The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Silvae of Statius

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 01 / February 1906, pp 37 - 47

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993570, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993570

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1906). The Silvae of Statius. The Classical Review, 20, pp 37-47
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993570

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE SILVAE OF STATIUS.

I 3 105-110.

digne Midae Croesique bonis et Perside
 gaza, 105
 macte bonis animi, cuius stagnantia rura
 debuit et flauis Hermus transcurrere
 ripis
 et limo splendente Tagus. sic docta fre-
 quentes
 otia, sic omni detectus pectora nube
 finem Nestoreae precor egrediare senec-
 tae. 110

Heinsius and Markland, that is to say the two keenest minds that have ever concerned themselves with Statius, independently altered *detectus* to *detersus*. Their reason for the change they did not state, and Mr Vollmer cannot guess it. '*detectus*' says he 'ist ohne Bedenken; die Wolke *tegit*, ihr Verschwinden *detegit*, vgl. Liu. xxxiii 7 *iam iuga montium detexerat nebula*'; and neither he nor his numerous admirers have any suspicion that this note is a surrender instead of a defence. It was not because they did not see its meaning that Heinsius and Markland condemned *detectus*, but because they saw it. *omni detectus pectora nube* is good and clear Latin, and it signifies *apertus, simplex*. Hor. epist. i 16 62 'noctem peccatis et fraudibus obice *nubem*,' a veil of concealment; Quint. inst. viii proem. 20 '(cultus) muliebris et luxuriosus non corpus exornat sed *detegit mentem*,' lays the mind bare, Sen. ad Marc. 26 4 'nihil in obscuro, *detectas mentes* et aperta praecordia et in publico medioque uitam.' Conversely a dissimulator is called *tectus*, κρυψίνους: Cic. de fin. ii 54 'is enim, qui occultus et *tectus* dicitur, tantum abest ut se indicet, perficiet etiam ut dolere alterius improbe facto uideatur.'

Is *simplex* what Statius means? Far from it, he means *serenus*. *nube* is rightly understood by Mr Vollmer himself as 'Sorge und Furcht'; which interpretation he supports in a characteristic manner by quoting a few examples which are relevant (such as Ouid. ex Pont. ii 1 5 'pulsata curarum nube serenum') and a larger number which are not: one of these is Ouid. met. i 357, where Deucalion, after the ebb of the deluge, says 'terrent etiamnum nubila mentem,' that is 'I still tremble when I see clouds in the sky.' Now *nubes curarum* non *tegit* pectora, 'ihr

Verschwinden' non *detegit* pectora. When Homer at Il. xvii 591 says τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα, just as when he says at iii 442 ἔπος φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν, the meaning of ἐκάλυψε is not *hid* (ἐκρυψε) but *wrapped*. Mr Vollmer therefore, in writing 'die Wolke *tegit*, ihr Verschwinden *detegit*,' puts the case against *detectus* in a nutshell.

What the *nubes curarum* does is to make the spirit gloomy; its victim is not *tectus* but *nubilus*, and to remove the gloom is not *detegere* but *detergere*. Fest. p. 363 Muell. '*tersum* diem pro sereno dictum ab antiquis,' Hor. carm. i 7 15 sq. 'albus ut obscuro *deterget* nubila caelo | saepe notus,' Apoll. Sid. carm. 7 135 '*detersam mentem* caligo relinquat,' Symm. ep. ii 24 'ut sollicitudinem . . . spes promissa *detergeat*,' vi 72 'praestate litteras, quarum laetitia *nubem tergeat* praesentis iniuriae.' But the corruption *detectus* appears to indicate the form *deteretus*. Nonius p. 179 quotes from Cato 'circumtonsi et *terti* atque unctuli' and from Varro 'aerea *tertia* nitet galea'; and that the Romans of later times maintained their ancient freedom against the assaults of grammarians is shown by the precept of the appendix Probi G.L.K. iv 198 4 '*tersus* non *tertus*.' In Statius as in other writers of Domitian's day there are traces of antique orthography preserved in the corruptions of the MSS. Theb. i 706 *ultra est* ω, *ultra sim* P, that is *ultrast*; ii 417 *toruus et* ω, *seruo sed* P, that is *toruos et*; ix 865 *obliquus* ω, *oblitus* P, that is *oblicus*. In Theb. xi 152-4 we find

ardet inops animi, nec tam considerare regno
 quam scelus et caedem et perfossi san-
 guine fratris
 expirare cupit.

What 'sanguine fratris expirare' can mean I do not know; but I know that in Verg. georg. ii 510 we read 'gaudent *perfusi sanguine fratrum*'; that Virgil's own spelling, as Quintilian inst. i 7 20 declares on the authority of Virgil's handwriting, was *perfussi*; and that Virgil's cod. Gudianus, which offers *refussa* at Aen. i 126 and *infussa* at iv 250, has *confossae* at iv 250 where other MSS have *confusae*. So I conjecture

perfussus sanguine fratris
 expirare cupit.

At Theb. v 131 the Puteaneus presents *gauissa*.

I 4 58-62.

tunc deus, Alpini qui iuxta culmina dorsi
signat Apollineos sancto cognomine lucos,
respicit, heu tanti pridem securus alumni, 60
progressusque moras 'nunc mecum,

Epidauria proles,
hinc' ait 'i gaudens'.

Rutilius Gallicus has fallen ill of overwork in the service of the state, and Apollo, at first neglectful, now intervenes. Since *progressusque moras* has neither sense nor structure most editors read *praegressus*, 'quod explicant' says Markland '*statim, sine mora*; non male ad sensum, sed phraseos desunt exempla, et deerunt si recte auguror'; Mr Vollmer translates 'dem Zögern Aeskulaps zuvorkommend, der Jupiters Strafe fürchten könnte, weil er von diesem mit dem Blitze getroffen worden, als er den Hippolytus oder Glaucus ins Leben zurückgerufen'. For the sweet sake of a MS reading we would all believe these explanations, or any others; but *praegressus* is a conjecture, and a conjecture cannot count on such devotion: it ought to mean something, not to beg a meaning from public charity. The form of the sentence resembles Ach. i 126 sqq. 'iam dudum tacito lustrat Thetis omnia uisu, | *nec perpessa moras* "ubinam mea pignora, Chiron, | dic" ait': instead of *progressus* we want some word to signify *abruptus* (Theb. xi 201 'abrupte moras, celeremus', Ach. ii 198 'heia, abrupte moras'). Now in the line above, 60, the reading of the MS is not *pridem* but *precidem*; and I ask the question whether this is not *praecidens*, first added in the margin to restore what had been torn away from the beginning of u. 61 (torn away I say, for *praecidens* could hardly be corrupted to *progressus*), and then mistaken for a correction of *pridem* in u. 60, so that the gap in u. 61 still remained and was filled up otherwise. For '*praecidensque moras*' see Plin. ep. ix 14 'cuius cunctationem. . . temporis ratio praecidit.'

I 4 71-75.

prima togae uirtus illi quoque: clarus et
ingens
eloquio; mox innumeris exercita castris
occiduas primasque domos et sole sub omni
permeruit iurata manus, nec in otia pacis
permissum laxare animos ferrumque re- 75
cingi.

The construction breaks down in 73 sq. The acc. *domos* is governed by the transitive

verb *permeruit* (=meruit per) as by *perfuris* in Theb. iv 388 sq. 'Eoasque domos flagrante triumpho | *perfuris*.' But if *permeruit* is a transitive verb it cannot be taken with *sole sub omni*, which requires the intransitive *meruit*. What has happened is rendered clear by the parallel of Theb. i 200 sq. '*primaque occiduaeque domus et fusa sub omni* | terra atque unda die': a verse is lost which completed the sentence something in this fashion,

occiduas primasque domos et sole sub omni
<effusos pelagi tractus terrasque patentes>
permeruit iurata manus.

I 5 34-41.

non huc admissae Thasos aut undosa
Carystos,
maeret onyx longe queriturque exclusus
ophites: 35
sola nitet flauis Nomadum decisa metallis
purpura, sola cauo Phrygiae quam Synnados antro
ipse cruentauit maculis lucentibus Attis
quoque Tyri niueas secat et Sidonia rupes.
uix locus Eurotae, uiridis cum regula
longo 40
Synnada distinctu uariat.

I cannot here recover the words of Statius, but I think that I can restore the sentence to its original form and divert conjecture from a false track.

The first difficulty is the *purpura* of u. 37. Purple marble, porphyry, was not hewn from the quarries of Numidia: what they produced was giallo antico, and that is why they are called *flaua*. Nor was it purple marble that Attis sprinkled with his blood-stains: they were purple, but it was white, ii 2 87 sqq. 'Synnade quod maesta Phrygiae fodere secures | per Cybeles lugentis agros, ubi marmore picto | *candida* purpureo distinguitur area gyro.' The second difficulty is verse 39, which has no meaning or construction. The least improbable conjecture is perhaps Heinsius' '*quasque Tyros uena secat e Sidonide rupes*'; but nothing is known of marble quarries at Tyre or Sidon.

These two difficulties should help to solve one another. The *sola nitet* . . . *decisa* of 36 and the *sola* . . . *quam* of 37 cannot belong to *purpura*, and the only word in the passage to which they can belong is the *rupes* of 39. The *Tyri* and *Sidonide* of 39 cannot belong to *rupes*, and the only word in the passage to which they can belong is the *purpura* of 37. Further, almost all the

marbles mentioned at this place are mentioned also at i 2 148 sq. in these verses :

hic Libycus Phrygiusque silex, hic dura
Laconum
saxa uirent, hic flexus onyx et concolor alto
uena mari rupesque nitent, quis purpura
saepe
Oebalis et Tyrri moderator liuet aeni.

That is how Statius describes porphyry ; and here he describes it again :

sola nitet flauis Nomadum decisa metallis 36
quoique Tyri et Sidonia rupes 39
purpura, sola cauo Phrygiae quam Synna-
dos antro 37
ipse cruentauit maculis lucentibus Attis. 38

Verse 39 was probably repeated after 38 by reason of the homocoteleuton *-allis, attis*, and then wrongly deleted in the first place instead of the second. The construction is 'sola nitet rupes Nomadum metallis decisa, eaque rupes quoi (liuet saepe?) Tyri et Sidonia purpura.' *rupi* would be more regular than *rupes*, but the hyperbaton is like Luc. i 13 sqq. 'heu quantum terrae potuit pelagique parari | hoc, quem ciuiles hauserunt, sanguine, dextrae' and Sil. xi 459-61 'sed, quos pulsabat Rhipaeum ad Strymona, nerui, | auditus superis, auditus manibus Orpheus, | emerito fulgent clara inter sidera caelo'; and the ambiguity, if ambiguity there be, is like Prop. ii 26 7 'ne forte tuum mare nomen haberet' and Hor. epist. i 19 28 'temperat Archilochi musam pede mascula Sappho.' Statius himself has a more violent dislocation of words in Theb. ix 135 sqq. 'uidit, quamquam undique crebrae, | Hippomedon, ante ora minae, saeuoque proteruam | abstulit ense manum.' For 'Tyri et Sidonia purpura,' see ii 2 122 'Troica et Euphratae diademata,' v 1 26 'Apollineus Bacchique sacerdos'; though *niueas secat* may contain another substantive in disguise.

II 1 19-30.

ipse etenim tecum nigrae sollemnia pom-
pae
spectatumque urbi scelus et puerile fere-
trum 20
produxi, saeuos damnati turis acruos
plorantemque animam supra sua funera
uidi,
teque patrum gemitus superantem et
bracchia matrum
complexumque rogos ignemque haurire
parantem

uix tenui similis comes offendiquetenendo. 25
et nunc heu uittis et frontis honore soluto
infaustus uates uersa mea pectora tecum
plango lyra. et diu comitem sociumque
doloris,
si merui luctusque tui consortia sensi,
iam lenis patiare precor. 30

The oldest conjecture at u. 28 is *at diri*; Markland's *en diri* is apter, but the elision of an iambus before *en* is probably illegitimate. Mr Vollmer writes *sed tu*: both words are inoffensive, but both are superfluous. What the sense and context suggest is a word to signify *acris* or *recentis*, a fresh and overwhelming grief ('me fulmine in ipso | audiuerunt patres' he proceeds in 30 sq.); and the letters of the text point straight to such a word :

crudi comitem sociumque doloris.

crudi = *et udi*, for the confusion of *c* with *e* and of *r* with *t* are both common enough. The cod. Matritensis which has preserved us Statius' siluae contains also the astronomica of Manilius, and at Man. iv 350 it has '*et imine*' for '*crimine*,' at iii 10 '*laetum*' for '*lacerum*,' and at i 821 '*aera*' where Manilius' other MSS have '*acta*': in the siluae it offers i 4 1 *eloto* for *clotho*, iv 4 91 *iuueneae* for *iuuencae*, i 4 74 *permetuit* for *permeruit*, and ii 6 10 *ut se* for *urse*. The comparison of fresh grief to a raw wound is frequent, as at Plin. ep. v 16 11 '*ut enim crudum adhuc uulnus medentium manus reformidat, deinde patitur atque ultro requirit, sic recens animi dolor consolationes reicit ac refugit, mox desiderat et clementer admotis adquiescit*,' and is used by Statius himself in v 1 18 sq. '*cum plaga recens et adhuc in uulnere primo | nigra domus*' and in uu. 3 sq. of this very poem, '*abruptis etiam nunc flebile uenis | uulnus hiat magnaeque patet uia lubrica plagae*': he repeats the phrase itself at Theb. iii 334 sq. in describing a wounded bull fresh from victory over its rival, '*uacua iacet hostis harena | turpe gemens crudosque uetat sentire dolores*'; he varies it at silu. v 5 38 sq. '*ille ego, qui quotiens blande matrumque patrumque | uulnera, qui uiuos potui mulcere dolores*.'

II 1 45-49.

blandis ubinam ora arguta querellis
osculaue impliciti uernos redolentia flores
et mixtae risu lacrimae penitusque loquentis
Hyblaeis uox mixta fauis, cui sibila
serpens
poneret et saeuae uellent seruire nouercae.

That Statius, who at i l 15 sq. appears to have written 'ora . . . mixta notis belli,' could write 'uox mixta fauis' is not incredible; but neither he nor any known Latin author could place it side by side with 'mixtae risu lacrimae': 'tears blent with smiles and a voice blent with honeycomb.' All that Mr Vollmer has to say is '*mixta* ist chiasmisch wiederholt,' as if that mended matters. Markland conjectured *incta*; but it comes nearer to the MS and suits well the artificiality of Statius to write 'Hyblaeis uox muls a fauis,' that is 'sweetened.' It was the admixture of honey which produced the drink called *mulsum*, and the word is applied to honeyed speech in Plaut. Poen. 325 'ut muls a loquitur' and rud. 364 'ut dulcis es, ut *muls a* (*multa* C) dicta dicis.' In other connexions also the poets use *mulcere* for 'sweeten': Sil. vii 169 'pocula nec norant sucis *mulcere* Lyaei,' Man. v 264 sqq. 'Arabum Suriis *mulcebit* odores | et medios unguenta dabit referentia flatus, | ut sit adu- lterio suorum gratia maior,' 332 sq. 'ille da- bit cantus inter conuiuia dulcis | *mulcebitque* sono Bacchum,' 'make the wine taste sweeter.' In Colum. x 261 sq. we have 'rosa praestat honores | caelitibus templisque Sabaeum *miscet* odorem,' which is an imitation of Verg. Aen. i 416 sq. 'Sabaeo | ture calent arae sertisque recentibus halant.' But 'miscet Sabaeum odorem' is no sort of Latin for 'miscetur cum Sabaeo odore,' and here too I should write *mulcet*.

II 1 65-68.

obuius intranti rursus quis in ora manusque prosiliet breuibusque umeros circumdabit ulnis?

muta domus, f a t e o r, desolatique penates, et situs in thalamis et maesta silentia mensis.

'inepta et nullius sensus uox ista *fateor*' said Markland, who lived in the eighteenth century, knew the meaning of Latin words, and attended to the context. Now come down to the year 1893 and listen to Mr F. Skutsch in Fleck. Jahrb. vol. 147 pp. 827-8.

credisne nullum fere siluarum uocabulum coniecturis magis uexatum esse quam illud *fateor*? taedet sescenta illa conamina, ineptissima plerumque, recensere; putes criticos non minus nostri loci securos quam sermonis latini ignaros fuisse. nam quam saepe parentheticum illud *fateor* poetae adhibuerint, dici nequit; uide, ut ex multis pauca delibem, Ouidium rem. 314, met. ix 362; ipsum Statium silu. iii 4 39; Martialem i 90 5, ii 28 5, iii 12 1, Claudianum compluribus locis quos Birtii index subministrabit; Maximianum ii 29, v 39; poet.

lat. min. iv p. 424 c. 527 u. 4 Baehr., ibd. v p. 367 c. 62 u. 3. sed Marklandus 'si domus muta est et desolata' inquit 'quaeso a te, Stati, quid ad rem est siue tu hoc fatearis siue non fatearis?' hanc tamen quaestionem non minus recte ceteris poetis quos nominaui plurimis locis eorum quos modo congressi proposueris. immo non pauci loci erunt quibus minus bene illud *fateor* explices quam nostro. nam Statius sane fatetur quod, si propositum exequi uolt, celare praestaret; consolari uolt amicum, sed ne consolaturus quidem celat, quantum damni pueri mors praematura attulerit. at apud Ouidium l. i. si Dryopae in arborem mutatae soror ait *opemque* | non *poteram* tibi ferre, soror: *quantumque ualebam* | *crescentem truncum ramosque amplexa morabar* | et, *fateor*, uolui sub eodem cortice condi, hoc loco *fateor* uix intellegitur, nisi compertum tibi est quantopere huius parenthesis uis continuo usu debilitata sit, qua de re fusius dicendi compendium mihi faciunt quae adnotauit Bonnetus de Gregorii Turonensis latinitate p. 258 adn. 2.

Perhaps the fittest reply would be 'nugatur, fateor, Skutschius.' It is Mr Skutsch himself who is 'sermonis latini ignarus' and 'nostri loci securus.' The parenthetic *fateor* has two meanings: it means to confess or concede something which one might be thought willing to deny (Ouid. rem. 314 'curabar propriis aeger Podalirius herbis | et, *fateor*, medicus turpiter aeger eram'), and it means to declare something which one has the power to conceal (Ouid. met. ix 362 Stat. silu. iii 4 39 'nil ego, nil, *fateor*, toto tam dulce sub orbe | aut uidi aut genui'). Out of all the poets 'innumerable' examples Mr Skutsch neither quotes nor can quote a single one where *fateor* is used as I have used it above and as Statius must have used it if he used it here. Mr Skutsch fancies that Statius 'fatetur quod, si propositum exequi uolt, celare praestaret: consolari uolt amicum.' Statius, on the contrary, is extolling the graces of Glaucias and magnifying the loss which Melior has sustained: this has been his theme ever since u. 35 'confer gemitus pariterque fleamus'; the whole paragraph consists of enquiries like 'quis tua colloquiis hilaris mulcebit amantis | pectora?' and exclamations like 'heu lactea colla'; and in the next verse 69 he proceeds 'quid mirum, tanto si te pius altor honorat | funere?' But suppose that Statius wanted to conceal or deny the truth: how could he? Which knew best whether Melior's house was silent and Melior's hearth was desolate? Melior or Statius? And then Gregory of Tours (who uses *fateor* in some such sense as 'comme bien vous le pensez') is fetched from the 6th century to corrupt the Latinity of the 1st.

Mr Vollmer says that 'dieser partikelartige Gebrauch (fast = "leider") des Verbum'

is found 'schon Verg. A. ii 134 xii 813.' It is not: those passages are these, 'eripui, fateor, leto me et uincula rupi, "Iturnam misero, fateor, succurrere fratri] suasi.' Markland proposed *pariter*, which is violent, and Baehrens *stat ero*, which is unnatural. I conjecture

muta domus mussat desolatique penates,
mus-mus shortened to *mus* and *fat* expanded to *fateor*. See Auson. parent. ix 15 '*muta domus silet et torus alget*,' Prop. iv 3 53 '*omnia surda tacent*,' Petr. 126 '*fabula muta taces*,' Ouid. met. iv 433 '*muta silentia*,' Verg. Aen. xii 718 '*stat pecus omne metu mutum, mussantque iuuencae*.' If the repetition of the syllable *mus* (though it is hardly a repetition, since the *u* of *musso* is probably long) strikes any reader as displeasing, let him ask himself why '*Sinin infandum*' at Theb. xii 576 and '*siluas uasta* at Luc. vi 42 do not so strike him.

II 1 124-129.

Hereuleos annis aequare labores
 coeperat adsurgens, sed adhuc infantia
 iuxta; 125
 iam tamen et ualidi gressus mensuraque
 maior
 cultibus et uisae puero decrescere uestes,
 cum tibi quas uestes, quae non gesta-
 mina mitis
 festinabat erus.

Down to the year 1900 the reading of the MSS at the end of u. 125 was supposed to be *mixta*. Markland in 1728 emended *iuxta*, but many editors still retained *mixta*, and Mr Vollmer in 1898 of course was one of them. In 1900 Mr Klotz informed us that *iuxta* is actually the reading of the Matritensis, and he prints it in his text, and so do the following editors: Markland is not mentioned. This is the way to deal with conjectural emendators: reject their emendations as long as you can, and then, when you are forced to accept their emendations, suppress their names. Heinsius conjectured *sancire* for *sanare* at ii 1 84, Lindenbrog *declinis* for *declinuis* at ii 3 45, Markland *cervae* for *terrae* at ii 3 22, *carpit* for *carpsit* at ii 6 98, *nec* for *haec* at iv 5 37, and *nam* for *uanam* at v 1 76: all these conjectures are now found in the Matritensis and received into the text of editions, but nothing is said of their discoverers.

127 sq. *uestes*, | cum tibi quas *uestes*.¹

¹ '*uestes* mit Nachdruck wiederholt' Vollmer; and similarly at v 5 33 sq. (*iunat inlaudabile car-*

'*haec pauperies sermonis*' says Markland 'non Statiana est, sed alius cuiuspiam, qui in margine libri sui hanc uocem scripserat ad explicandam aliam quae in contextu erat, et quae difficilior illi uidebatur.' It may be so, or it may be that the genuine word had fallen out; and an appropriate word which might easily fall out after *i quas* is <*lanas*>. Perhaps too there is another place where *lanas* has been supplanted by *uestes*. At Ouid. her. xiii 37-40, when most MSS give 'scilicet ipsa geram saturatas murice *uestes*, | bella sub Iliacis moenibus ille gerat? | ipsa comas pectar, galea caput ille prematur, | ipsa nouas *uestes*, dura uir arma ferat?' Mr Vollmer will again be ready with the comment '*uestes* mit Nachdruck wiederholt,' overlooking '*comas pectar*' as he overlooked '*quae non gestamina*;' but Mr Sedlmayer's cod. Gothanus posterior, which has several traits of integrity, offers '*saturatas murice lanas*,' and if this is a conjecture it is a good one: met. vi 9 '*tinguebat murice lanas*,' art. i 251 '*de tincta murice lana*,' iii 170 '*de Tyrio murice, lana, rubes*.'

Markland and most editors, in the middle of u. 129, punctuate '*erus?*' which is wrong; Mr Klotz punctuates '*erus!*' which is worse. The stop to be placed at the end of a sentence is determined by the principal verb: the principal verb of this sentence is '*uisae*,' which is neither interrogative nor exclamatory. The '*quas*' of '*quas uestes*' (unless you supply '*non*' from the next clause) is exclamatory, like the '*quem*' of '*quem, Natura, patrem*' in u. 34: the '*quae*' of '*quae non gestamina*' is interrogative; but if you insist upon expressing these facts by punctuation you must print '*cum tibi quas uestes! quae non gestamina? mitis | festinabat erus*.'

II 1 227-230.

ades huc emissus ab atro
 limine, cui soli cuncta impetrare facultas,
 Glaucia:² insontes animas nec portitor
 arcet
 nec durae comes ille ferae. 230

men | fundere et inkompte miserum *laudare* dolorem) '*laudare* durch das vorhergehende *inlaudabile* gestützt und gegensätzlich betont.'

² 'Ich halte den Hiat nach dem Vocativ ebenso wie nach einer Interjection für berechtigt' Vollmer. This opinion will carry such weight as belongs to the opinions of a metrist who scans both *Pladiumque* and *reicitque* as $\bar{\cup} - \bar{\cup} - \bar{\cup}$. If the text were right, it would of course be *Γλαυκία* (Martial calls him *Glaucias* as well as *Glaucia*) shortened in lieu of elision like Virgil's *Pelio Ossam*; but this has no parallel in Statius, who at iii 2 65 writes *Pelion Ossae*. The old conjecture *Glaucia*; <*nam*> *insontes* is the most probable.

This 'comes,' according to Heinsius, is Cerberus' brother the dog Orthrus, whom Silius xiii 845 sets to worry unchaste Vestals; according to O. Rossbach Rhein. Mus. 1893 p. 594 it is the 'ianitor... sedis laxae, qui viscera saeuo | spargis nostra cani' of Luc. vi 702 sq., perhaps the same as 'ostia Ditis | centenis suetus Briareus recludere palmis' in Sil. xiii 587 sq. If either of these explanations is right, *durae* must be altered, as the old editors, who were at home in Latin poetry, altered it, to *dirae*: it is in this age, the age of the Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie and the thesaurus linguae Latinae, that scholars accept '*durae* ferae' as a Roman's designation of Cerberus.

But side by side with Charon it is not any associate of Cerberus' that one expects to find; it is Cerberus himself, whose especial duty it is to prevent the escape of the dead: Fronto fer. Als. p. 228 Nab. 'canem denique custodem apposuisse umbris territandis, quae aufugere ad superos cuperant'; and since it is necessary to change at least one letter of the MS text perhaps that letter should not be *u* but *f*:

nec *durae* comes ille *serae*.

Tib. i 2 6 '*dura ianua fulta sera*.' Cerberus himself is the companion of the inexorable bar: he is chained to it as a 'canis catenarius.' Prop. iv 11 25 sq. '*Cerberus* et nullas hodie petat improbus umbras | et iaceat tacita laxa catena *sera*,' 7 89 sq. 'nox clausas liberat umbras | errat et abiecta *Cerberus* ipse *sera*.'

II 2 138-154.

at nunc discussa rerum caligine uerum
aspicis: illo alii rursus iactantur in alto,
set tua securos portus placidamque quie-
tem 140
intrauit non quassa ratis. sic perge nec
umquam
emeritam in nostras puppem dimitte pro-
cellas. 142
tuque, nurus inter. 147
. praecordia curae,
non frontem tuescere minae, sed candida
semper
gaudia et in uultu curarum ignara uo-
luptas;
non tibi sepositas infelix strangulat arca 150
diuitias audique animum dispendia tor-
quent
fenoris: expositi census et docta fruendi
temperies. non ulla deo meliore cohae-
rent

pectora, non alias docuit Concordia
mentes. 154
discite securi, quorum de pectore mixtae 143
in longum coiere faces sanctusque pudicae
seruat amicitiae leges amor. ite per annos
saeculaeque et priscae titulos praecedite
famae. 146

The first word of u. 140 is in the MS *et*. The old editors saw that an adversative particle was wanted, and they changed it to *at*; this however stands at the beginning of u. 138, and Dr Postgate's *sed* is the more probable. In the last German editions the passage wears this shape,

at nunc discussa rerum caligine uerum
aspicis—illo alii rursus iactantur in alto—,
et tua etc.

It is thought more probable that an author should thus tear 'iactantur in alto' away from 'portus' and 'ratis' and attach it to 'discussa caligine uerum aspicis' than that one letter should be lost or altered in the course of 1300 years; and to have such notions of probability is thought 'vorsichtig.'

In uu. 142-154 reason, I know not how, has got the upper hand, and modern editions arrange the verses as above, accepting Calderinus' lacuna in 147 and Amiterninus' transposition of 143-6, despite what Cruceus sagely calls its 'audacia Scaligeriana.' There remain the difficulties of 154 and 143, in which neither *docuit* nor *discite* has any meaning.¹ The old editors changed *discite* to *uiuere*, which is violent, and *docuit* to *deciuit*, which fails to complete the sense (e.g. *magis deciuit*). Nothing seems more

¹ 'Aus deo meliore ist zu Concordia (zu i 2 240) ein *melior* oder *melius* zu ergänzen, wie oft ein comparativer Begriff nur bei einem Satzgliede ausgedrückt wird, weil seine Betonung für zwei ausreicht, vgl. iii 2 77 Anm. Theb. iii 454 (aus *largius* zu *pronus* ein *magis*) xi 435 ff. Prop. i 2 13 (zu *picta* ein *melius* zu ergänzen) App. Verg. Epigr. xiii 9 f., ebenso *magis* ἀπὸ κοινοῦ Leo Anal. Plant. i 47 Hor. Sat. i 2 123. *docuit* ist richtig: Concordia giebt den Aufmerksamen gute Lehren. Daran schliesst sich vortrefflich v. 143 *discite*, das nur wie *docta* v. 152 auch auf Epikurs Lösung σοφιδάτης ᾧν (epist. S. 131 17 Us.) anspielt, auf das Streben immer weiter zu kommen im Reiche der Wahrheit, vgl. Sen. Ep. 76 3 *tamdiu discendum est, quemadmodum uiuas, quamdiu uiuis*' Vollmer. 'τὸ *discite* nullum ad casum refertur, neque uero necesse fuit Statio adicere, quid discendum esset Pollio, quem philosophantem iam ante fecerat. nihil ergo mutandum' Cruceus. 'tibi qui diceret, *disce*, recte diceret. omnia enim ignoras, et de quocumque id intellegeres, bene intellegeres. at Pollio docto et Pollae iam compositae ad omnium uirtutum muliebrium legem dici non potest *discite*, nisi addatur, quid discendum restet' Gronovius.

likely than that this passage, which has suffered both dislocation and loss, has suffered loss at the point of dislocation, and that both *docuit* and *discite* were furnished with a meaning by some such verse as this :

non alias docuit Concordia mentes
< uincula amare magis. fallentis gaudia
uitae >
discite securi.

Compare v 1 43 sq. 'si uos collato pectore mixtos | iunxit inabrupta concordia longa catena.'

II 4 16-19.

huc doctae stipentur aues, quis nobile fandi
ius Natura dedit : plangat Phoebeius ales
auditasque memor penitus dimittere
uoces
sturnus et Aonio uersae certamine picae.

If Markland or Gronovius set eyes on this sentence he would suppose *dimittere* to be a misprint. When he found that it was the reading of all modern editions he would wonder what had happened since his time to the study of Latin or of natural history. The clause means, without a shadow of ambiguity, that the starling remembers to forget completely the words which he has heard : Catull. 64 207 sqq. 'caeca mentem caligine Theseus | consitus oblito *dimisit* pectore cuncta | quae mandata prius constanti mente tenebat.' In the 17th and 18th centuries, which knew more about starlings or Latin verbs, they used to read *demittere* : Liu. xxxiv 50 2 'ut eas uoces uelut oraculo missas in pectora animosque *demitterent*.'

II 6 21-25.

quid si nec famulus ? uidi ipse habitusque
notauit
te tantum cupientis erum ; sed maior in
ore
spiritus et tenero manifesti in sanguine
mores.
optarent multum Graiae cuperentque
Latinae
sic peperisse nurus. 25

Neither in old nor new editions do I find a word about the *sed* of u. 22. Yet what can it mean ? Not 'but,' not 'ay and,' not 'to proceed,' not 'to resume.' Mr. Krohn has proposed *sic*, which seems almost equally inappropriate. Then there remains *maior* : greater than what ? 'seruo scilicet' quoth the Delphin editor. *sed* wants removing and *maior* wants defining :

spe maior in ore

spiritus,

that is 'praeter expectationem magnus,'
'maior quam pro aetate et condicione.'
Compare 75 'solito sublimius ora leuauit.'

II 6 85-95.

sed nec seruilis adempto 85
ignis : odoriferos exhaustit flamma Sabaeos
et Cilicum messes, Phariaeque exempta
uolucris
cinnama et Assyrio manantes gramine
sucus
et domini fletus : hos tantum hausere
fauillae,
hos bibit usque rogos ; nec quod tibi Setia
canos 90
restinxit cineres, gremio nec lubricus
ossa
quod uallauit onyx, miseris acceptius
umbris
quam gemitus. sed et ipse iuuat.
quid terga dolori,
Vrse, damus ? quid damna foues et
pectore iniquo
uulnus amas ? 95

'93 *sed et ipse iuuat*. haec uerba, quorum sensum et connexionem cum praecedentibus aut subsequentibus nullatenus uideo, corruptissima puto' Markland. They have lately taken to printing '*sed et ipse iuuat*?' or '*sed (et ipse iuuat) quid*'; of which Markland would probably say, as he said of Cruceus' conjecture *iuua*, 'nihilo melius adhuc intelligo.'¹ The sense needed is 'but enough of lamentation' or the like : for instance

sed flesse iuuat,

that is *flendi finem facere* : 'but it is well to make an end of weeping ; why thus succumb to grief ?' FLESSE is ET ESSE, compare ii 1 88 *flegisse* for *elegisse* and ii 2 103 *emis* for *finis* ; then *esse* and *ipse* are so often interchanged that I have ceased to note examples, but here are some : Ouid. her. xx 50, 124, amor. i 4 46, met. xii 536, xiii 58, 864, trist. ii 134, iii 1 14, iv 1 37, 3 56, 7 11, v 2 58, 12 19, ex Pont. iii 1 133, iv 13 12, Catull. 106 1, Verg. catal. 9 24, Prop. iii 1 36, Sen. suas. vi 27, Sen. Oct. 449, Mart. x 1 4, Iuu. xiv 244.

¹ *sed* plötzliche Wendung, hervorgehoben durch die sofort folgende Parenthese : aber—jetzt ist es Zeit, sich aufzuerheben und bei dieser Aufforderung unterstützt mich der Tote, der nicht will, dass zu viel um ihn geklagt werde' Vollmer.

III praef. 23–27 ed. Klotz.

Earinus praeterea, Germanici nostri libertus, scit quam diu desiderium eius moratus sim, cum petisset ut capillos suos, quos cum gemmata pyxide et speculo ad Pergamenum Asclepium mittebat, uersibus dedicarem.

I should have said nothing about Mr Vollmer's *scis*, did I not see it accepted by all the subsequent editors,—though Dr Postgate would transfer the clause '*scis* . . . moratus sim' to its proper place at the end of the sentence.

Mr Vollmer began upon this passage in Fleckeisen's annual for 1893, p. 832: 'fugit adhuc editores quam sensu cassum sit uerbum *scit*. nihil ad rem attinet Earinum scire quam diu Statius neglexerit optato obsequi, immo Statii intererat liberto imperatoris cunctationem excusare, non prae se ferre, id quod Marklandus bene sensit *quam diu* interpretatus *quam non diu*.' There was no 'cunctatio': whether you read *scit* or *scis*, Markland's interpretation is equally necessary; and in 1898 Mr Vollmer accepts it, '*quam diu* hat schon Markland richtig als *quam non diu* verstanden.'

This objection having vanished, another starts up in its place: '*scit* hat keinen Sinn, da St. nicht wie in Praef. I die einzelnen Adressaten als Zeugen für seine *celeritas* aufruft, sondern sich nur an Pollius wendet.' The first half of this reason, 'St. nicht . . . aufruft,' is *petitio principii*; it is false unless *scit* is false, which is the very question at issue: the second half, 'sondern . . . wendet,' is pure irrelevance. *sondern* is commonly regarded as an adversative particle: what opposition here exists between the words which precede and follow it? This praefatio, being an epistle to Pollius, is of course addressed 'nur an Pollius,' whether you read *scis* or *scit*; and the praefatio to book I, in which 'die einzelnen Adressaten' are invoked by Statius 'als Zeugen für seine *celeritas*,' is addressed 'nur an Stella,' and instead of being as Mr Vollmer fancies, a contrast, is a parallel. The difference in sense between *scit* and *scis* is simply this: the former means 'Earinum testor, me eius desiderium non diu moratum esse' the latter means 'te testor, me Earini desiderium non diu moratum esse'; and which is better? which knew most about the 'capilli Flauii Earini,' Earinus or Pollius?

But 'neque a ratione grammatica non abhorret persona tertia quam non eius sequi debebat, sed suum'; 'die Verderbnis (erwiesen durch das nach *scit* unmögliche *eius* . . .

sim) hat ihren Ursprung in der Verkennung des Anakoluthon.' Is Statius then required to write better Latin than Livy or Caesar or Cicero? Liu. xxxii 34 5 'an, quod a sociis *eorum* non abstinuerim, iustam querellam habent?' Caes. b. G. ii 1 2 'coniurandi has esse causas: primum, quod uererentur ne omni pacata Gallia ad *eos* exercitus noster adduceretur,' v 27 2 'Ambiorix ad hunc modum locutus est: sese pro Caesaris in se beneficiis plurimum ei confiteri debere, quod eius opera stipendio liberatus esset, quod Aduaticis, finitimis *suis*, pendere consuesset, quodque *ei* et filius et fratris filius ab Caesare remissi essent,' Cic. de or. i 232 'quod cum interrogatus Socrates esset, respondit sese meruisse ut amplissimis honoribus et praemiis decoraretur et ut *ei* uictus cotidianus in Prytaneo publice praeberetur,' pro Ligar. 36 'T. Ligarius, qui tum nihil egit aliud (neque enim haec diuinabat) nisi ut *eum* tui studiosum et bonum uirum iudicares.' Even *ille* is so used: Iuu. xiii 202 sq. 'quaerebat enim quae numinis esset | mens et an hoc *illi* facinus suaderet Apollo.'

IV 3 153–157.

iurauit tibi iam niualis Arctus,
nunc magnos Oriens dabit triumphos.
ibis qua uagus Hercules et Euhan, 155
ultra sidera flammeumque solem
et Nili caput et niues Atlantis.

I have never seen this passage rightly explained. Mr Vollmer says on u. 156 '*ultra s. fl. s.* über ihre Bahnen hinaus, weiter als ihr Aufgangs- und Untergangsort, im Folgenden durch Nil und Atlas als östlichsten und westlichsten Punkt (chiastisch zu *Hercules et Euhan*) genauer bestimmt.' The interpretation of *Nili caput* as 'östlichsten Punkt' is refuted by the *Oriens* of 154, and the sense of 156 is altogether misunderstood. Dr Postgate in *Philologus* 1905 p. 129 no less erroneously supposes '*sidera flammeumque solem*' to have some connexion with the '*arces igneas*' of Hor. carm. iii 3 10.

These praises of Domitian are taken from Virgil's praises of Augustus in Aen. vi 791–805. Domitian has conquered the North and will conquer the East. *Arctus* reminds the poet of Hercules' expedition to the Hyperboreans, *Oriens* reminds him of Euhan's march upon the Indies; and he adds that Domitian will go wherever these two great travellers have been before him, that is all the world over: 'ibis qua uagus Hercules et Euhan' is Verg. Aen. vi 801 sqq.

'nec uero Alcides tantum telluris obiuit . . . nec . . . Liber.' Domitian will go 'ultra sidera flammeumque solem': that is Aen. vi 795 sq. 'iacet extra sidera tellus, | extra anni solisque uias.' These words of Virgil's were misunderstood by the writer of the *Hercules Oetaeus* just as Statius' words are misunderstood by Mr Vollmer: 42-5 'te, clare Titan, testor: occurri tibi | quacumque fulges, nec meos lux prosequi | potuit triumphos; solis excessi uices | intraque nostras substitit metas dies.' But Virgil did not deal in these absurd hyperboles, and his meaning is correctly explained by Seruius: 'nulla terra est, quae non subiaceat sideribus; unde perite addit *extra anni solisque uias*, ut ostendat xii signa, in quibus est circulus solis.' Virgil's '*extra sidera . . . extra anni solisque uias*' and Statius' '*ultra sidera flammeumque solem*' both mean 'south of the zodiac and the ecliptic.' This use of *sidera κατ' ἑξοχήν* for the twelve zodiacal constellations recurs in Luc. iv 57 '*sidera respiciens delapsae portitor Helles*'; Aries, the leader of the zodiac, looks back over his shoulder at the other eleven as they follow him round the sky: *signa* is thus used ib. 109 and *astra* in Man. i 607. Then we proceed in u. 157 'et Nili caput.' This phrase was a proverb long before Statius' time: Pind. Isth. vi (v) 33 καὶ πέραν Νείλοιο παγῶν καὶ δι' Ὑπερβορέους, schol. τὴν ξύμπασαν οἰκουμένην θέλει εἰπεῖν. The founts of Nile do not indeed lie south of the whole zodiac, for Capricorn is much further south than they, but they lie south of most of the zodiac; and though the ancients did not know this for a certainty, they knew that the Nile was already a great river at a latitude far south of Cancer; which is quite enough for Statius, since the poets, as I will shortly show, do not always remember that the zodiac is oblique. The use of *Nili caput* therefore to signify a region even further south than '*sidera flammeumque solem*' presents no difficulty; but what of *niues Atlantis*? surely Atlas is not south of the zodiac. In fact no, but in poetry yes: this, as I said before, is taken from Verg. Aen. vi 795 sqq. 'iacet extra sidera tellus | extra anni solisque uias, ubi caelifer Atlas | axem umero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum.' 'significat' says Seruius 'Maurorum Aethiopiam, ubi est Atlas; de qua Lucanus (iii 253-5) '*Aethiopumque solum, quod non premeretur ab ulla | signiferi regione poli, nisi poplite lapso | ultima curuati procederet ungula Tauri*.' I must here explain these verses of Lucan, because they are not understood by Lucan's editors. When he

says 'the land of the Aethiopians, which would lie under no portion of the zodiac (signifer polus = poli pars signifera), did not the hoof of Taurus project,' he means that Aethiopia lies further south than any part of the zodiac except the hoof of Taurus. But of course the hoof of Taurus is not by any means the southernmost part of the zodiac: Taurus is a northern constellation, and his hoof, though it projects a long way southward, only just crosses the equator. Lucan has forgotten that the zodiac is oblique: he imagines it torn from its actual position and nailed neatly along the tropic of Cancer: if this operation could be effected without bringing the sky down, the hoof of Taurus would be, as Lucan fancies, the southernmost part of the zodiac, and would have Aethiopia under it, and all the rest of the zodiac would be north of Aethiopia. Virgil shares Lucan's error that Aethiopia is south of the zodiac, and he further believes that Atlas is in Aethiopia; and both errors are copied by Statius. I may add that some geographers held *Nili caput* and *niues Atlantis* to be one and the same spot: Vitr. viii 2 6 'ex monte Atlante Dyris, qui . . . peruenit . . . in Aegyptum . . . et ibi Nilus appellatur.'

IV 4 18-24.

te quoque clamorae quanam plaga mitior
urbi
subtrahit? aestiuos quo decipis aere soles?
quid tuus ante omnes, tua cura potissima,
Gallus, 20
nec non noster amor, dubium morumne
probandus
ingeniine bonis? Latiis aestiuat in oris
anne metalliferae repetit iam moenia
Lunae
Tyrrhenasque domos?

I have punctuated verses 20-4 so as to show that they are modelled upon Hor. epist. 1 3 9-13 'quid Titius, Romana breui uenturus in ora, | Pindarici fontis qui non expalluit haustus, | fastidire lacus et riuos ausus apertos? | ut ualet? ut meminit nostri? fidibusne Latinis | Thebanos aptare modos studet auspice Musa | an tragica desaeuit et ampullatur in arte?' The vulgate punctuation is 'quid? tuus . . . amor (dubium . . . bonis) Latiis . . . domos?'

IV 8 45-50.

di patrii, quos auguriis super aequora
magnis 45
litus ad Ausonium deuexit Abantia
classis,

tu, ductor populi longe migrantis, Apollo,
cuius adhuc uolucrum laeua ceruice
sedentem
respiens blande felix Eumelis adorat,
tuque, Actaea Ceres. 50

Verses 48 sq. describe a statue whose head is turned to look at a dove perched upon its shoulder, the dove which led to Italy the Euboean colonists who founded Cumae and afterwards Neapolis: iii 5 79 sq. 'Parthenope, cui mite solum trans aequora uectae | ipse Dionaea monstraui Apollo columba.' Whose statue? Parthenope's, say the commentators; and they add that Parthenope was the daughter of Eumelus, perhaps the Eumelus mentioned in Kaibel's inscr. Gr. Sicil. et Ital. 715 Εὐμηλον θεὸν πατρῶον φρήτορον Εὐμηλιδῶν. But Parthenope, like the rest of the Sirens, was the daughter of Achelous: Sil. xii 33 sq. 'Sirenum dedit una suum memorabile nomen | Parthenope muris Acheloias.' The belief that she had another father named Eumelus has no ground except the *Eumelis* of this verse; and the *Eumelis* of this verse is a conjecture. The reading of the Matritensis is *eumeliss*; and what this means may be seen from the following errors in the same MS: iii 3 210 *sitiss* for *situs*, iv 3 134 *boniss* for *bonus*, v 2 22 *generosiss* for *generosus*, 4 5 *trucibiss* for *trucibus*. The statue was not a statue of Eumelis but of Eumelus, whoever Eumelus may have been.

V 1 242-246.

sic, ubi magna nouum Phario de litore
puppis
soluit iter iamque innumeros utrimque
rudentes
lataque ueliferi porrexit brachia mali
inuasitque uias, in eodem angusta phaselos 245
aequore et immensi partem sibi uindicat
austri.

Gronovius diatr. p. 271 explains '*in eodem angusta phaselos Aequore*, scilicet *est, fertur*.' Geuertius on the other hand, whom Markland follows, writes '*it eodem*' in u. 245. Mr Vollmer—but his explanation is only fit for a footnote.¹ Here is much ado

¹ 'Der Vordersatz geht bis *mali*; *inuasitque* hat *phaselos* zum Subject, *que* schliesst sich an das folgende *et*; der Tempuswechsel *inuasit* . . . *uindicat*, welcher bislang die Herausgeber zur falschen Interpunction nach *uias* veranlasst hat, besteht zu Recht: das Boot (hier nicht ein nachgeschleppter Kahn) hat mit dem grossen Schiffe zugleich die Fahrt angetreten und bekommt nun auf der ganzen Reise doch noch genug von dem Winde, der eben wie der Glanz des Kaiserhauses *immensus* ist.'

about a simple matter: *et* . . . *sibi* means *sibi quoque*.

V 2 58-60.

bibe talia pronis
auribus, haec certent tibi conciliare propinqui,
haec iterent comites praecepta senesque paterni.

talia and *haec* are the merits and achievements of Crispinus' father, which he is himself too young to remember. '*comites paterni sunt comites patris*' says Markland; '*sed quinam sint senes patris non intelligo*.' But to Mr Vollmer, whose fortitude enables him to reject Heinsius' *bibe* in u. 58 and retain the MS reading *tibi*, the phrase presents no difficulty: '*unter senes paterni* ist wohl der vom Vater bestellte tutor oder paedagogus verstanden.'

Statius wrote

haec iterent praecepta senes comitesque paterni.

A scribe passed from *-es* to *-es* and wrote *praecepta senesque paterni*, omitting *comites*: this word he then added in the margin. The next copyist saw that it must be inserted somewhere, but he did not see that *senes* and *que* must be wrenched apart and *comites* thrust between them: he placed it before *praecepta*, mending the metre and the grammar and not much concerned about the sense.

V 3 47-50.

atque utinam fortuna mihi, dare manibus
aras,
par templis opus, aeriamque educere molem
Cyclosum scopulos ultra atque audacia saxa
Pyramidum, et magno tumulum praetexere
luco.

When I first read Mr Vollmer's note, '*Cycl. scopulos* Plin. n. h. iii 89 *scopuli tres Cyclosum* bei Sicilien,' I did him the injustice of supposing that no one else could have mistaken the sense of the words. But when I turned to other editions I found none in which the phrase was explained aright. Is it then so hard to see that when *Cyclosum scopuli* are set beside *saxa Pyramidum* they must signify the architecture of Tiryns and Argos and Mycenae? Eur. Tro. 1087 sqq. Ἄργος, ἵνα τε τείχη λάϊνα Κυκλώπι' οὐράνια νέμονται, Sen. H.f. 996 sqq. '*maius mihi | bellum Mycenis restat, ut Cyclopia | euersa manibus saxa nostris concidant*,' Thy. 407 sq. '*Cyclosum sacras |*

turres, labore maius humano decus,' Stat. Theb. iv 151 'Cyclopus ductas sudoribus arces.' *scopulos* is just the word for the huge polygonal blocks of the Mycenaean masonry.

V 3 264-270.

quae lamenta tuli! ueniam concede,
manes,
fas dixisse, pater: non tu mihi plura
dedisses. 265
felix ille patrem uacuis circumdedit
ulnis
uellet et Elysia quamuis in sede locatum
abripere et Danaas iterum portare per
umbras
temptantem et uiuos molitum in Tartara
gressus
detulit infernae uates longaeua Dianae. 270

Whether 266-70 are punctuated thus, or whether with the old editors a colon is placed at the end of 268, the sentence has no meaning.¹ Aeneas, patrem post amplexus asportare temptantem (et, ut hoc addam, uiuum Tartara ingressum), detulit Sibylla! Everything, from the undefined *ille* of 266 to the serried absurdities of 269 sq., points in one direction: a verse has been lost after 268.

¹ 'Construere: *felix ille* (Aeneas) *patrem uacuis circumdedit ulnis* (vgl. Verg. A. vi 700 ff.) *et, quamuis uellet in El. sede locatum abripere et iterum per Danaas* (vergleichend wie einst in Ilion *per Danaos*) *umbras portare, temptantem* (scil. abripere et portare) *et uiuos gressus in T. molitum detulit Sibylla*' Vollmer.

felix ille patrem uacuis circumdedit ulnis
uellet et, Elysia quamuis in sede locatum,
abripere et Danaas iterum portare per
umbras,
<quem proli uentura suae praenoscere
fata>
temptantem et uiuos molitum in Tartara
gressus
detulit infernae uates longaeua Dianae.

I have borrowed the contents of my verse from iv 3 131 sqq., where the Sibyl says 'me duce praescios Auerni | Aeneas auide futura quaerens | lucos et penetrauit et reliquit.' All is now in order: *felix patrem amplexus est et, si liceret, abripere uellet ille, quem detulit Sibylla*. Another verse, as Dr Postgate has perceived and as Heinsius once conjectured (at Ouid. fast. i 287), is missing between 273 and 274: for example

si Thessalicis Admetus in oris
<coniuge ab infernis potuit gaudere re-
ducta>,
si lux una retro Phylaceida rettulit umbram.

Another again, as Markland detected, has been lost after 129.

Mr G. A. Davies has already brought back the sentence to its proper form by introducing the relative pronoun; but he alters the *temptantem* of 269 into *quem tandem*, removing an apt word and creating a coordination which is not apt, 'tandem et . . . molitum.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

QUINTILIAN'S QUOTATIONS FROM THE LATIN POETS.

THE question of the textual accuracy of the quotations in Quintilian is an important one in such a case as Hor. C. i. 12. 41, where all the MSS. of Horace give *incomptis capillis*, while Quintilian reads *intonsis capillis*. The editors of Horace do not agree in their estimates of the value of this indirect testimony—indirect in the sense that Quintilian's discussion is not concerned with this particular word—but none of them seems to have made a thorough test of the matter. This has been done, however, by Professor Morgan in the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. xii, pp. 234 ff., but only with reference to the quotations from Horace. The present paper has been prepared in the belief that a wider range of evidence, obtained in a search for all the dis-

crepancies between Quintilian and the poets from whom he quotes, throws new light upon the question. The references have all been drawn from the index of quotations in Meister's edition of Quintilian, vol. ii, pp. 339 ff. This list, while perhaps not absolutely complete, is at least nearly enough so to serve the present purpose. Authors of whom only fragments remain are not considered.

CATULLUS.

Six references to Catullus are recorded, but two of them are not quotations. One (i. 5. 20) is only an allusion to a poem, without reproduction of any part of it. The other (i. 5. 8) merely mentions the fact that Catullus uses the barbarous word *plexenum*.