

wine, and hence the *iustitium* was being broken.<sup>21</sup> The penalty paid may, in our view, be excessive, but it was in accordance with statute and that statute was one governing *maiestas*.<sup>22</sup>

We may now briefly recapitulate our conclusions. At the beginning of his reign Caligula conspicuously forgave some people who had been charged with *maiestas* in the time of Tiberius. In the years following, however, he himself accused others of the crime and finally, in 39, revived the charges against those he had earlier absolved. At no time did he abolish the laws of *maiestas*.

Why did Caligula reactivate the specific charges in A.D. 39? Presumably his spies were alerting him to the menacing discontent among the senators (the Lepidus/Lentulus Gaetulicus affair(s) followed later that year). Now under threat, he could identify with Tiberius and saw what seemed to him the gains accruing from a ruthless pursuit of senators on the model of his predecessor.<sup>23</sup>

In recent times Caligula has received a good deal of attention and re-evaluation.<sup>24</sup> It may very well be, however, that in the light of what we have had to say, the chapter of his life dealing with *maiestas* may also need to be rewritten.<sup>25</sup>

Darwin College, University of Kent at Canterbury  
University College, Galway

ARTHUR KEAVENEY  
JOHN A. MADDEN

<sup>21</sup> See Balsdon, p. 43, and the Loeb edn of Dio n. 2 on 57.14.10.

<sup>22</sup> This incontrovertible case has naturally caused difficulties for those who wish to believe that Gaius had abolished the *lex maiestatis*. Thus Barrett asserts (p. 86) that some lesser charge is more likely here but offers no evidence or argument. Bauman's treatment (pp. 105–6) is most unsatisfactory. He believes Caligula abolished the *lex maiestatis* entirely (pp. 23, 205) but still sees this incident as an instance of *impietas* (i.e. *maiestas*) and makes no attempt to resolve the contradiction. A. Ferrill, *Caligula Emperor of Rome* (London, 1991), pp. 98, 112–113, is also inconsistent. He notes the destruction of documents relating to specific cases at the start of the reign but then goes on to talk of a revival of the treason law when the documents were resurrected in A.D. 39.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Bauman, p. 210; M. Grant, *The Twelve Caesars* (London, 1975), pp. 118–19.

<sup>24</sup> Notably in the biographies of Barrett and Ferrill.

<sup>25</sup> We should like to thank an anonymous referee for some helpful suggestions.

## PROBLEMS OF TEXT AND INTERPRETATION IN STATIUS, *THEBAID* I–VI

The text is taken from the edition of D. E. Hill, *Mnemosyne* Supplement 79 (Leiden, 1983). The following works are referred to by author's surname only: H. W. Garrod, *P. Papini Stati Thebais et Achilleis* (Oxford, 1906); L. Håkanson, *Statius Thebaid* (Lund, 1973); A. Klotz, *P. Papini Stati Thebais* (Leipzig 1908; revised edn by T. C. Klinnert, 1973); R. Kühner, C. Stegmann, and A. Thierfelder, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (Leverkusen, 1955; 2 vols.); R. Lesueur, *Stace Thébaïde* (Paris, 1990, 1991, 1994; 3 vols.); J. H. Mozley, *Statius* (Loeb edition, London, 1928; 2 vols.); E. C. Woodcock, *A New Latin Syntax* (London, 1959).

Th. 1.529–32

tunc rex longaeuus Acasten  
(natarum haec altrix eadem et fidissima custos  
lecta sacrum iustae Veneri occultare pudorem)  
imperat acciri tacitaeque innummurat aure.

532 tacitaeque . . . auri Klotz: taciteque . . . auri Deipser: tacitoque . . . ore Koestlin

Adrastus orders Acaste to be summoned and 'whispers in her silent ear' the instruction to bring his two daughters to the banquet where they will be seen by their predestined husbands for the first time. The arresting novelty of *tacitaque inmurmurat aure* depends on a combination of two things: first, the use of the local ablative with a verb implying motion and regularly constructed with *in/ad* and the accusative, or with the poetic dative of goal of motion (as at *Th.* 11.63 *terraeque inmurmurat*);<sup>1</sup> secondly, the use of hypallage of the 'sleepless pillow' variety (with the same adjective at *Th.* 11.146 *tacitos auerterat ignes*). The emendations proposed are all attempts to normalize what seems a typically Statian innovation and miss the real difficulty, that *tacita* is otiose, for would not even a garrulous old servant keep quiet when receiving whispered instructions from her master? (*OLD* s.v. does not recognize 'discreet' as a meaning of *tacitus*). Of course, poets write poetry not *précis*. Nevertheless the adjective makes sense but lacks point.

The unsurprising confusion of *tacit-* and *tact-* occurs in the manuscripts at *Th.* 7.579 and in the *codex Mediceus* at *Th.* 3.107, and here *tacta* (which, incidentally, makes an ablative absolute with *aure* and so obviates any syntactical discomfort) is pointed. 'Touching the ear' is a custom best known in connection with engaging a witness, *antestari*. Pl. *Persa* 748 and Hor. *Serm.* 1.9.76–7 illustrate the manner in which this was done—by the complainant touching the earlobe of the witness to be engaged. Pliny (*N.H.* 11.251) explains why: *est in aure ima memoriae locus, quem tangentes antestamur*. But the practice is found in contexts other than legal as an accepted way of warning someone to keep something in mind and not let it slip the memory: Virg. *Ecl.* 6.3–4; *Copa* 38 (*Mors aurem uellens 'uiuite' ait, 'uenio'*); Sen. *Apoc.* 9.4; Sen. *Ben.* 5.7.6.

The action of the epic cannot be launched if Polynices does not marry Adrastus' daughter and bring Argos into war with Thebes, and the importance of Adrastus' order to Acaste here is suitably stressed by a warning not to forget it.

*Th.* 2.26–31            illos ut caeco recubans in limine sensit  
                         Cerberus, atque omnes capitum subrexit hiatus;  
                         saeuus et intranti populo, iam nigra tumebat  
                         colla minax, iam sparsa solo turbauerat ossa,  
                         ni deus horrentem Lethaeo uimine mulcens  
                         ferrea tergemino domuisset lumina somno.

Scholars have reacted to the startling *atque* in both possible ways. The older editors and Garrod, Klotz, and Hill retain it, the latter taking it to mean *statim*. He has the *OLD* (s.v. *atque* 6) to support him. But this usage is otherwise only attested as a Plautine colloquialism, for at Virg. *Georg.* 1.203 and at Statius *Th.* 8.760 we have parallels to the not uncommon Virgilian use of *atque* 'introducing a dramatic moment' (R. G. Austin on *Aen.* 6.162). Others have emended: *aeque* Unger (favoured by Håkanson), *alte* Lachmann, *ecce* Baehrens, *anguicomus* Koch, *una* J. B. Hall.<sup>2</sup> W. S. Watt,<sup>3</sup> keeping *atque*, neatly proposes *et* for *ut* (26).

However, if we examine the structure of this section in its totality, Klotz's analysis is compelling: the first main clause in it is *iam . . . tumebat* (28). And W. B. Anderson's<sup>4</sup> warning is wise: 'attempts to make a principal clause of *atque* . . . *hiatus* (27) by emendation or otherwise are futile'. In other words, *sensit* and *subrexit* are both

<sup>1</sup> Investigated by R. D. Williams in 'The local ablative in Statius', *CQ* 1 (1951), 143–6.

<sup>2</sup> *ICS* 14 (1989), 234–5.

<sup>3</sup> *Eranos* 85 (1987), 49.

<sup>4</sup> *PCPS* 178 (1941–5), 10–11.

contained in the *ut*-clause. So why has the *atque* which conjoins them, and is syntactically unobjectionable, caused so much malaise? Because it is felt to be stylistically awkward in the proximity of conscious structuring (*iam* (28) . . . *iam* (29); 31 is a golden line) which would be sustained if it were changed to *utque*.<sup>5</sup> Given appropriate punctuation we now have:

illos ut caeco recubans in limine sensit  
Cerberus utque<sup>6</sup> omnes caput subrexit hiatus  
(saeuus et intranti populo), iam nigra tumebat  
colla minax, iam sparsa solo turbauerat ossa,  
ni deus horrentem Lethaeo uimine mulcens  
ferrea tergemino domuisset lumina somno.

*Th.* 2.246–53

hi fibris animaque litant, hi caespite nudo,  
nec minus auditi, si mens accepta, merentur  
ture deos, fractisque obtendunt limina siluis.  
ecce metu subito (Lachesis sic dura iubebat)  
impulsae mentes, excussaue gaudia patri,  
et turbata dies. innuptam limine adibant  
Pallada, Monychiis cui non Argiua per urbes  
posthabita est Larisa iugis;

Since we already have an accusative of goal of motion (*Pallada*), *limine* can only be classified as an ablative of route (see Kühner–Stegmann–Thierfelder, I, 350–1 and Woodcock, p. 31), and ‘by way of the threshold’ is intolerably lame—how else were they to enter the temple and approach the cult-statue? The difficulty has provoked conjectures: *lumine* editors before Kohlmann; *limite* Baehrens; *innuptum limen* Phillimore (but what then of *Pallada*?); *milvia* Alton;<sup>7</sup> *Pallada* Anderson.<sup>8</sup>

*limine* looks like a perseveration of *limina* (248), also in the fifth foot. At *Th.* 2.479, where *P* gives *limine*, *ω* offers *culmine*, and I suggest that *in culmine* should be read here, referring to what is three lines later (256) called *celsam* . . . *arcem*, i.e. the summit of Larisa, the citadel of Argos. For *culmen* in this sense, with no qualifying *montis* or the like, cf. *Th.* 2.34.

*Th.* 3.269–70

‘bella etiam in Thebas, socer o pulcherrime, bella  
ipse paras ferroque tuos abolere nepotes?

269 pulcherrime *ω*: pulcherrima *P*

Jupiter, insisting that destiny must be fulfilled, has despatched Mars to inaugurate the war between Argos and Thebes. Venus tries to dissuade him.

Mars, as the father of Harmonia the wife of Cadmus, is called the father-in-law of Thebes at *Th.* 7.666–7, and *socer* here is defended by some (e.g. Lesueur) by reading this cryptic allusion into it. For it is surely impossible for Venus to address as ‘father-in-law’ the god who had been her adulterous lover and caught with her *in flagrante delicto* (as she goes on to say at *Th.* 3.273–4). The father-in-law in question must be her own. This is one case where the *Puteaneus* can be trusted. The ‘editors before Bernartius’ were right. Read *socero pulcherrima bella*: ‘Do you yourself prepare

<sup>5</sup> For the confusion of *a* and *u* in the manuscripts, see A. Klotz, *Achilleis* (Leipzig, 2nd edn, 1926) praef. XII and O. A. W. Dilke, *Statius Achilleid* (Cambridge, 1952), Intro. 19.

<sup>6</sup> Dr J. B. Hall has kindly informed me that *ut(que)* occurs at this point as a superscript variant in the previously uncollated Bodleian manuscript Rawlinson G. 114 (thirteenth century).

<sup>7</sup> *CQ* 17 (1923), 178.

<sup>8</sup> *CQ* 18 (1924), 207.

war even against Thebes, war most lovely in the eyes of (*datius iudicantis*) my father-in-law?', namely Jupiter, father of Vulcan, who shortly before had relished the prospect of hostilities (*Th.* 3.244–52).

*Th.* 4.414–18

Lethaeaque sacra  
et mersum Ismeni subter confinia ponto  
miscentis parat ante ducem, circumque bidentum  
uisceribus laceris et odori sulphuris aura  
graminibusque nouis et longo murmure purgat.

The terrified Eteocles consults Tiresias, who informs him that necromancy is the surest means of divination, and then *sacra et . . . parat . . . ducem* beforehand, i.e. before beginning the elaborate ceremonial for calling up the shades of the dead. Mozley and Hill inform us that *ducem* refers to Laius. Admittedly he is addressed as *dux* by Tiresias at *Th.* 4.610, but he does not lead the array of ghosts of which he is the last to appear (*Th.* 4.604–9). And in what sense could Tiresias 'prepare' a ghost? And, most grotesque of all, why is Laius' ghost located with what seems geographical precision at a place without any connection with the dead or the underworld? Tiresias is performing a ritual of purification: *purgat* (418). There is only one person present in need of it: Eteocles. That is why he is rather bizarrely said to be 'submerged beneath the juncture of the Ismenos mingling with the sea' (for the syntax of *miscentis* cf. *Th.* 7.812 *uoluentis machina mundi*): he is undergoing a thorough baptism in the currents of the estuary, near where Crenaeus' body was to come to rest at *Th.* 9.358–9 *iacet ipse procul, qua mixta supremum | Ismenon primi mutant confinia ponti* (in fact the Ismenos does not debouch into the sea, but into Lake Iliki!). Some such lustration, whether in sea water (Eur. *I.T.* 1193) or in fresh water (*Th.* 9.573–4), was a necessary precaution before and after contact with supernatural powers, and Eteocles had had some uncanny experiences (406) to be got rid of. Lactantius Placidus was right after all: 'parat ante ducem *ad futurum scilicet sacrificium Eteoclen*'.

*Th.* 5.236–9

ut uero Alcimedem etiamnum in murmure truncos  
ferre patris uultus et egentem sanguinis ensem  
conspexi, rigure comae atque in uiscera saeuus  
horror iit:

Hypsipyle shudders when she catches sight of Alcimede carrying her father's severed head, still muttering, 'and the sword lacking blood'. G. Wiman,<sup>9</sup> attributing this puzzling phrase to manuscript corruption, conjectured *egentes sanguine sensim*, which was rightly rejected by R. Helm<sup>10</sup>—in favour of the explanation of Lactantius Placidus: *quia senem occiderat et gladium cruore non tinxerat*. Her father, we are to believe, was so old and frail that he did not have a single drop of blood in him, not even as much as the decrepit old sheep whose throat Medea slit *et exiguo maculauit sanguine ferrum* at Ovid *Met.* 7.315 (adduced by Müller).

In this passage, as elsewhere, Statius is indulging in gruesome horrors: it needs blood—and lots of it:

ferre patris uultus *nec* egentem sanguinis ensem

(for the confusion cf. *Th.* 10.122 *nec Pω: et B*).

<sup>9</sup> *Eranos* 35 (1937), 19–20.

<sup>10</sup> *Lustrum* 1 (1956), 293.

Th. 6.355–61

interea cantu Musarum nobile mulcens  
 concilium citharaeque manus insertus Apollo  
 Parnasi summo spectabat ab aethere terras  
 .....  
 orsa deum, nam saepe Iouem Phlegramque suique  
 anguis opus fratrumque pius cantarat honores.  
 tunc aperit quis fulmen agat, quis sidera ducat  
 spiritus, unde animi fluuiis, quae pabula uentis . . .

Housman<sup>11</sup> pointed out the absurdity of taking *orsa deum* in apposition to *quis fulmen agat* etc. because even if the former phrase could mean ‘the deeds of the gods’ (Mozley)—which it may not—it makes nonsense to suppose that these are to be identified with the causes of natural phenomena. His solution was to posit a lacuna of one verse after 357 and fill it notionally with *caelicolum meritas non longa sonantia laudes*. Hill adopts this idea of a lacuna in spite of the generous but trenchant criticism of Housman by R. Helm.<sup>12</sup>

*orsa* here may not have lost sight of its participial origin and the meaning of *ordior* (cf. Th. 2.420 *si . . . orsa tulisses* ~ 423 *inciperes*): ‘his beginnings’; *deum* would belong to the type of objective genitive with which Statius achieves some compressed phrases,<sup>13</sup> and *sunt* is to be supplied: ‘his preludes are about the gods’, for he had these already prepared, having often celebrated one or other of them. Then (360) he begins the new section *de rerum natura*. No lacuna needs to be posited, but repunctuation is required.

Forest Hill, Oxford

P. T. EDEN

<sup>11</sup> CQ 27 (1933), 9–10 = *Classical Papers* 1206–7.

<sup>12</sup> *Lustrum* 1 (1956), 285–6: ‘Allein hier ist dem scharfsinnigen Gelehrten nicht gelungen, zu überzeugen. Der Ausdruck *non carmen deo erat* ist an sich unbefriedigend, und das dann folgende *tunc aperit* schliesst sich nicht gut an.’

<sup>13</sup> Statius offers some bold examples of this usage: Th. 1.230 *errores . . . nemorum* ‘wanderings in the glades’; Th. 1.230–1 *deorum . . . crimina* ‘crimes against the gods’; Th. 5.717 *nuntius . . . prolis* ‘news about his offspring’; Th. 11.251 *post exulis otia tauri* ‘after the leisure afforded to others by the bull’s exile’.

## THE CHRONOLOGY OF NICOMACHUS OF GERASA

The relative and absolute chronology of Middle Platonic philosophy is often uncertain, causing problems in connecting a philosopher either to other philosophers or to the surrounding culture.

John Dillon<sup>1</sup> attempted to date the philosopher and Neopythagorean Nicomachus of Gerasa by reference to the later philosopher Proclus. Proclus was born in 412 and claimed to be the reincarnation of Nicomachus.<sup>2</sup> In the *Theologumena Arithmeticae*,<sup>3</sup> wrongly attributed to Iamblichus, 216 years is given as the period between

<sup>1</sup> J. Dillon, ‘A date for the death of Nicomachus of Gerasa?’, *CR* n.s. 19 (1969), 274–5, reprinted in J. Dillon, *The Golden Chain*, XV (Variorum, 1990).

<sup>2</sup> ‘He (Proclus) was convinced that he belonged to the Hermetic tradition and he believed according to a dream he once had that he possessed the soul of the Pythagorean philosopher Nicomachus.’ ‘Life of Proclus’ by Marinus ch. 28 (translated by L. J. Rosan in his *The Philosophy of Proclus*, 1949). In ch. 35 a horoscope for Proclus is given which dates his birth as February 18, 412.

<sup>3</sup> Text, V. de Falco (Leipzig, 1922), translation by R. Waterfield, *The Theology of Arithmetic* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1988).