

nable to suppose that it was in fact in September of 52 that he produced our extant, “philosophical” version<sup>43</sup>).

In part, at least, the revised speech was intended for Milo himself, as a *consolatio*: represented as a Stoic hero, Milo should be consoled by his altruistic self-sacrifice on behalf of the Republic; it was the “jury” which was to be in tears at the prospect of Milo’s exile, whereas Milo himself would endure *exilium* in a manner worthy of his stature: “valeant, valeant, cives mei . . . , ego cedam atque abibo”<sup>44</sup>). It had been a difficult summer for the *boni*, and Cicero sent letters of consolation to at least two other friends in exile<sup>45</sup>). When Milo, in exile in Massilia, received his *consolatio*, he replied, “Had this speech actually been delivered, I would not now be eating these mullets”<sup>46</sup>), thus making clear the degree to which he was in truth a *sapiens*.

Hattiesburg, Mississippi  
Ames, Iowa

Mark Edward Clark  
James S. Ruebel

## TWO NOTES ON OVID, HEROIDES X

### I.

Inde ego – nam uentis quoque sum crudelibus usa – 29  
 uidi praecipiti carbasa tenta noto.  
 † aut uidi aut tamquam quae me uidisse putarem,  
 frigidior glacie semianimisque fui.

31 aut (1<sup>o</sup>) ut Bentley tamquam que me G: a\*quam que me P<sup>ac</sup> (om. aut): fuerant que me W<sup>vi</sup> rec.: certe cum me rec.: etiam cum me FP<sup>2</sup> rec. (unde etiam cum te c. Bentley): tantum quia me Madvig: quod erant quae Heinsius putarem] -avi G (Madvig): -abam Pa Y

43) Perhaps suggested by Dio Cassius 40.54.2 (κατὰ σχολήν). Cicero’s schedule later in 52 and early in 51 was no less crowded, as shown by *Fam.* 7.2.

44) *Mil.* 93

45) *Fam.* 5.18, 5.17. Clark (above, n. 25) p. lvii, notes that the *Pro Milone* does not exhibit a true *commiseratio*; but he overlooks that the speech was to be a *consolatio* for Milo.

46) Dio Cassius 40.54.3.

Any assault on this 'versus depositus' (Palmer) must begin by abandoning the *aut...aut* construction of the manuscripts<sup>1</sup>): *uidi* in the previous verse shows that Ariadne did see Theseus' ship, and so rules out any expression of doubt of the kind in *Virg. Aen.* 6.454 *aut uidet aut uidisse putat per nubila lunam* (cp. also *Her.* 18.32, *F.* 6.632, *Met.* 8.513, 9.688). Bentley's *ut* is therefore the starting-point for emendation, with *tamquam* and the mood of *putarem* likely targets for further change, since they appear to flow from the initial misconception that Ariadne is doubting whether she did in fact see the ship. So far only Housman (*Classical Papers* [1972], p. 399 f.) has proceeded along these lines, and his proposals, *ut uidi haut dignam quae me uidisse putarem* or *ut uidi haut umquam quae me meruisse putarem*, have the defect of introducing a note of complaint before it is called for<sup>2</sup>). Ariadne's first reaction is mere shock, which soon wears off and gives way to indignation (33 *nec languere diu patitur dolor*). What is wanted in line 31 is something like "when I saw this unbelievable sight," for which Catullus offers a well-known precedent in 64.55 *necdum etiam sese quae uisit uisere credit*, and to show how it might be elicited from the garbled words of the paradosis, one could suggest for example *ut uidi nondum quae (or quod) me uidisse putabam*. (The placement of *nondum* is admittedly unusual, but the normal order *quae me nondum* would put *nondum* in ambiguous proximity with *uidisse*).

## II.

Occurrunt animo pereundi mille figurae,	81
morsque minus poenae quam mora mortis habet.	
Iam iam uenturos aut hac aut suspicor illac,	
qui lanient auido uiscera dente lupos.	
Forsitan et fuluos tellus alat ista leones?	85
Quis scit an haec saeuas tigridas insula habet?	
Et freta dicuntur magnas expellere phocas;	

1) In general the critical notes draw their material from the editions of A. Palmer (1898) and H. Dörrie (1973), but my report of P at 10.29 derives from personal inspection by Michael Reeve (to whom I am also indebted for helpful criticism).

2) Another objection to Housman's conjectures (pointed out to me by Michael Reeve) is *haud*, used 53 times in the *Metamorphoses* but otherwise only *Tr.* 1.3.73 *haud aliter*.

quis uetat et gladios per latus ire meum?  
 Tantum ne religer dura captiua catena,  
     neue traham serua grandia pensa manu, 90  
 cui pater est Minos, cui mater filia Phoebi,  
 quodque magis meminì, quae tibi pacta fui!  
 Si mare, si terras porrectaque litora uidi,  
     multa mihi terrae, multa minantur aquae.  
 Caelum restabat; timeo simulacra deorum; 95  
     destituor rapidis praeda cibusque feris.  
 Sive colunt habitantque uiri, diffidimus illis;  
     externos didici laesa timere uiros.

86 *uersus nondum sanatus* haec] et hec P an et saeuam tigrida Naxus habet Gronouius (Dia ferat *Editor Etonensis*): an et saeuas tigridas illa ferat *van Lennep*: alii alia forsitan et (*u.* 85), quis scit an et *transp. Housman*, damnare uoluerunt alii alios *uersus*, 85–86 *Palmer*, 87–88 *Riese*, 93–96 *Palmer*, 93–94 *van Lennep*, 95–96 *Bentley*, 85–96 *Jachmann*, 86–95 *Schmitz-Cronenbroeck* unum *uersum ante u.* 96 *excidisse suspicatus est Burman*

It has been clear for a long time that something has gone badly wrong in this passage. Attempts to repair the damage by excising single couplets have seemed unavailing; most recently M. D. Reeve (*CQ N.S.* xxiii [1973] 332) has restated and amplified the arguments for more drastic action, removing 86–95 and marking a lacuna of uncertain length. This suggestion has the salutary effect of directing attention to the entire passage, but despair on this scale may be too extreme a reaction. The problematical lines in this passage are of three kinds: (a) 88 and 93–95, which can hardly be Ovidian because of inanity of content or incompetence of expression or both; (b) 86, which cannot be sound in its transmitted form, but which is unobjectionable in content, and (c) 89–92, which are faultless in expression but unsuited to their present context. Deletion is the appropriate remedy for the first category, but not for the other two; it seems quite unlikely that the hand responsible for the mere rodomontade *timeo simulacra deorum* also produced four such well-turned lines as 89–92. Positive grounds for rearrangement rather than excision emerge from the clear relation of 96 (wild beasts) to 83–87 and 89–92 (men) to 97–98. These arguments result in the following text:

Occurrunt animo pereundi mille figurae, 81  
     morsque minus poenae quam mora mortis habet.  
 Iam iam uenturos aut hac aut suspicor illac  
     qui lanient auido uiscera dente lupos.  
 Forsitan et fuluos tellus alat ista leones? 85

Quis scit an haec saeuas tigridas †insula habet.†	
Et freta dicuntur magnas expellere phocas;	87
[quis uetat et gladios per latus ire meum?	88
Si mare, si terras porrectaque litora uidi,	93
multa mihi terrae, multa minantur aquae.	94
Caelum restabat; timeo simulacra deorum;]	95
destituor rapidis praeda cibusque feris.	
Sive colunt habitantque uiri, diffidimus illis;	
externos didici laesa timere uiros.	98
Tantum ne religer dura captiua catena,	89
neue traham serua grandia pensa manu,	
cui pater est Minos, cui mater filia Phoebi,	
quodque magis memini, quae tibi pacta fui!	92

Line 86 still requires emendation to remove the solecism *quis scit an. . .habet?* and the elision in *insula habet*, and no solution so far proposed compels ready assent (van Lennep's *quis scit an et saeuas tigridas illa ferat?* may be the least unattractive), but this can now be tolerated as an isolated difficulty<sup>3</sup>). Indeed, one ought perhaps to feel relieved that this much-abused passage<sup>4</sup>) has suffered no other permanent damage.

Toronto

Richard J. Tarrant

3) The only other cause for misgiving in the text printed above is the single *sine*, for which the closest Ovidian parallel is *Epist. Sapph.* 211, in a spurious work (see "The Authenticity of the Letter of Sappho to Phaon (*Heroides* XV)," *HSCP* 85 (1981) 133–54 ; other examples in Reeve, *CQ* N.S. 23 (1973) 332 n. 2. The emphasis on wild animals in 83–87 + 96 removes any ambiguity in *sine* ("if, on the other hand, *men* live here...").

4) At another point, 79–80, I would prefer deletion (with Palmer) where Reeve tries to salvage the couplet by resourceful emendation (*et* for *sed* in 80, adopted by Goold in the new Loeb text). The pairing of Ariadne with *ulla relicta* still lacks point, and the limitation of *quaecumque potest ulla relicta pati* to sufferings short of death seems very strained. Given the presence of interpolation elsewhere in the vicinity, it seems better to remove the couplet than to expend heroic efforts on its behalf.