

*Cephisias* Ov. *Met.* 7.438; *Cnosias* Ov. *AA* 1.293, 556; *Cythereias*† Ov. *Met.* 15.386; *Daulias* Catull. 65.14, *ES* 154, *Ciris* 200,<sup>11</sup> *Cons. ad Liv.* 106; *Daunias* Hor. *C.* 1.22.14;<sup>12</sup> *Heliades*\* Ov. *Met.* 2.340, 10.91, 263, *F.* 6.717, *Culex* 129; *Heliconiades*\* Lucret. 3.1037; *Ilias* (= 'Trojan')\* Virg. *Aen.* 1.480, 2.580<sup>13</sup> etc., Ov. *Her.* 16.338; *Ionias*\*† Ov. *Her.* 9.73, *AA* 2.219; *Lemnias*\* Ov. *Her.* 6.53, 139, *AA* 3.672; *Lesbias* *ES* 16; *Lycorias* Virg. *G.* 4.339; *Methymnias* *ES* 15; *Minyeias* Ov. *Met.* 4.1; *Naias* Virg. *E.* 6.21, Ov. *AA* 2.110, *F.* 1.512, *ES* 162; *Nisias* *ES* 54 (*bis*); *Nysias* Ov. *F.* 3.769; *Ophias* Ov. *Met.* 7.383; *Pallantias*\* Ov. *Met.* 9.421, 15.191, *F.* 4.373; *Pelasgias*\* Ov. *Her.* 9.3; *Pelias*\* Ov. *Her.* 3.126, *AA* 1.696, *Rem.* 48, *Met.* 13.109, *Ex P.* 1.7.32, 2.2.26; *Pelopeias* Ov. *Met.* 6.414, *F.* 3.83; *Phaestias* Ov. *Met.* 9.716;<sup>14</sup> *Phasias* Ov. *Her.* 6.103, *AA* 2.103, 382, *Met.* 7.298; *Pleiades*\* Virg. *G.* 1.138, Hor. *C.* 4.14.21, Prop. 2.16.51, 3.5.36, Ov. *Met.* 1.670 etc. (9×), Germ. *Arat.* 256, Manil. 1.371 (?), 4.522, 5.142, 710; *Potnias* Ov. *Ib.* 553; *Pyrrhias* *ES* 15; *Scyrias* Ov. *AA* 1.682; *Thaumantias* Virg. *Aen.* 9.5, Ov. *Met.* 4.480; *Thespias* Ov. *Met.* 5.310; *Thestias*\* Ov. *Rem.* 721, *Met.* 8.452, 473; *Thoantias*\* Ov. *Her.* 6.163.

With the exception of a few such as *Ἑλικωνιάδες*, *Ὀλυμπιάδες*, and *Πηλιῶδες*, names formed in this way were evidently not especially favoured before the Hellenistic period. The odd man out here, as noted above, was, interestingly, Euripides. These words were recommended, not only by their decorative and associative qualities, which they shared with many Greek proper names, but also, particularly in dactylic metres, by their metrical convenience; and it will be seen that Callimachus and Apollonius provide most of the Greek examples. Callimachus' predilection had indeed been briefly noted by Pfeiffer;<sup>15</sup> in him and Apollonius it verges on a mannerism. As such it was clearly recognized and exploited, for the same reasons, by Ovid in his turn. It is by no means the only game that he plays with Greek proper names,<sup>16</sup> but it is particularly distinctive and individual to him, and it deserves to rank as one of his many trademarks.

Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

<sup>11</sup> Hence Lucret. 4.545 *Dauliades* coni. Bergk.

<sup>12</sup> 'the Greek accident strikes a mock-heroic note' (*N-H ad loc.*).

<sup>13</sup> '*Iliades* in this sense is a Virgilianism' (Austin *ad loc.*).

<sup>14</sup> *inter Phaestiades* Lenz (-*adas* in the index), Anderson.

<sup>15</sup> On fr. 185: 'Call. uti solet huiusmodi formis, v. *Ἀκτιῶδες*, *Πελασγιάδες* etc.'. See R. Schmitt, *Die Nominalbildung in den Dichtungen des Kallimachos von Kyrene* (Wiesbaden, 1970), pp. 73–4; his list lumps together words in -*ás* and -*íás*, and is incomplete as regards Callimachus.

<sup>16</sup> See Kenney (ed.), *Ovid Heroides XVI–XXI* (1996), pp. 249–51; id., in J. Binns (ed.), *Ovid* (1973), pp. 126–7 (by no means complete).

## PROBLEMS OF TEXT AND INTERPRETATION IN STATIUS, *THEBAID* VII–XII

The following works are referred to by author's surname only: H. W. Garrod, *P. Papini Stati Thebais et Achilleis* (Oxford, 1906); D. E. Hill, *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos Libri XII* [*Mnemosyne* Supplement 79 (Leiden, 1983)]; A. Klotz, *P. Papini Stati Thebais* (Leipzig, 1908; revised edn by T. C. Klinnert, 1973); R. Lesueur, *Stace Thébaïde* (Paris, 1990, 1991, 1994; 3 vols); J. H. Mozley, *Statius* (Loeb edn, London, 1928; 2 vols); J. J. Smolenaars, *Statius, Thebaid VII* [*Mnemosyne* Supplement 134 (Leiden, 1994)]; P. Venini, *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos Liber XI* (Firenze, 1970).

Th. 7.351–3

omnibus inmixtas cono super aspice laurus  
armaque uel Tityon uel Delon habentia, uel quas  
hic deus innumera laxauit caede pharetras.

These troops have emblazoned on their helmets pictures recalling Apollo's birth or exploits. All five twentieth-century editors (Garrod, Klotz, Mozley, Hill, Lesueur) print *innumera* with a small group of MSS in spite of its unsuitability to describe the slaughter of a single monster, the Python. Earlier (Th. 1.562ff.), describing the same event, Statius writes (567) *absumptis numerosa in uulnera telis*: the wounds were numerous, one for each arrow. That we should here accept the *innumeras* of *P* $\omega$ , and replace *quas* by *qua*, is put beyond reasonable doubt by Ovid, *Met.* 1.459–60 *qui modo pestifero tot iugera uentre prementem / strauimus innumeris tumidum Pythona sagittis*, and by Th. 5.533 (also of the Python) *uexit harundineam centeno uulnere siluam*.<sup>1</sup>

Th. 7.404–5

quippe serunt diros monitus uolucresque feraeque  
sideraque auersique suis decursibus amnes.

All twentieth-century editors print *auersique*, though Lesueur alone informs us that it is the reading of *P*—which may account for its persistence. Streams 'deflected from their downward channels' are not portentous but the result of the entirely natural phenomenon of flooding (cf. Th. 7.426–9). Those that defy gravity, on the other hand, have been a sign that the natural order of things has gone awry at least since Eur. *Medea* 410 ἄνω ποταμῶν ἱερῶν χωροῦσι παγαί (the same ἀδύνατον at Th. 7.553). Mozley actually translates the phrase 'backward flowing rivers'. There could hardly be a better argument for adopting *aduersi* with a number of MSS.

Th. 8.162–3

quae tibi nunc facies, postquam permissa gemendi  
copia! qui fletus galeis cecidere solutis!  
162 nunc *P* $\mu$  $\tau$ ; tunc  $\omega$

The disappearance of Amphiaraus causes utter dejection to the Argives. Mozley, opining that *tibi* 'may be an ethic dative here', translates it 'think you'. But for an epic poet to address a single unspecified member of his audience or his protagonists in this way is surely unthinkable (the generalizing use of the second person singular of a verb [as at Th. 7.528 *uideres*] is quite a different matter). *tibi* must go. At Th. 2.474 and 10.711, where *P* offers *tibi*,  $\omega$  correctly offers *ibi*. But here *ibi* cannot simply replace *tibi* because hiatus in the first foot after a monosyllable other than *heu* would not be acceptable. And with *ibi* (not *hic*) we need *tunc* (not *nunc*).

*Hactenus haec*, but at this point my attention was drawn<sup>2</sup> to the edition of Caspar Barth (1664), who on *tibi* comments '*Non est quem alloquatur hoc loco Papinius*', and

<sup>1</sup> Smolenaars 164, taking *hic* (353) = 'here' = 'at Thebes', persists in his view that the reference is not to the Python, but to the pestilence which had recently ravaged Thebes. It is difficult to visualize how this could be pictorially represented.

<sup>2</sup> By the anonymous referee.

who finds clearly written in his *liber optimus* '*Tunc ibi quae facies*'. Whatever its source, this reading should be adopted: justification for it is provided above.

*Th.* 8.695–8

non secus obiectas acies turbamque minorem  
dissimulat transitque manu; tamen ora Thoantis,  
pectora Deilochi, Clonii latus, ilia torui  
perforat Hippotadae.

Tydeus, with Eteocles as his sole objective, pretends that the enemy troops are not there and passes through them *manu*, 'by fighting' or 'with violence'—according to the received punctuation. The list of his victims is then quite illogically introduced by *tamen*, 'nevertheless'. Sense can be restored by moving the semicolon to precede *manu*, which then occupies an emphatic position:

dissimulat transitque; manu tamen ora Thoantis. . .

'nevertheless with sheer brute force he pierces Thoas' face . . .'

*Th.* 10.470–1

qui tremor inlicita caeli de lampade tactis,  
hic fixit iuuenem. . .

Amphion, discovering the massacred Thebans, is shocked as if struck by lightning. The *inlicita*, 'unpermitted', offered by *P* and the primary MSS, is meaningless in this context (which did not prevent Lactantius Placidus from 'explaining' it!). In a few late MSS it was supplanted by the facile correction *elicit*,<sup>3</sup> 'enticed out', whose meaning is hardly less obscure. Other suggestions range from Phillimore's imaginative *ilicibus* to Garrod's sensible *inicitur* (accepted by Hill) and Lesueur's *illatus*. However, at *Th.* 11.528 *P* wrongly offers *inliciti* for  $\omega$ 's correct *impliciti*, which suggests that the true reading here is *inflicta*: 'such a trembling as in those struck by heaven's lightning dashed against them'. [Strictly speaking, *de* indicates 'the point from which a downward-directed action proceeds' (*OLD* s.v. 2b); *lampas* was understood by Lactantius Placidus to mean '*fulmen*', and this is the second time in Book X that Statius gives the word an unusual sense (at 121 it refers to the radiance of the rainbow).]

*Th.* 10.930–4

cedunt acies, et terror utrimque,  
quo ruat, ardenti feriat quas corpore turmas.  
[intra se stridere facem galeamque comasque  
quaerit, et urentem thoraca repellere dextra  
conatus ferri cinerem sub pectore tractat.]

Capaneus blazes spectacularly when hit by Jupiter's lightning. Lines 932–4 are not to

<sup>3</sup> *elicit* persists in T. C. Klennert's revised Teubner edition of Klotz, who, however, in the *Corrigenda et Addenda* of his first edition (1908) abandoned *elicit* ('uocem . . . inanem esse concedo') in favour of his later suggestion *inicta*.

be found in *P*. Barth considered them spurious and Klotz<sup>4</sup> judged them 'das Product der ausmalenden Phantasie eines Lesers'. However, in lexical, stylistic and metrical terms there is nothing in this passage that is impossible for Statius. And omission by the *Puteaneus* does not automatically signal spuriousness. Consider *Th.* 9.53 *quando alius misero ac melior mihi frater adeptus*, a verse integral if not indispensable to its context, whose authenticity is not questioned. Yet it is omitted by *P* and, for that matter, by a number of primary MSS.

932–3 require emendation because *stridere* . . . *quaerit* does not make sense. *quaerit* (933) has been the undeserving target of some repellent conjectures: *saevit* (Klotz), *questus* (Garrod), *maeret* (Brakman<sup>5</sup>). Imhof's *sentit* at least provides the verb of perceiving which *stridere* needs to govern it—but with the loss of the apt *quaerit*, 'he looks for', something which has gone missing (cf. *Th.* 11.278). Better is to assume that the *uerbum sentiendi* was to be found in a lacuna of one verse, which fell out before 932. A notional supplement might be

fulmine conuulsus subito stupet inscius, audit

—with a comma after *facem*.<sup>6</sup>

*Th.* 11.239–50

nuntius exanimi suspensus pectora cursu	
Aepytus ad regem portae statione relicta	240
tendit et haec trepido uix intellectus anhelat:	
'rumpe pios cultus intempestiuaque, rector,	
sacra deum: frater muris circum omnibus instat	
portarumque moras frenis adsultat et hastis,	
nomine te crebro, te solum in proelia poscens.	245
fleat maesti retro comites, et uterque loquenti	
adgemit et pulsus exercitus obstrepat armis.	
ille uocat. nunc tempus erat, sator optime diuum!	
quid meruit Capaneus?' turbatus inhorruit altis	
rex odiis, mediaque tamen gausus in ira est.	250

There is much disagreement about who speaks each section of 246–9, and consequently about the punctuation. As in the printing of the passage above, Hill and Venini<sup>7</sup> follow Klotz in giving the whole passage *rumpe* (242) . . . *Capaneus* (249) to the messenger Aepytus.<sup>8</sup> Garrod and Mozley end Aepytus' speech with *poscens* (245) and put *nunc tempus* (248) . . . *Capaneus* (249) in inverted commas as being the words 'he calls' (*ille uocat* 248); *fleat* (246) . . . *uocat* (248) then belong to the narrator Statius. Both of these views are mistaken.

Considerations that any interpretation must take into account are the following.

(1) In 246–7 'each of the two armies groans and with clashing weapons makes a din at him as he speaks' means that the speaker must be audible to both armies to provoke such reactions and must therefore be Polynices who is 'pressing on the walls' (243) of Thebes, where the battlements are manned by the Theban army—his supporting

<sup>4</sup> *Hermes* 40 (1905), 362–3.

<sup>5</sup> *Mnemosyne* 57 (1929), 261.

<sup>6</sup> Lesueur finds another way out of the difficulty with the conjecture *interea stridere* (historic infinitive) *faces*.

<sup>7</sup> Venini 73–6, while noting with disapproval that P. H. Damsté (*Mnemosyne* 37 [1909], 104) had suggested ending Aepytus' speech with *armis* 247.

<sup>8</sup> Not Aegyptus, as Klinnert twice names him in his note on *Th.* 11.246ff.

Argive army is on the plain behind him. Eteocles and Aegyptus are in the city. Polynices' companions in the background (*retro* 246) weep in sadness and the groaning armies try to drown his words because the only outcome of his summons must be fratricide. That this is the situation is put beyond doubt by *Th.* 11.369–70 (Antigone to Polynices) *summitte animos: en utraque gentis / turba rogant ambaeque acies*.

(2) *uocat* (248) means not 'shouts' and even less 'prays' (as Mozley) but 'challenges' (*prouocat* (cf. *uocatus* at *Th.* 11.287 and 381, and *uocasti* at 389). Aegyptus has already—and emphatically—told Eteocles that his brother is challenging him to single combat (245) and has no need to repeat himself, so his speech must end with *armis* (247) before *ille uocat*.

(3) *nunc tempus* (248) . . . *Capaneus* (249) is too overcharged to be appropriate on the lips of a messenger. Like the preceding *ille uocat* it must be spoken by Eteocles for a number of reasons. First, Eteocles has just made prayer and is restarting sacrifice to Jupiter *merito* . . . *pro fulmine* (205) and so quite appropriately now addresses him a second time (after his first address at 210). Secondly, Jupiter had protected Thebes by killing Capaneus—someone who is even more worthy of the same fate must be someone also fighting for Argos, in fact the sole survivor (discounting Adrastus) of the Seven against Thebes, Polynices. Thirdly, the words are an opening expression of the *alta* . . . *odia* (249–50) which we are next told Eteocles feels towards his brother.

Of twentieth-century scholars J. B. Poynton<sup>9</sup> came nearest to the truth, clearing the ground of previous misconceptions.

Forest Hill, Oxford

P. T. EDEN

<sup>9</sup> *CR* 53 (1940), 13, after E. H. Alton had completely misunderstood the situation in *CQ* 17 (1923), 185.

#### RELATIO VS. ORATIO: TACITUS, ANN. 3.12 AND THE SENATUS CONSULTUM DE CN. PISONE PATRE

Tiberius' speech at the outset of the trial of Cn. Calpurnius Piso, as Tacitus reports it at *Annals* 3.12, sheds light on two discrepancies between *relatio* and response in the recently published *senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre* (hereafter *SCPP*).<sup>1</sup>

The *SCPP* was published throughout the Empire, according to its publication order, *quo facilius totius actae rei ordo posterorum memoriae tradi posset atque hi scire<nt> quid et de singulari moderatione Germ(anici) Caesa(ris) et de sceleribus Cn. Pisonis patris senatus iudicasset* (lines 165–8). Besides the senate's judgements about Germanicus' *moderatio* and Piso's *scelera*, the body of the document also contains thanks to the immortal gods and to Tiberius (12–22), a list of posthumous punishments for Piso (71–108), verdicts on other defendants (109–23), and commendations for members of the imperial family and for the equestrian *ordo*, the *plebs*, and the soldiers (123–65). The punishments and verdicts respond to the *relationes* of lines 6–11, which ask the senate's view on the cases of Piso and his son and wife, and its judgement about his *comites*, but the thanks and commendations were added by the senate on its own initiative. Reference to Germanicus' *moderatio* might seem to be of a piece with the commendations of the *virtutes* of Livia and Drusus, Agrippina,

<sup>1</sup> Published in complementary Spanish and German editions: A. Caballos, W. Eck, F. Fernández, *El senadoconsulto de Gneo Pisón padre* (Sevilla, 1996) and W. Eck, A. Caballos, F. Fernández, *Das senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*, Vestigia 48 (Munich, 1996).