

Notes on Statius' *Thebaid* Books 3 and 4

J. B. HALL

This is the second in a projected series of six papers presenting conjectures in the text of Statius' *Thebaid*. The first of these papers appeared in *ICS* 14 (1989) 227-41; the rest will follow at intervals. As before, I take my lemmata from D. E. Hill's edition (Leiden 1983), and have regularly consulted the editions by Gevartius (1616 and 1618), Cruceus (1618), Veenhusen (1671), O. Müller (1870), Garrod (1906), Klotz (1908; revised by Klinnert, 1973) and Mozley (1928). There is a commentary on Book 3 by H. Snijder (Amsterdam 1968).

3. 6-12

"ei mihi" clamat,

"unde morae?" (nam prona ratus facilemque tot armis

Tydea, nec numero uirtutem animumque rependit)

"num regio diuersa uiae? num missus ab Argis

subsidio globus? an sceleris data fama per urbes

finitimas? paucosne, pater Gradiue, manuue

legimus indecores? . . . "

10

Through the long night the evil tyrant Eteocles broods deeply on the tardiness of his cut-throats' return. Three reasons for the delay suggest themselves to him: his men lost their way; or they met with reinforcements from Argos; or (and here we come to the problem) something involving the neighbouring cities impeded them. As Mozley renders the Latin, *an sceleris data fama per urbes / finitimas* means, "Or has news of the deed spread round the neighbouring cities?", and his rendering is faithful to the Latin. Lactantius comments first on the word *sceleris*, which he interprets to mean *uiolatae legationis sanctimonia* (but surely *sanctimoniae* is required?), *uel quod religiosum officium legati peteretur insidiis*; he then adds words which make explicit what is by no means implicit in the Latin as transmitted: *dicit quippe a finitimis ciuitatibus Tydeo aduersus insidiantes esse subuentum*. Quite so, that is what Eteocles must be wondering; but that is not the same thing as saying that "the neighbours have heard of his crime": we need to be told that they not only heard about it, but did something about it. A further point is that in line 4

nothing whatever to do with the cult-site at Dodona. His father and he would, however, both be happily accommodated by the common noun *diuo*.

3. 108-09

nunc quoque Tartareo multum diuisus Auerno
Elysias, i, carpe plagas . . .

What is the point of *quoque*? Maeon has not been to Hell before now. I would much prefer *i nunc Tartareo* . . .

3. 125-26

stat sanguineo discissus amictu
Luctus atrox caesoque inuitat pectore matres.

"Incites" is how Mozley renders *inuitat*, but his rendering rather invites *inritat*, altogether the more effective verb.

3. 127-28

scrutantur galeas frigentum inuentaue monstrant
corpore, prociuae super externosque suosque.

That the mothers should "scrutinize" the helmets of the dead warriors (in order to identify them, if possible) is altogether natural, but what would be the point of their "showing" the bodies they had found, when no distinction is here drawn between friend and foe (*externosque suosque*) and there were presumably bodies for the "showing" to be found all over the field? I suggest *lustrant*, continuing the idea of attempted identification.

3. 133-36

at uaga per dumos uacuique in puluere campi
magna parens iuuenum, gemini nunc funeris, Ide
squalentem sublata comam liuentiaque ora
ungue premens . . .

Ide appears only here in the whole of the *Thebaid*, and, unless time has denied us knowledge of a well-known story, the epithet *magna* must surely have been as mystifying to Statius' audiences as it is to me now. An effective alternative to so cryptic an adjective would be *ante*, contrasting with *nunc*. In the next line, would somebody tell me what on earth is the point of the participle *sublata*, "uplifted" (hardly *reiecta terrore*, which was how Wakefield interpreted it)? Ide will hardly get far looking for her sons unless she keeps her head down. Mozley translates as though the text read *diffusa*, and that indeed is one out of a considerable number of participles which would at least give us some sense here.

3. 160–64

sed nec bellorum in luce patenti
 conspicui fatis aeternaque gentibus ausi
 quaesistis miserae uulnus memorabile matri,
 sed mortem obscuram †numerosaque funera passi, †
 heu quantus furto cruor et sine laude iacetis!

To obelize the whole of the second half of 163, as Hill does, is to evince an unwarranted defeatism: it is only in the word *numerosaque* (or its alternative *numerandaque*) that the fault lies; unless, that is, one can stomach Mozley's defence of *numeranda* as meaning "suffering deaths which were (only) for the counting . . . they were only two more in the list of dead." Equally silly is Lactantius' gloss: *quia inter paucos nec in magno proelio concidistis*: neither of these considerations necessarily implies an obscure death. Try *renuendaque*, which is very nearly an anagram of *nūerandaque*.

3. 165–68

quin ego non dextras miseris complexibus ausim
 diuidere et tanti consortia rumpere leti:
 ite diu fratres indiscretique supremis
 ignibus et caros urna confundite manes!

Tanti . . . leti is translated "so noble a death" by Mozley, but such a sense is gainsaid by the preceding context, which emphasises the obscurity of the young men's death. Some point would be introduced if *tanti* concealed an original *iuncti*. Nor is there any point in saying *ite diu fratres*, since, in death as in life, they will always be brothers. Perhaps *pii*?

3. 183–88

sed nec ueteris cum regia Cadmi
 fulmineum in cinerem monitis Iunonis iniquae
 consedit, neque funerea cum laude potitus 185
 infelix Athamas trepido de monte ueniret,
 semianimem heu laeto referens clamore Learchum,
 hic gemitus Thebis . . .

Does not *consedit* in 185 call for a corresponding *reuenit* in 186?

3. 229–35

"talīs mihi, nate, per Argos,
 talis abi, sic ense madens, hac nubilis ira. 230
 exturbent resides frenos et cuncta perosi
 te cupiant, tibi praecipites animasque manusque
 deuocuant; rape cunctantes et foedera turba,
 cui dedimus; tibi fas ipsos incendere bello
 caelicolas pacemque meam . . ." 235

I have three suggestions to make in this passage. For *exturbent* (cf. 233 *turba*) perhaps *excutiant*; for *cuncta*, and as an alternative to *uincla*, proposed by Bentley, perhaps *pacta*; and for *cui*, which makes a sort of sense only if taken with *tibi*, and no sense at all with Hill's punctuation, perhaps *quae: foedera . . . quae dedimus* will then correspond to *pacem . . . meam*, just as *cunctantes* corresponds to *ipsos*.

3. 241–43

sic Fata mihi nigraeque Sororum
iurauere colus: manet haec ab origine mundi
fixa dies bello, populique in proelia nati.

How can distaffs “swear”? Could Statius conceivably have written *ius neuere*? It was in such terms (*sic*) that the Fates spun Jove's authority (*ius*). *Iam neuere* or *sic neuere* would, I feel, be less forceful.

3. 293–94

(haud mora) desiluit curru clipeoque receptam
laedit in amplexu dictisque ita mulcet amicis.

Various critics, including Peyraredus, Barthius and O. Müller, have taken exception to *laedit* and advanced conjectures designed to eliminate it. I agree with them that the idea of “harming” is out of place here (even if we contemplate a picture of a clumsy giant not knowing his own strength), and suggest *claudit*: Venus is swept snugly within Mars' shield.

3. 320–23

uolat ignea moles
saeua dei mandata ferens, caelumque trisulca
territat omne coma iamdudum aut ditibus agris
signa dare aut ponto miseros inuoluere nautas.

If anyone can believe, with Mozley, that *territat* means *terrore cogit*, μακρρίζω. But in any case, what a pathetic thought! “The thunder-bolt compels the sky in terror to give signs to the fields.” How, precisely, does a thunderbolt make the sky do anything? And are “signs” all that will be given to the fields? How much more sense there would be in

caelumque trisulca
territat omne coma, minitata aut ditibus agris
damna dare aut ponto miseros inuoluere nautas!

3. 330–32

sic nota in pascua taurus
bellator redit, aduerso cui colla suoque
sanguine proscissisque natant palearibus armi.

Perhaps *aduersi*?

3. 333–35

tunc quoque lassa tumet uirtus multumque superbit
pectore despecto; uacua iacet hostis harena
turpe gemens crudosque uetat sentire dolores.

Garrod and Snijder both objected to *pectore despecto* (which is indeed a silly thing to say, whether *despecto* be taken to mean “looked down on” or “despised”), but their conjectures are nugatory. Hill’s comment, “lassus taurus despiciens . . . uulnera a fronte passa uidet et superbit,” might have given him a clue but did not. Write *uulnere despecto*.

3. 358–60

nocte doloque uiri nudum ignarumque locorum
nequiquam clausere; iacent in sanguine mixti
ante urbem uacuum.

To say that Thebes was an “empty” city would be a lie, and a transparent one: everybody knows that Tydeus has not killed the women, children and old men. There is regular confusion on the part of scribes between *uacuum* and *uiduus* (which are not synonyms), and it is the latter epithet which we require here.

3. 360–62

nunc o nunc tempus in hostes,
dum trepidi exanguesque metu, dum funera portant,
nunc, socer, haec dum non manus excidit; . . .

Nunc socer haec dum non is what the Puteaneus (alone) offers; the other manuscripts give *dum capulo nondum*. Mozley, strangely, thinks that *haec dum non manus excidit* has to be completed by the ablative *memoria*, notionally supplied; but could he, or anyone who accepts the reading of the Puteaneus, explain why the Argives would be likely to have short memories of Tydeus’ achievements, nay, why they might be likely to forget here and now, on the spot? *Capulo*, on the other hand, joins with *excidit* to give admirable sense; and Garrod’s *dum capulo nondum haec* misses the mark by no more than a hair’s breadth. Write *dum capulo haec nondum manus excidit*.

3. 403–04

... ubi maximus illi
sudor . . .

Amongst other details of the fight, Tydeus relates *ubi maximus . . . sudor*. The sweat of course is his own, not another's; O. Müller surely cannot have been the only editor of Statius to recall *Th. 2. 275 f. sed plurimus ipsi / sudor*; and I cannot but marvel that nobody has thought of introducing *ipsi* into the present passage.

3. 460

mons erat audaci seductus in aethera dorso

Not *seductus*, surely, but *subductus*?

3. 516–20

“equidem uarii, pater, omina Phoebi
saepe tuli: iam tum, prima cum pube uirentem
semideos inter pinus me Thessala reges
duceret, hic casus terraeque marisque canentem
obstipuere duces, . . . ”

520

Hic in 519 is anything but clear, and the variant *hi*, offered by at least one manuscript (*apud* O. Müller), is useless. Perhaps *hinc* (cf. 516–17), meaning “from this source,” namely, from Phoebus.

3. 573

(te pudor et curae retinent per rura, Melampu)

Amphiaraus returns to Thebes, but Melampus stays in the country. Why? Because of “shame and cares,” say the manuscripts. Cares, they are understandable enough; but why on earth should Melampus be ashamed? All that he and Amphiaraus had done was, at Adrastus’ behest, to explore the will of heaven; and if heaven’s will was adverse, as indeed it was, that was nothing to cause him shame. *Pavor*, on the other hand, would be very much to the point.

3. 575–77

et iam suprema Tonantis
iussa fremunt agrosque uiris annosaque uasant
oppida

Premunt, not *fremunt*?

3. 602

diu tuto superum contemptor

For *tuto* Cassellanus 164 gives *tutos*; and there might be something to be said for *tutus*, to avoid adverbs in juxtaposition.

3. 697–98

aspice res humiles, atque hanc, pater, aspice prolem
exulis; huic olim generis pudor.

Argia pleads with her father for war, and, as an argument in its favour, urges that he leave no legacy of shame to his grandson Thessandrus. Surely that argument would be properly presented if in 698 we read

huicne olim generis pudor?

3. 704–05

nescis, pater optime, nescis,
quantus amor castae misero nupsisse marito.

“Thou knowest not, good father, thou knowest not what deep affection a husband’s misery implants in a loyal bride” is how Mozley renders these lines; but I see no sense in this sentiment, even if syntax permitted it: are we seriously to believe that the wives of the disadvantaged love them more than other women love husbands for whom all is going well? Surely it all depends on the individual? Let me hazard the guess that 705 originally ran

quam sit onus castae misero nupsisse marito.

That would be a true enough sentiment.

3. 718–20

tu solare uirum, neu sint dispendia iustae
dura morae: magnos cunctamur, nata, paratus.
proficitur bello.

The final parataxis here makes for a weak close to Adrastus’ comforting speech. Perhaps

magnos cunctanti, nata, paratus
proficitur bello,

with a general statement about strategy by way of conclusion?

4. 38–42

rex tristis et aeger
pondere curarum propiorque abeuntibus annis
inter adhortantes uix sponte incedit Adrastus,
contentus ferro cingi latus; arma manipuli
pone ferunt, . . .

40

It is a sad fact, but true, that all our years pass away, and so perhaps somebody can tell me how the words *propior . . . abeuntibus annis*

(literally, "nearer to the passing years") convey the notion that Adrastus is now not far from death? He is moreover dreadfully unhappy about embarking on the war and, after *tristis, aeger pondere curarum* and *uix sponte incedit*, it is hard to see how he could be "content" with anything to do with the business, be it wearing his sword or (so E. H. Alton in *CQ* 17 [1923] 175) surrounding himself with a bodyguard. I suggest *non laetus ferro cingi latus*. One final observation on this passage: *manipli* may be the reading of all the manuscripts, but it is still a ludicrous reading, since the *arma* are those of the king himself, and not even one platoon, let alone several (*manipli*), would be needed to carry them. The certain correction *ministri* was advanced by Markland in his note on *Silu.* 5. 2. 154, and printed by O. Müller in his edition of 1870. Garrod and Klotz then concurred in forgetting about it altogether, and, not perhaps surprisingly, it failed to reemerge in Hill's edition of 1983. I may note, by way of confirming Markland's conjecture, that Par. lat. 13046 glosses *manipli* with *armigeri*.

4. 74-76

proxima longaeuo profert Dircaeus Adraeto
signa gener, cui bella fauent, cui commodat iras
cuncta cohors: . . .

It would be premature to say of a warrior going into uncertain battle that *bella fauent* (and of Polynices it would, of course, be ultimately untrue), and in any case the anaphoric *cui* requires that both clauses have to do with the *cohors*: hence Bentley's *gerit*, and Damsté's *fouent*, to which I will now add the small adjustment *fouet*. That the whole cohort gave full support to its leader may pass unquestioned, but it is not the unanimity of the cohort which is in point here, as the sequel shows, but the nature of its composition: the succeeding lines tell us in some detail that the *cohors* was made up partly of Theban exiles, and partly of Peloponnesian troops: a mixed company, therefore, and *mixta cohors* is needed to introduce what follows.

4. 93-95

ecce inter medios patriae ciet agmina gentis
fulmineus Tydeus, iam laetus et integer artus,
ut primae strepuere tubae: . . .

It would be something of a medical miracle for a wounded man to recover at the first sound of the trumpet's blast, but here there is no miracle: as lines 398 ff. of the previous book make clear, Idmon of Epidaurus had already attended to the wounds Tydeus had sustained. At *Ov. Ep.* 3. 86 all the manuscripts give *impiger* but the correct reading is *integer*, conjecturally retrieved by Hoefft: in the present passage the process of corruption has travelled in the opposite direction.

4. 105–06

Ioniis et fluctibus hospita portu

Chalcis

Various cities heard the tidings of war, among them Chalcis, “welcome haven from Ionian billows” (as Mozley puts it). This sense, surely the one intended by Statius, would be better expressed if the text read

Ioniisque e fluctibus.

4. 110–11

omnibus aeratae propugnant pectora crates,
pilaque saeua manu; patrius stat casside Mauors.

Saeua is, quite frankly, pitiful, just about the last adjective that a master composer would think of. Better by far would be *sueta*, after which *patrius* . . . *Mauors* will figure now as an elegant complementation.

4. 121–24

quos celer ambit
Asterion Dryopumque trahens Erasinus aristas,
et qui rura domant Epidauria (dexter Iaccho
collis at Hennaeae Cereri negat); . . .

The Dorian contingent assembles, amongst its number being those who dwell by the rivers Asterion and Erasinus. The picture of “Erasinus sweeping on his flood Dryopian harvests” bodes no good at all for the locals: if he carries away their crops on a regular basis, perhaps they should contemplate emigration! But no: what the river drags along are the *harenas* of Dryopia. The inhabitants of Epidaurus, on the other hand, live in hilly terrain, whereas *rura* are quintessentially *Cerealia* (Ov. *Fast.* 1. 683). Perhaps *saxa*, or possibly *lustra*?

4. 131–32

umeros ac pectora late
flammeus orbis habet

Habet is distinctly dull and inexplicit. Try *obit*.

4. 152–54

dat tamen haec iuuenum tercentum pectora, uulgos
innumerum bello, quibus haud ammenta nec enses
triste micant.

Lactantius' silly comment on *innumerum bello* should make everyone chuckle; everyone, that is, except those who edit the *Thebaid*. Hear what he says: "INNVMERVVM BELLO expositio, quid sit ter centum pectora, uulgus innumerum: quia tam fortes erant, ut multorum facta fortia sua uirtute pensarent." First we have three hundred represented as "countless" when Adrastus' own Argive contingent alone had amounted to three thousand (4. 63); then we have the suggestion that The Magnificent Three Hundred could counterbalance "the brave deeds of many," for all that (as the succeeding context states) they were not armed with javelins or swords, but only with pine-wood staffs and arrows (a second-class military accoutrement, in other words)! The mistake made by Lactantius, and indeed by all editors of the *Thebaid*, stems from failure to see that Statius intended *in numerum*, "to make up the number," and, not least because everybody appears to have made that same mistake, I am inclined to think that Statius separated *in* from *numerum*. Either therefore *in numerum bello*, or, as I should myself prefer, *in belli numerum*. The lads from Tiryns, to be blunt, are no more than a make-weight in the host from the Peloponnese.

4. 154-56

flauae capiti tergoque leonum
exuuiae, gentilis honos; et pineus armat
stipes, inexhaustis artantur tela pharetris.

Perhaps *inexhaustisque*?

4. 168-71

squalet triplici ramosa corona
Hydra recens obitu: pars anguibus aspera uiuis
argento caelata micat, pars arte reperta
conditur et fuluo moriens nigrescit in auro.

In his apparatus criticus to 170 Hill argues that the transmitted form of words *arte reperta* may without any difficulty be retained if one understands *arte* to refer, not to the maker of the shield, but to Hercules and Iolaus who used a stratagem to kill the Hydra. By the same token, presumably, these two then embalm the Hydra in gold, as they also engrave it in silver? How very singular! As the thinking student of the *Thebaid* has for centuries observed, however, there is a fault in *reperta*, and conjectures proliferate like the suckers of the Hydra (*torre repressa*, *arte reposta*, *retorta*, *repressa*, *aere perempta*, *altera reptans*, etc.). "Part by a cunning device is sunken" translates Mozley, noting that "*reperta must be corrupt, but no emendation seems convincing*." He and the others have missed the obvious: *arte perita*, which is almost invited by Mozley's own translation.

4. 173–75

at laterum tractus spatiosaque pectora seruat
 nexilis innumero Chalybum subtemine thorax,
 horrendum, non matris opus.

I am sure we should all be relieved to hear that it was not Capaneus' mother who knitted his corselet; but then wrought-ironwork is not to many women's taste as an evening occupation. Strange that no one, not even Barthius (who expostulated on this "*stulta lectio*"), spotted

horrendum Mauortis opus.

4. 182–86

hic fretus doctas anteire canendo
 Aonidas mutos Thamyris damnatus in annos
 ore simul citharaque (quis obuia numina temnat?)
 conticuit praeceps, qui non certamina Phoebi 185
 nosset et inlustres Satyro pendente Celaenas.

I find a difficulty here in *conticuit praeceps*, and the lack of any obvious or necessary connexion with the *qui*-clause which follows. "Fell on the instant mute . . . for that he knew not what it was to strive with Phoebus . . ." is how Mozley translates, but his translation signifies naught to me: is there any sense in saying (in almost so many words) that, *because* he was no Marsyas, Thamyris fell silent? I feel pretty certain that Statius did not write *praeceps* here, but what he did write for the moment eludes me. The kind of sentiment that seems to be called for is

conticuit, felix qui non certamina Phoebi
 nosset et inlustres Satyro pendente Celaenas.

To be rendered mute is good luck by comparison with being hung up and flayed.

4. 196–99

illa libens (nam regum animos et pondera belli
 hac nutare uidet, pariter si prouidus heros
 militet) ipsa sacros gremio Polynicis amati
 exuerat cultus haud maesta atque insuper addit: . . .

I have to say that I do not follow Hill's defence of *si* against the alternative reading *ni(si)* in 197: "alii bellare recusabunt si Amphiarus pariter . . . militabit, i.e. contradicet": Argia (*illa* 196) wants war for the sake of her husband Polynices, and she sees that the war effort will fail if . . . if what? Amphiarus, the *prouidus heros*, has already been compelled to war by Fate (189 f. Atropos had thrust arms into his reluctant hand), and Eriphyle's treachery has merely clinched his doom. Surely in this context, with Argia

determined to bring on the war and Amphiaraus already committed to it against his will, there is no point in canvassing the possibility that he might not in fact take part in the action to come. *Ni* or *nisi*, therefore, is required here. In line 198 the feminine pronoun *ipsa* is quite superfluous: of course no one else is going to remove Argia's necklace. *Militet ipse*, on the other hand, would add welcome emphasis to Amphiaraus' hoped-for involvement. Here, therefore, *ipsa* should be changed to *ipse*, just as, conversely, *ipse* was changed to *ipsa* in line 193 by Sandstroem, with the justified approbation of subsequent editors. Finally, in line 199 I should say that there is much to be said for reading *exuerat nexus*, in other words taking the verb from the Puteaneus and the noun from the other manuscripts.

4. 204–05

cum tu claudare minanti
casside ferratusque sones

Perhaps *ferratumque*?

4. 214–17

Taenariis hic celsus equis, quam dispare coetu
Cyllarus ignaro generat Castore prolem,
quassat humum;

Taenariis begins a new paragraph in modern editions, and the reader's attention is now turned back from Argia and Eriphyle to the doomed prophet. In this context *hinc* would be better than *hic*.

4. 282–84

hi lucis stupuisse uices noctisque feruntur
nubila et occiduum longe Titana secuti
desperasse diem.

The primitive Arcadians were terrified by eclipses is what Statius is saying here, but the expression as given by the manuscripts is awkward, with *lucis* . . . *uices* an ambivalent phrase as well able to signify the return of light as its departure, and *nubila* lacking point as a qualification of *noctis*. Clearer by far, and not, I venture to suggest, appreciably less attractive, would be *fugam* for *uices* and *solis* for *noctis*.

4. 292–94

uenit et Idaeis ululatus aemulus Azan
Parrhasique duces, et quae risistis, Amores,
grata pharetrato Nonacria rura Tonanti.

clause in 404 referring, as Lactantius informs us, to Creon, who took over after the death of Eteocles and Polynices. Of preceding scholars, only Baehrens, so far as I can discover, was troubled by *morum*, but his *quorum* is plainly wrong. "Miserable and wicked" is Mozley's translation, and a very free one it is too! Furthermore, it is not the character of the two brothers that needs emphasis at this point, but the sad outcome of their fighting. *Mortis*, I suppose, is a possibility, but *sortis*, or even *euentus*, would accord better with the sequel.

4. 409–18

<p>ille deos non larga caede iuuenum, non alacri penna aut uerum salientibus extis, nec tripode implicito numerisque sequentibus astra, turea nec supra uolitante altaria fumo tam penitus, durae quam Mortis limite manes elicitos, patuisse refert; Lethaeaque sacra et mersum Ismeni subter confinia ponto</p>	<p>410</p>
<p>miscentis parat ante ducem, circumque bidentum uisceribus laceris et odori sulphuris aura graminibusque nouis et longo murmure purgat.</p>	<p>415</p>

W. S. Watt, in *Eranos* 85 (1987) 50, proposes to read *uiuum* for *uerum* in 410, and this seems to me right; but other difficulties remain, I believe, and they concern the word *elicitos* in 414 and the words *parat ante* in 416. Consider first the overall syntactical structure of 409 to 414: *ille* (sc. Tiresias) *refert deos non tam penitus caede iuuenum patuisse quam manes elicitos* fails because *manes elicitos* does not properly answer to the sequence of ablatives introduced by *caede iuuenum*: indeed, it breaks the structure completely. What is required is not *elicitos* but rather *si cieat*, which leads the thought naturally and easily to the calling up of Laius (414–18). "'Parat' must be taken both with 'Lethaeaque sacra,' and with 'ducem,' i.e., Laius," says Mozley in his note on these lines, but *parat ducem* strikes me as an exceedingly odd expression. I suggest that what Statius wrote was not *parat ante ducem* but *petit arte ducem*, with *arte* replacing the gratuitous *ante* as an introduction to the rituals described in 416 to 418.

4. 434–42

<p>extra inmane patent, tellus Mauortia, campi; fetus ager Cadmo, durus qui uomere primo post consanguineas acies sulcosque nocentes ausus humum uersare et putria sanguine prata eruit; ingentes infelix terra tumultus lucis adhuc medio solaque in nocte per umbras expirat, nigri cum uana in proelia surgunt terrigenae; fugit incepto tremibundus ab aruo agricola insanique domum rediere iuueni.</p>	<p>435</p> <p>440</p>
--	-----------------------

Hill makes much of his heavier punctuation after *campi* in 434, but makes nothing of his lighter punctuation after *Cadmo* in 435, when the former is just wrong, but the latter disastrous. If a comma only follows *Cadmo*, then Cadmus becomes the subject of the relative clause which follows, and we are confronted with an extraordinary inversion of events, whereby Cadmus' ploughing of this patch of earth comes after, not before, the war between Eteocles and Polynices, and, what is yet more remarkable, after his own sowing of the Spartoi! At the very least, a full stop is required after *Cadmo* (as was proposed first by Barthius); but that, I believe, is not enough. To save time and space, let me come straight to what I think is needed in 434–35, and that is:

extra inmane patet tellus Mauortia Cadmi,
fetus ager bello.

Patet indeed is given by a number of manuscripts, but *tellus, campi* and *ager* is too much of one thing, and *fetus* calls out for an ablative indicating the bloody crop produced by the *ager*. The subject of the relative clause now becomes, as become it must, the *agricola* of 442. One further correction is needed, and that is *eruere* for *eruit* in 438.

4. 455–57

trunca dehinc nemora aduoluunt, maestusque sacerdos
tres Hecatae totidemque satis Acheronte nefasto
uirginibus iubet esse focos.

Maestus is disquietingly pointless: Tiresias is here merely doing his job, and emotion will not be a help at this juncture, only a hindrance. I think Statius wrote *ternaeque* or *triplicique*.

4. 473–79

"Tartarae sedes et formidabile regnum Mortis inexplatae, tuque, o saeuissime fratrum, . . .	474
soluite pulsanti loca muta et inane seuerae Persephones uulgasque caua sub nocte repostum elicit, et plena redeat Styga portitor alno.	477

Two comments on 479. First, let me commend the tentative suggestion made by Rubenbauer in *ThLL*, s.v. "elicio," that Statius might have written *elicite*; and I commend it the more warmly since it was with *elicite* already in mind as a possibility that I made my way to his article in search of evidence (which I did not find) that *elicere* might be used, not of calling out, but of casting out. Then there is *redeat*, defended against conjecture by Klotz ("quasi redire Styga non latinum esset"—well, is it?) and by Hill, who adduces the Virgilian *redire uiam* and its Statian imitation, together with

Hor. *Sat.* 1. 6. 94, where the verb is not *redire* but *remeare*. Apropos of which, it was a pity that no one told Garrod that the third person singular of the present subjunctive of *remeare* is not *remeat*.

4. 514–15

scimus enim et quidquid dici noscique timetis
et turbare Hecaten . . .

Perhaps *poscique* for *noscique*? After all, if something is said, it may be presumed to be known.

4. 614–15

iacet ille in funere longo,
quem fremis, et iunctae sentit confinia mortis.

Longo seems a strangely pointless adjective in this context: of course death is long, but how is that fact relevant to the still living Oedipus? Much more to the point would be *uiuo*.

4. 664–66

isque ubi puluerea Nemeen efferuere nube
conspicit et solem radiis ignescere ferri,
necdum compositas belli in certamina Thebas, . . .

Madvig, Koestlin, Baehrens, Slater and Garrod had all taken offence at the phrase *solem radiis ignescere ferri*, but all of them, according to Klotz, "diminish the poetic force of the passage," and Hill is evidently of the same opinion as Klotz. It is thus "poetical," in their view, to say that "the sun grows hot with the rays of the iron"; others, however, might say that it was not so much "poetical" as "lunatic." The various conjectures so far propounded may be found in the apparatus criticus of Klotz's edition (for Hill has time only for Madvig's suggestion, and then, one suspects, simply because it is also found as a reading in a manuscript). To them let me add one more: for *et solem* read *atque solum*.

4. 686–87

Argolicos paulum mihi fontibus amnes
stagnaue et errantes obducite puluere riuos.

Fontibus is absolutely pointless. What is needed is a word which will correspond to *puluere*, and that is *sordibus*.

4. 691–92

uim coeptis indulgent astra, meaeque
aestifer Erigones spumat canis.

Sirius is indeed represented in Latin literature as suffering from hydrophobia (see *OLD s.v.*), but any suggestion here of a liquid secretion in the form of saliva would be at odds with Bacchus' insistence that the stars also are helping to dry Argos up completely. The conjecture I propose is one of the easiest in the book: read *spirat* for *spumat*.

4. 723–24

una tamen tacitas, sed iussu numinis, undas,
haec quoque, secreta nutrit Langia sub umbra.

I do not see the force of *haec quoque*, and note that Mozley, revealingly, takes no account of it; *sed*, moreover, is not the word we want in 723, as Mozley's "and she" makes clear. I suggest that we read:

una tamen tacitas ut iussu numinis undas
sic quoque secreta nutrit Langia sub umbra:

although her waters are silenced by Bacchus' command, even so Langia keeps them flowing on in secret.

4. 725–27

nondum illi raptus dederat lacrimabile nomen
Archemorus, nec fama deae; tamen auia seruat
et nemus et fluuium; manet ingens gloria nympham.

Tantum for *tamen*? The fact that Langia is not yet famous is no impediment to her preserving her grove and her river; but preserving her grove and her river is all that she can do at present.

4. 753–56

"diua potens nemorum (nam te uultusque pudorque
mortali de stirpe negant), quae laeta sub isto
igne poli non quaeris aquas, succurre propinquis
gentibus; . . . "

And so mortals are denied the feelings of modesty (*pudor*), are they? What a very novel twist to the traditional view, of Jove, for example, and Venus, those paragons of immodesty! Of course it was not Hypsipyle's modesty that seemed to deny her mortality, but her *decor*. And it is her *decor*, as expressed in the adjective *pulchro* (747) which leads us to the second problem in this passage, for Hypsipyle is not cheerful (*laeta*) but sad (*pulchro in maerore*). Appreciably more appropriate to this context than *laeta* would be *sola*.

4. 772–73

dixit, et orantis media inter anhelitus ardens

uerba rapit, cursuque animae labat arida lingua.

Where is the object of *rapit*? It cannot be *uerba*, for that forms part of the phrase *media inter . . . uerba* and cannot be coerced into performing a second function. Why not *orantem*, therefore? Then there is the question of the aptness of *rapit*, apt enough indeed as long as *uerba* was imagined to be its object, but not if the object is *orantem*. *Capit*, on the other hand, would suit well enough.

4. 779–80

at nostris an quis sinus, uberaque ulla,
scit deus;

I cannot remember ever coming across *an quis* as an alternative to *numquis* or (though less credibly in this passage) *ecquis* in subordinate clauses, and Kühner–Stegmann, *Lat. Gramm.* I 634 offers only the slightest attestation, and that in the comic writers, for the use of *an quis* in primary clauses. I am inclined to think that Statius here wrote *numquis*.

4. 805–06

pars cingunt, pars arta plebe sequuntur
praecelerantque ducem.

I cannot imagine why nobody, apparently, has proposed *praecelerantue*.

4. 816–20

incubere uadis passim discrimine nullo
turba simul primique, nequit secernere mixtos
aequa sitis, frenata suis in curribus intrant
armenta, et pleni dominis armisque feruntur
quadripedes;

820

For *frenata suis in curribus . . . armenta* Mozley gives “bridled horses with their chariots,” and the question at once arises why Statius should have preferred *in* to *cum*; to which question the answer is that *in* was not Statius’ preference but came in as a scribal aberration. Then, there is the matter of the quadrupeds described as “full” of riders and armour: did anyone ever consciously so describe a mounted charger? The right word here is *proni*, not *pleni*.

4. 820–24

hos turbo rapax, hos lubrica fallunt
saxa, nec implicitos fluuio reuerentia reges
proterere aut mersisse uado clamantis amici
ora. fremunt undae, longusque a fontibus amnis
diripitur;

820

Fremunt undae—what is this to the business? No statement about this river could be less relevant at a time when men and beasts are hurling themselves into the water all along the length of the river, right back to its source, and the noise of the river must have been drowned by the noise of men, beasts and clanking metal. Perhaps *ferunt undas*, or *premunt undas*?

* * *

Let me end by listing a number of unpublished conjectures by Gilbert Wakefield (1756–1801) and Jeremiah Markland (1693–1776). Those by Wakefield in Books 1 and 2 I presented in my previous paper (231 n. 7); I now add those in Books 3 to 12. The conjectures by Markland, which I now give for all twelve books, may be found in a British Library copy of Gronovius, shelfmark 1067. a. 17.

First then, Wakefield's contributions: 3. 109 *amnis*; 207 *lumina*; 257 *fruges*; 375 *nuptis*; 379 *blanditusque*; 505 *pacabile* (?); 531 *fuluos*; 644 *uictos*; 4. 55 *toto*; 217 *intermicat*; 224 *euittata*; 254 *deas*; 255 *intulit*; 308 *his*; 314 *corrupta*; 327 *albis*; 366 *turgida*; 434 *campis*; 464 *sanguen* (= P); 550 *quo legit et*; 608 *albumue*; 731 *arida* (= Schrader *apud* Haupt); 734 *et caecis*; 5. 45 *ulua*; 95 *tremetem*; 100 *it Pallados*; 161 *coniectis* (= Schrader); 329 *et tutum*; 489 *accensa 'st*; 497 *iacentem* (= Peyraredus); 586 *fronti*; 708 *calenti*; 727 *numine*; 731 *prior* (= δ); 732 *arrexerat*; 6. 26 *pollentis*; 97 *trementes*; 196 *tenera ora*; 208 *exundat*; 303 *tenero*; 678 *arida*; 7. 69 *in tegmine*; 202 *terras . . . impetat*; 311 *feruent ingentia*; 453 *parantum*; 471 *rubet*; 565 *coeli quondam*; 595 *illi*; 626 *uexat uel uersat*; 634 *fassa manum uel missa manu*; 650 *ueritus . . . et mansisse*; 8. 70 *alterni . . . leti*; 398 *clipei clipeis*; 575 *raptat*; 689 *iam saeuior*; 712 *permixtis*; 9. 72 *torta*; 114 *corpus agit*; 215 *sic saltem*; 350 *flamina*; 419 *iraque* (?); 621 *lacrimisque*; 873 *aspera*; 10. 308 *colla reducta*; 523 *mirantur agri*; 735 *alta*; 762 *at uos o! superi*; 823 *saeuit*; 833 *acta Iouem*; 11. 165 *gerentem*; 285 *primitiae*; 562 *peractus*; 12. 69 *sortis* (= Ntδ Schrader); 232 *rumpit iter*; 361 *qui uacat*.

The contributions by Markland are as follows: 1. 65 *explicui*; 130 *socii- . . . regni*; 202 *omnia nutu*; 226 *Aoniae . . . Thebes*; 298 *hic Tyrio*; 517 *comantes*; 2. 325 *longum*; 347 *difficilemque suis*; 412 *inertes*; 520 *damnatisque*; 573 *confessus* (= Dδ); 609 *minitantem uana*; 3. 250 *uergam*; 329 *torquet . . . sitis*; 365 *extant*; 654 *et aram* (?); 4. 114 *animis* (?); 353 *praemisere*; 522 *liuentesque*; 746 *ferebat*; 5. 20 *tu tamen*; 554 *adiacet*; 612 *uersantem*; 616 *et blanda*; 668 *meritus*; 6. 150 *uigemus*; 513 *qui mortis*; 829 *cara labores*; 847 *perfusa*; 7. 13 *propera*; 8. 40 *superis quin*; 46 *pandam mea regna*; 217 *obrepere*; 392 *regentum*; 654 *in uulnera*; 9. 159 *is functis*; 319 *Ismenide cretus*; 370 *nunc ponto submersa*; 385 *heu* (= various manuscripts); 415 *riuos*; 419 *simulque*; 514 *Mycene*; 780 *miseros* (= Ntδ); 824 *mersum tacito*; 897 *it sonus*; 10. 46 *balatusque repens*; 129 *iura* (= various manuscripts); 167 *it furor*; 470 *qui tremor elisa*; 522 *inque*

*immane; 671 i prior; 819 refixos (?); 824 omnis, eunt; 907 superum
chorus; 11. 667 confessus tacuit; 12. 249 magnaē strident; 587 rogantes.*

University of London