Ovid, however, does not at first recognise the symptoms, not only because he is new to love (as we know from lines 19–20 and 26 of 1.1) but because to the rationalising Ovid Cupid's epiphany in 1.1 remains at this stage just a *legomenon*. His initial response, therefore, is to try to analyse the situation rationally: *Esse quid hoc dicam* – perhaps one might even say that he tries to circumscribe τὸ ἄλογον with λόγος, and λόγος in the double sense of language and reason. Then, when he first raises, only to discount, the possibility that love is the cause, both reason and feeling come into play (*nam, puto, sentirem*) and reason is already a weakening force (*puto*).[10] Only with lines 6–8 does Ovid fully accept the validity of his supernatural encounter in 1.1. Love with as it were a small 'l' becomes Love the god himself; Love's arrows, allegedly discharged in 1.21–5, have in fact stuck fast; Love, allegedly king of Ovid's *pectus* in 1.26, is certainly now tormenting that *pectus*; Love is already working his insidious harm (the process described in 1.2.6 comes after, and validates, the fact of the initial wounding). In effect, then, lines 6–8 of poem 2 mean 'poem 1 was no mere *legomenon* – it was all true after all'.

This analysis brings out another link between the two poems. The first poem advances as an explanation for Ovid's writing of love poetry and falling in love a 'what-is-said' supernatural story; the second tries to explain perplexing physical symptoms by a rationalising process of 'saying'; both poems, in effect, broach different explanations for the same phenomenon, and both explanations are keyed by the word *dico*. In the event, rationalism proves inadequate and the supernatural 'what-is-said' story provides the true explanation.

There is then no inconsistency at all between *Amores* 1.1 and 1.2. Rather, the formal doubt, created by *dicitur*, over the veracity of Cupid's epiphany to Ovid in 1.1 inaugurates an interplay between ignorance and knowledge not only on the part of the reader but also on the part of Ovid the dramatic character, who is himself a schizophrenic figure, part rationalist, unconvinced of the truth of 1.1, part lover, driven by the crazy logic of the situation to final acceptance of the irrational. Such schizophrenia of attitude is of course the source of many of the most piquant effects in the *Amores*, few, however, as elegant and sustained as the seeming inconsistency between 1.1 and 1.2.[11]

University of Durham JOHN MOLES

[10] Of course the sentiment of line 5 is also comically absurd, an absurdity pointed by (the often ironic) *puto* (surely one knows if one is in love), but that absurdity is evident only to those with some experience of love, not at this point in the narrative to Ovid the dramatic character.

[11] I thank Tony Woodman and Trevor Fear for comments on an earlier draft of this note.

ARIADNE'S FEARS FROM SEA AND SKY (OVID, *HEROIDES* 10.88. AND 95-8)

In Ovid, *Heroides* 10.79ff. Ariadne starts to consider various dangers which to her mind threaten her life as that of any deserted woman (80). She lists some of these dangers in the following catalogue (83–8):

> Iam iam venturos aut hac aut suspicor illac,
> qui lanient avido viscera dente lupos.
> Forsitan et fulvos tellus alat ista leones?
> Quis scit an et saevam tigrida Dia ferat?[1]

[1] This seems to be the best emendation of this line; see Palmer's apparatus criticus (A. Palmer, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides* [Oxford, 1898], *ad loc.*).

Et freta dicuntur magnas expellere phocas;
quis vetat et gladios per latus ire meum?

Wolves (83f.), lions (85) and a tigress (86) serve as examples of wild animals on land; in line 87 Ariadne turns to the sea, expressing her fear of 'magnas... phocas'. All commentators and nearly all scholars seem to agree that in line 88 she suddenly changes the topic and talks about human beings, probably pirates (Palmer).[2] However, a reference to 'homines' would be rather odd here, especially because Ariadne stated before that there is no trace of other people: 'vacat insula cultu; non hominum video, non ego facta boum./ Omne latus terrae cingit mare; navita nusquam./ Nulla per ambiguas puppis itura vias' (59ff.). Accordingly, many scholars tend to delete line 88 and much more of the passage.[3] Birt supposes a lacuna after 87, assuming the loss of a longer catalogue of sea-animals.[4] I do not think that a whole catalogue is necessary here, but would like to suggest another solution: to translate 'gladius' with 'sword-fish'. The only scholar who to my knowledge considers this possibility is J. Gilbert,[5] without, however, arriving at a decision and obviously without influencing later interpretations (probably because of his obscure place of publication). The sword-fish (gladius Gr. ξιφίας) is mentioned by Aristotle;[6] in Latin literature the elder Pliny knows about its ability to pierce even ships.[7]

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* confirms that the swords of these fish 'are most formidable weapons of aggression. These fish never hesitate to attack whales and other cetaceans, and, by repeatedly stabbing them, generally retire from the combat victorious:... they follow the instinct so blindly that they not rarely assail boats and ships in a similar manner'.[8] Thus the sword-fish makes good sense in the passage discussed here, and the couplet aptly rounds off the catalogue. Ariadne's immediately following statement, that she fears slavery even more than being killed by the animals mentioned before, appears to be much more comic.

After this amusing climax Ariadne resumes pondering over possible threats (93–8):

Si mare, si terras porrectaque litora vidi,
multa mihi terrae, multa minantur aquae.
Caelum restabat; timeo simulacra deorum;
destituor rapidis praeda cibusque feris.
Sive colunt habitantque viri, diffidimus illis;
externos didici laesa timere viros.

In line 95 she expresses her fear of 'simulacra deorum' (for the phrase cf. *Met.*1.73 'astra tenent caeleste solum formaeque deorum'). One may see here a non-technical and humorous comment on an issue discussed, for example, in Philodemus, *De Dis*: 'the idea that the sun and moon and certain other heavenly bodies each have an anthropomorphic god attached to them and occupying the same portion of space as they do' (P. G. Woodward, 'Star Gods in Philodemus', *CEn.* 19 (1989) 29–47, p. 29).

[2] Palmer, op. cit. (n. 1), comm. *ad loc.*; for the whole passage, see, apart from Palmer's commentary, W. Schmitz-Cronenbroeck, *Die Anfänge der Heroiden des Ovid* (diss. Köln, 1937), p. 25; G. Peters, *Observationes ad P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistulas* (diss. Leipzig, 1882), pp. 28–30.

[3] For example Peters, op. cit. (n. 2), deletes 88, 93–5 and establishes the sequence 85–7, 96–8, 89–92; Schmitz-Cronenbroeck, op. cit. (n. 2), p. 25, ejects 86–95; Palmer, op. cit. (n. 2), inclines to eject 89–96.

[4] Th. Birt, *De Halieuticis Ovidio Poetae falso adscriptis* (Berlin, 1878), p. 40.

[5] J. Gilbert in *Jb der Fürsten- u. Landesschule St. Afra in Meissen*, 1896, p. 7.

[6] Arist. *H.A.* 2.13.9; cf. also Opp. *H.* 1.182, 2.462–6.

[7] Plin. *N.H.* 32.15; cf. also *N.H.* 9.21, Ov. *Hal.* 97.

[8] *Encyclopaedia Britannica*[11] 24.274.

Lines 96–8 would be tedious if Ariadne were talking once more about wild beasts and human beings on the island; however they have much more point if referred to the 'caelum': this area is populated with 'simulacra deorum', 'ferae' and probably with 'homines', and all these frighten Ariadne. For the 'ferae', the constellation of κῆτος comes first to mind, and Ovid himself depicts in his *Metamorphoses* the frightening appearance of other monsters when narrating the story of Phaethon: 'per insidias iter est formasque ferarum!/ utque viam teneas nulloque errore traharis,/ per tamen adversi gradieris cornua tauri/ Haemoniosque arcus violentique ora Leonis/ saevaque circuitu curvantem bracchia longo/ Scorpion' (*Met.* 2.78ff.). The 'homines', too, can be looked upon as inhabiting the sky, as there are many tales attributing human origin to figures in the sky, e.g. Perseus. Woodward (art. cit. p. 33) counts 34 human beings as being catasterized in Eratosthenes. Ariadne thus refers to animals and human beings in the sky, pointing out that she cannot trust 'externi viri' (98) after her experience with Theseus. 'Externus', which normally means 'coming from another country' (e.g. Prop. 1.2.20, Pelops and Hippodameia), is humorously extended to mean 'from another world'.

Keble College, Oxford/
University of Freiburg ARIANE HEWIG

SIMULTANEOUS HUNTING AND HERDING AT *CIRIS* 297–300

Poetic incompetence is often blamed for infelicities or incongruities which appear in the poems collected in the *Appendix Vergiliana*, and in many cases such censure is justified. However, in the passage which is the subject of this note, *Ciris* 297–300, it is possible to reinterpret the incongruity which critics have remarked: when the pertinent evidence from antiquity is adduced, the lines are revealed as a display of scientific and etymological *doctrina*.

The *Ciris* contains the story of Scylla's ill-fated passion for Minos, her decision to cut off the sacred lock of her father Nisus, and her subsequent transformation into a sea bird. Midway through the poem, Scylla falters in her resolve to destroy Nisus in order to win the love of his enemy Minos and subsequently reveals her passion for Minos to her nurse Carme. It happens that Carme knows of Minos' past, and at 286–309 she recounts the story of her daughter Britomartis. Britomartis, a follower of Diana, hunted in the woods of Crete, where Minos saw her and conceived a passion for her; she in turn rejected Minos' advances, and eventually leapt into the sea to escape him. According to Carme, some say that Britomartis was subsequently transformed into the goddess who was worshipped on Aegina as Aphaia, while others maintain that Luna (Diana) was called Dictynna after her. (Traditionally the name Dictynna was derived from the fishermen's nets, δίκτυα, which were said to have saved Britomartis from death, but the text of the *Ciris* includes no overt reference to this Greek etymology.) Understandably, Carme wishes that such things had never happened to her daughter:

> atque utinam celeri nec tantum grata Dianae
> venatus esses virgo sectata virorum,
> Cnosia nec Partho contendens spicula cornu
> Dictaeas ageres ad gramina nota capellas. (*Ciris* 297–300)[1]

[1] I cite the text as printed by R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil* (Cambridge, 1978).