

## NOTES ON THE EPIC POEMS OF STATIUS

I. THEBAID<sup>1</sup>

- 1.472–6            ‘forsan et has uenturus amor praemiserit iras,  
                       ut meminisse iuuat.’ nec uana uoce locutus  
                       fata senex, siquidem hanc perhibent post uulnera iunctis  
                       esse fidem quanta partitum extrema proteruo  
                       Thesea Pirithoo.

At their first meeting Polynices and Tydeus come to blows. They are reconciled by Adrastus, who expresses the hope that their quarrel will lead to loyal friendship between them, as it did.

*Esse pro fuisse dixit*, says Lactantius, more ingenuously than Klotz, who tries to make the same thing more palatable by saying *esse est pro imperfecti quodammodo infinitiuo*. Some have taken the accusative and infinitive to be a general statement,<sup>2</sup> but Heuvel is clearly right in saying that it is Tydeus and Polynices whom the poet has in mind. The most favoured solution has been Gruter’s conjecture *isse*, but (as Helm says) that produces an unnatural expression (the passages adduced by Mueller are not parallels); Mozley renders it by ‘grew’, thereby translating not what stands in his text but what ought perhaps to stand there, namely <cr>*esse*, a conjecture of Gil,<sup>3</sup> which has been almost entirely overlooked. This contracted form is found in extant literature only at Lucretius 3.683 and (*concesse*) Ovid, *Met.* 7.416 (at 3.200 Statius has *flesse*). The first letters of a line are particularly liable to omission; despite Hill, I do not find it at all surprising that at 1.544 *perseus* lost its first letter and the remnant became *aureus*.

- 2.535–6            ac prior ‘unde, uiri, *quidue occultatis* in armis?’  
                       non humili terrore rogat.

Tydeus challenges the Thebans who are lying in wait for him.

*Quid occultatis* could mean ‘what purpose do you hide’, but in this context we expect ‘why do you hide yourselves’; if this is the meaning, the active is used in the sense of the passive or reflexive. *TLL* 9.2.377.77 calls our passage dubious, and for the reflexive use of *occultare* quotes only Ulpian ap. *Dig.* 11.4.3: *scrutari cubilia atque uestigia occultantium* (where it would be easy to insert *se*). Other active verbs used by Statius in a passive or reflexive sense are *deuertis* (2.721), *miscentis* (4.416), *uoluentis* (7.812), *mutat* (11.337), *fuscarer* (*Silu.* 3.4.66). One might think of emending to *quidue occulti*

<sup>1</sup> The following editions are referred to: Delphin (London, 1824); Nisard (with French trans. by Arnould and Wartel, Paris, 1865); O. Mueller (Books 1–6, Leipzig, 1870); H. W. Garrod (*OCT*, 1906); A. Klotz (Leipzig, 1908); J. H. Mozley (Loeb edition, 1928); H. Heuvel (Book 1, Zutphen, 1932); H. M. Mulder (Book 2, Groningen, 1954); R. D. Williams (Book 10, Leiden, 1972); D. E. Hill (Leiden, 1983); R. Lesueur (Budé edition, Paris, 1990–4); J. J. L. Smolenaars (Book 7, Leiden, 1994). I am very grateful to Professor J. Delz for his comments.

<sup>2</sup> For example, R. Helm, *Lustrum* 1 (1956), 275.

<sup>3</sup> J. Gil, *Emerita* 35 (1967), 105.



*estis*, which would actually bring the expression closer to its Virgilian model, *Aen.* 9.376: *quiue estis in armis?*

2.624–5                      dum clamat, subit ore cauo Teumesia cornus,  
nec prohibent fauces.

Chromis dies when a Theban spear enters his open mouth.

This passage helps to emend the text of Lactantius's note on 3.13, *Chromis inter sacra uulnere prostratus occubuit*. For *inter sacra* read *intra s<u>a ora* (not Barth's *intra os acto*).

2.630–2                      fratris moribunda leuabat  
membra solo Periphas (nil indole clarius *illa*  
nec pietate fuit).

I suspect that an original *illo* has been assimilated in gender to *indole*.

4.292–4                      uenit et Idaeis ululatibus aemulus Azan  
Parrhasique duces, et quae *risistis*, Amores,  
grata pharetrato Nonacria rura Tonanti.

'Contingents came from many regions to aid Parthenopaeus, and among them is Nonacris, a region "pleasing to the Thunderer" because it was there that he seduced Callisto. Very well, but why should the Loves smile or laugh at the countryside itself?'; so Hall,<sup>4</sup> who proceeds to propose *quaesistis* for *risistis*. Why should the Loves smile? Because in Virgil, *Ecl.* 3.9 (*sed faciles Nymphae risere*) the Nymphs similarly smile at some sexual shenanigans. I agree, however, that they did not smile at the Nonacrian countryside: that was *where* the seduction took place. For *quae* read *qua*.

Perhaps there is another passage in Statius in which non-mortals smile at the sexual activities of mortals, namely *Ach.* 1.642ff., where Achilles is seducing Deidamia:

ui potitur uotis et toto pectore ueros  
admouet amplexus; *uidit* chorus omnis ab alto  
astrorum et tenerae rubuerunt cornua Lunae.

Here, for *uidit* (P), the other manuscripts read *risit*. Modern editors prefer *uidit*, and there is little doubt that they are right; see Dilke's note on the passage, and the commentators on Catullus 7.7–8, *aut quam sidera multa, cum tacet nox, /furtiuos hominum uident amores*.

4.317–19                      ut stetit aduersisque impexit pectora frenis  
(*ille ad humum pallens*): 'unde haec furibunda cupido,  
nate, tibi?'

Atalanta confronts her son Parthenopaeus as he drives to war.

*Ille ad humum pallens* is a ridiculously incomplete parenthesis. Like Garrod and Damsté, I think that the only possible solution is the assumption of a lacuna, and suggest a supplement which would make it easy to explain the omission:

<sup>4</sup> J. B. Hall, *ICS* 17 (1992), 57–77, at 70.



(ille ad humum pallens <deiecit lumina) mater  
incipit irascens>: 'unde' *e. q. s.*

5.29–32

immania uulnera, rector,  
integrare iubes, Furiis et Lemnon et *artis*  
arma inserta toris debellatosque pudendo  
ense mares.

Hypsipyle begins to tell the story of the murdering women of Lemnos.

What does *artis toris* mean? 'The bed's embrace', says Mozley (and Lesueur follows suit with 'la couche des étreintes'); *ad occultandos enses accommodatis*, says Damsté;<sup>5</sup> neither view commands assent, nor do the suggested substitutes *atris* and *altis*. At Val. Fl. 5.222 *artus* appears in our oldest manuscript (V) as a corruption of *astus*; if a similar corruption has occurred in our passage, *astu* would give excellent sense.

5.116–17

*qua* pace feras uolucresque iugari  
mos datus. heu segnes!

The words of Polyxo, rousing her fellow women of Lemnos against their menfolk, who have crossed over to the mainland to make war on the Thracians.

The only way of punctuating *qua . . . datus* is as an exclamation (so Hill), but this is hardly convincing (it is a very different sort of exclamation from that which follows). Much more appropriate in the context would be a clause introduced by *quin*, which could have been assimilated to *pace* (for various similar corruptions of *quin* see Hill's notes on 3.508, 8.40, 8.557): 'why, beasts and birds have been endowed (by nature) with the habit of copulating in peace', i.e. not in conditions of war.

5.326–9

iam magis atque magis uigiles dolor angere sensus,  
et gemitus clari, et paulatim inuisa Polyxo,  
iam meminisse nefas, iam ponere manibus aras  
concessum, et *multum* cineres iurare sepultos.

The women of Lemnos begin to rue the murder of their menfolk.

*Multum* is adverbial, as at *Silu.* 2.1.53–4, *iurataque multum/barba mihi*, 'the beard you have often sworn by'; but in our passage it does not make sense to say that the women *were allowed to swear often*; the frequency of the swearing is irrelevant. Hence *iurare* is not governed by *concessum* but is historic infinitive; so too, I am sure, is *meminisse*, like *angere* in 326, and *concessum* (sc. *est*) is a single finite verb in a series of infinitives. Statius is fond of the historic infinitive (see Heuvel's note on 1.413 and Hill's note on 6.456), and has no qualms about using finite and infinitive forms side-by-side; e.g. 4.733: *pati, sed perfurit*; 7.65: *tremet . . . et mugire*; 8.217: *obruit et . . . inrepere*; 9.110–11: *nec ire . . . nec . . . exilit*.

5.633–7

'hocne ferens onus inlaetabile matris  
transfundam gremio? *quae* me prius ima sub umbras  
mergat humus?' simul haec terraque et sanguine uultum  
sordida magnorum circa uestigia regum  
*uertitur*.

635

<sup>5</sup> P. H. Damsté, *Mnem* 36 (1908), 381.



Hypsipyle shrinks from her painful duty of handing over the dead child Opheltes to his mother Eurydice.

In the text of 633–5 given above I have followed the traditional punctuation. That this is right is shown by the Virgilian antecedents: *Aen.* 10.675–6 *quae iam satis ima dehiscat/terra mihi?*; 12.883–4 *o quae satis ima dehiscat/terra mihi?* For *satis* Statius has substituted *prius* (cf. *Aen.* 4.24: *sed mihi uel tellus optem prius ima dehiscat*), but that does not affect the construction, which is that of a pathetic question doing duty for a wish (L.H.Sz. 331). Hill and Lesueur are mistaken in adopting Brinkgreve's aposiopesis after *quae*, the antecedent of which will then be either the subject of *transfundam* (i.e. Hypsipyle) or *matris* (i.e. Eurydice), neither an attractive option. And the Virgilian passages guarantee *quae* against *quin*, an old conjecture reported in Delphin and repeated by Hall.<sup>6</sup>

Mozley translates *circa . . . uertitur* by 'she turns to follow the mighty chieftains', and Lesueur tags along, explaining that 'l'expression équivaut à *quorum uestigia sequitur*'; this is incredible. Much more convincing are the older translations: *aduoluitur pedibus illustrium ducum* (Delphin), *elle se roule aux pieds des héros grecs* (Nisard); she throws herself at their feet, begging them to kill her (628–30). For *pedes* in contexts of supplication, see Lucan 7.377ff. *supplex . . . uolueret ante pedes*, and the passages listed under *OLD* sense 7c, which show that a common verb in such contexts is *uolui* (*OLD* 3b adduces *Theb.* 11.739–40 and *Silu.* 5.1.112–13) or a compound thereof; this suggests that in our passage *uertitur* is a corruption of *uoluitur*.

6.332–5                    *quin et Thessalicis felix Admetus ab oris*  
                               *uix steriles compescit equas, Centaurica dicunt*  
                               *semina: credo, adeo sexum indignantur, et omnis*  
                               *in uires adducta uenus.*

Admetus's mares were said to be of Centaur origin.

*Credo* is misinterpreted by both Mozley ('methinks') and Lesueur ('il me semble') in being construed with what follows. It refers to what precedes, and means *credo id quod dicunt*. Nisard gets it right: 'on les dit issues des centaures; je le croit, tant elles s'indignent de leur sexe'. Similarly 7.158–9, *olim inuitum iaculatus nubibus ignem, / credimus*.

6.355–61                    *interea cantu Musarum nobile mulcens*  
                               *concilium citharaeque manus insertus Apollo*  
                               *Parnasi summo spectabat ab aethere terras;*  
                               *orsa deo—nam saepe Iouem Phlegramque sui que*  
                               *anguis opus fratrumque pius cantarat honores—*  
                               *tunc aperit quis fulmen agat, quis sidera ducat*                    360  
                               *spiritus, unde animi fluuiis, quae pabula uentis, e. q. s.*

358 deo *P:* deum *cett.*

The most helpful contribution to the understanding of this passage is that of Delz.<sup>7</sup> He takes *orsa deo* in apposition to *terras* or (better) to *summo spectabat ab aethere terras*, and gives it the sense of 'Ausgangspunkt und Inhalt des Liedes für den Gott'. I prefer to put a heavy stop after *terras* and take *orsa deo* as the beginning of a new

<sup>6</sup> J. B. Hall, *ICS* 17 (1992), 287–99, at 292.

<sup>7</sup> J. Delz, *Hermes* 111 (1983), 381ff.



sentence and as meaning 'the god's song'. Then comes a parenthesis in which we are told what Apollo is *not* going to sing about on this occasion because he has done so often enough on past occasions. After the parenthesis the construction is not resumed but (as often after a parenthesis) there is an anacoluthon: *aperit* repeats the idea of *orsa* (= *carmen*) and *tunc* (as Delz says) contrasts with *saepe* in 358; this time the god's themes are questions of natural phenomena. The parenthesis looks forward; this is not infrequent (L.H.Sz. 729 ad med.), but instances are not always recognized for what they are. There is another anacoluthon involving a parenthesis at 11.165–8.

In 358 *sui* has been queried by Hall,<sup>8</sup> but I think that it is sound. I take it to glance at the connection between Python (the serpent) and Pythius (Apollo).

7.10–12                   atque ibi seu posita respirat cuspide Mauors,  
quamquam inuisa quies, seu (quod reor) arma tubasque  
insatiatus *habet*, e. q. s.

I regard *habet* as impossible; and preferable to other conjectures (*auet*, *obit*, *hiat*) is *amat*, proposed by Meurig Davies,<sup>9</sup> but seldom mentioned by later editors. *Amat* goes well with *insatiatus* (cf. 7.703: *inexpleto saeui Mauortis amore*), and the corruption is plausible: forms of *habeo* and *amo* are variants at Martial 8.78.16 (adduced by Meurig Davies), Ovid, *Trist.* 4.4.21 and *Fast.* 6.294; at Ovid, *Pont.* 2.5.58 I would read *amanda* for *habenda* and at Val. Fl. 1.672 *amat* for *habet*.

7.306–8                   hi deseruisse feruntur  
exilem Glisanta Coroniamque feracem,  
messe Coroniam, Baccho Glisanta *colentes*.

Hill's punctuation in 307 (comma after *feracem*, not after *Coroniamque*) is undoubtedly right, but it leaves a problem about the construction of the ablatives *messe* and *Baccho* in 308 if *colentes* is taken in the sense of 'cultivating'. The problem disappears if *colentes* is taken in OLD sense 5, 'ornantes', 'embellishing'.

7.422–3                   haec audit Pelopea phalanx, sed bellicus ardor  
consiliis obstat diuum prohibetque *timeri*.

*Haec*, namely the bad omens encountered by the Argives on their way to Thebes, is the subject of *timeri*. This might seem too obvious to point out, but it is apparently usual to supply *consilia*, from *consiliis*, as the subject. It would also be possible, but unnecessary, to change to *timere* with *phalangem* as subject.

7.625–7                   uentus uti primas struit inter nubila uires,  
lenis adhuc, frondesque et aperta cacumina *gestat*,  
mox rapuit nemus et montes patefecit opacos.

Smolenaars convincingly argues that *cacumina* are mountain-tops, not tree-tops, but his view that *frondesque et aperta cacumina* is an elaborate hendiadys, 'the foliage (of the trees) of the exposed (sc. to wind) mountain-tops', is far from convincing; *cacumina* seems impossible as the object of *gestat* (the light wind certainly does not

<sup>8</sup> Hall (n. 6), 295.

<sup>9</sup> E. L. B. Meurig Davies, *CQ* 44 (1950), 31.



'carry along' the mountain-tops). Hall reports Wakefield's conjecture *uexat* for *gestat*,<sup>10</sup> and this, I think, is right; it derives support from Lucretius 1.274–5 (adduced by Smolenaars), *montisque supremos/siluifragis uexat flabris* (sc. *uentus*); this passage would then be one of the few in which Statius shows traces of Lucretian influence. For the interchange of initial *u* and *g*, cf. *uenus* > *genus* (Manilius 4.719), *genas* > *uenas* (Cicero, *De orat.* 2.235).

8.225–7

nunc funera rident  
auguris ignari, contraque *in tempore* certant  
Tiresian laudare suum.

The Thebans mock the death of the Argive augur Amphiaraus and praise their own Tiresias.

I doubt whether any classical Latin poet ever wrote anything so feeble as *in tempore*, 'en cette circonstance' (Lesueur). The obvious emendation *in pectore* appears in a few manuscripts and was strongly supported by Gronovius quoted by Hill, who nevertheless says *in pectore* . . . *uix possumus interpretari ob pectus*. But that is what it does mean: for causal *in* see *TLL* 7.2.1044.79ff. (listing *inter alia* Propertius 4.2.27: *laudabar in illis* [sc. *armis*]; see Rothstein on 1.3.44) and 7.1.783.7ff. On this use of *pectus*, and on its interchange with *tempus*, Hill's own note says all that need be said.

8.267–70

sic ubi per fluctus uno ratis obruta somno  
conticuit, *tantique* maris *secura* iuuentus  
mandauere animas, solus stat puppe magister  
peruigil inscriptaque deus qui nauigat alno.

I have discussed this passage elsewhere.<sup>11</sup> Since a dative, either expressed or understood, is essential with *mandauere*, I proposed (i) either to understand *mari* (instead of, as others do, *somno*) or to change *maris* to *mari* (the final *s* having come from the beginning of *secura*); (ii) to replace *tanti* with *cuncti* in the sense of *ceteri omnes*, contrasting with the following *solus*. As a preferable alternative I now suggest *stantique mari* (although *securus* often has a genitive, it can do very well without one); for this use of *stare*, see *OLD* sense 9 (e.g. Virgil, *Ecl.* 2.26: *staret mare*). The repetition of the verb (here in a different sense) in the next line can be paralleled by many passages in Statius; see Heuvel on 1.74, Mulder on 2.127, Williams on 10.132.

8.616–19

sic Pandioniae repetunt ubi fida uolucres  
hospitia atque larem bruma pulsante relictum  
stantque super nidos ueterisque exordia fati  
adnarrant *tectis*: it truncum ac flebile murmur.

What is *tectis*? A local ablative ('at their home') would be impossibly feeble, especially after *larem* and *super nidos*. A dative ('tell to the house the . . . story', Mozley) is not credible. Lesueur translates 'font à leurs petits l'antique récit de leurs infortunes'; this is good sense, but how it is obtained from *tectis* is incomprehensible. To obtain it we must read *teneris*, a word of which Statius is quite fond (51 instances, as compared with 29 in Virgil); he uses it substantivally at 6.303 (see Hill's note) and at *Silu.* 2.3.37 (*a tenero* = *a puero*).

<sup>10</sup> Hall (n. 4), 76.

<sup>11</sup> W. S. Watt, *BICS* 31 (1984), 160.



- 8.622–4                incohat Ismene: 'quisnam *hic* mortalibus error?  
                              quae decepta fides? curam inuigilare quieti  
                              claraque per somnos animi simulacra reuerti?'

So these three lines have always been punctuated, but it is impossible to construe the accusative and infinitive constructions in 623–4 unless one replaces the first two question-marks with a comma, and takes *hic* as prospective. Nisard's translation is correct: 'Quelle est cette erreur commune aux mortels et cette vaine croyance que la douleur veille dans le repos de la nuit' *e. q. s.*

- 9.805–11              acrior hoc iuuenem stricto mucrone petebat  
                              Amphion, cum se medio Latonia campo  
                              iecit et ante oculos *omnes* stetit obuia uultu.  
                              haerebat iuueni deuictus amore pudico  
                              Maenalius Dorceus, cui bella suumque timorem  
                              mater et audaces pueri mandauerat annos.  
                              huius tum uultu dea dissimulata profatur:

omnes (*ex omnis*) *P*: omni *cett.*

To prevent Parthenopaeus from being attacked by Amphion Diana intervenes in the guise of his guardian Dorceus.

The most recent discussion of this passage is that of Eden.<sup>12</sup> He asks what is the point of Diana disguising herself if she had just stood full-face 'before all eyes', including those of Parthenopaeus; he would therefore change *omnes* to *comitis*: Diana 'stood before his eyes, confronting him, with the features of his comrade', that is Dorceus. I believe that this is on the right lines, but *comitis* is palaeographically remote; moreover a less specific word would be preferable at this point. The obvious word is *hominis* (easily confused with *omnis*), 'with the features of a human being', whom the poet proceeds to identify as Dorceus.

- 10.439–41            sic ait et magno proscissum uulnere pectus  
                              iniecit puero, supremaque murmura uoluens:  
                              'hoc tamen interea †et tu† potiare sepulchro.'

Dymas kills himself on top of the corpse of his young leader Parthenopaeus.

To replace *et tu* Williams listed six conjectures, none of which 'can be said to heal the passage'; he could have added *tectus*, conjectured by Helm<sup>13</sup> and advocated by Zwierlein<sup>14</sup> (by itself *hoc sepulchro tectus* is unexceptionable, but *potiare* in conjunction with it is feeble). Since Williams's edition there have been other contributions: Lesueur reads his own *tutus*, surely the worst of all the proposals, and J. Delz has suggested *hac tamen interea nece tu potiare sepulchro*; Delz argues<sup>15</sup> that *tu* should be retained, since the passage is modelled on *Aen.* 9.422–4: *tu tamen interea* . . . The easiest way to obtain appropriate sense while retaining *tu* would, I submit, be *interea est* <ut> *tu potiare*; for *est ut*, see *OLD* s.v. 'sum', sense 7. This reading has the added advantage of giving a more natural sense to the subjunctive *potiare*, which is otherwise slightly awkward, whether taken as jussive or as potential.

<sup>12</sup> P. T. Eden, *Mnem* 47 (1994), 234–5.

<sup>13</sup> Helm (n. 2), 296.

<sup>14</sup> O. Zwierlein, *RhM* 131 (1988), 74, n. 12.

<sup>15</sup> J. Delz, *MH* 32 (1975), 155, n. 1.



- 10.445–6            uos quoque sacрати, quamuis mea carmina surgant  
inferiore lyra, memores *superabit* annos.

Williams's note brings out the strangeness of the last three words:

Status has two ideas in his mind: that the years will remember Hopleus and Dymas and that they will conquer time. The combination of these two ideas into the phrase 'you will conquer the mindful years' is not unjustly described by Barth as 'mirior locutio quam facilior'.

I would omit one letter and read *sperabit* (the same corruption has probably occurred at Val. Fl. 1.74): in keeping with the modesty of the *quamuis* clause, the poet promises not the certainty but merely the hope of immortal fame.

- 12.5–10            agmina iam *raris* Dircaea penetibus *errant*,  
noctis quæsta moras; . . .  
. . .  
uix primo proferre gradum et munimina ualli  
soluere, uix totas reserare audacia portas.

9

The morning after the end of the fighting at Thebes.

If *penatibus* is ablative of 'place at which' (so Delphin and Nisard), then the Thebans wander around their homes complaining that daylight is slow to come. If it is 'place from which' (so Mozley and Lesueur), then they wander from their homes, similarly complaining; but why 'wander'? and is not this an improbable anticipation of line 9, *uix primo proferre gradum*? To obtain a more credible sense, and in particular to give some point to *noctis quæsta moras*, I would change *errant* to *haerent*, quoting Housman (on Manilius 2.71): *errandi haerendique uerba passim confusa*.

*Raris* might mean 'few and far between', but, as Lesueur (p. 177) says, there is nothing to indicate that Thebes had been materially destroyed. So it must mean 'sparsely populated', as at *Silu.* 3.5.78–9, *rara colonis/Parthenope*. Where Statius imagined that the bulk of the population had gone we can only guess; Lesueur thinks that they had been killed in the fighting, but perhaps the women and children had been evacuated. One is tempted to change *raris* to *tutis*; their homes were 'now safe', since the fighting had ended.

## II. *ACHILLEID*<sup>16</sup>

- 1.124–5            tunc blandus dextra atque imos demissus in armos  
pauperibus tectis inducit et admouet antris.

admouet antris ω: admonet antri P

Chiron courteously invites Thetis, who has come to talk to him about Achilles, into his home.

The vulgate *admouet antris* is an intolerable repetition of *tectis inducit*. Hence modern scholars follow P's reading *admonet antri*, of which they give various explanations: she needed reminding that the entrance to the cave was low (Brinkgreve); he guides her in the darkness of the cave (Prinz); he is 'perhaps simply reminding her that it is only a cave' (Dilke). None of these is at all credible. I expect *tectis inducit* to be

<sup>16</sup> The following separate editions are referred to: M. R. J. Brinkgreve (Rotterdam, 1913); O. A. W. Dilke (Cambridge, 1954).



followed by a mention of the next stage of the narrative, perhaps some sort of preparation for their conversation (which Thetis actually begins in the next line but one). I would therefore, with the minimum of change, read *admouet auris*, 'lends her his ear'; for this expression, see *TLL* 1.772.19ff.

1.270-2

cape tuta parumper  
tegmina nil nocitura animo. cur ora reducis  
*quidue parant oculi?* pudet hoc mitescere cultu?

Thetis, having brought Achilles to Scyros, tries to persuade him to put on feminine dress.

'What means that glance?' is Mozley's rendering of *quid parant oculi?*, and so all other moderns known to me. But, if he has just turned away his face, how can she see his glance? And what is the exact meaning of *parant*? The humanists knew better; here is a sixteenth-century note reported in Delphin: *uidebatur enim lugere uelle*, that is, he seemed about to burst into tears.

1.379-81

digreditur multum cunctata in limine mater  
dum repetit monitus arcanaque murmura figit  
auribus et *tacito* dat uerba nouissima uultu.

Thetis takes her leave of Achilles, whom she has just brought to Scyros.

Here are some comments on 381: Dilke: '*tacito* . . . *uultu* "by facial expression without speech", in which case *uerba* is not literal and refers to signs given after the *murmura* of l. 380'; Dilke (alternatively): 'Thetis' countenance is so composed that she hardly seems to be speaking'; Browning: 'Thetis takes a silent farewell of her son, only her expression betraying her emotion.'<sup>17</sup> To my mind these are all sophistical attempts to reconcile two irreconcilables, silence and speech; and since *dat uerba* is surely above suspicion, it must be *tacito* that is wrong. I suggest *pauido*, a corruption which has occurred also at Seneca, *Phaedr.* 636 (*pauidae* Axelson: *tacitae* codd.); note also *Theb.* 11.409 (*pauent* PO: *tacent* ω); the phrase *pauido uultu* is found at Ovid, *Pont.* 2.8.39, [Seneca], *H.O.* 700, Lucan 5.213. Thetis is afraid of what the future holds for her son; she says so herself right at the beginning of the speech which immediately follows, *depositum* . . . *ingens timido commisimus astu* (385), and she is called *timida* at 211, 534, and 624.

1.753-5

*aure* pauent aliae, sed uix *noua* gaudia celat  
Pelides audisque *nouos* heroas et arma  
uel talis uidisse cupit.

*aure* Garrod: iure codd.  
noua] sua K<sup>2</sup>

When Achilles and his girl-companions hear the news of the arrival in Scyros of Ulysses and Diomedes, his reaction is very different from theirs.

I regard Garrod's *aure* as a good emendation of *iure* (the girls had no 'justification' for being afraid). The phrase *aure pauere* (or *pauescere*), 'be afraid with one's ears', that is because of some news (or noise) which one has heard, occurs in two other passages of Statius, *Theb.* 1.366 and 12.222 (*nil corde nec aure pauescens*). It is possible that

<sup>17</sup> R. Browning, *CR* 5 (1955), 252.



another passage could be adduced, *Ach.* 1.794–5: *adspicit* [sc. *Lycomedes Achillem*] *intentum uigilique haec aure trahentem, cum paueant aliae*; perhaps *aure* should be supplied with *paueant*, although clearly it need not be.

Statius is not averse to repetition of words, but, if one instance of *nouus* is to be changed to *suus*, it should surely be *noua* in 753, not (as Garrod) *nouos* in 754; *sua gaudia* is much more convincing than *suos heroas*. For the corruption, cf. Seneca, *Phoen.* 23, *nouum* Peiper: *suum* codd.; at Ovid, *Fast.* 3.34 *sua* and *noua* are variants.

1.889–91                    demittit clipeum regisque ad lumina uersus  
attonitum factis inopinaque monstra pauentem,  
sicut erat, *nudis* Lycomedem adfatur in armis:

*nudis P: nudus uel mediis cett.*

Achilles in his newly acquired armour addresses Lycomedes, king of Scyros.

In 891 the traditional reading is *mediis*, but its meaning is opaque. Modern editors adopt P's *nudis*, but that is no less opaque, and receives no illumination from Mozley's rendering of it, 'in naked panoply of arms'. Emendation is both easy and certain: read *ni<ti>dis*; to dazzle young Achilles, Ulysses had brought him brand-new shining armour (at *Theb.* 6.905–6 and 7.241 Statius has *nitentia arma*). For the corruption, cf. *Silu.* 1.2.262, where M has *uindum* (sic) for *nitidum*; at Manilius 5.372 and Martial 10.17.6 forms of *nidus* and *nitidus* are variants; and at Val. Fl. 1.135 *nitidis* is very attractive as an emendation of *nudis*.

2.101–2                    haec mihi prima Ceres, haec laeti munera Bacchi,  
sic *dabat* ille pater.

Achilles relates how the first food given to him by Chiron had been the flesh of wild beasts.

*Dabat* does not mean 'allowed' (Nisard and others) but is equivalent to 'dicebat', 'narrabat' (*OLD* 28, *TLL* 5.1.1687.58ff.): Achilles is repeating what he had been told of his childhood by Chiron (cf. *dicor* 382). Thus *sic* is not parallel to *haec . . . haec*, and *sic . . . pater* should stand in parenthesis.

*Aberdeen*

W. S. WATT