

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

NOTES ON TWO STATIAN *ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ*

I

Statius' fourth book of *Silvae* is introduced by a prose letter which dedicates the collection to his friend M. Vitorius Marcellus. A lacuna in the fourth line has eroded part of the opening compliment to the dedicatee, and with this encouragement, the extant text has at two points been misunderstood, at least by Statius' modern interpreters. The letter begins as follows:

Inveni librum, Marcelle carissime, quem pietati tuae dedicarem. reor equidem aliter quam invocato numine maximi imperatoris nullum opusculum meum coepisse; sed hic liber tres habet * * * se quam quod quarta ad honorem tuum pertinet. primo autem septimum decimum Germanici nostri consulatum adoravi; secundo gratias egi sacratissimis eius epulis honoratus; tertio viam Domitianam miratus sum, qua gravissimam harenarum moram exemit. cuius beneficio tu quoque maturius epistolam meam accipies, quam tibi in hoc libro a Neapoli scribo . . .¹

F. Vollmer glossed the word *pietati* with the note "gegen den Dichter und dies Buch," and current translations² seem to follow him. But, although it is futile to try to reconstruct the exact wording which once filled the lacuna, the context imposes another sense on *pietati*: it means Marcellus' devoted allegiance to the emperor.³ Statius is attempting to palliate the embarrassing necessity of placing his poem to Marcellus fourth in the book of which Marcellus is the dedicatee. His friend is such a loyal subject of the emperor, argues Statius, that he will be more pleased that the book

begins with three poems in honor of the emperor than that it contains a poem honoring himself. And if there were any doubt that *pietas* toward the emperor is at issue here, it should be removed by the statement at *Silvae* 4. 4. 57-58, arresting even by Statian standards of overstatement: "Latii ducis . . . quem tibi posthabito studium est coluisse Tonante."

At the end of the letter, Statius breaks off a debate which he has been conducting with an imaginary critic, and says:

in summam, nempe ego sum qui traducor; taceat et gaudeat. hunc tamen librum tu, Marcelle, defendes, et si videtur, hactenus, sin minus, reprehendemur. vale.

The many wrong explanations and revisions of the last sentence which are current need not be registered here. In it Statius has returned to the idea with which he began. The word *hunc*, by its position at the head of the sentence, and by its disjunction from its noun, is made to carry the strongest possible emphasis. It means "this book in contrast to my others," and Statius is thinking again of the fact that so much of Book 4 is devoted to the emperor. Whether the poetry is good or bad, Marcellus will defend the book because it has a praiseworthy subject. But for the future, the poet avows, he will abide by Marcellus' judgment on the poetic qualities of the *Silvae*. If Marcellus thinks he should not publish such poems, he will write no more (*si videtur, hactenus*); but if his friend does not think he should stop, Statius will brave the carping of his critics (*sin minus, reprehendemur*).⁴

1. This and all following passages from the *Silvae* are given according to the text of A. Klotz's (second) Teubner edition of 1911.

2. Specifically, J. H. Mozley's in the Loeb edition, and H. J. Izaac's in the Budé.

3. Commentators prior to Vollmer had recognized that *pietas* in this passage had reference to the emperor. "Erga imperatorem" is the simple note in the Delphin edition of 1824, put out in London by A. J. Valpy; and the word was similarly explained in a Paris edition of 1658 which incorporated notes by Guyet and Peyrared. In the closely contemporary letter of dedication by which Martial presented his eighth

book of *Epigrams* to Domitian, *pietas* is used in the same way: "Hic [liber] tamen, qui operis nostri octavus inscribitur, occasione pietatis frequentius fruitur."

4. The latter part of the passage was thus explained by Markland, who judged it necessary, however, to emend *reprehendemur* to *reprehendamur*. But although this emendation would certainly make the passage simpler, it may not be necessary. *Reprehendemur* could probably be defended as expressing Statius' determination to go on writing, criticism or no; for this use of the future (though none of the parallels is very close), see Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, p. 311, section 174 b α.

Before saying more about the peculiar emphasis on Marcellus' loyalism, it is necessary first to identify the man himself more precisely. M. Vitorius Marcellus⁵ belonged to an undistinguished Italian family from Teate (*Silv.* 4. 4. 85–86) which had risen no higher than equestrian standing, or had at best attained a lowly place among the senatorial families.⁶ Marcellus himself lifted the family's status to sudden eminence by marrying the daughter of that Gaius (Gnaeus?) Hosidius Geta who had won triumphal ornaments during Claudius' British expedition and acquired patrician rank for his family.⁷ The date of this marriage cannot be precisely fixed, but it probably took place sometime between 83 and 88, when Marcellus was in his early twenties. That was the optimal time for an ambitious young man to form a marital alliance,⁸ and it suits the age of Marcellus' son, who seems to have been between three and six years old in the early nineties, when Quintilian began to write the *Institutio oratoria*.⁹

Of the senatorial career on which Statius' friend embarked, only two stages are directly known to us: his consulate during the last *nundinum* of 105, which is documented by the *fasti*, and the office which he held in the summer of 95, when Statius wrote *Silvae* 4. 4.¹⁰ This was the *cura viae Latinae*, periphrastically described in verses 59–61. In the lines im-

mediately following, the poet expresses the hope that Marcellus will soon obtain a legionary command, so it is likely that the *cura viae* was his first praetorian assignment. It would follow that he had held the praetorship recently, perhaps a year or two previous to the date of the poem. One comes to the same conclusion by arguing from the year of his consulship. Under ordinary circumstances, he would be about forty-two years old when he reached that office in 105. His thirtieth year, in which he became eligible for the praetorship, would then have fallen in about A.D. 93, two years before *Silvae* 4. 4.

It was clearly not by virtue of his position within the hierarchy of the senate that Vitorius Marcellus would have attracted notice. What accounts, then, for the honor which Statius showed to this junior praetorian, conferring on him not only one of his poems, but also the dedication of a book? It is true that the dedicatees of the other books were not very illustrious in public life. But for these others, there is always some factor which makes Statius' association with them seem natural and understandable. Not so with Marcellus. He was not a fellow poet, like the dedicatee of Book 1 of the *Silvae*, Arruntius Stella; lines 46–49 of *Silvae* 4. 4 exclude the possibility that Marcellus dabbled in verse. There is no sign that he cultivated around himself a circle of poets and literarily inclined socialites, like

5. *PIR*¹ V 519; R. Hanslik, s.v. "Vitorius (2)," *RE*, Suppl. IX (1962), 1744–45.

6. The idea that the Vitorii were equestrian is plausible enough, but it has been bound up with some misconceptions. Mommsen (*Gesammelte Schriften*, VII, 222) thought that the *avus* to whose military exploits Statius alludes in *Silv.* 4. 4. 72–73 was Marcellus' own father, and that he distinguished himself as a high equestrian officer. But, as H. Dessau pointed out in a footnote to Mommsen's article (*loc. cit.*), the *avus* is generally taken to be Marcellus' father-in-law, C. Hosidius Geta. Vollmer's belief that the Vitorii were equestrian apparently rested on a confusion of Vitorius Marcellus with Vettius Marcellus, one of Nero's procurators (see his commentary to *Silv.* 4. 4. 85, p. 466). Hanslik on the other hand declares that Marcellus' father "gehörte dem Ritterstand noch nicht an"; this confident statement rests on a false inference from a passage in A. Stein, *Der römische Ritterstand* (Munich, 1927), p. 372. That the Vitorii possessed at least equestrian standing seems indicated by Marcellus' marriage into a distinguished patrician family (the Hosidii). That they had not yet produced a consul one may infer from the *fasti* and from Statius' slighting remarks in *Silv.* 4. 4. 74–77.

7. For the triumph, see Dio 60. 20. 4 and *Silv.* 4. 4. 72–73, for the patriciate, see the (acephalous) inscription *ILS* 971

which Groag quotes, s.v. "Hosidius (5)," *RE*, VIII (1913), 2490. The Geta named in the passage from the *Silvae* is Marcellus' son C. Vitorius Hosidius Geta, whose name appears in the records of the Arval College. Groag (*ibid.*, 2491) allowed that Marcellus' wife might be the granddaughter rather than the daughter of Hosidius, presumably because the difference in ages between a *socer* who was consul in about the year 45 and a *gener* who was only a praetor in 93 seemed so great. But the singular *avus*, in a passage describing relationships within a real family, ought to mean "grandfather" and nothing else.

8. R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), I, 64.

9. The treatise was written in order to educate the future orator, and specifically Marcellus' son, "ab ipsis dicendi velut incunabulis" (1 *pr.* 6); later, Quintilian says that the child's training should begin after his first *triennium* (1. 1. 16). The fifth or sixth year is suggested by the similar way in which Quintilian speaks of his own five-year-old son at 6 *pr.* 6–7, and of Marcellus' son at 1 *pr.* 6. In any case, Marcellus' son will have been younger than nine: cf. 6 *pr.* 10. On the date of the *Institutio*, see n. 12.

10. The poem (with the preface to the book, written simultaneously) is one of the most precisely datable of all the *Silvae*. See Vollmer's commentary, pp. 8–9.

Atedius Melior, the dedicatee of Statius' second book.¹¹ He was not, like the dedicatee of the third book, Pollius Felix, an old friend and a compatriot from the south of Italy. The absence of any obvious connection between poet and patron makes it both more difficult and more exigent to explain the dedication to Marcellus. Certainly Statius did not select his man at random. Within five years of *Silvae* 4, and possibly at a much closer interval than that, Marcellus was singled out for the dedication of another and more imposing book, Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*.¹² Mere coincidence will not have caused attention to converge in this way upon the young praetorian.¹³

One might explain Marcellus' prominence by arguing that, if he lacked political importance, he nevertheless exercised great influence as a social figure, in virtue of his tie with the Hosidii. Both Statius and Quintilian depended more on the interest of socially well-connected people than on political favors, and so for them Marcellus would have been an ideal person to cultivate. Perhaps this explanation is correct. But Marcellus may after all have made himself a force in public life despite his youth.

There is no parallel in the *Silvae* for the way in which Statius speaks of Marcellus' zeal in serving Domitian. His words cannot help but derive particular significance from the time at which the poem and the prefatory letter were

written. The theme of loyalty reflects experience of the oppressive regime which Domitian had imposed after crushing the conspiracy of Saturninus. In one other place Statius allows a glimpse into that precarious era through which his contemporaries suffered in silence until the tyrant died. In a passage praising the character of Atedius Melior, he inserts the lines (*Silv.* 2. 3. 66–69):

[tu cui] . . . nec spes
improba, sed medius per honesta et dulcia limes,
incorrupte fidem nullosque experte tumultus
et secrete, palam quod digeris ordine vitam . . .

The idea had already been adumbrated in an earlier passage (lines 15–16 of the same poem): "placidi Melioris aperti / stant sine fraude lares." What had happened to Melior is easy to surmise. He had realized with a scare that his harmless efforts to gather a social following might waken the emperor's suspicion. Hence Statius' protestation that his friend would never allow traitorous enterprises to take shape at his gatherings.

The poem to Marcellus, on the other hand, conveys no hint of insecurity; his credit for *pietas* is solidly established. According to Statius (*Silv.* 4. 4. 28–49), Marcellus' interests and energies were concentrated on the profession of oratory, and he enjoyed great success in that field. It would not be unreasonable to postulate a connection between his pro-

11. It is significant that Stella and Melior are prominent also in Martial's books, while Marcellus is nowhere mentioned.

12. The *Institutio* was probably written in the early nineties. Quintilian says that he began his work after retirement, and that he retired after twenty years of teaching (1 *pr.* 1). If he did not begin teaching until Galba brought him to Rome, the *Institutio* cannot have been begun until after 88. In any case, Book 3 was not written until some time after 86, because in 3. 7. 4 there is a reference to Domitian's Capitoline games, first instituted in that year. Another passage, 7. 4. 2, presupposes Agricola's conquest of Britain, and that too defines 86 as a *terminus post quem*. It took a little more than two years to complete the work according to the *epistula ad Tryphonem*; while Quintilian was busy with it, Domitian appointed him to instruct the sons of Flavius Clemens, who were designated to succeed the emperor. It is unlikely that the boys were named his heirs while Domitian still hoped for sons of his own. In about 90 his hopes were high, as the empress was expecting a child, according to Martial 6. 3. The child, if it was born, did not live long, because nothing is subsequently heard of it. But it must be after this year that Clemens' sons were adopted and put under Quintilian's care. For a *terminus ante quem* one can use 10. 1. 91, which was clearly written before Domitian's death in 96. Therefore, Book 10, and very likely the whole

work, was completed before September 96. These data do not permit a more precise dating than *ca.* 90–96. The evidence is discussed at length by Schwabe, *s.v.* "Fabius (137)," *RE*, VI (1909), 1956–57, and by M. L. Clarke, *G and R*, 2nd Ser., XIV (1967), 33 ff.

13. That Vitorius Marcellus also engaged the attention of the *grammaticus* Valerius Probus is, I think, unlikely. Gellius (*NA* 4. 7) mentions an "epistula Valerii Probi grammatici ad Marcellum scripta super accentu nominum quorundam Poeniorum"; and some have suggested that the Marcellus meant is our man (see J. Aistermann, *De M. Valerii Probi Berytii vita et scriptis*, diss. Bonn, 1909, pp. 81 f.). If Probus' work had been a book of some length, there might be some merit in the argument that Vitorius Marcellus, as a man interested in literature and scholarship, was a suitable dedicatee. But what Probus sent was only a letter, and that on an extremely specialized subject. He could not have written in this form unless he were able to presume a real interest in the pronunciation of Punic on Marcellus' side. Since we have no reason to think that Marcellus delved into this subject, it seems best to look elsewhere for the recipient of Probus' letter. If one had to choose among the plethora of Marcelli attested during the early Empire, one might sooner point to someone like Q. Caecilius Marcellus of Carthage (*PIR*² C 55).

fession, his zealous fealty to the emperor, and his prominence during the middle nineties, and to suggest that, like many another ambitious young senator, he had placed his talent at the emperor's disposal.

II

The second poem of Statius' fifth book extols the youngest of the poet's friends, the sixteen-year-old Vettius Crispinus.¹⁴ He was the son of Vettius Bolanus, the erstwhile governor of Britain who during the civil war of 69–70 had conformed his actions with Flavian interests, and had been rewarded by adlection into the patriciate.¹⁵ Of Crispinus nothing is heard after (or for that matter, before) the time of Statius' poem. A brother, alluded to but not named in the poem, must be identified with a certain M. Vettius Bolanus, of whom we do hear again: he was *consul ordinarius* in the year 111.¹⁶

According to Vollmer (in his commentary, p. 511) and to the writer of the *Pauly* articles, Crispinus and Bolanus junior were twins (*Zwillingsbrüder*). This assertion is based on *Silvae* 5. 2. 75, in which Statius declares that it was always Crispinus' way *aequaevo cedere fratri*.¹⁷ But to understand *aequaevus* as meaning "identical in age" is to impose upon the Latin word a narrow precision which it does not have. When Vergil called Priam the *aequaevus* of Anchises (*Aen.* 2. 561), he surely did not wish to suggest that these two venerable figures shared the same birthday, but was reminding his readers that they were cousins,

both belonging to the generation third in descent from Tros. Nor did Apuleius, when he termed Protagoras the *aequaevus Democriti* (*Flor.* 18), mean anything more than that they were approximately contemporary. Statius' use of the word, then, does not compel us to regard the Vettii as twins. Furthermore, three details of Bolanus' history indicate, if they do not prove, that he was an older brother, not a twin. First, it was he who inherited his father's full name. Second, verse 126 shows that he had already done his military service before Crispinus began it. And finally, Bolanus reached the consulate in the year 111. There is no room in the years 107, 109, or 110, and little room in 108, for his brother to have preceded him; the *fasti* are also full for the three years following 111. Either Crispinus did not live to be consul, or there was a difference of several years between him and his brother.

If one now looks at the full context of the phrase in line 75, it is plain that *aequaevus* was not meant to define the age of Bolanus vis-à-vis Crispinus, but that Statius is contrasting their generation with that of their parents, who are next mentioned: "... pietasque per omnes / dispensata modos; aequaevo cedere fratri / mirarique patrem miseraeque ignoscere matri . . ."

It is necessary to deal first with this misconception about the brothers' ages in order to proceed to the more interesting problem raised by the bizarre episodes of family life which Statius evokes in lines 61–96. The discussion will be clearer if the whole passage is set out at the beginning:

iamque alio moliris iter nec deside passu
ire paras; nondum validae tibi signa iuventae
inrepere genis, et adhuc tenor integer aevi.
nec genitor iuxta; fatis namque haustus iniquis
65 occidit et geminam prolem sine praeside linquens.

14. *PIR*¹ V 325; E. Sattmann, s.v. "Vettius (27)," *RE*, VIII A (1958), 1858. Crispinus' age is given in *Silv.* 5. 2. 12–13: "octonos bis iam tibi circuit orbes / vita."

15. According to Tacitus (*Hist.* 2. 97), Bolanus had denied Vitellius reinforcements from the army of Britain. That the family was patrician follows from *Silv.* 5. 2. 28, and from Crispinus' enrollment among the *Salii Collini* (*Silv.* 5. 2. (129–31)); but that it was Vespasian who bestowed the patriciate is conjectural.

16. *PIR*¹ V 324; E. Sattmann, s.v. "Vettius (26)," *RE*, VIII A (1958), 1858.

17. *Geminam prolem* in *Silv.* 5. 2. 65 means "two sons," not "twins"; cf. *gemma cum prole* of Nestor's sons Antilochus and Thrasymedes, *Ilias latina* 177; *geminio natarum pignore* of Adrastus' daughters Argeia and Deipyle, *Theb.* 1. 394.

- nec saltem teneris ostrum puerile lacertis
 exuit albenque umeros induxit amictu.
 puem non corrumpit pubes effrena novaeque
 libertas properata togae! ceu nescia falcis
- 70 silva comas tollit fructumque expirat in umbras.
 at tibi Pieriae tenero sub pectore curae
 et pudor et docti legem sibi dicere mores;
 tunc hilaris probitas et frons tranquilla nitorque
 luxuriae confine tenens pietasque per omnes
- 75 dispensata modos; aequaevo cedere fratri
 mirarique patrem miseraeque ignoscere matri
 admonuit fortuna domus. tibine illa nefanda
 pocula letalesque manu componere sucos
 evaluit, qui voce potes praevertere morsus
- 80 serpentum atque omnis vultu placare novercas?
 infestare libet manes meritoque precatu
 pacem auferre rogis; sed te, puer optime, cerno
 flectentem iustis et talia dicta parantem:
 'parce, precor, cineri: fatum illud et ira nocentum
- 85 Parcarum crimenque dei, mortalia quisquis
 pectora sero videt nec primo in limine sistit
 conatus scelerum atque animos infanda parantes.
 excidat illa dies aevo nec postera credant
 saecula! nos certe taceamus et obruta multa
- 90 nocte tegi propriae patiamur crimina gentis.
 exegit poenas, hominum cui cura suorum,
 quo Pietas auctore redit terrasque revisit,
 quem timet omne nefas. satis haec lacrimandaque nobis
 ultio. quin saevas utinam exorare liceret
- 95 Eumenidas timidaeque avertere Cerberon umbrae
 immemoremque tuis citius dare manibus amnem.'

Statius relates that Bolanus senior died while Crispinus was very young; that Crispinus was invested with the *toga virilis* at an unusually early age; and that his mother attempted to poison him. He draws no connection between these events, but the sequence which practically imposes itself is as follows:

There is every reason to suppose that Bolanus left a will. He was a senator and therefore wealthy, and also an elderly man. Hence he had had both opportunity and need to arrange for succession. The bulk of his estate would naturally have been divided between his sons.

When he died, Bolanus junior could take possession immediately. He had already assumed the *toga virilis* and was therefore a

legally responsible person who could dispose of property. Crispinus, however, was an *impubes*, and could not. His inheritance would remain in suspense until he assumed the *toga virilis*. When a testator left property to an *impubes*, he had to make some provision for the possibility that the latter might die before reaching the age of legal responsibility. He generally did so by naming a *substitutus pupillaris*, who would inherit if the minor died. It was quite common for the mother to be named the *substitutus*.¹⁸ A poor judge of character could thus expose his younger children to great danger and his widow to great temptation.

It is difficult to resist the conjecture, melodramatic though it may be, that Crispinus' mother set out to murder him precisely in

18. "... There are some texts which show that, so far from desiring to safeguard the children by separating the administration of their property from the custody of their persons, a father might do all he could to see that the mother had

charge of both," writes H. F. Jolowicz, *JRS*, XXXVII (1947), 87, citing as evidence ps.-Quintilian *Declam.* 388 (p. 434 Ritter) and *Digest* 38. 17. 2. 25 and 46.

order to secure his inheritance. The situation outlined shows how she stood to gain by her act, and also explains why she made no attempt against the older brother. As some commentators on Juvenal have seen, Statius preserves a historical illustration of the danger envisaged by Juvenal in *Satire* 6. 629–31: “vos ego, pupilli, moneo, quibus amplior est res / custodite animas et nulli credite mensae: / livida materno fervent adipata veneno.”

After the attempt was discovered and the mother punished, Crispinus’ guardians must have decided to safeguard him for the future by announcing his coming of age. Although the donning of the *toga virilis* had important legal consequences, there were apparently no legal regulations which fixed the time for it. Normally a boy celebrated the day sometime

between his fourteenth and his sixteenth year, but the family had complete discretion in the matter. So there was no obstacle to prevent Crispinus’ guardians from moving the date up.¹⁹

The sequence of events as I reconstruct it differs from the sequence as Statius presents it, with the murder attempt following the taking of the *toga virilis*. But this is not a serious objection. Statius does not profess to be giving a chronological narrative, and other examples (notably his remarks on the career of Rutilius Gallicus in *Silv.* 1. 4)²⁰ demonstrate that he sometimes ignored the actual order of events.

PETER WHITE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

19. For the age and significance of investiture with the *toga virilis*, see J. Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*², pp. 127–32. For the legal problems which beset the institution of an *impubes* as one’s heir, see M. Kaser, *Römisches Privatrecht*, I, 74 ff.; and the article by Jolowicz cited in n. 17. Vollmer (in his commentary, pp. 511, 516) had suggested that the mother tried to poison Crispinus in order to secure for his

brother the *Erstgeburtsrecht*. But he would have been hard put to explain what the *Erstgeburtsrecht* was.

20. *PIR*¹ R 167; Groag, s.v. “Rutilius (19),” *RE*, I4 (1914), 1255–63. It was not until the discovery of *ILS* 9499 that scholars realized what liberty Statius had taken with the chronology of Rutilius’ career, which he recounts in *Silv.* 1. 4. 71–93.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF KONON’S *DIEGESEIS*

All citations are according to the text as printed by Jacoby, *FGrH*, 26 F 1.

I. *πρῶτον τὰ περὶ Μίδα καὶ Βριγῶν, ὅπως τε θησανυρῶι περιτυχῶν ἀθρόον τε εἰς πλοῦτον ἦρθη καὶ Ὀρφέως κατὰ Πιέρειαν τὸ ὄρος ἀκροατῆς γενόμενος πολλαῖς τέχναϊς Βριγῶν βασιλεύει*. In this, the opening sentence of the passage, H. Gerstinger (“Ad Cononis *Διηγησέων* fragmentum I,” *Serta Philologica Aenipontana* [Innsbruck, 1962], p. 239) would read *τελευταῖς* in place of *τέχναϊς*. Gerstinger’s proposed reading would make sense, and there can be little doubt that what Midas learned from Orpheus were *τελευταί* in some sense of the word. But this is not sufficient justification for replacing *τέχναϊς*, which is not really a difficult reading in the first place. There are also other passages dealing with the same subject which furnish positive grounds for retaining the reading. Clement of Alexandria (*Protr.* 11. 3. 2) says that Midas, after being instructed by Orpheus, “propagated a

cunning deceit (ἔντεχνον ἀπάτην) among his subjects.” Justin (11. 7. 14) says that Midas had been Orpheus’ student and that he “Phrygiam religionibus implevit, quibus tutor omni vita quam armis fuit”—a statement which strongly suggests the crafty exploitation of religious rites. Finally, Polyaeus (*Strat.* 7. 5) tells that Midas and his followers attracted Phrygians from their homes by presenting a religious procession and then seized the vacated houses and established Midas as ruler. We might also consider the fact that the practitioners of Orphic rites had a reputation for charlatanry. See, e.g., L. Moulinier, *Orphée et l’Orphisme à l’époque classique* (Paris, 1955), pp. 32 ff.

XXXI. Tereus is the subject of the following sentence. *καὶ ὡς ἐπεμάνη καὶ ἐμίγη ἀκούσῃ Φιλομήλαι τῇ ἀδελφῇ Πρόκνης, καὶ τέμνει τὴν αὐτῆς γλῶτταν, δεδιδῶς τὸν ἐκ λόγων θρίαμβον*. There is apparently no passage in classical Greek in which the word *θρίαμβος*