Conjectures

D. A. Slater

CONJECTURES.

STATIUS, *Silvae*, ii. 1. 230. Can *fere* here be a scribe's correction of *ere*, a relique of *Erebi*, the final syllable of which might easily be lost before the following *tu*? Statius elsewhere personifies *Erebus*, and the epithet *durus* is most appropriate to *Death*. Read

'Insontes animas nec portitor arcet
Nec dur*i* comes ille Ere*bi* :—tu pectora mulce,' etc.

The *comes* or attendant will still be Cerberus.

id. ib. ii. 6. 60 sqq. Read perhaps,—with transposition of a single letter, *curtassent* for *ructassent*,—

O quam *divitiis censuque* exutus *opimo*
Fortior, Urse, fores ! si vel fumante ruina
Curtassent dites Vesuvina incendia Locros.

Markland's *Locri* (in the form Locro*e*, Buecheler) for *Locros* is usually accepted; but *ructare* does not appear to occur elsewhere in Statius, and the passage is full of monetary terms,—*divitiae, census, fidem negare, Fortuna redit*. It is a question of pounds, shillings and pence rather than of poetry. For *curtare* cf. Horace, *Satires*, ii. 3. 124, and Persius, vi. 34.

id. ib. iv. 5. 10. In view of ii. 3. 51, 'Phoebi frondes,' the expression 'Veris frondes' seems not impossible, or Markland's 'vernis frondibus' may be right. But '*Annuae* frondes' is certainly prosaic. Scribes occasionally confuse the letters *n* and *d* (**D** D), and frequently mistake *it* for *u*. Read

'Nunc cuncta Veris (*sive ver*n*is*) frondibus *additis*
Crinitur arbos.'

Addere is a vox Horatiana,—frequent in Alcaics and common in Statius.

Statius, *Thebaid*, iv. 665. Is *solem* here a corruption of *fontem* (fole for fote)?—

'Isque ubi pulverea Nemeen effervere nube
Conspicit et *fontem* radiis ignescere ferri.'

An allusion to the brook Nemea might supply that touch of poetry which Klotz, in the new Teubner edition, complains is lack-ing in the emendations which he cites. The brook was a feature both of the valley and of the story (cf. Frazer's Pausanias' *Description of Greece*, vol. iii. pp. 88–94); and the glint of armour on the water would readily arrest attention. 'Through the bottom of the valley . . . meanders like a thread the brook Nemea, fed by the numerous rills which descend from the neighbouring hills' (op. cit. p. 89). 'But when Adrastus and the rest of the seven champions were marching . . . against Thebes, it chanced that they passed through the vale of Nemea, and being athirst and meeting the nurse with the child, they begged of her water to drink. So *she led them to a spring of water* which bubbled up beside a thick bed of celery,' etc. (ib. p. 92). It was by this spring that Opheltes was killed.

Klotz removes the obelus from the passage; but as it stands it must surely be corrupt. My suggestion, *frondem*, which he quotes, was prompted less by Koestlin's *silvam* than by *Silvae*, i. 3. 6, 'Nemeae *frondentis*' alumnus.'

Plato, *Republic*, 365 E. εἰ δὲ εἰσί τε καὶ ἐπιμελοῦνται (sc. θεοὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων), οὐκ ἄλλοθέν τοι αὐτοὺς ἴσμεν ἢ ἀκηκόαμεν ἢ ἔκ τε τ ῶ ν λ ό γ ω ν καὶ τῶν γενεαλογησάντων ποιη-τῶν. οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι λέγουσιν κ.τ.λ. For the difficulties of τῶν λόγων see translations and commentaries. Prof. Burnet (*C.R.* xix. 101[b]) proposes τῶν νόμων (from F) and would explain the corruption as arising from the use of a compendium in the original MS. A simpler solution would be to read λογ⟨ί⟩ων (ΛΟΓΙΩΝ for ΛΟΓΩΝ). The λόγιος,—associated with the ἀοιδός by Pindar (*Pyth.* i. 94) as is the λογογράφος with the ποιητής by Thucydides (i. 21),—would in this context be either the early prose-chronicler, or better perhaps the depositary of theological tradi-tion, as in Herodotus (ii. 4), who applies the word to the priests at Heliopolis, whom he consulted as the chief authorities on the gods of Egypt—οἱ γὰρ Ἡλιοπολῖται λέγονται Αἰγυπτιῶν εἶναι λογιώτατοι.

Catullus, lxiv. 241–245.

At pater, ut summa prospectum ex arce petebat,
Anxia in assiduos absumens lumina fletus,
Cum primum *inflati* conspexit lintea veli,
Praecipitem sese scopulorum e vertice iecit,
Amissum credens immiti Thesea fato.

For *inflati* the Itali conjectured *infecti* (from 225), a conjecture which some editors (*e.g.* Haupt and Baehrens) receive into the text. If, as seems more than possible, the word is corrupt, read rather

cum primum *falsi* conspexit lintea veli

from Statius, who twice alludes to the fate of Aegeus, in lines apparently derived from these, and who on both occasions applies this same epithet (*falsus*) to the sail which was the cause of the catastrophe. See *Thebaid*, xii. 626, and *Silvae*, iii. 3. 180. *Inflati* is certainly otiose, and may have come in from the influence of *flamine* in line 239. *Falsi* would give point to *credens* below.

Ovid, *Metam.* x. 637. Read perhaps

Dixerat: utque rudis primoque cupidine tacta,
Quid *sciat*, ignorans, amat et non sentit amorem.

Sciat for *facit* (codd. omnes et Plan.) is a very slight alteration, and the double oxymoron thus obtained seems to be sufficiently rhetorical and effective. As against Ehwald's theory, *ad loc.*—*i.e.* that 'Quid facit' represents 'Quid facio?' (question), whereas 'Quid faciat' would represent 'Quid faciam?' (deliberation),—cf. i. 643; vii. 679, Unde sit, ignoro; ix. 526, Quid velit, ignorans; xi. 719; and perhaps also *Heroides*, i. 71, Quid timeam, ignoro. Timeo tamen omnia. Merkel puts the ordinary view of the MS. reading in a nutshell when he describes it as— 'manifestus, quantum puto, barbarismus et sine exemplo.'

Statius, *Silvae*, iii. 5. 281 sqq.

Umbramque senilem
Invitet ripis discussa plebe supremus
Vector et in media componat molliter *alga*.

Here, if the text be sound, we must, I take it, accept Stephens' explanation ('Alga cymbam substernat, qua reponat se molliter pater traiciens') in preference to Markland's view that *alga* represents the bank or shore (cf. *e.g.* Val. Flacc. i. 252, Molli iuvenes funduntur in alga); for *componat* can hardly bear the meaning of '*trans fluvium* incolumes . . . *exponit*' in the lines from the Sixth Aeneid (415–16), of which these are an echo. Perhaps, however, we ought rather to read 'in media componat molliter *alno*,' and compare Juvenal, iii. 265–6,

'Taetrumque novicius horret
Porthmea nec sperat caenosi gurgitis *alnum*';

and *Thebaid*, iv. 479,[1]

Plena redeat Styga portitor *alno*.

Virgil, *G.* i. 318–321.

. . . Omnia ventorum concurrere proelia vidi;
Quae gravidam late segetem ab radicibus imis
Sublimem expulsam eruerent: ita turbine nigro
Ferret hiemps culmumque levem stipulasque
   volantes.

The difficulties of sense and construction which to some editors and readers this passage presents (see Conington, *ad loc.*) would vanish if we could regard *ferret* as a corruption of *verrit*. No variants appear to be reported from the MSS., and the tradition is so good that to propose any emendation would seem hazardous. But it is noteworthy that in the passage of Lucretius (i. 271 sqq.) which Virgil had in mind—so Conington suggests—when he wrote this description, the word (verrere) occurs in the sense required:

'Nubila caeli
Verrunt ac subito vexantia turbine raptant.'

The time is Autumn (316), and hiemps seems therefore to be best understood of a winter storm. Make the one slight change involved by the substitution of *verrit* for *ferret* and give this meaning to hiemps; then all semblance of difficulty disappears, and Conington's translation of the passage will run: 'I have seen all the armies of the winds meet in the shock of battle, tearing up by the roots whole acres of heavy corn, and whirling it on high, just as a' winter storm sweeps 'down its dark current light straw and flying stubble.'

D. A. SLATER.

---

[1] The bold accusative (Styga) in this passage,—which the Oxford editor is inclined to emend,—is probably to be explained as modelled on the Virgilian 'Itque redit*que viam*' (*Aen.* vi. 122), just as the '*eadem* dea turbida' of *Thebaid*, ii. 208, at which so many critics ride a tilt, is a mere reminiscence of Virgil's '*Eadem* impia Fama' (*Aen.* iv. 298). Statius is full of such reminiscences as these.