

NOTES ON STATIUS, SILVAE¹

The following editions are referred to: Barth (1664); Markland (1728); Baehrens (1876); Vollmer (1898); Slater (English translation, 1908); Saenger (1909); A. Klotz (ed. 2, 1911); Phillimore (OCT, ed. 2, 1917); Mozley (Loeb ed., 1928); Frère—Izaac (Budé ed., 1944); van Dam (Book 2, 1984).

Håkanson = L. Håkanson, 'Stattius' Silvae: critical and exegetical remarks', Lund, 1969.

- 1,3,40-42. ... *ad silvas quae respicis, aula, tacentes,*
 qua tibi tuta quies offensaque turbine nullo
 nox silet et nigrōs invitant murmura somnos.
41. *tuta* Politianus: *tota* M
42. *invitant* Peyraredus: *imitantia* (vel *mutantia*) M

Description of an *aula* in the villa of Manilius Vopiscus.

This passage has been much discussed. The fullest and best treatment is that of J.A. Willis, Phoenix 20, 1966, 310 f., who convincingly argues (a) in favour of the emendation *invitant*, (b) against both the manuscript reading *nigrōs* and Peyraredus's often accepted conjecture *pigrōs*; he supports Markland's <te>neros. For this some good parallels have been adduced, but it has seldom even been mentioned in modern editions and is described by R. Helm (Lustrum 1, 1957, 273) as „ganz unpassend". I suggest that a preferable adjective might be *gratos*; if this had been reduced to *grōs* through neglect of a medial contraction, <ni>grōs would have been a natural guess, in the light of the context, to fill out the metre.

Markland was troubled by the apparent contradiction between the total (he read *tota*) silence of the night and the murmurings (of rivers or trees); he suggested, but rejected, the explanation that some noises were not regarded as spoiling sleep, and in his Addenda he proposed to get rid of the contradiction by changing *et* to *aut*. But his rejected explanation is right; in a different context the point has been made and well illustrated by O. Zwierlein, 'Kritischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien Senecas', Mainz 1986, 192 f.: „Mit dem antiken 'locus amoenus' [...] war ja keineswegs die Vorstellung von möglichst großer Stille verbunden. [...] Das Singen der Vögel und das Murmeln des Baches bringt also den Schlaf."

¹ I am very grateful to Professor R.G.M. Nisbet for commenting on an earlier version of these notes.

- 1,3,101-4. *seu tibi Pindaricis animus contendere plectris
sive chelyn tollas heroa ad robora sive
liventem satiram nigra rubigine turbes
seu tua non alia splendescat epistula cura.*
104. *tua M: tibi Markland*

The four genres of poetry practised by Manilius Vopiscus: lyric, epic, satire, and epistle.

„With no less skill” (Mozley). Even if we accept that *non alia* can have the sense of *non minore*, it is not clear with what other genre or genres the epistle is being compared. As so often, Markland divined the poet’s intention: „intelligit simplicitatem styli Epistolarius”; he therefore adopted the old conjecture *non alta*. But neither this nor Otto’s *non ulla* is really convincing. Instead I suggest *non <s>oli<t>a* (a phrase which occurs twice elsewhere both in the *Silvae* and in the *Thebaid*): it is not usual to lavish artistic pains on the epistle.

- 1,4,4-6. *e s caelo †dives† Germanice, cordi
(quis neget?): erubuit tanto spoliare ministro
imperium Fortuna tuum.*
4. *es s: et M*

Domitian must be blest by heaven in that his faithful helper Rutilius Gallicus has recovered from illness.

Only Vollmer defends *dives*, and his defence („der Kaiser ist reich, weil ihm das Geschick einen solchen Diener erhalten”) can be rejected out of hand. The favourite emendations have been:

1. *dive es*, trenchantly dismissed by E. Courtney, TAPA 114, 1984, 334: „*divus* is never applied to a living emperor, its vocative is not used to address people, and Statius never employs it in the singular”.
2. *dis es*, which seems to me to be an intolerable repetition of *caelo*.

Other suggestions are *Diti es* and *divae es*, both inappropriate. Perhaps *dux es*; for this mode of addressing the emperor there is a parallel at 4,1,46, where Markland’s *dux* (for *rex*) is a certain emendation.

Whatever the solution of this problem, I think that all editors since the sixteenth century have been wrong to change *et* to *es*; Statius means „dear to the gods as well as to human beings”.

- 1,4,48-49. *sic itur in alta
pectora, sic mixto reverentia fidit amori.*

As *praefectus urbis* Rutilius Gallicus tempers power with mercy, thus winning affection.

„So doth reverence trust the love wherewith it mingles” (Mozley). Well might Markland comment „inutilis prorsus et nullius sensus sententia”. Most of the emendations which have been suggested (*se dat amori, sidit amore, iusto ... cedit amori*)

aim at obtaining the sense „reverence gives way to affection”. I think it more probable that Statius said „reverence is strengthened by an admixture of affection”, i.e. (perhaps) *cre*scit amore.

1,4,86-88.

*gaudet Trasimennus et Alpes
Cannensesque animae; primusque insigne tributum
ipse palam laeta p o s c e b a t Regulus umbra.*

Libya now pays tribute to Rome, thus making amends for the disasters of the Punic Wars.

„Is it really possible to accept this picture of Regulus' ghost claiming his private share of the money extorted in Libya?”, asks Håkanson (48), who is therefore inclined to adopt Baehrens's *noscebat*: „Regulus appears (*palam*), and looks with triumphant joy at the tribute”. Exactly so; instead of *noscebat* read *spectabat*. It is quite possible that *spec-* became *pesc-* by one of those rearrangements of four or more letters which are copiously illustrated by Housman, Manilius 1, p. lviii.

1,6,4-8.

*Saturnus mihi compede exsoluta
et multo gravidus mero December
et ridens Iocus et Sales protervi
adsint, dum refero diem beatum
laeti Caesaris ebriamque †parcen†.*

„Locus desperatissimus” (Klotz). A list of about 10 suggestions can be compiled from the current editions (another will be found in ThLL V 2, 14, 73 ff.). Most of these are fantastic, but two do make sense: *noctem* (Richard Thomson, ob. 1613), the most favoured emendation, and *Romam* (Bentley); neither however has any palaeographical probability at all. If we delete *par* (i.e. *P*) as having arisen from the erroneous repetition of *que* (i.e. *q*. or similar symbol), it is not difficult to fill out *cen* to make *cenam*; and that the entertainment which Statius proceeds to describe could be called a *cena* is shown by 32 *epulas*, 43 *una vescitur omnis ordo mensa*, 48 *dapes*, 50 *convivam*, 94 *convivia* and *dapes*. As for *ebriam*, the abundance of wine is mentioned four times: in lines 5, 33, 41, and 95.

2, praef. 5-7. *primum enim habet* [sc. *hic liber meus*] *Glauciam nostrum, cuius gratissima infantia et qualem plerumque infelices sortiuntur (apud te complexus amabam) iam non tibi.*

The first poem in Book 2 is on the death of Glaucias, the favourite of Atedius Melior.

The text given above is that of Vollmer, followed by most of the modern editors. But the parenthesis is intolerable; even more so is the isolated *iam non tibi* (sc. *est*: 'is not yours any more', i.e. is dead). Even Vollmer had doubts about the latter, and suggested a lacuna as a possible alternative solution; it is indeed the only possible solution. Although certainty is unattainable, I think that the most economical way of obtaining sense may be to write *cuius gratissima*⟨*m*⟩ *infantia*⟨*m*⟩, *et qualem plerumque infelices sortiuntur, apud te complexus amabam iam non*⟨*minus quam*⟩ *tu.*

- 2,1,41-43. *o ubi purpureo suffusus sanguine candor
sidereique orbes radiataque lumina caelo
et castigatae collecta modestia frontis ...?*

Description of Glaucias's beauty.

I do not believe in „eyes furnished with rays (radiance) from heaven". Perhaps *radiantia lumina, ocelli* (cf. Ovid, *Am.* 3,3,9 *radiant ut sidus ocelli*). Markland pointed out that *orbes* and *lumina* occur together at Lucan 2,184f. and Silius 9, 400 (*oculi* and *lumina* at Lucan 5,212f.); whatever the exact meaning of the two words in these passages, in ours *orbes* could refer to shape and *lumina* to brightness; neither needs to be a mere synonym of *ocelli*.

- 2,1,50-51. *heu lactea colla,
‡bracchiaque‡ numquam domini sine pondere cervix!*

Glaucias's physical beauty.

I agree with those editors who construe *domini* with *cervix* (Melior's neck was never without the weight of Glaucias), not with *pondere* (Glaucias's neck was never without the weight of Melior); both the parallels adduced by van Dam and (as he says) common sense show that this must be so. Since 1898 most editors have followed Saftien in emending *que* to *quo* („without the weight of which"), but the asyndeton *colla bracchia* (whether or not one understands *lactea* with *bracchia*) is thoroughly objectionable. I suggest that, if one takes *que* to be *quae*, M's reading can be accepted as it stands: *heu lactea colla! / bracchia quae! numquam ... cervix:* „what lovely arms! never was the master's neck without their weight." For the position of exclamatory *quis* see [Seneca], H.O. 1178 *morior Alcides quibus!*; 1185 ff. *feminae cuius manu / ... / vincor!* 1206 *titulus extremus quis est!*

- 2,1,67-68. *muta domus, fateor, desolatique penates,
et situs in thalamis et maesta silentia mensis.*

The effect of Glaucias's death on Melior's home.

fateor was first rejected (as „inepta et nullius sensus vox") by Markland, and later, at considerable length, by Housman (*Class. Papers* 642 ff.). Yet it is still accepted by van Dam on the ludicrous grounds that (a) *fateor* is common in parentheses, (b) no one has offered a satisfactory emendation. Housman described Markland's *pariter* as 'violent' and Baehrens's *stat ero* as 'unnatural'; the other seven emendations listed by van Dam are even worse (and that applies to Housman's *mussat* as much as to the others). Perhaps the simplest emendation would be *facta est*; this is no doubt a somewhat prosaic locution (Horace, *Sat.* 1,5,95 *iter ... factum corruptius imbri*; frequent in elegy and epigram), but it is occasionally found in more elevated poetry, e.g. Virgil, *Georg.* 2,534 *rerum facta est pulcherrima Roma*; Lucan 7,702 (*Caesar*) *factus campis felicior istis*; Seneca, *Med.* 280 *nocensum facta* (cf. H.O. 198); Silius 3,356 *nomen Romanis factum mox nobile damnis*.

2,2,60-61. *iam Methymnaei vatis manus et chelys una
Thebais et Getici cedit tibi gloria plectri.*

As a poet Pollius surpasses Arion, Amphion, and Orpheus.

Editors are divided as to whether *una* is the adverb or the adjective, and in the latter case whether it means 'sole' or 'unique'. But these doubts merely increase one's suspicions of the word; Markland was surely right in suggesting *illa*, which few modern editors except Baehrens (who adopted it) even deem worthy of mention. Apart from the last letter *una* has four minimis, *illa* three.

2,2,100-103. *saepe per autumnum iam pubescente Lyaeo
consendit scopulos noctisque occulta sub umbra
palmite maturo rorantia lumina tersit
Nereis et dulces rapuit de collibus uvas.*

„Why on earth should the Nereid wipe her wet eyes with a vine-stem before stealing the grapes, especially a vine-stem with ripe grapes hanging from it?“, A. Ker (CQ 3, 1953, 3), who proposed to replace *lumina tersit* by *vimina torsit*, „wrenched a dew-wet spray from (or „on“) a ripe vine-stem“. Håkanson (60) agrees with Ker that „this eye-brushing is ridiculous“, but rightly rejects Ker's emendation on the grounds that *vimina* is scarcely the word which one expects, and that *torquere* in the sense 'wrench off' is unparalleled and unconvincing. Håkanson's own suggestion is *munera carpsit*, which does not seem very probable palaeographically and in any case is an unpleasant anticipation of *rapuit uvas* in the next line. I think that there is no real doubt about the sense which is required: the Nereid brushed aside (*tersit*) the dew-laden vine-leaves in order to get at the ripe grapes underneath; for *tergeo* = 'remove by wiping' see OLD, sense 2. The only doubt is about the neuter plural dactylic word which Statius used to denote 'leaves'. Perhaps *tegmina* (sc. *uvarum*); ThLL (VI 1011,67 ff.) lists three passages (two of them from Cicero's poetry) for the phrase *foliorum tegmen*. For the corruption of *tegmina* to *lumina* see Housman's note on Manilius 1,416.

2,3,14-17. *ibi demum victa labore,
fessa metu, ... fluxos collegit amictus
artius et niveae posuit se margine ripae.
fluxos Scriverius: flauos M*

The nymph Pholoe is being pursued by Pan.

Many attempts have been made to explain or emend *niveae*; see the discussions of Håkanson (66 f.) and van Dam. I think it is certainly corrupt, and that the obvious replacement is a word meaning something like *gramineae* (cf. Theb. 9,492) or *floreae*. Such a word is Markland's *viridis* or *viridi*, and if this adjective were palaeographically more convincing there would be no need to look farther. As an improvement in this respect I would suggest *vernae*, a word which Statius uses about nine times; at *Silv.* 3,5,58 *vernos* is an old emendation which has been uni-

versally accepted for the manuscript reading *nervos*, which clearly shows how the corruption could have occurred in our passage (*uernae* > *neruae* > *niueae*).

2,3,39-42. *primaevam v i s u platanum ...*
deposuit iuxta v i v a mque adgressit harenam
optatisque aspergit aquis.

Pan plants a plane-tree.

It is impossible to believe that *visu* goes with *primaevam* ('young to see') or with anything else in the sentence. By contrast the old conjecture *nisu* ('by dint of effort') makes good sense, and the noun is used by Statius elsewhere.

As for *vivam*, it is natural to think of Virgil's *vivoque sedilia saxo* (Aen. 1, 167), 'natural', i.e. not man-made; but this is not a convincing meaning with *harenam*. Still less convincing are Frère—Izaak's 'vivifiant' (Slater's 'quickening') and Vollmer's 'naturfrisch, feucht'. Like van Dam, I would emend, not however to his *niveam* but to *bib(ul)am*; this is a common epithet of *harena* (see ThLL II 1968, 75 ff.), and is clearly appropriate here in view of the next line. For the confusion of *b* and *u* see note on 2,6,42 below.

2,6,12-14. *ne comprime fletus,*
ne pudeat; rumpat frenos dolor iste d i e s q u e
si tam dura placent.

Statius urges Ursus to give free rein to his grief for the death of his favourite Philetus.

diesque is quite meaningless; so is the old conjecture *deosque*, although a second accusative with *rumpat* seems the most probable solution. Håkanson (72 f.) argues for the seventeenth-century conjecture *decusque*; like van Dam, I am not convinced by this. Instead I suggest *(mo)dosque*, comparing Juvenal 8,88 *pone irae frena modumque*. I admit that in our passage also we should expect *modumque* rather than *modosque*, but the plural has the authority of Statius himself at the beginning of this very poem: *lacrimis quisquis discrimina ponis / lugendique m o d o s*. In both passages *modos* is parallel to a preceding plural noun.

2,6,41-43. *nec petulans acies blandique severo*
igne oculi, qualis †bellis† iam casside visu
Parthenopaeus erat.

Philetus's appearance is compared to that of Parthenopaeus, described in Theb. 9,699 ff.: *ast ubi pugna / cassis anabela calet, resoluta vertice nudus / exoritur*, etc. In that passage Parthenopaeus has taken off his helmet; so too in Martial 9,56, 8 he is *casside liber*; one expects the same sense in our passage. I agree with Housman (Class. Papers 574) that the only word which is clearly corrupt is *bellis* (I see nothing really objectionable in *visu*, though such an ablative with *talis* or *qualis* may not be very common); even if *bellis* could be made to construe satisfactorily, it is „at best superfluous beside *casside*” (Housman), and the same is true of Postgate's

emendation (in *Philologus* 18, 1905, 124) *bellans*. Substitute a word meaning 'lacking' which can govern the ablative, and no other change may be necessary. Baehrens wrote *liber*; palaeographically easier, I suggest, would be *viduus* (> *bidus* > *bellis*); at Theb. 10,183 the Puteaneus has corrupted *vidui* to *dubii* (intermediate stage perhaps *bidui*). For the confusion of *u* and *b* see note on 2,3,41 above.

2,6,93-95.

*quid terga dolori,
Urse, damus? quid damna foves et pectore iniquo
vulnus amas? ubi nota reis facundia r a p t i s?*

Staius urges Ursus to cease mourning for Philetus.

„Why do you not use your famous eloquence now to console yourself?” As van Dam says, this seems to be the obvious meaning. If *reis* is sound, Ursus was presumably an advocate who was good at consoling his clients. But what does *raptis* mean? It is usually taken as *raptis in ius*, ‘dragged into court’, which I regard as impossible. Equally unsatisfactory is *raptis e iudicio*, i.e. ‘acquitted’, despite Markland’s citation of Seneca, *Dial.* 10,6,1 *ut quaedam iudicia constet ab illo* [sc. *M. Livio Druso*] *rapta*, of winning a case contrary to all expectations. I would emend to ⟨f⟩*ractis*, ‘crushed’ being either ‘condemned’ or (more probably in view of the context) ‘downcast’, ‘dejected’, as at Theb. 8,211 *fracta dehinc cunctis aversaque pectora bello*; Staius may be echoing Horace, *Odes* 4,1,14 *pro sollicitis non tacitus reis*.

3,1,123-28.

*praecipuus sed enim labor est excindere dextra
oppositas rupes et saxa negantia ferro.
hic pater ipse loci positus Tiryntibus armis
insudat validaque solum deforme bipenni ...
ipse fodit.*

Hercules himself helps in the building of his temple.

Vollmer, followed by Klotz, construes *hic* with *loci*. For such a genitive with an adverb of place see Kühner—Stegmann 1, p. 434; but I have found no instance of this particular combination *hic loci* (there is certainly none in either the comic or the epic poets). Even if it could be paralleled, *loci* in our passage would be particularly otiose.

It has been traditional to construe *loci* with *pater*, in the sense of *loci custos* (1,1,66), ‘the patron of the place’ (Mozley). The phrase could then be a reminiscence of Virgil, *Aen.* 8,31 ff. *huic deus ipse loci fluvio Tiberinus amoeno / ... / visus*, but *deus loci* is much easier than *pater loci*, and we would expect *pater Tiryntibus* to have no genitive with it here any more than it has at Val. Flacc. 3,565.

The best solution is that which at one time occurred to Klotz but was apparently rejected by him, *operi*; for the dative cf. Calpurnius, *Ecl.* 5,10 *iam certe potes insudare labori*. This is not difficult palaeographically; the *p/c* confusion is common. With *operi* it is quite possible that *hic* (‘hereupon’) should be changed to *huic*.

3,3,85-86. *iamque piam lux alma domum praecelsaque toto
intravit Fortuna gradu.*

Claudius Etruscus is promoted to a distinguished position in the emperor's service.

"*toto* Enallage statt *tota*", Vollmer; „with steps unchecked”, Slater; „de plein élan”, Frère—Izaac. I suspect that *toto* should be *laeto* (*l* and *t* are easily confused). This is strongly supported by 5,1,75 *venitque gradu Fortuna benigno*, where the context is similar to ours (promotion of a man in the emperor's service).

3,3,98-102. *vigil idem animique sagacis
†exitus† evolvit quantum Romana sub omni
pila die quantumque tribus, quid templa, quid alti
undarum cursus, quid propugnacula poscant
aequoris aut longe series porrecta viarum.*

98. *uigilite animaeque M*

As a *rationibus* to Nero, Claudius Etruscus has control of imperial expenditure.

Most emendations of *exitus* have taken the form of an adjective or participle, like *et citus*, *anxius*, *excitus*, *cognitus*; these are justly described by E. Courtney (BICS 13, 1966, 99) as „truly unattractive”. Courtney suggests *scitius*, which is a prosaic word: in verse outside comedy, apparently *scite* first in Prudentius, *scitius* nowhere attested. Better, I suggest, *(s)edulus*.

3,5,85-86. *pax secunda locis et desidis otia vitae
et numquam turbata quies somnique peracti.*

Statius is describing Naples.

„*somni peracti* die man zu Ende bringen kann”, Vollmer. This in effect means ‘sleep unbroken’, a repetition of *numquam turbata quies*. Surely the old emendation *parati* is more probable, although it has been adopted only by Baehrens and is not even mentioned in some editions; the meaning will then be much the same as that of *somni faciles* (see Nisbet—Hubbard on Horace, Odes 2,11,8). At Seneca, Ag. 976 *paratum* and *peractum* are variants.

4,1,44-47. *sic Ianus clausoque libens se poste recepit.
tunc omnes patere dei laetoque dederunt
signa polo, longamque tibi, dux magne, iuventam
annuit atque suos promisit Iuppiter annos.*

46. *dux* Markland: *rex M*

Janus has just promised a glorious future for the emperor.

If *patuere* is genuine, its only possible sense is the rather weak one attributed to it by Håkanson (110 f.): the gods 'revealed themselves' by giving signs in the sky (so too Leo, *Ausg. kleine Schr.* 1,93). Håkanson thinks that Statius is remembering Lucan 2,1 f., where *irae patuere deum* is followed by *signa dedit mundus*. I doubt whether the resemblance between the two passages is close enough to guarantee *patuere* in ours. If the word requires emendation, as I think it does, in preference to the conjectures *favere* and *plausere* I should read *<s>tupuere*, an easy correction (loss of initial letter by haplography, and inversion of *p* and *t*), and a favourite word of Statius. That *stupere* can be used of joy is shown by a fragment of Caelius preserved by Quintilian 9,3,58 *stupere gaudio Graecus*. At Ach. 1,14 f. Statius uses the word of the attitude of the world towards the emperor (*quem longe primum stupet Itala virtus / Graiaque*), but the passage which lends the strongest support is *Silv.* 4,2,20 ff., where there is the same sequence of astonishment (on the part of Jupiter's temple) and joy (among the gods) at the emperor's new palace: *stupet hoc vicina Tonantis / regia, teque pari laetantur sede locatum / numina*.

4,2,26-29.

aemulus illic
*mons Libys Iliacusque nitet, * * * multa Syene*
et Chios et glaucae certantia Doridi saxa
Lunaque portandis tantum suffecta columnis.

The various kinds of stone used in the construction of the emperor's palace.

In 27 the first hand of M marks a lacuna, which scholars have filled in various ways; most insert a connective (*et, nec, hic, tum, quin*), since the asyndeton is suspicious. A few have queried *multa*; certainly an adjective of quantity is out of harmony with the qualitative words *nitet* and *glaucae*. Both these points could be met by reading *<si>mul at<ra> Syene*. The reference is to *syenites*, granite from Syene, about which Kees in REIV A 1020,30 ff. says: „wegen seiner dunklen Verwitterung wird er gelegentlich auch als 'schwarzer Stein' ... bezeichnet"; he refers to Diodorus 1,47,3 (*λίθου μέλανος τοῦ Συηνίτου*) and 1,64,7, and to Strabo 17,1,33.

4,4,64-66.

nec enim tibi sola potentis
eloquii virtus: sunt membra accommoda bellis
quique gravem t a r d e subeant thoraca lacerti.

Praise of Vitorius Marcellus.

The usual interpretation of line 66 is that Marcellus's frame is so robust that he has difficulty in getting into his cuirass; with good reason Slater comments „this seems grotesque”. Less grotesque is Barth's *<haud> tarde*, but the most ingenious suggestion is Slater's *Aeacidae*; he claims that „the breastplate of Achilles” was proverbial, but his reference to Juvenal 11,30 (*loricam ... Achillis*) hardly proves this (any other part of Achilles's armour would have suited Juvenal's purpose just as

well). True, Achilles is one of the seven Achaeans who in the Iliad sometimes wear a *thorax*; another is Agamemnon, whose *thorax* has the distinction of being the only one to which Homer devotes a detailed description (Il. 11,24-28). Could Statius have written *Atridae*, which is palaeographically much superior to *Aeacidae*?

4,8,6-9. *nec solum festas secreta Neapolis aras
ambiat: et socii portus dilectaque miti
terra Dicarcheo nec non plaga cara madenti
Surrentina deo sertis altaria cingat.*

On the birth of a third child to Julius Menecrates: not only his native Naples but Puteoli and Surrentum as well must join in the rejoicing.

secreta 'in lonely isolation' (Mozley), reinforcing *solum* (so Vollmer). This is incredible. Of the half-dozen emendations which have been suggested only Markland's *laetata* is likely to be on the right lines, but for palaeographical reasons it can hardly be the right expression. Perhaps *sua laeta*; for the „very early and common" confusion of *l* and *r* see Housman, Class. Papers 161.

5,1,81-85. *ille ... ferrique togaeque
consilia atque ipsam mentem probat. ille †iubatis†
molem immensam umeris et vix tractabile pondus
imposuit.*

Domitian promotes Abascantus to the important post of *ab epistulis*.

iubatis, in the sense of *puerilibus*, was justly ridiculed by Markland; in the sense of *virilibus* (i.e. Abascantus had a mass of manly hair flowing over his shoulders) it is just impossible, at least in this context. Most of the suggested emendations (listed by Klotz) are likewise objectionable; the favourite one has long been *subactis*, a metaphor from the breaking-in of an animal, but it is difficult to believe that it could mean *exercitatis* (so Phillimore). More interesting is Saenger's *iuvantis*; the genitive of a present participle seems a good idea, but *iuvare* gives a weak sense. Substitute *volentis*, corrupted to *iubatis* partly by perseveration from the ending of *probat*. The present participle of *volo* ends a hexameter 13 times in the epics (including Theb. 1,172 f. *nec impositos umquam cervice volenti / ferre duces*) and three times in the *Silvae*.

5,1,119-20. *fovet anxia curas
coniugis hortaturque simul flectitque labores.*

Priscilla supports her husband in the execution of his duties.

The context requires *flectit* to mean something like 'alleviates' (Mozley), 'mildert, erleichtert' (Vollmer), not 'guides' (Slater). Now in the article on *flectere* in ThLL (VI 896,37 ff.) there is a section headed 'lenire, mitigare, temperare' in which our passage is the first example; the other six (especially those with a prepositional phrase like *ad* or *in aliquid*) are quite unlike it. I doubt whether *flectit labores* can mean 'alleviates duties'; the verb one might have expected is *fallit*, in the

sense of 'efficit ne labores sentiantur' (cf. Porphyrio on Horace, Sat. 2,2,12; ThLL VI 188,9 ff.). But *fallit* is palaeographically remote; much closer is *fulcit*, which is what I think Statius wrote; *fulcit labores* (= *laborantem*) is no more difficult than *fovet curas* (= *curantem*).

5,1,205-8. *ille etiam certe rupisset tempora vitae
ne tu Tartareum chaos incommitata subires,
sed prohibet mens fida duci miranda que sacris
imperii et maior amor.*

205. *certe* edd. vett.: *erecte* (ex *recte* corr.) M

207. *duci* Domitius: *ducis* M

After the death of his wife Abascantus is prevented from taking his own life by his loyalty to, and affection for, the emperor.

In 205 neither the obelus nor any of the wild guesses listed by Klotz is justified. I have returned to what used to be the vulgate.

In 207, according to Vollmer, *sacris imperii* means *sacro imperatori*: „den der Kaiser selbst bewundern muss”; this is quite incredible. Two emendations are worthy of consideration, Barth's *servandaque* and Markland's *iurataque*; but with either of these the order of words is wrong. This, however, can easily be put right: read *iurata* (rather than *servanda*) *sacrisque*.

5,2,99-110. *nuper cum forte sodalis
immeritae falso palleret crimine famae, ...
tu, quamquam non ante forum legesque severas
passus sed tacita studiorum occultus in umbra,
105 defensare metus adversaque tela subisti
pellere, inermis adhuc et tiro, paventis amici.
... stupere patres temptamina tanta
conatusque tuos, nec te reus ipse timebat.*

Crispinus, although only a youth of sixteen and without experience of the courts, had appeared before the centumviral court in defence of a friend.

„Quid mirum si reus non timeret patronum?”, asks Markland. The fears of the accused (for himself) have been mentioned in 100 (*palleret*) and 106 (*paventis*), and neither the paradoxos nor any of the conjectures recorded by Klotz (such as *nec tunc, pro te, de te, tecte, tacite*) makes another mention of any fears of his in the least convincing. I suggest *nec tu reus ipse timebas*, the reference being to a different occasion, on which Crispinus himself (*ipse*) was a defendant (it is perhaps not surprising that Statius gives no hint of the charge); as a result of his previous experience of the courts he had no fears.

5,3,74-77. *nec enim Marathoniam virginem
parcius extinctum saevorum crimine agrestum
fleverit Icarium Phrygia quam turre cadentem
Astyanacta parens.*

Erigone grieved for her father just as much as Andromache for her son.

The perfect subjunctive *fleverit* is inexplicable. Substitute *fleverat*. The use of the pluperfect in the sense of the aorist needs no illustration, but it may be noted that *fleverat* is similarly used of mythological *exempla* by Propertius 1,15,10 and 1,20,16.

5,3,138-40. *inde frequens pugnae nulloque ingloria sacro
vox tua; non totiens victorem Castora gyro
nec fratrem caestu virides †clausero† Therapnae.*

The victories of Statius's father in literary contests were more numerous than those of Castor and Pollux in their respective sports.

The most recent discussion of this passage is by Håkanson (147 f.), who proposes *coluere Therapnae*. „the sense being not much different from that of *plausere Therapnae* (4,8,53), which is of course impossible, since this verb never occurs with an accusative”. Despite Håkanson's parallels I should prefer *auxere*, ‘honoured’ (like *auget* at 3,5,103); M's reading would then be an attempt to make a Latin word out of the slight corruption *ausere* (*hausit* and *auxit* are variants at Theb. 6,937).

5,5,33-34. *iuvat heu, iuvat inlaudabile carmen
fundere et incompete miserum laudare dolorem.*

In his sorrow for the death of his adopted son Statius finds relief in ‘pouring forth song that merits no praise’.

laudare has clearly been influenced by *inlaudatum* in the previous line, so that the verb which it has displaced need not bear a very close resemblance to it. Only two suggestions deserve mention, Markland's *nudare* and Unger's *laxare* (the latter supported by Håkanson 157); of these I think that the former gives the better sense. In preference to *nudare*, however, I suggest *vulgare* (a word which is used five times in the Thebaid); perhaps a unconscious reminiscence of Virgil, Aen. 10,64 *verbis vulgare dolorem*.