

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](#)



Remarks on the Culex

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 07 / October 1902, pp 339 - 346

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00206525, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00206525

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1902). Remarks on the Culex. The Classical Review, 16, pp 339-346
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00206525

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Surely Sophocles could not have written ὄμοῦ . . . ὄμοῦ and not meant them to correspond, as in *O.T.* 4, 5. Give to οὐδ' ἀνέραν the sense of 'and relaxed not' (cf. Eur. *I.T.* 318) and render. 'All the while bloody eyeballs bedewed his beard with

slimy beads and relaxed not; all the while, etc.

1350: νομάδ' may be vindicated by Suidas: νομαδῆρης· ὁ ἰδιώτης βίος. In Eur. *Cycl.* 120 the connotation seems not to be 'roaming' but 'living wild.' J. S. PHILLIMORE.

REMARKS ON THE CULEX.

THE authors of the Culex and Ciris and Aetna were mediocre poets, and worse; and the gods and men and booksellers whom they affronted by existing allotted them for transcription to worse than mediocre scribes. The Ciris was indited by a twaddler, and the Culex and Aetna by stutterers: but what they stuttered and twaddled was Latin, not double-Dutch; and great part of it is now double-Dutch, and Latin no more. The deep corruption of the MSS is certified not merely by the jargon which they offer us, but by other and external proofs. For 150 verses of the Aetna we have the fragmentum Gyrardinum, and it reveals, for instance, that the MSS on which we depend for the bulk of the poem have altered u. 227 '*ingenium sacrare caputque attollere caelo*' into '*sacra per ingentem capitique attollere caelum.*' For 100 verses of the Ciris we have the codex Bruxellensis, and it tells us that the other MSS have substituted *secum* *heu* for *sheu* at 469 and *uexauit et aegros* for *uexarier undis* at 481. In the Culex the MS on which we chiefly rely can here and there be tested by other authorities, and they prove that it has corrupted *Zanclaea* to *metuenda* at 332 and *cui cessit Lydi timefacta* to *legitime cessit cui facta* at 366. Such are the scribes, and that is half the difficulty: then there are the poets. Just as it is hard to tell, in Statius or Valerius Flaccus, whether this or that absurd expression is due to mis-copying or to the divine afflatus of the bard, so in the Culex and Ciris and Aetna it is for ever to be borne in mind that they are the work of poetasters. Many a time it is impossible to say for certain where the badness of the author ends and the badness of the scribe begins. And many a time, when the guilt is firmly saddled on the copyist, there is no more to be done except sit down and sigh; because in such corruptions as *metuenda* for *Zanclaea* all vestige of the truth has vanished: etiam periire ruinae.

Here then, between poets capable of much and copyists capable of anything, is a pro-

missing field for the exercise of tact and caution: a prudent editor will be slow to emend the text and slow to defend it, and his page will bristle with the obelus. But alas, it is not for specimens of tact and caution that one resorts to the editors of the Culex; it is rather to fill one's bosom with sheaves of improbable corrections and impossible explanations. In particular the editions of Baehrens in 1880 and of Leo in 1891 are patterns of insobriety.

Witness one piece of precipitate blundering, which I select from many others, not because it is more flagrant than the rest, but because there is no denying it; it is convicted not merely by sense and reason, which are easily set aside, but by *eventus, stultorum magister*. The MS text of 365 sq. stood as follows:

Mucius et prudens ardorem corpore passus,
legitime cessit cui facta potentia regis.

Baehrens took 367 '*hic Curius clarae socius uirtutis et ille*' and placed it after 365; he took 368 '*Flaminius deuota dedit qui corpora flammae,*' threw away the last five words and altered the sole survivor to *Fabricius* with Heyne; struck off *legitime* from 366, clapped *Fabricius* in its stead, changed *facta* with the old editors to *fracta*; and behold—

Mucius et prudens ardorem corpore passus;
hic Curius clarae socius uirtutis et ille
Fabricius, cessit cui fracta potentia regis.

Mr Leo retained the MS text with the one change of *facta* to *fracta*, and wrote this note: '*potentia regis legitime, i.e. iure cessit uirtuti omni ui ac potentia destitutae, legitimum scilicet in regiam potestatem imperium uirtus exercuit. qui uocabuli usus licet, si lexicis fides, exemplis careat, tam apte quadrat ad ipsam rem et uocabuli naturam, ut de ueritate lectionis nullus dubitem.*'

The cod. Corsinianus discovered by Mr. Ellis gives in 366 *cui cessit lidithime*; that is *cui cessit Lydi timefacta potentia regis.*

En hic declarat quales sitis iudices. But it is not because they happen to be proved wrong that I condemn these treatments of the passage, for even prudent criticism may be wrong: it is because they are not prudent; because they exhibit confidence and credulity where everything counselled hesitation and scepticism.

Of the MSS. of the *Culex*, B, cod. Bembinus saec. ix, is not only much the oldest but also in general the most trustworthy. But there are two others, later and on the whole less faithful, which in certain passages far excel it: Γ, cod. Corsinianus saec. xiv uel xv, and V, cod. Vossianus saec. xv. I will cite the most important readings of both, premising that some of them may be only conjectural emendations, but that others of them must be genuine and all of them may.

Γ. 15 *asteris* Γ, *astrigeri* B. 192 *detraxit ab arbore truncum* Γ, *truncum detraxit ab ore* B. 210 *quis inquit*] *quid inquit* Γ, *inquit quid* B. 337 *Troia ruenti*] *troias uenti* Γ, *troia furenti* B. 352 *laetans*] *laetum* Γ, *laetum* B. 362 *moritura camilli* Γ, *mora melli* B. 366 *cui cessit lidithime* Γ, *legitime cessit cui* B.

V. 60 *spretis* V, *pretis* B. 93 *liget* V, *licet* B. 237 *tue...ire* V, *tuas...iras* B. 249 *uecordem* V, *ui cordam* B. 304 *talis...belli* V, *tali...bellis* B. 330 *ipse* V, om. B. 332 *Zanclaea*] *ranolea* V, *metuenda* B. 340 *ne quisquam* V, *neque* B. 343 *Argea*] *argoea* V, *argore* B. 378 *mali nec* V, *malignae* B. 390 *propter* V, *praeter* B.

Γ and V. 2 *orsum* ΓV, *ursum* B. 10 *poliantur* ΓV, *spoliantur* B. 311 *uiridantibus* (= *feridantibus*¹) *feritatis* ab ΓV, *feritatis et* B. 312 *Ida* ΓV, *daque* B. 355 *egea* ΓV, *erea* B. 357 *omnis in aequoreo* *fluitat* ΓV, *fluctuat omnis in aequoreo* B. 399 *pudibunda ruborem* ΓV, *rubibunda terrorem* B.

Mark that B, at 192, 210, 312, 332, 357, 366, is proven guilty of gross and deliberate interpolation; and that B is the best MS. *vāφε καὶ μέμνας' ἀπιστεῖν*.

94, 95.

o pecudes, o Panes, et o gratissima tempe fontis Hamadryadum.

'tempe fontis' is naught; 'gratissima fontis' (propter fontem) is almost incredible; either construction is further encumbered by the second genitive 'Hamadryadum'; and no such change as Heinsius' 'frondis'

¹ For *uir* and *fer* confused see Prop. ii 6 24, Ou. her. ix 141.

will be any help. I expect some noun in apposition with 'tempe' and signifying 'abode' or 'resort': Mr Leo's 'hortus' is well enough; but since the model of these verses is Verg. georg. ii 469 'frigida tempe' I propose

gratissima tempe,
frigus Hamadryadum.

That is 'sedes frigida': Mart. iv 64 14 'quodcumque iacet sub urbe frigus'.

FRIGVS = FRIOVS and *frivus* = *fnotis*. Lest this progress in error should seem at all unlikely, let us pursue the adventures of the word *Zanclaea* in 332. The archetype had *zanclaea*: *z* = *r* and *c* = *o*, so in V appears *ranolea*. But also *z* = *t*, *a* = *u*, *cl* = *d*, and hence arose *tundea* (see Sil. i 662 *Zanclen* corrupted to *tandem* and *tandes*), which was altered by transposing one letter to the nearest Latin word *tuenda* (so *fnotis*, *fontis*), and then enlarged for metre's sake to *me-tuenda*, which is in B. Then the *m* was absorbed in the *m* preceding it, and (*m*)*etuenda*, since *n* = *ri*, appears in Γ as *et uerida*.

137, 138.

hic magnum Argoae naui decus edita pinus proceros decorat siluas hirsuta per artus.

edita B, *adita* V, *addita* Γ as Heinsius and Schrader had conjectured. *addita* may of course be right (Schrader lib. emend. p. 24 quotes Verg. Aen. viii 301 and Stat. Theb. i 22), but the *edita* of B will yield unimpeachable sense, provided you avoid the blunders of Heyne and Mr Leo, who explain '*edita*, excelsa (cf. inf. 170)' and '*naui edita pinus* dictum est ut u. 171 *cui crista superne edita*.' *naui decus edita* means *genita ad nauem decorandam*. Compare on the one hand 401 'Cilici crocus *editus* aruo,' and on the other Ou. amor. ii 5 4 'ei mihi perpetuum nata puella malum,' Hes. op. 804 'Ὀρκον...τὸν Ἐπὶς τέκε πῆμ' ἐπιόρκους, hymn Hom. Merc. 160 sq. *μεγάλην σε πατὴρ ἐφύτ-ευσε μέριμναν | θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισι*, and finally cul. 265-267

ecce Ithaci coniunx semper decus Icarioris
femineum concepta decus manet et procul
illam
turba ferox iuuenum telis confixa procorum.

illam BΓ, *illa* V et edd. On these verses there is not one blot but two: it is fruitless to remove the ungrammatical *illam* (into which *illa* would hardly have been altered) without removing also the ridiculous repetition of *decus*. *manet* too, as the words now stand, is a trifle foolish. The phrase

'concepta decus femineum,' as Ribbeck has seen, signifies 'ideo concepta ut feminarum decus esset': the second *decus* must give place to something which will render *illam* grammatical; and the form of the sentence may be thus restored:

ecce Ithaci coniunx semper decus Icarioris
femineum concepta manet, <pauet> et
procul illam
turba ferox iuuenum telis confixa procorum.

Of course I cannot answer for the verb, which may have been *timet* or *cauet* or *fugit* or *uidet*. The construction is 'Icarioris, decus femineum concepta, semper manet Ithaci coniunx.'

178—189.

naturae comparat arma :
ardet mente, furit stridoribus, intonat
ore,
flexibus euersis torquetur corporis
orbis, 180
manant sanguineae per tractus undique
guttae,
spiritibus rumpit fauces. cui cuncta
parantur,
paruulus hunc prior umoris conterret
alumnus
et mortem uitare monet per acumina;
namque,
qua diducta genas pandebant lumina
gemmae, 185
hac senioris erat naturae pupula telo
icta leui, cum prosiluit furibundus et
illum
obtritum morti misit; cui dissitus
omnis
spiritus et cessit sensus. tum cet.

182 *parant* scripsi, *paranti* libri. *cui* refero to the following *hunc*: 'eum, cui cuncta parantur, prior conterret culex': so 410 sq. 'et, quoscumque nouant uernantia tempora flores, | his tumulus super inseritur.' Scaliger wrote '*quo cuncta parante*,' and certainly the dative *cui* (serpenti) *paranti*, which Mr Leo makes to depend on *prior*, is unaccountable: but even with this change the *hunc* of 183, referring to *ducem gregis* far away in 175, remains very poor and bare.

189 *et cessit* scripsi, *excessit* libri. *cessit* ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, 'cessit spiritus et sensus,' as 170 sq. 'attollit nitidis pectus fulgoribus et se | sublimi ceruice caput,' i.e. 'attollit se pectus et caput,' and 328 'Rhesi uictorque Dolonis.' See Lucr. iii 356 'at dimissa anima corpus caret undique sensu.' *excessit sensus* is said to mean 'excessit e sensibus': and pray what may be the meaning of 'spiritus excessit e sensibus'?

192—197.

ualidum dextra detraxit ab arbore
truncum
(qui casus sociarit opem numenue
deorum
prodere sit dubium, ualuit sed uincere
tales
horrida squamosi uoluentia membra
draconis) 195
atque reluctantis crebris foedeque
petentis
ictibus ossa ferit, cingunt qua tempora
cristae.

The MS reading of 193 *qui...numenue*, retained by Heyne, is defensible and means 'dubium sit prodere qui casus quodue numen sociarit': see Ou. met. xiv 162 'qui te casusue deusue | seruatur, Achaemenide?' Scaliger proposed *cui* for *qui*, and this gross solecism, excusable in the 16th century (though even then Lambinus knew better), is repeated in the 19th by Haupt and Mr Leo. The *numenue* of V will make Latin of it, and may be right, since 'sociarit' is all the better for having a dative; but it is awkward here to designate the shepherd by the relative pronoun, so we had best content ourselves with the text of B.

194 *tales* BF, *tali* V. When Sillig and the subsequent editors write *talis* (qualis, quales?) they are only erasing a vestige of the truth: the corruption is in *horrida*. Propertius, and Horace in his satires (for Verg. Aen. xi 309 is no parallel), are the only poets between Lucretius and Prudentius who are known to admit such corruptions as 'horridā squamosi'; and the diction of 'horrida uoluentia membra' is equally ἐπὶ νόμον, horridum. In Virgil's 'tardaque Eleusinae matris uoluentia plaustra' *tarda* adheres adverbially to *uoluentia*, which *horrida* cannot: uoluenti actio tarda esse potest, horrida non item. *tales* survives to tell us what manner of word stood once in *horrida*'s stead: it was a spondaic acc. plur. substantive, 'ualuit uincere squamosi draconis membra tales — uoluentia': the order of the words is quite legitimate in any poet, let alone a poet who writes 205 'in fessos requiem dare comparat artus' for 'dare fessos artus in requiem'. The sense is satisfied by *orbes*: I know no suitable word which could easily be mistaken for *horrida*, but here is one which could easily be lost before *squamosi*:

ualuit sed uincere tales
<spiras> squamosi uoluentia membra
draconis.

i.e. *squassuquamosi*. Verg. georg. ii 153 sq. 'tanto | *squameus* in *spiram* tractu se colligit anguis'.

I have made a similar correction in 266 (on 137 above); and here are others: 292—296.

sed tu crudelis, crudelis tu magis, Orpheu,
oscula cara petens rupisti iussa deorum:
dignus amor uenia, <ueniam> si Tartara
nossent.

peccatum meminisse grauest.

This is one of the few places in the *culex* where Baehrens has distinguished himself: he has restored *ueniam* for *gratum*. The emendation is as certain as Bentley's *Parin Paris* for *Parin creat* in Verg. Aen. x 705: with Virgil's 'ignoscenda quidem, scirent si ignoscere manes' before his eyes it was impossible for the poet to write otherwise.

385—391.

hunc ubi sollicitum dimisit inertia
uitae,

quantumcumque sibi uires tribuere
seniles, 388

conformare locum capit impiger.

sibi uires BF, *uires sibi* V. The use of *sibi* for *ei*, though incorrect, is not unexampled; but this unmetrical variant of V points to

sibi
uires in the archetype, and I conjecture

quantumcumque <uiro> uires tribuere
seniles.

Compare moret. 107 'saepe uiri nares' &c.

216—221.

praeda Charontis agor: uidi ut flagrantia
taedis

lumina, cum lucent in festis omnia
templis.

obuia Tisiphone, serpentibus undique
compta,

et flammis et saeua quatit mihi uerbera;
pone

Cerberus est, diris flagrans latratibus ora, 220

anguibus hinc atque hinc horrent cui
colla reflexis.

217 in festis scripsi, infestis libri. 219

pone Haupt, pone est iam Peerlkamp, poenae
libri. 220 est scripsi, et libri. flagrans

Scaliger, flagrant libri. nolo conicere
'Cerberus et diris flagrat latratibus Orthrus.'

For the elision 'uidi ut' see 288 'drae exorabile'; for 'ut' in the sense of 'tam-

quam' see 2 'atque ut araneoli tenuem formauimus orsum,' i.e. formauimus orsum tamquam araneoli orsum. The meaning is 'uidi lumina eius tamquam lumina taedis flagrantia cum omnia lucent in festis templis,' 'I have beheld his eyes, as it were the flaming light of torches when temples are all ablaze with festival.' Virgil Aen. vi 300 says of Charon 'stant lumina flamma' and Seneca H. f. 767 'concauae lucent genae.' The phrase 'flagrantia taedis | lumina' is imitated from Aen. vi 593 sq. 'fumea taedis | lumina.'¹

243—253.

quid, saxum procul aduerso qui monte
reuoluit,

contempsisse dolor quem numina uincit
acerbus?

otia quaerentem frustra bitis? ite, 245

puellae,
ite, quibus taedas accendit tristis Erinys.

sic in, 'Hymen' praefata, dedit co-
nubia Mortis?

atque alias alio densas super agmine
turmas,

impietate fera uecordem Colchida
matrem,

anxia sollicitis meditantem uolnera
natis; 250

iam Pandionias miserandi prole
puellas,

quarum uox Ityn edit Ityn, quo Bisto-
nius rex

orbis epops maeret uolucres euectus in
auras.

245 *frustrabit is ite* scripsi, *frustra sibilite* B (*sublite* Γ), *frustra ceu uite* V. The easiest change from B is Heinsius' 'acerbus | otia quaerentem frustra sibi? ite,' and the hiatus can be defended by Verg. Aen. i 405. But the addition of 'otia' etc. weakens rather than strengthens what has been said of Sisyphus, and I assent to Mr Leo that we have here a phrase like 258 'eheu mutandus numquam labor' and Verg. Aen. vi 845 'quo fessum rapitis, Fabii?' referring to the gnat itself and preparing the transition

¹ I subjoin for comparison the readings of Baehrens and Leo.

Baehrens:

praeda Charonis agor *uigilis*. flagrantia taedis
limina tum lucent *infernis obdita* templis.
obuia Tisiphone cet.

Leo:

praeda Charonis agor. *uiden* ut flagrantia taedis
limina collucent? infestis *obuia* templis,
obuia Tisiphone cet.

from the men to the women of the underworld. Mr Leo conjectures *sinite, ite*: I think that *frustrabitis* is better in itself and better explains the variation of the MSS; for no one can pretend that such nonsense as *ceu uite* is an attempt to emend *siblite*.¹ This is one of several places where B and V have corrupted in different ways the reading of their common source: compare 249 *Colchida*] *conchida* B, *colchita* V; 269 *poenane*] *poenaeque* B, *pene* V, and especially 334 *generamen prolis*, where V preserves *generamen* but corrupts *prolis* to *probis*, I preserves *prolis* but corrupts *generamen* to *gener ante*, B corrupts both words, but only to the slightest extent, *generam plis* to *gener amplis*. So here the *siblite* of B arises from the transposition *frustra sibi ite*, the *ceu uite* of V from the omission *frustrau(itis)ite* = *frustra uite*.

247 *sicin scripsi, sicut libri*: idem error Prop. iii 6 9. 'sicut Hymen praefata' can be construed; but then the verses 246 and 247 are *harena sine calce* and want tying together with an *et* or a *quas*. With the interrogation compare Catull. 64 28 'tene Thetis tenuit' etc.

251 *miserandi scripsi, miserandas BV, miseranda I*, both of which are utterly absurd. Itys, *ἡ τὴν ἀφ' οὗ παθεῖν*, was not the offspring of Progne and Philomela. The only editor of the culex who seems to be aware of this is Heinsius, who proposes *miseranda sorte*: I have thought it safer to follow the MSS where they coincide and abandon them where they differ. *miserandi* agrees with the genitive contained in *Pandionias*: the construction is like Ou. amor. i 8 108 '*mea defunctae ossa*' or Liu. ii 53 1 '*Veiens bellum, quibus Sabini arma coniunxerant*', but the scribes knew not what to make of it. Pandion was 'miserandus prole', *αἰωρόκος*: Ou. met. vi 675 sq. '*hic dolor ante diem longaeque extrema senectae | tempora Tartareas Pandiona misit ad umbras*'.

But now I come to the central difficulty of the passage, the verse 248 and the sentence to which it belongs. The accusatives *turmas*, *Colchida*, *puellas* have no construction; the apposition of *Colchida* with *turmas* is ridiculous; the word *turmas* is no name for companies of heroines unless they happen to be Amazons; and the phrase *alias alio super agmine turmas* is nonsense. The idiom *alius...alius* is employed in Latin with a single substantive for the purpose of

dividing a whole into parts: '*alias ex aliis fingendo moras*', 'delay after delay'. Two substantives are never used in this idiom (*moras alias ex aliis cunctationibus*), because there is then no whole to be divided: the division has been made already, and the superaddition of *alius...alius* is not merely unexampled but unimaginable. The employment of *alius...alius* with a couple of substantives gives quite a different sense, and apportions the one to the other: '*legiones aliae alia in parte resistunt*', 'some legions in one spot, others in another'. The phrase *alias alio super agmine turmas* will not mean the same as *turmas alias super aliis*, 'troops upon troops': it will mean 'some troops upon one troop, others upon another'; which is nonsense, whatever language you write it in.

Therefore the passage is not simply corrupt, as most editors think, nor simply defective, as Mr Leo thinks, but both. The following is the irreducible minimum of correction:

<iam prope conspicio, uestram quae uertice
turbam>
atque alias alto densas super eminent
umbras,
impietate fera uecordem Colchida matrem,
anxia sollicitis meditantem uolnera natis;
iam Pandionias cet.

The corruption sprang from *aemine tumbras*; and the verse above may have fallen out through the likeness of *turmas* (*turbas* V) and *turbam*. For the distribution of *uertice* and *alto* on either side of the conjunction compare 12 '*Phoebus erit nostri princeps et carminis auctor*' and 196 sq. '*reluctantis crebris foedeque petentis | ictibus ossa ferit*'. The confusion of *alto* with *alio* is common, and was here helped by the presence of *alias*: I will cite a perfect parallel from Manil. v 44. The man born under the constellation Argo, says Manilius, will become a seafarer,

totumque uolet transnare profundum
classibus, atque alios menses aliumque
uidere
Phasin, et.....Tiphyn superare.

I agree with Lachmann at Prop. i 1 12 that *alias menses* is quite sound and means 'new seasons,' 'an unfamiliar climate,' and that Val. Fl. vi 324 quoted by Bentley, where a Scythian says to an Argonaut '*alium hic miser aspicias annum*,' is a complete defence of the reading. Bentley, who denies this, says nothing in support of his denial; but

¹ Baehrens' '*otia quaerenti frustra ceruice puellae*' incurs the similar objection that it does not account for the reading of B.

arcis Ericthoniae; comes huic erat aura
secunda
per placidum cursu pelagus; Nereis ad
undas 345
signa dabat pars inflexis super iacta
carinis.

ad undas in 345 is impossible, and modern editors read with Paldam *ab unda*. But how to explain the corruption? Thus:

comes huic erat aura secunda
per placidum cursu pelagus; Nereis ab
unda...

-undās and *unda* were transposed. To write *cursus* (acc. plur.) for *cursu* in the next line would be a further improvement; but the absolute use of 'secundo' is well established, and 'currimus aequor' will justify 'placidum cursu pelagus' in the sense of 'smooth to sail over'. The *secundis* of Γ may indicate *ab undis* rather than *ab unda*.

In 346 the MSS vary thus: *pars inflexis* BV, *parsim flexis* Γ; *iacta* B, *icta* ΓV, *acta* codd. dett. et edd. The words '*pars inflexis super acta carinis*' are supposed to mean '*pars Nereidum* (though *Nereis*, not *Nereides*, has preceded) *acta super inflexis carinis*', and '*carinis*' is supposed to mean '*curribus*'. From the reading of Γ there at once emerges *passim flexis*, and I conjecture

signa dabat passim flexis super alta
carinis.

'flexis super alta', steered over the sea: *carinis* is dative. Both *iacta* and *icta* may come from *acta*.

362—371.

hic et fama vetus numquam moritura
Camilli,
Curtius et, mediis quem quondam sedi-
bus urbis
deutum bellis consumpsit gurgis in
unda,
Mucius et prudens ardorem corpore
passus, 365
cui cessit Lydi timefacta potentia regis;
hic Curius clarae socius uirtutis et ille
flamminius deuota dedit qui corpora
flammae.
iure igitur talis sedes pietatis honores
istarum piadasque duces, quorum deuota
triumphis 370
moenia rapidis Libycae Karthaginis
horrent.

364. Heyne's *gurgitis unda* is an improvement and possibly right; but this is a poor

poet and we must not ask too much of him. *bellis* is plainly corrupt, and I think the easiest and aptest correction is *liuens* (= *libells*): see Catull. 17 10 sq. 'totius ut lacus putidaeque paludis | *liuidissima* maximeque est profunda uorago', Verg. Aen. vi 320 'uada *liuida* uerrunt'.

In Stat. silu. ii 6 38–44 are these words:

non tibi femineum uultu decus oraque supra
mollis honos, quales dubiae discrimina formae
de sexu transire iubent; toruoque uirilis
gratia, nec petulans acies, blandique seuerio
igne oculi, qualis, *bellis* iam casside, uisu
Parthenopaeus erat; simplexque horrore de-
coro
crinis.

Most editors alter *iam*, which is very appropriate, and retain *bellis*, which is at best superfluous beside *casside*; Messrs. Krohn and Koltz have seen that an adjective should be restored, but they adopt Adrianus' frightful conjecture *bellus*; Baehrens' *liber* spoils the sense by laying stress on the placidity of this boy's looks when Statius is laying stress on their manliness. Write *liuens iam casside*, 'with the bruise of the helmet on his brow': Hor. carm. i 8 10 sq. '*liuida* gestat armis | brachia.'

368. Nothing is known of any such *Flaminius*: Nicolaus Loensis proposed *Caecilius*, and further, since the words as they stand are no description of Metellus' exploit in rescuing the Palladium, *lumina* for *corpora*. I offer this:

graminibus deuincta gerit qui tempora
Flamma.

He imitates Verg. Aen. vi 772 'umbrata gerunt ciuili tempora quercu': see also Lygd. 6 2 'hedera tempora uincta geras' and Tib. ii 5 5 'triumphali deuinctus tempora lauro.' The confusion of *tempora* with *corpora* is common, as Ou. met. vii 429, her. ix 140, fast. iv 143: *deutum* occurred in 364 and *deuota* will occur in 370, so we can dispense with it here: *dedit* for *gerit* was probably a deliberate alteration consequent on the other changes. I should not wonder if a verse¹ beginning with *Fabricius* had been lost between 367 and 368, and *Flamminius* were a mixture of *Fabricius* and *graminibus*.

Plin. n. h. xxii 11 'praeter hos contigit eius (i.e. gramineae) coronae honos M. Calpurnio Flammae tribuno militum in Sicilia,' Flor. i 18 13 'repidatum est semel circa Camerin-

¹ Such as 'Fabricius, ducibusque aequata laude tribunus.'

ensium saltum, sed eximia uirtute Calpurni Flammae tribuni militum euasimus, qui lecta trecentorum manu inessum ab hostibus tumultum occupauit atque moratus hostes est, dum exercitus omnis euaderet. ac sic pulcherrimo exitu Thermopylarum et Leonidae famam adaequauit.' Ampel. 20 (qui pro p. R. salute se optulerunt) 5 'trecenti sub Calpurnio Flamma contra Poenos, qui in Siciliensi saltu morte sua exercitum p. R. liberauerunt, ut plane ccc Lacedaemoniorum apud Thermopylas gloriam adaequarent.' Liu. xxii 60 11 'si, ut nobis adulescentibus priore Punico bello Calpurnius Flamma trecentis uoluntariis, cum ad tumultum eos capiendum situm inter medios duceret hostes, dixit "moriatur, milites, et morte nostra eripiamus ex obsidione circumdatas legiones," si hoc P. Sempronius diceret, nec uiros equidem nec Romanos uos ducerem, si nemo tantae uirtutis exstisset comes.'

Six words in the yerse, and I have altered five of them; so willkürlich, so unmethodisch, so subjektiv-ästhetisch is my criticism.

370 *istarum piadasque* B, *Scipidasque* V, *Scipiatosque* T. Editors fling *istarum* to the winds, adopt Bembus' arbitrary change of acc. to nom., and in 369 Heyne's *tales* for *talis*, and write the verses thus:

flammae
(iure igitur tales sedes pietatis honores),
Scipidaeque duces, quorum cet.

This is no way to deal with a passage where the metre has a word too many and the syntax a word too few: far shrewder is Naeke, who says at Val. Cat. p. 293 'uersus excidit unus, cuius residuum in uoce *istarum* latet.' I believe that from this relic almost the very words of the author can be recovered:

iure igitur talis sedes pietatis honores
instaurat < pia sic meritis. te, Regule,
cerno
Sci>piadasque duces, quorum cet.

The scribe glanced from the first to the second *pia*. *talis* is acc. plur., and *talis honores* refers to 358 sq. 'hic alii se dant pariles uirtutis honore | heroes mediisque siti sunt sedibus': *sedes pia* occurs in 39 and 375, *pietatis honores* in 225, *instaurat*

honores in Verg. Aen. v 94, where however the verb has the special force of 'denuo instaurat.' The construction then is 'iure igitur (ob pietatem uersibus 361-8 significatam) sedes pia instaurat tales pietatis honores uiris tam bene meritis.'

371 *rapidis* B, *romanis* IV interpolate. The sense required was first pointed out by Naeke l.c. p. 294, who conjectured *harundinibus*; Haupt *uepretis*, which is what the poetaster ought to have written; Ribbeck *rapinis*, 'turnip fields', which perhaps he was not incapable of writing. That turnips were grown in the province of Africa appears from the fact that Vespasian was pelted with them at Hadrumetum in his proconsulship, Suet. Vesp. 4. Even closer to *rapidis* would be *rapicis*, 'turnip leaves', Plin. n.h. xviii 127, which of course has its antepenultimate short like *tribunicus*, though Georges marks both of them long. But bad as this poet indisputably is, these scribes are worse, and I suspect that they had more hand than he in sowing turnips on the site of Carthage.

401-403.

hic Cilici crocus editus aruo
laurus item Phoebe decus surgens, hic rhododaphne
liliaque.

In 1897, in the Journal of Philology vol. xxv p. 244, I wrote

I will take the opportunity of emending 402, which is usually reduced to metre by reading *surgens decus*, an arrangement the scribes were not likely to disturb. Write *decus ingens*: *ingens* becomes *urgens* (Stat. Theb. vi 827 *ingentibus* and *urgentibus* MSS), the *s* of *decus* adheres and makes *surgens* (Stat. Theb. i 357 *gelidas surgens* and *gelidas urgens* MSS).

For the rhythm see 381 'digredior numquam rediturus. tu cole fontes': so in 173 sq. I should punctuate 'aspectuque micat flammaram) lumine toruo | metabat sese circum loca'.

Mr Vollmer in 1900, in the Rheinisches Museum vol. lv p. 521, writes

u. 402 legendum puto per oxymoron *laurus item Phoebe decus urgens*, nempe Daphne amore urget deum.

At me litterulas stulti docuere parentes.

A. E. HOUSMAN.