, one might accept it as apt analogy.

Beyond this, if we are to (re)consider why Daedalus is peculiarly important, other than sophistically assembled Parallels, we might closely examine the first: creativity. This gives a crucial poetological aspect as Ovid, like Daedalus, actively (with arguable success) affects novel artistic *mimesis*.[90] And herein lies perhaps the heart of their analogy: Ovid's approach to "mythopoesis" resembles the creative attitude of Daedalus. The poet actively creates not just an *opus* (a poetic monument) but a 'living' subjective work – produced by his 'own' readings of myth, which are in turn meant to be read; effectively Daedalus does so too.[91] Ovid invites the audience to consider his analogies and oeuvre overall, in *our* here and now; Daedalus also reads into his situation creatively, using nature and producing something that in turn must be interpreted (failure to do so is fatal). By the additional richly imbibed parallels and the ensuing responsibilities, Ovid's self-analogy with Daedalus is therefore eminent for his potential 'present' as an artist – while also leading the audience to further subjective interpretations.[92]

[89] Ibid. 3: namely that he is lascivious and *nimium amator ingenii sui* (Quint. *Inst*. 10.1.88: "too much a lover of his own wit").
[90] Wise 1977, 58.
[91] Beard 1993, 62-64.
[92] Lecznar 2016, 134. Returning to Joyce: "[…] only the dead certainties of the past can help us gain any control over the confusions of the present". Where Joyce employs a multiplicity of allusion, so too does Ovid (with perhaps less "anarchy") – to (self)characterise his 'own' past, present and future.

Reuben Riepma
s2299704

Conclusion

As it has been heretofore set out, there are at least six thematic parallels between the figures of the poetic 'self', Ovid, and his character Daedalus. To arrive at a similar but more simple conclusion, an astute audience might have noticed the several pointers (among countless other mythological references), such as the exiled speaker's desire to emulate Daedalus and fly from exile (*Tr*. 3.8.6ff), or his warning to his literary offspring to avoid being like Icarus (*Tr*. 1.1.89-90), that explicitly analogise the poet and Athenian craftsman. Nonetheless, to come to a more than superficial analogy, based on shared themes rather than more limited *exempla*, this study has identified and expanded the parallels. Both Ovid and Daedalus share these aspects: firstly they have an essential talent for innovation; they also suffer exile; they both advise their offspring (with words of moderation); they grieve and repudiate their arts; they may be consoled by literary immortality. It is also useful to recall the caveats of these parallels: they fit only literary textual interpretations, rather than necessarily mapping onto the historical reality of Publius Ovidius Naso, and as such, alternate 'self-analogy'/mythologisation might be interpreted elsewhere. It has nonetheless been fruitful to explore how a figure such as Daedalus is paralleled, thus representing his author. As hypothesised, this is for the rhetoric effect of self-aggrandisement and evocation of sympathy, but also for the aesthetic approach of using a common motif or mythic character for the *Jetztzeit* – dragging us into the here and now.

Reuben Riepma
s2299704

Bibliography

Primary

Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca/Epitome,* ed. by R.S. Smith and S.M. Trzaskoma (2007), Indianapolis.

Augustus, *Res Gestae*, ed. by J. Scheid (2007), Paris.

Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica*, ed. by P. Goukowsky (2006-2014), Paris.

Catullus, *Carmina*, ed. by R.A.B. Mynors (1958), Oxford.

Horace, *Opera*, ed. by H.W. Garrod and E.C. Wickham (1963), Oxford.

Homer, *Iliad XIII-XXIV*, ed. by D.B. Monro and T.W. Allen (1963), Oxford.

Ovid, *Ars Amatoria*, ed. by E.J. Kenney (1994), Oxford.

— *Heroides*, ed. by H. Dörrie (1971), Berlin.

— *Metamorphoses*, ed. by R.J. Tarrant (2004), Oxford.

—*Tristia* / *Epistulae Ex Ponto*, ed. by S.G. Owen (1963), Oxford.

Virgil, *Aeneid*, ed. by R.A.B. Mynors (1969), Oxford.

Quintilian, *Institutionis Oratoriae*, ed. by M. Winterbottom (1970), Oxford.

Secondary

Ahern, C.F. (1989) 'Daedalus and Icarus in the *Ars Amatoria*', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 92: 273-296.

Anderson, W.S. (1989) 'The artist's limits in Ovid. Orpheus, Pygmalion, and Daedalus', *Syllecta Classica* 1: 1-11.

Armstrong, R. (2009) 'Against Nature? Some Augustan Responses to Man-made Marvels', in *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture*, ed. by P. Hardie (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 75-94.

Barbanera, M. (2013) *The Envy of Daedalus: Essay on the Artist as Murderer*, Munich: Wilhelm Fink.

Beard, M. (1993) 'Looking (harder) for Roman myth: Dumézil, declamation and the problems of definition', in *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft*, ed. by F. Graf (Berlin: De Gruyter), 44-64.

Bloch, D.J. (2000) 'Ovid's *Heroides* 6: Preliminary Scenes from the Life of an Intertextual Heroine', *Classical Quarterly* 50: 197-209.

Bömer, F. (1977) *Metamorphosen, Buch VIII-IX, Kommentar*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Conte, G.B. (1994) *Latin Literature: A History*. Baltimore: John Hopkins.

Cowell, F. (1974) 'Book Production in Ancient Rome', *History Today* 24: 794-798.

Cursaru, G. (2012) 'Le Mythe de Dédale et d'Icare et le Thème du Vol des Mortels en Corps Vivant', *Phoenix* 66: 298-334.

Davisson, M.H.T. (1984) ‘Parents and Children in Ovid's Poems From Exile’, *Classical World* 78: 111-114.

— (1997) ‘The observers of Daedalus and Icarus in Ovid’, *Classical World* 90: 263-278.

Faber, R. (1998) ‘Daedalus, Icarus, and the Fall of Perdix’, *Hermes* 126: 80-89.

Fitton Brown, A.D. (1985) ‘The Unreality of Ovid’s Tomitan Exile’, *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 10: 18-22.

Frontisi-Ducroux, F. (1975) *Dédale: mythologie de l’artisan en Grèce ancienne*. Paris: François Maspero.

Gaertner, J.F. (2007) ‘Ovid and the Poetics of Exile: How Exilic is Ovid’s Exile Poetry?’, in *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, ed. by J.F. Gaertner (Leiden: Brill), 155-172.

Galinsky, K. (2015) ‘Augustus’ *Auctoritas* and *Res Gestae* 34.3’, *Hermes* 143: 244-249.

Grebe, S. (2010) ‘Why Did Ovid Associate His Exile with a Living Death?’, *Classical World* 103: 491-509.

Helzle, M. (1989) ‘Mr and Mrs Ovid’, *Greece and Rome* 36: 183-193.

Hoefmans, M. (1994) ‘Myth into reality: the metamorphosis of Daedalus and Icarus’, *L'Antiquité Classique* 63: 137-160.

Horsfall, N. (2013) *Virgil, “Aeneid” 6*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Huskey, S.J. (2006) ‘Ovid’s (Mis)Guided Tour of Rome’, *Classical Journal* 102: 17-39.

Joyce, J. (1916) *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. New York: Huebsch.

Lateiner, D. (1977) ‘Obscenity in Catullus’, *Ramus* 6: 15-32.

Lecznar, A. (2016) ‘Shut Your Eyes and See: Digesting the Past with Nietzsche and Joyce’, in *Deep Classics: Rethinking Classical Reception*, ed. by S. Butler (London: Bloomsbury Academic), 127-144.

Martorana, S. (2016) ‘Daedalus’ myth and its occurrences in Ovid’, *Myrtia* 31: 167-195.

Maier, F. (1981) *Ovid: Dädalus und Ikarus. Der Prinzipat des Augustus. Interpretationsmodelle*. Bamberg: Buchner.

McGinn, T.A.J. (2008) ‘Something Old, Something New: Augustan Legislation and the Challenge of Social Control’, *Ancient History Bulletin* 22: 1-32.

McGowan, M. (2009) *Ovid in Exile: Power and Poetic Redress in the Tristia and Epistulae Ex Ponto*. Leiden: Brill.

Miller, J.F. (2009) *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mühlethaler, J.C. (2012) ‘Le vol d’Icare’, *Anabases* 16: 85-101.

Myers, K.S. (2014) ‘Ovid’s Self-Reception in his Exile Poetry’, in *A Handbook to the Reception of Ovid*, ed. by J.F. Miller and C.E. Newlands (Chichester: Wiley), 8-21.

Niżyńska, J. (2001) ‘Marsyas's Howl: The Myth of Marsyas in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Zbigniew Herbert's "Apollo and Marsyas”’, *Comparative Literature* 53: 151-169.

Pavlock, B. (1998) ‘Daedalus in the Labyrinth of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*’, *Classical World* 92: 141-157.

— (2009) *The Image of the Poet in Ovid’s Metamorphoses*. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Peek, P.S. (2001) ‘Black Humour in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*’, *Ramus* 30: 128-151.

Rowe, G. (2013) ‘Reconsidering the *Auctoritas* of Augustus’, *Journal of Roman Studies* 103: 1-15.

Schmid, W. (1983) ‘Socratic Moderation and Self-Knowledge’, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 21: 339-348.

Sharrock, A. (1994) *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spoo, R.E. (1994) *James Joyce and the Language of History*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Syme, R. (1978) *History in Ovid*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tarrant, R. (2002a) ‘Chaos in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and its Neronian Influence’, *Arethusa* 35: 349-360.

— (2002b) ‘Ovid and Ancient Literary History’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, ed. by P. Hardie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 13-33.

Wise, V.M. (1977) ‘Flight myths in Ovid's *Metamorphoses’*, *Ramus* 6: 44-59.

Dictionaries

Ackermann, C. (ed.) 1986. *LIMC*. Zurich.

Cancik, H. and Schneider, H. (eds.) 2006. *Brill’s New Pauly*. Leiden.

Hornblower, S., Spawforth, A. and Eidinow, E. (eds.) 2012. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford.

Montanari, F. (ed.) 2015. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden.