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 *Siluae* of Statius

J. P. Postgate

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 07 / October 1903, pp 344 - 351

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00208494, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00208494

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate (1903). The Manuscript Problem in the *Siluae* of Statius. The Classical Review, 17, pp 344-351 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00208494

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE MANUSCRIPT PROBLEM IN THE *SILVAE* OF STATIUS.

My prediction in this Journal (vol. xvi. p. 421) that Herr A. Engelmann's dissertation there reviewed would raise a commotion in Germany has been speedily fulfilled, as may be seen from the literature cited in the footnote.¹ Of the writers upon the subject the co-editor of the *Leipziger Studien* is on the side of Herr Engelmann, and his paper would have been noticed in company with the dissertation had I then known of its existence. Herr Vollmer and the Teubner editor Herr Klotz are as we expect upon the other side. It is not my intention to follow this controversy, less important than the disputants imagine, through its entanglements of misconception and unimportant detail, but to offer, in continuation of my previous article, a summary of the chief issues which have emerged from the dispute and a contribution towards the solution of a perplexed and difficult problem.

I.—*The Vetus Poggii.*

Late in 1417 or early in 1418 the celebrated discoverer of ancient classics Poggio Bracciolini wrote from Constance to Francesco Barbaro a letter in which the following passage occurs.²

Ago tibi gratias pro xx florenis, quos dedisti Matthaeo: liberatus enim sum aere alieno, utque aliquid incipiam referre, mitto ad te per Presbyterum Brandinum Pisanum, qui est ex familia Cardinalis Pisani, Silium Italicum, libros V Statii Silvarum, item M. Manilium Astronomicum. Is qui libros *transcripsit* ignorantissimus omnium *viventium fuit*, divinare oportet non legere, ideoque opus est ut *transcribantur* per hominem doctum. Ego *legi usque ad xiii librum* Sili, multa emendavi, ita ut *recte scribenti* facile sit similes errores deprehendere eosque corrigere in reliquis libris, itaque da operam ut *transcribantur*, postea mittas illos Florentiam ad Nicolaum. Orationum volo hic exemplar remanere, post modum vel ego ipse deferam vel per alium ad te mittam, idque quam primum. Lucretius mihi *nondum redditus* est, cum sit *scriptus*: locus est satis longinquus, neque unde aliqui veniant: itaque expectabo quoad aliqui accedant qui illum deferant: sin autem nulli venient, non praeponom publica privatis.

This is the account of the discoverer himself and with this any restoration of the

history that we may choose to make is bound to square. I have therefore put in italics everything which bears immediately or mediately upon the origin of the manuscript or manuscripts which Poggio sent to his friends.

There are three possibilities with which we must reckon. Either (1) the copyist of the works enumerated was the original scribe, in which case Poggio bought the MS from the monks outright and had no copy made: or (2) the MS was copied for him by a 'local scribe' (Mr. Clark's phrase) as the Lucretius seems to have been: or (3) it was transcribed by some countryman of Poggio's who accompanied him.

The first view is that of Dr. C. Wachsmuth,³ it is *prima facie* consistent with the Latin, and I should hesitate to reject it unconditionally. But there are some considerations not to be ignored that militate against it. In the first place, we might have expected that Poggio would naturally and unconsciously express himself differently when treating of two such dissimilar transactions as the procuring of a copy of one author (Lucretius) and the securing of the exemplar of the others. But in his language appears no such difference, as is obvious on comparing his words for the copying in the two cases (*transcribere* and *scribere*). So if Poggio's correspondent perceived any difference, he must have had a knowledge of the circumstances which enabled him to go behind the words. For the rest, *fuit* is consistent with Prof. Wachsmuth's interpretation, but *viventium* seems somewhat to discountenance it. It would seem then that the first hypothesis is not so well supported by Poggio's actual phrases as either of the other two.

When Poggio received this MS, he read and corrected it as far as the 13th book of Silius, but no farther. Accordingly when the *Silvae* reached Barbaro for the purpose of being copied 'by a scholar,' and was subsequently sent to Niccolo at Florence, there were no corrections in it from the hand of Poggio. Poggio did not follow his MS to Italy: his hopes of preferment kept him at Constance about the person of the new Pope Martin V. When the Pontiff left Geneva on Sept. 12, 1418, Poggio left it too and travelled in the papal retinue as far as

¹ Curt Wachsmuth, 'Zu den Handschriften der Silven des Statius,' *Leipziger Studien*, 1902, pp. 203-214; Fr. Vollmer, 'Zur Ueberlieferung v. Statius' *Silvae*,' *Hermes* 38 (1903), pp. 134-139; A. Engelmann, 'Ueber die Handschriften der Silven des Statius,' *ib.* pp. 285-291; A. Klotz, *ib.* pp. 468-480.

² Mr. A. C. Clark in *Classical Review*, vol. xiii. 1899, pp. 124 *sq.*

³ Mr. Clark mentioned it as a possibility *l.c.* though he did not approve of it.

Mantua, where, as Mr. Clark says, he became desperate and suddenly went off to England without even taking leave of his friends. Martin V did not make his entry into Rome till the end of September 1420; and all this time Poggio was in Britain. He was there when Martin offered him the post of papal secretary. This offer was accepted, and Poggio returned to Italy at a date which cannot be fixed exactly but was not earlier than the very end of 1420.¹ The *Vetus Poggii* of the *Siluae* was then at Florence in the possession of Niccolo. This we know not merely from the presumption that Barbaro would carry out the instructions of his friend, but from a later letter of Poggio who complains that Niccolo kept the MS fourteen years.

Lucretium tenuisti per annos quattuordecim, eodem modo Asconium Pedianum, sic et Petronium Arbitrum et Statium Siluarum.—(Tonelli, i. p. 303).

It follows that Niccolo could not have had the *Vetus* before some not very early date in 1418 and Poggio could not have entered any correction in the MS till 1431 or 1432 at the earliest. As to the subsequent history of the *Vetus* during Poggio's lifetime we have no direct information; but it seems unlikely that he would again run the risk of losing his precious possession. His later years were untroubled by the monetary difficulties of his earlier life, and it is natural to suppose that the *Vetus* remained a part of his classical library till his death at Florence in 1459.

II.—*Politian's Vetus Poggii.*

Angelo Poliziano, the most brilliant scholar and poet among the Italians of his time, was born in 1454, five years before the death of Poggio. At the age of ten he began to study Latin in Florence, just the same number of years after the decease of its illustrious Chancellor; eight years more and he produced an edition of Catullus. Five years later he was chosen to be tutor to the children of the Prince of Florence and before he was thirty he was recognised as the most eminent of the classical professors of Italy, a pre-eminence never questioned during the ten years of life which alone remained to him.

For Politian the *Siluae* of Statius seem to have had a special attraction. He lectured on them publicly in the year 1481;

¹ In Pastor's *History of the Popes* (Eng. tr.), I. p. 258, the year is given as 1423.

but his interest goes back further still as we learn from a letter which he wrote to Filippo Beroaldo in the last year of his life (April 1, 1494) where he refers to annotations on the *Siluae* which, while still a youth and before the death of Domitius (that is before 1478), he had entered in the margins of his own 'codex' (quas ego adulescens vivente adhuc Domitio marginibus domestici codicis adscripseram). The fruit of his studies is seen in the felicitous emendations which have obtained a place in the text.

Some time between the years 1475 and 1494 (Klotz), or between the first of April and the end of September 1494 (Engelmann), Politian had a piece of good fortune which must be told in his own words. These are extant in a copy of the *editio princeps* of the *Siluae* at the Corsini Library in Rome, and stand, as an epilogue 'To the Reader' at the end of the selection of manuscript readings which he had transcribed into that copy with his own hand.

Incidi in exemplar Statii Sylvarum quod ex Gallia Poggius Gallica scriptum manu attulerat. A quo videlicet uno licet mendoso depravatoque et (ut arbitror) etiam dimidiato reliqui omnes codices qui sunt in manibus emanarunt. Quare cautio mihi fuit ne quid in corrigendo hoc nostro ab illo mutarem. Ne nimia (ut adsolet) diligentia aut mihi aut ceteris studiosis noceret. Quem si modum tenerent ceteri librorum emendatores tenuissentque priores, minus multo laboris in hac re quam nunc habemus haberemus. vale qui legis et quod sedulo fecimus queso Boni consule.

Tuus Angelus Politianus

This is the last we hear of the *Vetus Poggii*.

III.—*The Credibility of Politian's Statements.*

It might have been supposed that the precise statements of a scholar of the domicile, the date, and the standing of Politian in a matter where we can impute no motive for distorting the truth would have been accepted without question. And so they were, until the patrons of the recently discovered Madrid MS used every weapon to force their favourite upon public acceptance, not merely as the best but as the sole representative of the genuine tradition of the text.² With these pretensions the

² Herr Vollmer has *Hermes* p. 135 n. 'it is certain that M stands at the head of all our MSS.' *ib.* p. 138 'M is the only source of our tradition.' These statements are not equivalent, whatever Herr Vollmer may think.

statement of Politian and the evidence of his excerpts could by no possibility be reconciled; and accordingly they must be got out of the way. There were two effective modes of doing this. You could assert that Politian is not to be believed when he states that he found the MS of Poggio; or you could assert that he is not to be believed in his account of the lections which he professed to have excerpted therefrom. I will deal with these contentions successively. Of the anterior plausibility of the first the reader can judge for himself from the facts and dates about Politian which have been given above. That he did find some codex which he believed to be ancient has not yet been denied. But it is alleged that this distinguished professor of Florence was so ignorant of the handwriting of his own countrymen within the previous fifty years that he mistook some copy of the Madrid MS for the *Vetus Poggii* itself, a MS written either in Florence or Rome for one in a foreign script (*Gallica manu scriptum*).¹ The elementary ignorance which this imputes to a student of manuscripts like Politian is such that, apart from all other considerations, I feel compelled to accept the statement of Politian that he did find the *Vetus Poggii*, even at the expense of rejecting the statement of scholars four hundred years later that he did not.

The second theory is hardly less derogatory to Politian but in a different way. He *did* find, it is admitted, the *Vetus Poggii*, but (seeing that we know that the *Vetus* is the *Matritensis*) he could not read what he

found. For it did not contain what he says that it did.

Now all that we know of Politian's manuscript is what he tells us and the only way of determining whether it was our *Matritensis* is to compare his account with that codex. First then it is admitted on all hands that in contents, that is in actual readings, there was a very close similarity between the two manuscripts. For this purpose it is not necessary to draw upon the lections which from the similarity of the ink and handwriting are maintained by Herr Engelmann to be undoubtedly excerpts of Politian's: it is enough to refer to those which are assigned by name to the *vetus codex* and for which Klotz Praef. p. liv and Engelmann, p. 141, use the symbol A*. Against these striking correspondences in the lections of the two codices are to be set differences no less striking.

These differences are the following:

1. Politian's codex was written in a 'Gallic' hand. For the script of the *Matritensis* see below.

2. Politian conjectured from the condition of his codex that it was mutilated (*dimidiatus*).

The *Matritensis* ends with a clear subscription:

FINIS ADEST VERE PRECIUM VULT SCRIPTOR
HABERE.

3. The verse l. 4. 86a

attollam cantu gaudet thrasymennus et
alpes

stood in the text of the editio princeps and opposite it Politian noted 'hic versus deest i libro vetustissimo poggii qui e Germania in Italiã e relatus.' The verse is in its place in the *Matritensis*.

Now those who maintain that Politian's codex was the *Matritensis* accuse him, as Klotz says, referring to the third consideration alone, of the grossest negligence; Si quis tenuerit eundem esse codicem Poggianum et M—id quod minime suadeo—is *summae arguet negligentiae Politianum* (my italics) qui versum I. 4 86a in suo exemplari scriptum deesse contenderit,' p. lxxiii. But that is not all. They involve themselves in hopeless inconsistency. The only evidence for the identification is the testimony of Politian, and if in a crucial matter he is so untrustworthy, we can believe nothing that he says.

¹ I translate Herr Vollmer's little romance for the benefit of the English reader. 'Of course Politian knew that Poggio had found the *Silvae*. Now he came upon an exemplar *Gallica scriptum manu* i.e. in the archaising learned hand of the 15th century, and in this stood written by some one or other' [here are then things that Herr Vollmer does not know] 'the observation *istum librum ex Gallia Poggiius attulit* as in late MSS of the elegies to Maecenas we find *inuenta ab Henoc in Dacia*, or in the Ambrosianus of the Orestis tragoedia *Horestis fabula ab Enoch Asculano reperta*. The writer of this of course only meant this to apply to the *Silvae* in general: but Politian referred the notice to the codex before him, which on the ground of the writing he might well regard as a Poggianus.' *Hermes* p. 138. Herr Klotz approves of this *ib.* p. 480 'Die Möglichkeit dieses Irrthums hat Vollmer S. 138 vollständig glaubhaft (my italics) erklärt.'

It may be worth while adding here that in another case Politian was perfectly well able to distinguish between an old manuscript of foreign origin, the Ambrosianus of Columella, and a copy of a Poggianus made by Poggio's contemporary Niccolo (Haeussner, *Die Handschriftliche Ueberlieferung des Columella*, p. 10).

IV. *The date and handwriting of the Matritensis.*

The Matritensis has now forced its way into the discussion, and its claims to consideration can be no longer ignored.

When we have to fix in time and space any document as to whose origin we have no direct contemporary testimony, the evidence to be weighed is of two kinds which differ radically from each other. One is internal and is concerned with the contents of the document, and the other is external and is concerned with its form. It is imperative that these two kinds should be judged apart and with a single eye.

For this reason I submitted the problem of the date and handwriting of the Matritensis to acknowledged palaeographical experts who have no concern, or, I believe, acquaintance with this controversy. Their judgment which I proceed to quote was based on the reproduction of the first page of the codex at the end of the Teubner text, and is contained in a letter of Mr. F. G. Kenyon of date October 7, 1902. The following extract expresses the joint opinions of Sir E. M. Thompson, Mr. G. F. Warner, and Mr. Kenyon himself upon the three queries submitted: (1) As to the date of the MS, (2) As to its writing, (3) As to the question 'Would a Florentine scholar in say 1490 describe the MS as *'Gallica scriptum manu,'* or as *'Germanici librarii'?*

'Statius: this is more difficult to fix, but it appears to be earlier than the others' [Two MSS dated about 1470-1480 and somewhere about 1457] 'and probably circa 1430. The hand appears to be decidedly Italian; and it does not seem likely that it would be described by a Florentine as German or French: at the same time we have too few examples of south German and south French hands of this type and period to be able to dogmatise.'

From this independent judgment on the part of recognised authorities on the subject we learn that it is reasonable to hold first that the Matritensis may have been written in Italy between say the years 1420-1432, and secondly that it is not likely to have been the codex described by Politian as 'written in a Gallic hand.'

We have hitherto only regarded the text of the manuscript. But it contains corrections which have a bearing on the dispute. Herr Krohn who had abundant opportunities of studying the various hands distinguishes those made by the scribe him-

self (M^1), a first corrector (M^2 'manus altera' Klotz p. xc) and subsequent correctors (*m reliquae manus correctrices* Klotz *ib.*).¹ This corrector Herr Krohn and the Teubner editor identify with Poggio on the strength of the similarities in the formation of this corrector's letters and of the marginalia and corrections in a MS at Berlin (Hamiltoniensis 166) in the undoubted writing of Poggio. With the aid of a friend who has an excellent eye for the niceties of calligraphy I have compared the writing of the corrector M^1 on the first page of the Matritensis with that in two photographed pages of the Berlin MS kindly lent to me by Mr. Clark; and I incline to think with him that the handwritings may well be the same but that it would be rash to pronounce positively.

I should however myself have no reluctance in accepting Herr Krohn's opinion. For there is no reason why these corrections should not have been made by Poggio when superintending the production of a legible copy of the *Vetus* after its recovery from Niccolo, a conclusion fatal to the identification of the Matritensis with the *Vetus* which, as we know from Poggio himself, (p. 344 above) he had not read, much less annotated, beyond the 13th book of Silius.²

It seems a moderate and cautious conclusion from the evidence to say that the Madrid codex is a copy of the *Vetus Poggii* made after its arrival in Italy.

There is an argument to which, although it concerns the contents more than the form of the MS, I had better now advert. It is that drawn from the ignorance of the scribe. The same advocates who a while ago were so strangely lax in the interpretation of Poggio's statements now press them for all they are worth. The argument is this. The scribe of the *Vetus* was 'ignorantissimus omnium viventium'; the scribe of the Matritensis was, as we can see, 'ignorantissimus omnium viventium.' Therefore the scribe of the Matritensis was the scribe of the *Vetus*. The gaping character of this syllogism it requires no special training in logic to perceive. But let that pass. In this same Madrid library is a manuscript of a work of which Poggio obtained a copy at the same time as the

¹ Examples of M^1 , M^2 , and *m* may be seen in the page reproduced at the end of the Teubner text.

² Here I must contend against Mr. Clark (*l.c.* p. 127) and others that we are bound to take the plain meaning of Poggio's words. If we do not, we have no right to any opinion on the matter at all.

Siluae. This MS we know from the collation published by Professor Ellis in this periodical (vols. vii. 310 sq. 356 sq. 406 sq., viii. 4 sq. 138 sq. 289 sq.)¹ and this is what, according to Prof. Ellis, it gives for Manilius IV 410-414

Per denos numeros et quae sint insiſta
cuique
Sed proprias partes ipsas spectare
memento
Vel glacie rigidas uel quae sexus erat
ignis
Et sceleris utroque tamen quas largior
umor
Quaque minor ibi touit namque omnia
mixtis.

This is enough. But no one has ever identified this 'ignorantissimus omnium uiventium' either with the Poggian copyist of Manilius or with the scribe of the Matritensis of the Siluae.

V.—*The Discrepancies between the Matritensis and the Excerpts.*

We have been carried by the drift of our argument towards the conclusion that the Matritensis is a copy of the *Vetus* and that the Excerpts are extracts from the *Vetus*. But serious difficulties remain to be overcome before we can accept this conclusion. Although there are a very large number of surprising coincidences between the lections of the *Vetus* as testified by the Matritensis and by the Excerpts, there are some quite as surprising divergencies.

I will take the first that comes as it has not been accorded the prominence which it deserves. In the *praefatio* to Book I. M has a gap of about eleven letters thus 'quid enim quoque auctoritate editionis onerari.' In the margin of the Corsini stands the supplement oportet huius. But (Engelmann, dissertation, pp. 85, 112) *only the o is in the writing of Politian*, the rest being supplied by another hand. Now where did this mysterious *o* come from? Not certainly from the Matritensis or any descendant of it. When a scribe fills up a gap, it is with words and not with a meaningless and ridiculously inadequate letter. The only rational explanation is Herr Engelmann's that the scribe of M did

not make out the *o* in the *Vetus* and that Politian did.

In another discrepancy the advantage lies with the Matritensis which has preserved a vestige of the truth lost in Politian's Excerpts. After the lines

Libyci quid mira tributi
obsequii et missum media de pace triumphum
laudem et opes tantas nec qui mandauerat
ausus
expectare fuit gaudet Thrasymentus et
Alpes (I. 4. 83 sqq.)

it has the extra line

Attollam cantu gaudet Thrasymentus et
Alpes.

Herr Engelmann who, as I have said before, 'holds a brief against the Matritensis,' would have it that this line is an interpolation of that MS, as if any one out of Bedlam 'interpolated' lines of this kind. I should not have referred again to this error which has since been exposed by Herr Klotz and Herr Vollmer: but its owner clings to it still; and, so far from having realized what constitutes an interpolation and under what conditions ditto-graphy arises, thinks he advances his cause by showing that his two adversaries' supplements for the end of 86 are inadmissible. Why if he showed that of a hundred such supplements as <sed quid tua, Gallica, facta> Attollam (Klotz olim), or <nec oportet lauriger ipse> Attollam (Vollmer, *Hermes*, 137), or <cur ipse ego facta necesse est> Attollam (Klotz nunc) each and all were intolerable, he would be no farther on. He must apply himself to a supplement which Statius might have written, not to those which could by no possibility be his. Such a supplement I have provided elsewhere.²

Confronted then by the witness of the Matritensis that the line was in the *Vetus Poggii* and by the witness of Politian that it was not, what are we to suppose? We may say that either witness is false or we may say that the *Vetus* was not the same. If we suppose that the line stood in the *Vetus*

² See *Classical Review*, vol. 16. p. 422 sq.

¹ I give the full references in order that any one who likes may test the ignorance of this scribe for himself and compare the result with the ignorance displayed in the Matritensis, a long extract from which is printed verbatim and literatim in Klotz *praef.* p. xlii. sqq.

At the request of correspondents I note that there is no error on p. 421 col. b of this notice in the passage: 'That the Matritensis . . . is not the "uetus codex Poggii" should be settled once and for all by the fact that according to the express testimony of Politian the "uetus" did not contain the line I. 4. 86a, and the Matritensis does contain it. If it is not, then, for all the good the Corsini copy is for the textual criticism of the Siluae, it might be flung into the Tiber.' 'If it is not' means 'if it is not so settled.'

when the *Matritensis* was written and was subsequently erased, we obtain a simple and sufficient solution of the difficulty.

Politian believed that the MS he had lighted upon was the genuine MS of Poggio, the one uncorrupted source of the text of the *Silvae*, and he would feel bound to take it as it stood. If there were alterations in it, and these there would be unless Poggio never did in Statius what he has told us he did in Silius, Politian could hardly fail to take them as authoritative. His great predecessor was the only one who had had access to the sole genuine tradition of the classic that he had rescued from oblivion; and he had no doubt good warrant for the alterations which he had made in his copy. The impeccable scribe was unknown to Poggio and Politian.

It will doubtless be urged that Politian's *deest versus* is not a proper way of describing a verse which was merely erased in the *Vetus*. But it is to be observed that we do not know *where* it stood in that MS. It may well have stood in the margin. The homoiographon gaudet Thrasymennus et alpes may have already produced the omission which Herr Klotz postulates in order to facilitate his derivation of all other existing MSS from the *Matritensis*.¹ The scribe of M, a most faithful copyist, may have noticed the mark which drew attention to this omission, and have restored the line to the text. Its subsequent erasure from the margin of the *Vetus* might well escape observation.

There is now no serious obstacle to our explanation. All remaining differences are of a comparatively trivial character; and with the supposition of a very moderate amount of correction in the *Vetus* before it came into the hands of Politian they vanish away.

It is always a satisfaction when a view adopted after long and anxious consideration is confirmed by the independent judgment of a competent critic who has himself been over the same ground, and hence I make no excuse for quoting from a letter of Mr. G. A. Davies, my colleague in the task of editing the *Silvae* for the Corpus, of date May 4, 1903, the following sentence

'Your conclusion as to the relations of M and Politian's excerpts is exactly the one which had commended itself to me; indeed it seems impossible to reach any other conclusion from the evidence.'

¹ See VII, below.

IV.—*The Script of the Vetus.*

A number of attempts have been made to write the history of the *Vetus*, that is to say of the exemplar of the *Matritensis*, by an examination of the corruptions which this MS contains. They have not been conspicuously successful, for the matter is hedged with difficulties into which I have no space to enter at present. But I will mention a possible solution which is based upon suggestions made by Dr. L. Traube, of Munich, and Mr. F. Jenkinson, of Cambridge, that a number of our difficulties would disappear if we supposed it to have been a copy by an Irish scribe of a St. Gallen MS of, say, the ninth or tenth century.

There is here no reason against his being, as Mr. Clark suggests, a local scribe.

VII.—*The origin of the Vulgar MSS.*

Herr Klotz has expended a good deal of pains on the examination of these MSS and has come to the conclusion that M is the progenitor of them all. That all extant MSS are ultimately derived from the *Vetus* we know from the direct witness of Politian; and the line of descent may have passed through the *Matritensis*. This is however no longer a self-evident proposition, but a hypothesis which requires further consideration. It is not refuted, as Klotz very rightly points out, by the fact that the errant line I. 4 86a is omitted in some of these MSS. This hexameter's position was obviously a precarious one and the causes tending to produce its omission would be always operative. But I cannot regard his discussion as conclusive, as it does not take account of the crucial evidence.

This is to be sought not so much in the agreements between the *Matritensis*, and the other MSS as in their agreements against the *Matritensis* with the readings recorded by Politian from the *Vetus*. One of the most important is the lacuna in the *prae-fatio*. If the original scribe of a manuscript has left a lacuna of eleven to twelve letters here, that is a strong argument for descent from the *Matritensis*. If on the other hand he has written *o* alone, leaving the rest to be filled up subsequently, his exemplar cannot have been M or a descendant of M; while if it has '*oportet*,' or the like, it very likely was not so either. About some of the MSS in England I have made inquiries. I am indebted to Mr. S. G. Owen for information about the reading of the Bodleian MS, Auct. F. 85 (F Klotz) and

to Miss Alford for information about the British Museum MS (Add. 6056). In F there is a 'lacuna of about twelve letters.' In Add. 6056 "oportet huius" is written by a different hand in a space left.' Both MSS have I. 4 86a, F in the form 'Attollam cantu gaudet thrasymemnis et alpes' (the same spelling and dots in the previous line also), Add. 6056 in the form 'Attollam cantu gaudet trasimenus et alpes.' That F is derived from M seems therefore possible (compare the report of its reading at I. i. 38, Klotz p. xlv.), and the same may be said of Add. 6056. Further than this with the material at my disposal I feel unable to go.

The origin of the vulgar MSS is a matter of comparatively little importance: it would be of more as soon as it could be shown that some of them derive from a copy of the *Vetus* made before it was 'corrected.' So I will only indicate one consideration, not without weight, which militates against the view that they are all descended from M. The extent and rapidity of the depravation of the vulgar text, as shown in the editio princeps (1470)¹, is without justification if the exemplar was no worse than the *Matritensis*; but it would be intelligible if these codices are descended from a bad copy of a manuscript as to which its owner wrote that you could not read it but only guess at what was intended.

VIII.—*The Sources to be used in the constitution of the text.*

The rest of our task may be briefly despatched. If the *Matritensis* was a copy of the uncorrected *Vetus*, it has a clear advantage over copies and excerpts made after the importation into the exemplar of corrections whose motives and sources we are now unable to trace, and this advantage is confirmed by the unmistakable fidelity of this copy. The alterations made in the *Vetus* by Poggio or others may have been justified, but alterations they certainly were, and they were made at a time and a place at which the exemplar of the *Vetus* was no longer accessible. While therefore it is our duty to take account of readings of the Excerpts which differ from M's, we must beware of attributing to them an exaggerated importance. A difference may be due to error in M: it may also be due to correction of the

Vetus or possibly to some mistake of Politian. Two or three illustrations will suffice.

At III 5.21 the *Vetus* had 'impenetrabile' which, and not '*haut* penetrabile' (rightly censured by Herr Engelmann p. 92) I had noted should be restored from M's '*ut* penetrabile' some months before the appearance of his dissertation. Similar corruptions occur elsewhere in M: cf. Engelmann p. 19. On the other hand in II 1. 120, III 1. 145, II 3. 55 M gives in 'umida' 'umentibus' 'umeris,' genuine and classical spellings of the *Vetus*, afterwards corrupted to the contemporary forms with *h* that appear in the Excerpts and which Herr Engelmann (p. 96) is so ill advised as to defend.

At IV 4.73 the Excerpts have 'auus,' but M the uncorrected *Vetus* reading 'auos,' rightly retained by Klotz. Statius, like his contemporaries Juvenal and Martial, wrote at least occasionally the ancient -o after u which was almost obsolete in his time. There are very few traces left of this spelling, not however none as Herr Engelmann asserts (p. 97). I note from the excellent Pithoeanus the following: *Theb.* 2. 442 'uolgi,' 9.741 'toruosque,' *Achill.* 1. 814 'nouos' with u written over the o, as at *Theb.* 12. 631 'elisos' was 'corrected' in just the same way to the usual 'Elisus.' How forms like this fare even in the best MSS may be seen from *ib.* 3.192 'magniloquos luit' where P, mis-reading 'luit' as 'iuit,' at the same time changed the supposed nominative 'magniloquos' to 'magnilocus.' I cite finally a place where the o has eluded destruction in the general corruption of the context. The violent Eteocles is replying to Tydeus, the rough-tongued ambassador of Polynices, (*Theb.* 2. 415 *sqq.*)

cognita si dubiis fratris mihi iurgia signis
ante forent nec clara odiorum arcana
paterent,
sufficeret uel sola fides quod toruos et illum
mente gerens, ceu saepta nouus iam moenia
luxet
fossor et hostiles inimicent classica turmas,
praefuris.

All our MSS have the corrupt *quam* for *quod*. In the next words the *toruos* et of all but P is right, the spelling apart, and this P indicates in its *seruo sed*. The sense is clear: 'Even if I had not already had the clearest tokens of my brother's hatred, your hostile language which is only in keeping on the field of battle would by itself have been proof enough.'

In each of these cases the change attested

¹ In the preface to Book II Engelmann notes 37 differences from the *Matritensis*, 28 of which the Excerpts correct into the exact reading of that MS (pp. 107 *sqq.*).

by the Excerpts was trivial but wrong: in another it was more important and right. The inscription of II 7 is *ad oppiam* in M and in the Laurentianus, the only old manuscript which contains any part of the Siluae. But the Excerpts have *ad pollam*. The agreement of M and L shows, as Herr Klotz rightly contends, that *ad oppiam* is the tradition and was the reading of the *Vetus*; and it would follow that *ad pollam* is an emendation, and probably an emendation of Poggio's.

Our conclusion then is this. In emending the numerous corruptions of the *Siluae* we must start from the Matritensis but employ the testimony of the Excerpts wherever there is no reason for disbelieving that it rests upon the primal text of the *Vetus*. Wherever there is serious discrepancy between the two authorities, our choice must, as in all such matters, be determined by intrinsic considerations.

J. P. POSTGATE.

NOTES.

A CORRECTION.—I may perhaps save some fellow-student from wasting time in a fruitless search if I call attention to a failure on the part of some high authorities to verify their references, which has lately caused me considerable trouble.

Zeller, Steinhart (*Platons Leben*, p. 328) and the writer of the article on Plato in Smith's *Dictionary of Biography and Mythology* all, in relating the story told by Diogenes Laertius on the authority of Hermippus that Plato died at a marriage feast, add to their reference to Diogenes another to Augustine *de Civitate Dei*, viii. 2.

Any mention of the tale will however be sought in vain at this place, and a hunt through the numerous allusions to Plato in Augustine will be found equally useless.

The source of the wrong reference is a note of the sixteenth-century translator of Diogenes, Thomas Aldobrandinus, on the passage (iii. 2) in which the account of Plato's death is given. After mentioning that while Cicero says he died writing, Diogenes Laertius says he died dining, Aldobrandinus passes on to consider the various statements of our authorities concerning the philosopher's age at the time of his death. As to this he states that 'S. Aug. lib. 8 de civitate Dei cap. 11' (not 2: the numbers are Arabic, not Roman) says 'idem quod Laertius'; that is, not that he died dining, but that he died aged 81; whereas St. Jerome, following Cicero, had made him only 80. It is to be observed that the agreement of Augustine with Diogenes in this point depends upon Aldobrandinus' own translation of Diogenes' *βιοῦς* as *cum uivisset*; whereas, rightly translated, Diogenes is found rather to confirm Cicero and Jerome. According to Seneca, *Ep.* 53, however, Plato died on his eighty-first birthday.

The note of Aldobrandinus will be found on p. 36 of the commentary added to his translation of Diogenes published at Rome in 1594.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

* * *

ST. LUKE ILLUSTRATED BY AESCHYLUS.—I do not know whether the following coincidence has been pointed out before, but a single line of Aeschylus seems to me to offer a striking parallel to the words of our Lord as recorded by St. Luke (xiv. 26) 'If any man cometh unto me, and *hateth* not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children,

and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple'—words which, taken literally as they stand, must have caused great searchings of heart to countless numbers of readers.

In a scene in Aeschylus towards the close of the *Choephoroi* where Orestes is depicted as halting between two opinions as to the duty of avenging his father's murder, he is obviously touched by his mother's natural allusion to his infant tendance at her hands, and is only confirmed in his determination by the grimly laconic reply of the friend to whom he has appealed:—

ἀπαντας ἐχθροὺς τῶν θεῶν ἡγοῦ πλέον
(*Cho.* 902)

i.e. 'deem all creation [*ἀπαντας* very emphatic] your *ἐχθροί* (fit and proper objects of your *ἐχθρός*) rather than the gods (whose *ἐχθρός* you must necessarily incur by disobedience).'

In both the heathen and inspired phraseology the meaning is practically the same—that the natural affections are the strongest and highest and purest influences known to humanity [note the insistence with which such relations are categorically harped upon in the passage from St. Luke], but that even these must be ignored and allowed to count as nothing in the balance if, or when, they clash with the express will and purpose of God.

W. F. R. SHILLETO.

OXFORD, May 16, 1903.

* * *

QUERY. VERSIONS INTO GREEK AND LATIN PROSE.—The undersigned will be much obliged if any of the readers of the *C.R.* can give him information as to the following:—

1. F. A. Paley's Translation into Greek Iambics of 'A change came o'er the spirit of my dream.' Holden, Fol. S. iii. p. 408. 2. F. A. Paley's Translation into Greek Prose of an English Passage commencing 'Sacrifices formed a part of every ancient system of religion . . .' 3. The English Passage, or a reference thereto, of the Greek Prose Version by F. A. Paley, beginning: *ὁ μὲν ἥλιος πάνυ σεμνῶς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς*. 4. The English Passage, or a reference thereto, of the Latin Prose Version by F. A. Paley, beginning 'Humanam naturam si quis recte aestimare velit . . .' The English commences 'To form a right judgment . . .' which is the only clue.

F. T. RICKARDS.

Victoria Terminus, Bombay

A A 2