

# 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](#)



---

**Lafaye's Notes on Statius Silv. I. and Klotz; Curae Statianae *Quelques notes sur les Silvae de Stace, premier livre*, par G. Lafaye. Paris, Klincksieck. 1896. Fr. 2.50. *Curae Statianae*. Dissertatio inauguralis. Scripsit A. Klotz. Leipzig. 1896. 1 Mk. 20.**

Robinson Ellis

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 01 / February 1897, pp 43 - 47

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00026081, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00026081](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00026081)

**How to cite this article:**

Robinson Ellis (1897). The Classical Review, 11, pp 43-47 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00026081

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

will look at i. 324-6, I shall be surprised if he approves Francken's putting 326 before 325. The reason given seems to me absurdly inadequate. And the further change of order in 326 (putting *scelerum* before *Syllam* in order to make it go with *docilis*) is an equally wanton disturbance.

On the other hand the editor keeps *motus* and *monitus* in i. 587-8, where I believe that Graevius Heins Burman and Schrader rightly transpose the words, and where a slip of eye and pen was so very easy. However, he may be right. His note on the clever conjecture *fulminis edoctus mentem* &c. is amusing, for we are told that Bentley was 'ut saepius, ornare potius quam emendare studens.' Which recalls to mind two famous lines of Burns.

There are many lines in Lucan where the order of words is differently given in different MSS. But i. 160, 589, are not instances of this, and Hosius rightly keeps the traditional order. But in 583 Francken is very likely right in reading *fracto Marium* with VG, for the other order is surely worse.

There are of course a number of passages where the MSS readings differ, where either reading makes sense, and where a final decision satisfactory to all scholars is perhaps not to be looked for. Here are a few passages where Hosius and Francken disagree, and where it is hard indeed to decide between them. Francken's reading is given first, and the MSS authority is appended to each.

I. 37 *ipsa* VUB<sup>1</sup>G<sup>1</sup>(AE), *ista* M. 103 *frangat* VAm C(BE), *franget* MUGT. 209 *iubam et vasto grave murmur* AGm (B<sup>1</sup>E), *iubas et vasto murmur* MVU. 453 *datur* MU, *datum* Gm [*datum est* VABEgT]. 531 *denso* Gm (and V acc to Hosius), *tenso* UCA(BE)v g (and M, but *in rasura* acc to Francken). 646 *an tollet* VUG, *attollet* A (B and *in ras* E) M (*in ras* acc to Francken).

In some passages where the two editors agree I still have doubts: here are some. Their text is given first.

I. 320 *micantes* A(BE)mu, *minantes* M VUGb, 588 *errantis* VUGmb, *volitantis* MA (BE) u g. 687 *Enyo* Vc, *Erinyes* (in various spellings) MABEUGv.

Questions of orthography are the plague of editors of Latin texts. Prof. Francken's rule is [Intr. pp. xxxvi. foll.] to note the instances where MSS preserve archaic spelling, whether this be accepted in the text or not. He himself uses a varying spelling, but gives no clear account of the method by which it is arrived at. Hosius [praef. pp. xxiv. xxv.] on the contrary leaves no doubt as to his procedure. Our editor however points out that the palimpsest fragments confirm his spelling in various points, though they are too meagre to furnish a standard. For instance *harena*. Why *arena* should nevertheless occur in the text [cf. i. 368, 685] is a natural question. The wording of this part of the introduction is certainly obscure. I will only note in the text *cespes*, *cohercere*, *limphatus*, *circuire*, *Tibris*, *exiliere* (488), and *maenia*. The last seems to be the cause of the misprint *manibus* (571). I should add that misprints are rare in this book.

Punctuation is a matter on which there are and will be wide differences of opinion. As instances of innovations in which I cannot agree it will be enough to refer to i. 126, 311, 520, 648.

I have not dealt with the details of books ii.-v., for my main object is to exhibit the freedom with which the editor has treated the MSS tradition whenever he finds cause of offence in the traditional text. With the utmost respect for him as a scholar, I must submit that his procedure is wholly inadmissible. To multiply details would serve no good purpose. If my principles are shown to be wrong I shall gladly welcome the exposure: meanwhile I have said enough to raise a serious and definite issue.

The photographic specimens of the codices A M V are interesting. I only hope that the second volume will contain a specimen of U. Of the printing &c. it need only be said that the book is produced in a style worthy of the traditions of the Dutch press.

W. E. HEITLAND.

#### LAFAYE'S NOTES ON *STATIUS SILV. I.* AND KLOTZ; *CURAE STATIANAE*.

*Quelques notes sur les Silvae de Stace, premier livre*, par G. LAFAYE. Paris, Klincksieck. 1896. Fr. 2.50. *Curae Statianae. Dissertatio inauguralis*. Scripsit A. KLOTZ. Leipzig. 1896. 1 Mk. 20.

THESE two pamphlets are the latest contribution I have seen in book-form to the literature, every year increasing, of the *Silvae* of Statius. The list of works on this subject which Lafaye marshals on the two

first pages of his little volume, nearly all fall within the last thirty years; during which these poems have been examined, especially by German scholars, with a new minuteness, generally resulting in articles, dissertations, or separate editions of some particular *Silva*. I miss however in this list the valuable dissertations of two Scandinavian philologists, Sandström and Lundström; the latter, especially, ought to have been included, full as he is of suggestive and bright remarks. Englishmen have particular cause to be interested in this return to an author on whom the eminent Cambridge scholar Markland lavished his erudition in an edition (1728) reprinted by Sillig early in the present century (1827). The work of Markland will remain a monument of the learning of his time; but the discovery of the Madrid MS., the best representative of that which Poggio found early in the fifteenth century at S. Gall, and the vastly increased materials now at our disposal for illustrating the manners and morals of the Romans under Domitian, make a new edition of the *Silvae* much desired, and it may confidently be expected not only that the text of the poems will soon appear in a critically much improved shape, but also that a new and enlarged exegesis will be brought to bear on the countless difficulties of allusion, whether to contemporary history, out of the way mythological legends, or facts of Roman every-day life, with which they abound.

M. Lafaye's notes extend to Bk. i. alone. Their strong point is the archaeological detail by which the author supports, sometimes the MS. text, sometimes a particular emendation. Such is the discussion by which he defends, with O. Müller, Stange and McNaghten, the emendation of Markland in i. 37.

*Dextra uetat pugnas: laeuam Tritonia virgo  
Non grauat.*

Where the MS. reading is *pugnes laeuum* corrected by Bährens to *pugnis Latium*. The left hand of the statue of Domitian, it has been argued, would naturally hold the reins; how then could it hold the image of Minerva? The poem gives no hint of a lorica, on which the figure might have been worked. M. Lafaye finds an explanation in an equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius (Fig. 1, p. 11) in which the right hand is extended, as a symbol of peace and protection (Quintil. *Inst.* xi. 3, 119), while the left hand has the palm turned upwards and seems to have held originally a statue, possibly of Victory

(there is no trace of reins); again in two equestrian statues figured on coins, in each of which the left hand is similarly employed in holding a small figure. This seems plausible enough, and the figure of Aurelius suggests a sufficiently close interpretation of the poet's words (i. 2) *Stat Latium complexa forum*; but the strangeness of the corruption *lauium* for *laeuam* still remains to vex the palaeographical sense and keep the matter uncertain.

ii. 4-6.

Demigrant Helicone deae, quatiuntque  
novena  
Lampade sollennem thalamis coeuntibus  
ignem,  
Et de Pieriis uocalem fontibus undam.

Lafaye shows that there is here an allusion to the actual ceremony with which the bridegroom received the bride, *aqua et igni*, both together holding a torch and a water jar. This function is here transferred to the Muses. It is however remarkable that the Muses do not ordinarily (Lafaye says never) hold torches; Statius perhaps knew that they possessed a sacred wood on Helicon (Paus. ix. 28-31) and represented them as carrying torches cut from this hallowed spot to give a joyous augury to the marriage of Stella.

I hardly know what to say of the explanation offered of the difficult words (iii. 32)

*Sic Chalcida fluctus*

*Expellunt fluuii*

‘L’Euripe repousse Chalcis, qui s’avance (*ἀκτὴν προβλήτρα* Ion dans Strab. i. 3, 19) comme si elle s’efforçait de rejoindre le continent tant voisin qu’elle regrette,’ that is to say the advance which the land makes at Chalcis towards the opposite shore of Boeotia is repelled by the strong flow of the Euripus. Possible; but what shall we make of *fluuii*?

Even more doubtful is the view (p. 34) taken of the words

*damnosaque fila senectae*

*Exuit*

where *fila*, which Markland explained of the *slough* which a serpent casts, is supposed by Lafaye to refer to the threads in which spiders enmesh their insect prey. He finds a similar allusion in Juvenal's well known (ix. 128) *obrepit non intellecta senectus* and in another passage of the *Silvae* (V. iii. 258)

nec segnis tabe senili  
Exitus instanti praemisit membra sepulchro.

It seems doubtful whether either a slough or a spider's thread was in the poet's thoughts; or even, again, the threads of the Fates (Stephens, 1651) with which, spite of *vv.* 123-4, *exiit* hardly agrees. May not *fila* refer to the texture or fibres of the body, which, as old age approaches, alter and suffer deterioration? cf. *defloccati senes*.

Most valuable are the historical notes on *vv.* 13 and 80 of this *Silva*. The only thing which I regret is, that the African inscription quoted from Cagnat is not printed *in extenso*. But I would object that in *v.* 102 the words

quoque anguis abundat

Spumatu

are *not* confined to the trained serpents which we know to have formed part of the therapeutic apparatus at the Asklepieion of Epidaurus, but are, as Rinn thought, and most readers of the whole passage would, I think, infer, general.

The note on *v.* 27

praecelsis quarum vaga molibus  
Crescit [unda

is a very good specimen of Lafaye's vindication of MSS. against unnecessary correction. Markland conjectured *cessit*, but the passage from Frontinus *de Aquaed.* is quite enough to prove that *crescit* is right; the words *acquisitionibus*, *acquisitionum* are in effect only another way of expressing the same idea.

I am less satisfied with the discussion on the much-vexed (*vi.* 15)

Et quod percoquit †Ebosia cannot†

and cannot bring myself to believe that *Ebosia* as representing *Ebusus* could be admitted by so careful a metrist as Statius. As I suggested in the *Journal of Philology*<sup>1</sup> (*v.* p. 203) it seems probable that the sugarcane is alluded to; *Ebosia* I suppose to be a corruption of *arbor Inda*; *arbor* first became *uebos*, then *ebos*. The form *Indus* as adjective occurs *S. II. i.* 160 *quod munera graminis Indi*, *III. iii.* 94 *Indi dentis honos*. The sugarcane was called by the Romans the Indian tree or Indian reed (see *J. of Phil.* *v.* pp. 262, 3).

<sup>1</sup> Of my three articles in the *Cambridge Journal of Philology* on the *Silvae*, M. Lafaye only mentions one (*vol.* xiii. p. 88) in his list; the latest is in *vol.* xx. p. 17 'An Oxford MS. of Statius' *Silvae*.'

ii. 235-6.

Omnis plebeio teritur praetexta tumultu  
Hinc eques hinc iuuenum †questus stola  
mixta laborat.

Lafaye ingeniously suggests for *questus -que aestus*, comparing the use of *unda* and *aestuarium* of a crowd. (The passage he cites from *Lucr. vi.* 1261 can hardly be so explained; to my mind Munro is quite convincing in supposing *aestus* to refer to the heat which was one of the chief causes of the plague raging.) This conjecture however draws with it a further change of *Hinc eques hinc* to *Hinc equitum*, which seems improbable.

iv. 62.

hunc mecum Epidauria  
Hinc alti gaudens [proles

Lafaye very cleverly

hinc mecum Epidauria  
Inquit abi gaudens. [proles

He compares *Theb. iii.* 229 *Talis mihi nate per Argos Talis abi*, and for *inquit* at the beginning of the verse *Theb. v.* 157.

v. 36-9.

Sola nitet flauis Nomadum decisa metallis  
Purpura, sola cauo Phrygiae quam Synnados  
antro

Ipse cruentavit maculis liuentibus Attis  
†Quoque Tyri niueas secat et Sidonia rupes.

Lafaye conjectures

Quasque Tyrus niueas secuit Sidonia rupes.

He rightly observes that Prudentius seems to be imitating Statius in *Contra Symm. ii.* 246-7

Et quae saxa Paros secat et quae Punica  
rupes  
Quae uiridis Lacedaemon habet maculosaque  
Synnas

though in Prudentius *rupes* must be nominative; in Statius it certainly seems to be accusative.

I think *Quoque* must be *Quotque*, would retain *Tyri*, and treat *et* as the vitiated word, perhaps a substitute for *arx*. At any rate *secat*, which Prudentius also has, commends itself as probable 'and all the white rocks which Tyre's Sidonian stronghold cuts into blocks.'

I cannot agree with the view (p. 69) that in vi. 37-40 *alis* is addressed to Domitian, and that *beate* ought to be *beati*. It is true that this makes it possible to retain *nescit* in 40 but at a cost which makes it not worth while. After the general public addressed in *putes* 34, a distinct vocative is called for: that vocative is, if MSS. are right, *annona* and it follows that *nescit* is a mistake for *nescis*.

The *Curae Stadianae* of A. Klotz mainly consists of an edition of *Silv.* ii. 2, with additional remarks on other crucial passages of the *Silvae*. The author, a native of Zittau in Saxony, is indebted to his fellow townsman M. Moritz Krohn, whose forthcoming edition will exhibit for the first time a collation of the Madrid MS. (M) now believed to be the earliest, for a complete conspectus of M's readings in ii. 2, and for new conjectures on this poem. He has besides given a full commentary on it, a careful perusal of which enables me to pronounce it useful—among other reasons, for recalling attention to the almost forgotten edition of Ferd. Morell, Paris 1602. Among the more interesting views I note Beloch's identification of *Megalia* v. 80 with the Neapolitan Castel del Uovo, the minute description of the various marbles mentioned in 86-93, the identification of the name of Pollius, owner of the villa at Surrentum, with the still surviving Marino di Paolo. Many of the discussions, too, of passages in other parts of the *Silvae* are suggestive.

On the following points I doubt:—

(1) Klotz (with De Vit in the excellent *Onomasticon*, which forms the last portion of his edition of Forcellini's *Lexicon*, interrupted alas! by the author's death at the end of O) considers the *Mygdonius senex* who is combined with Nestor in 108 to be Tithonus; and no doubt *Mygdonius cubilibus* in Theb. ii. 134 is the couch of Tithonus, and Tithonus is distinctly combined with Nestor as a type of prolonged old age in S. IV. iii. 150. But in Theb. v. 751-2 *Pyliae nec fata senectae Maluerit Phrygiis aut degere longius annis* Lactantius explains the 'Phrygian years' of Priam, adding only as a view of others (*alii*) that Tithonus may be meant. In I. iv. 125 *tu Troica dignus Saecula et Euboici transcendere pulveris annos, Nestoreosque situs*, where the Sybil and Nestor are combined with the *Troica saecula*, the question is much the same. Tithonus would suit with the Sybil better, Priam, *quem urbis Troiae excidium uidisse certissimum est* (Lact. on Th. v. 752) with Nestor; but in II. iii. 73 *Iliacos aequare senes et uincere persta a*

reference to Tithonus seems an almost ridiculous hyperbole, though the plural may possibly be thought to include him with Priam. Returning to II. ii. 107-8

Sis felix, tellus, dominis ambobus in annos  
Mygdonii Pylisque senis

there is a congruity in coupling Nestor with Priam, an exaggeration with Tithonus. In III. iv. 103-5 where Statius prays that Domitian may attain to the years of Troy and Pylos together (*Iliacos Pylisque simul*) the tone of the passage is extravagant, and poetically there would be nothing impossible in praying that he might survive for many hundred years; yet here too I should lean to the other belief as more congruous. The same question meets us in Verg. *Catal.* xi. 15, 16 *Carmina quae Phrygium saeculis accepta futuris, Carmina quae Pylivum uincere digna senem*, where the same principle, the better congruity of Nestor with Priam, seems to me to decide the point in his favour against the comparatively mythical husband of Aurora.

(2) 133-137

Tempus erat, cum te geminae suffragia  
terrae  
Diriperent, celsusque duas ueherere per  
urbes,  
Inde Dicarcheis multum uenerande colonis,  
Hinc adscite meis, pariterque his largus et  
illis,  
Ac iuuenile calens plectrique errore superbus.

Klotz seems to think that *plectri errore* can refer, not to Pollius, but to poems written in his honour by some Dicharchean (Puteolan) or Neapolitan. This is, of course, impossible. The only question is, what is *plectri errore*? Stephens says 'plectro errante super citharam'; Gronov similarly explains it by the words of Athenaeus *πάσας ἄμα τῷ πλήκτρῳ τὰς χορδὰς ἐντρέχοντες*; others of the turns and alterations of lyric poetry. Looking at the passage as a whole it seems more natural to refer it to the wandering life Pollius led between the two cities; he was proud of his wandering lyre, probably from the applause he gained as an *improvisatore*.

(3) I cannot see why McNaghten's more than probable explanation of the MS. reading in I. i. 27-8

te signa ferente

Et minor in leges iret gener et Cato castris

as referring to Castra Cornelia, 'a strong position about a mile from Utica' mentioned

by Caesar, *De Bello Civili* ii. 24, 2 should be rejected as not likely. *Constans*, which Klotz approves, will not commend itself to a trained ear, or rather will be pronounced perfectly impossible.

(4) In the disputed passage V. iii. 169-71

Baianaque mittunt  
Litora qua mediis alte permixtus anhelat  
Ignis aquis et operta domos incendia seruant

Klotz explains *domos seruant* of the subterranean fires which do not destroy the houses *by not breaking out*. This view is Gronov's (*Diatrib.* i. p. 360) 'neque enim

incendia proprie seruant domus, aut faciunt ut illae illaesae maneant; sed inter incendia continua domus illaesae manent et seruantur; ideo incendiis ascribit Poeta quod existit una et conjunctum est cum incendiis, nimirum durationem et conseruationem aedium.' Against this I allege the use of *domum seruare, limen seruare*, in Vergil (*Aen.* vii. 52, vi. 402) for keeping close to the house or threshold: so in Statius the subterranean fires each keep close to their assigned home, *i.e.* in the buildings built over to utilize and protect them.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

### THE REVENUE LAWS OF PTOLEMY PHILADELPHUS.

#### *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus.*

Edited from a Greek Papyrus in the Bodleian Library, with a translation, commentary, and appendices by B. P. GRENFELL, M.A., and an introduction by the Rev. J. P. MAHAFFY, D.D., Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1896. With Portfolio (13 plates). 31s. 6d. net.

In recent years countless Papyri have found their way from the Fayoum to the Museums of Europe but as yet nothing has been announced comparable in historical interest to this great document which now rests secure among the treasures of the Bodleian Library. The Revenue Papyrus, as Mr. Grenfell has named it, although, as Prof. Mahaffy remarks, the tax-farming or Telonic Papyrus would be a more exact designation, consists of two parts. The first, containing columns 1—72, was bought by Prof. Petrie from a dealer in Cairo in the winter of 1893-4. It is a roll dated in several places 'in the 27th year' of Philadelphus *i.e.* 259/8 B.C.; the length is 44 feet, the height cannot be so precisely determined since the papyrus has been broken near the top, but it varied from 9½ to 13 inches. When purchased, the whole roll was in a most delicate and brittle condition, and only those who have seen it can properly appreciate the dexterity and patience shown by Prof. Petrie in separating the folds and mounting the detached fragments. The outer parts have been long exposed to wear and tear, so that the first 15 columns are a hopeless wreck; more writing is preserved as the heart of the roll is reached, but even

here every column shows a gap varying from 8 to 2 lines. The second part, embracing columns 73—107, is a collection of fragments acquired by Mr. Grenfell at Cairo and in the Fayoum during the winter of 1894-5. They are terribly mutilated, hardly a single sentence remaining complete, and reconstruction is impossible, but internal evidence indicates that they came from a sister roll, which originally measured not less than 15 feet in length, and was probably once wrapped round the first roll.

The despatch with which this important discovery has been placed before the world cannot be commended too highly. Let us hope that the French scholars who have excavated Delphi will imitate this English example rather than the precedent of their compatriots who worked at Delos. Mr. Grenfell did not see the papyrus until June 1894; he was obliged to suspend his work during the winter of 1894-5 while absent in Egypt, and yet by the autumn of 1895 he succeeded in completing a transcription, translation, commentary and appendices. But this volume of 250 pages produced with such speed is not disfigured by carelessness or superficiality. The editor has done everything that can be done to lay a solid foundation. He has consulted with the two foremost European specialists on Ptolemaic papyri, Prof. G. Lumbroso of Rome, and Prof. U. Wilcken of Berlin, and has enjoyed the constant help and criticism of Prof. Mahaffy, who has examined with him all the problems of reading and interpretation, revised the whole work, and contributed a general introduction of lv. pp.