II

Seeing what was happening, most of the suppliants, who had refused (to be tried), killed each other there in the temple; some hanged themselves from the trees, οἱ δ' ὡς ἕκαστοι ἐδύναντο ἀνηλοῦντο. (Thucydides 3.81.3: Corcyra, 427.)

The striking word here is the final one. In her recent article 'Attitudes towards suicide in ancient Greece', *TAPA* 121 (1991) 1–34 (which, amidst many larger merits, at p. 19 correctly construes ἡ πόλις and διαφθείραντι – though not ἀτιμία – in the passage of Aristotle just discussed), Elise P. Garrison valuably retrieves this point from the oblivion to which Thucydides' commentators had consigned it. She writes (p. 13):

Thucydides, in the Corcyrean civil war episode (3.81), mentions the suicide of the Messenian prisoners who refused to be tried by their captors... [He] lends a 'tragic' air to this kind of suicide by using the word ἀναλίσκομαι for suicide. The basic meaning of ἀναλίσκω, 'use up' or 'spend', is extended by the tragedians to 'kill', and in this meaning seems primarily to be restricted to tragedy (e.g., Aesch. *Ag.* 570; Soph. *OT* 1174, Fr. 892 (Radt); Eur. *El.* 681)

This is all fair comment as far as it goes, but what needs to be added is that 'spending' life – whether one's own or another's – can be regarded as a favourite Thucydidean idiom:

(i) 4.48.3 (Corcyra again, two years later – and the only other instance of mass suicide in Thucydides; for individual suicide see 1.138.4 [Themistokles] and 2.92.3): the opponents of the demos ἐφυλάσσοντό τε ὡς ἐδύναντο καὶ ἅμα οἱ πολλοὶ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς διέφθειρον, [...] **ἀναλοῦντες** [Suid. Zonar.: ἀναδοῦντες codd.] **σφᾶς αὐτοὺς** κτλ.

(ii) 7.81.5 (Syracuse, 413): τοιαύταις δὲ προσβολαῖς καὶ οὐ ξυσταδὸν μάχαις οἱ Συρακόσιοι εἰκότως ἐχρῶντο, [...] καὶ ἅμα φειδώ τέ τις ἐγίγνετο ἐπ' εὐπραγίᾳ ἤδη σαφεῖ **μὴ προαναλωθῆναί τῳ** κτλ. (cf. Dio 59.18.4: ἑαυτοὺς προανάλωσαν)

(iii) 8.65.2 (Athens, 411): καὶ γὰρ Ἀνδροκλέα τέ τινα τοῦ δήμου μάλιστα προεστῶτα ξυστάντες τινὲς τῶν νεωτέρων κρύφα ἀποκτείνουσιν, [...] καὶ ἄλλους τινὰς ἀνεπιτηδείους τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ κρύφα **ἀνήλωσαν**.

Also noteworthy: Pericles' reference in 2.64.3 to Athens' 'expenditure' of lives on warfare (πλεῖστα δὲ **σώματα** καὶ πόνους **ἀνηλωκέναι** πολέμῳ) and Nicias' advice in 6.12.1 that, after the draining 420s, 'expenditure' begins at home (καὶ χρήμασι **καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν** ηὐξῆσθαι· καὶ ταῦτα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν δίκαιον ἐνθάδε εἶναι **ἀναλοῦν**).

The Queen's University of Belfast   DAVID WHITEHEAD

IO! IN OVID

The scribes of the Latin poets were not, as a rule, in the habit of interpolating exclamatory particles; on the contrary, their tendency was to trivialise. The particle *io* has MSS authority in two passages in Ovid where distinguished critics reject it.

Kenney in the Oxford Text of *Ars Amatoria* 3.742 prints,

labor, io: cara lumina conde manu.

labor io RO_g: labor, eo *Palmer*: labor et o B_bP_b*: labor iam *UW*: et labor et haec A_b: iam (o P_b) morior *aω*: iam moriar A_s

In his note on a passage where the particle is not in dispute, *Graia iuuenca uenit, quae te patriamque domumque / perdat! io, prohibe! Graia iuuenca uenit!* (*Her.* 5.117–18), Palmer says, '*io*, "ho!"' in Ovid always a cry or shout, either of joy or

calling assistance: never simply "Oh!" in grief.' Palmer then cites several passages from Ovid and concludes, 'all these passages prove that it is impossible that in *A.A.* 3.742 *io* can be the true reading. There the expiring Procris says, "*Labor, eo: c. l. c. m.*", "I am sinking, I am going".'[1] Among the passages cited by Palmer is *ecquis, io silvae, crudelius, inquit amavit* (*Met.* 3.442). But surely there Narcissus cries out in grief; note at 3.447 he will say '*quoque magis doleam...*' Does not *ecquis* also add a note of indignation to that grief?[2] Indeed, in the very passage which inspired Palmer's note (*Her.* 5.118), Cassandra's *io* is the *vox propria* of the enthused seer. Palmer's definitions of the particle are inadequate, and his consequent rejection of it is unconvincing.[3] Goold, who prints Palmer's *eo* in his revision of the Loeb text (Cambridge, MA, 1985), in '*Amatoria Critica*', *HSCP* (1965) 1–107, also notes (p. 94), that *io*, 'almost always introduces the sentence, immediately preceding a vocative or imperative.' Of the thirteen examples in Ovid eight immediately precede a vocative or an imperative, and four, though the vocative or imperative is there, do not.[4] The importance, then, is the *presence* of that vocative or imperative; an importance generally belied by modern punctuation. If, at *A.A.* 3.742, we take *conde* closely with *io*, as we ought, then is not Procris, in her grief, crying out for assistance? The colon after *io* should go. Cf. Tibullus 2.4.6, clearly alluded to by Ovid:

> uror, io remove, saeva puella, faces![5]

The similarity of construction is obvious, but note how Ovid has turned his model upside down: *remove* becomes *conde*, and *saeva* becomes *cara*.[6]

The second passage is *Her.* 14.103–4:

> quae tibi causa fugae? quid, io, freta longa pererras:
> non poteris vultus effugere ipsa tuos.

Since it is Io who is here apostrophised, *quid io* is usually understood as the unmetrical *quid Io* and emended.[7] MSS authority here is less easy to defend. The following points, however, may carry some weight.

1. Elsewhere Ovid uses *io* with neither vocative nor imperative, *io! forti victa puella viro est* (*Am.* 1.7.38).

2. In Silius there is a plea against flight, *quid, deinde, quid, oro, / restat, io, profugis?* (*Pun.* 5.634–5).

3. Dörrie's appeal (*op. cit.* n. 7, p. 189) to Aeschylus, *Suppl.* 162 now has more conviction since West, in his Teubner edition, *Aeschylus Tragoediae*, (Stuttgart, 1990), has pronounced that Greek text sound.

---

[1] *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides* (repr. Hildesheim, 1967).

[2] Cf. Martial, *ecquis, io, revocat discedentemque reducit? / ecquis, io, largas pandit amicus opes?* (5.25.4–5).

[3] Again, at *Met.* 5.625 *io Arethusa* is neither a cry of grief, nor joy; Alpheus is searching for the hidden nymph.

[4] *io* immediately precedes at *Her.* 5.118; *A.A.* 2.1; *Met.* 3.442; *Met.* 3.728; *Met.* 4.513; *Met.* 5.625 (*bis*); *Fast.* 4.447; words intervene at *Am.* 1.2.34; *A.A.* 2.1; *Tr.* 4.2.51; *Tr.* 4.2.52. At *Am.* 1.7.38 the particle appears with neither vocative nor imperative.

[5] Luck in his Teubner edition (Stuttgart, 1988) places a colon between the particle and the imperative.

[6] Procris' *io* may also remind us that, at the beginning of the episode, she had been likened to a Bacchant, *ut thyrso concita Baccha* (*A.A.* 3.710); cf. Silius 4.779 where Imilce, likened to a Bacchant, cries *io coniunx...refer*.

[7] The particle is accepted by H. Dörrie, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum*, (Berlin, 1971). Housman, in his denunciation of lines 103 and 106 as interpolations (*Classical Papers*, p. 408), is at his most amusingly perverse.

A final thought. If *io* is correct in this passage it may be another example of Ovidian playfulness; it would provide a verbal link between two myths whose protagonists have entirely opposing lots: Narcissus, utterly in love with his appearance, tries to embrace it, Io, utterly terrified by her appearance, tries to escape it.[8]

Penn State University   ALLAN KERSHAW

[8] I thank my colleagues Archibald Allen and Stephen Wheeler for helpful discussion.

LA FEMME RETROUVÉE?

nil nisi lasciui per me discuntur amores:
  femina praecipiam quo sit amanda modo.
femina nec flammas nec saeuos discutit arcus.

Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 3.27–9

In *C.Q.* 42 (1992) 551–2 E. J. Kenney impugned the appropriateness of *femina* in 28 on the grounds that it sabotages the poet's disclaimer to be treating not of women generally, but only of women not ruled out of bounds by the *stola* and *uittae*. Hesitantly he proposed to read in its place *non* or *nec proba*. It should be borne in mind that when a word has intruded itself from a nearby line and expelled the authentic reading, the *ductus litterarum* is no guide to emendation. The door stands open to bold measures. I propose to read *Thais*. The name of the famous courtesan well serves as the type with which Ovid proposes to deal. But what advantage has she over, say, Lais or even Phryne, whose names would fit here as well as hers? The answer comes from *Remedia Amoris* 385–6 *Thais in arte mea est: lasciuia libera nostra est; | nil mihi cum uitta; Thais in arte mea est.* Indeed, this distich might have been taken before now to suggest the presence of her name somewhere in the *Ars*, for it looks like the sort of self-reference that Ovid is especially fond of (we recall how he speaks at *A.A.* 2.169–72 of tearing his girlfriend's hair and perhaps her dress, a reference back to *Amores* 1.7, except that there he did not rip her dress; it is a cheat of clever Corinna's to secure a present!). Thais does appear at *A.A.* 3.604 *ut sis liberior Thaide, finge metus*, but the line is not as programmatic as the *Remedia* passage suggests its cross-reference is. The earlier part of the third book now in question is programmatic, and we find its language resumed in the *Remedia*. The restoration of Thais to 3.28 sharpens the point.

Mr Hollis points out that a word-order more in line with Ovidian practice for the pentameter would be *praecipiam Thais*; the evidence is assembled by M. Platnauer, *Latin elegiac verse* (Cambridge, 1951) 37–8. Nonetheless, the proper name at the head of the line strikes me as more emphatic.

King's College London   ROLAND MAYER

ON MARTIAL 3.44.15

In thermas fugio: sonas ad aurem.
Piscinam peto: non licet natare.
Ad cenam propero: tenes euntem.
Ad cenam uenio: fugas edentem.   15

So far as I can tell from the editions of Friedländer, Gilbert, Izaac, and Shackleton Bailey, no one has questioned or defended the pointless repetition of *cenam* in 15. It is, however, to the credit of the Loeb translator, Walter C. A. Ker, that he could not