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 Manuscript Problem in the *Silvae* of Statius.—Addendum

J. P. Postgate

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 01 / February 1904, pp 43 - 43

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00209165, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00209165

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate (1904). The Manuscript Problem in the *Silvae* of Statius.—Addendum. The Classical Review, 18, pp 43–43 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00209165

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE MANUSCRIPT PROBLEM IN THE *SILVAE* OF STATIUS.—ADDENDUM.

SOME observations upon my paper in the October No. of the *Classical Review* courteously communicated by Mr. A. C. Clark and Dr. A. Klotz make it necessary for me again to advert to this question.

1. Mr. Clark tells me that the *Matritensis* of Manilius is in the same handwriting as the *Matritensis* of the *Silvae*, and not in a different one as I had assumed, *i.e.* pp. 347–8. The comparison of a photographed page of the Manilius, which Mr. Clark was good enough to lend me, with a similar reproduction of a page of the *Silvae* has convinced me that this is the case.

My argument did not, however, depend on the diversity of the script in the two cases; but on the insufficiency of the proof which was drawn from the ignorance of the scribe. The fact that the scribe of the two *Matritenses* was a very ignorant man by no means proves that he was Poggio's 'ignorantissimus uiuentium.' Crass ignorance is by no means so uncommon as that.

2. Dr. Klotz informs me that he and Dr. Krohn lay a great deal more stress on the resemblance of the writing of the corrector in the *Matritensis* of the *Silvae* (M^2) to that of the *Matritensis* of Asconius and Valerius

Flaccus (class mark X. 81, Klotz Praef. p. xlix.) than on its resemblance to that of *Hamiltoniensis* 166. I am sorry if I have misrepresented the German scholars' views. But I certainly thought that the appeal was ultimately to the *Hamiltoniensis* which is in the undoubted writing of Poggio. X. 81 has indeed a *scriptio*, ending *Nos quod potuimus egimus Poggius Florentinus*, which may, unlike a number of other *subscriptiones*, be an autograph. But how is it proved to be such? If the proof be not the similarity of its script to an undoubted Poggian MS, I do not know what it is; and if so, then it is surely more logical to compare M^2 with the writing by which we have determined that of X. 81 to be Poggian. In fine two propositions must be established: (1) that M^2 is the handwriting of the scribe of X. 81; (2) that this scribe is Poggio himself. Of these two propositions I still await the proof. But it is a matter of indifference to my argument whether it be furnished or not, as I showed on p. 347*b*; and, as I said there, I am quite prepared to 'accept Herr Krohn's opinion.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

NOTE ON TACITUS *AGRICOLA*, 33. 2.

The first words of Agricola's speech stand thus in the MSS: 'Septimus annus est, commilitones, ex quo virtute et auspiciis imperii Romani, fide atque opera nostra, Britanniam vicistis.' Recent editors seem to have found much difficulty in the words 'virtute et auspiciis imp. Rom.'; and as I gather from Furneaux' edition, Peter alone has tried to explain them (wrongly, as I think) by making 'imperii Romani' equivalent to 'imperatoris,' and understanding the auspicia as those of Domitian. Furneaux adopts Nipperdey's conjecture, 'ex quo virtute vestra, auspiciis imperii Romani, fide atque opera nostra,' which is open to the serious objection that Tacitus would hardly have wedged in the auspicia between the virtue of the soldiers and the fides and opera of Agricola. Urlichs' 'auspiciis imp. Rom., virtute et fide vestra atque opera nostra' is not only violent, but spoils the rhythm of the sentence.

I venture to suggest that the MS reading is right, that the combination of virtue and auspicia is not un-Tacitean, that the words should be understood in a general sense and not of the Emperor, and that Tacitus was here thinking of the familiar passage of Virgil (Aen. VI. 781), 'En hujus, nate, auspiciis illa incluta Roma Imperium terris, animos aequabit Olympo.' Just above (29. 4) he has used words from this same book of the Aeneid, 'quibus cruda ac viridis senectus'; (Aen. VI. 304), and I am inclined to guess that his 'imperialist' feeling led him to the great 'Heldenschau' of his favourite poet at the moment when he was about to describe the contribution of Agricola towards the extension of the Roman dominion, for in it he would find in poetic combination the ideas of auspicia, virtue, and imperium. That auspicia could be used in a general sense, without special reference to an individual magistrate, seems