

## FURTHER STUDIES IN THE TEXTS OF LATIN POETS

Heather WHITE  
30c Bethune Road  
London N 16 5BD  
England

Recibido: 31 de agosto de 2007  
Aceptado: 24 de junio de 2008

### RESUMEN:

Notas críticas y de interpretación acerca de las Fábulas de Aviano y las *Silvae* de Estacio.

### ABSTRACT:

Some critical and interpretative notes about Avianus' Fables and Statius' *Silvae*.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Fábulas de Aviano, *Silvas* de Estacio, crítica textual, interpretación.

KEYWORDS: Avianus' Fables, Statius' *Silvae*, textual criticism, interpretation.

SUMARIO: 1. Notes on the Fables of Avianus. 2. Notes on the *Silvae* of Statius. 3. Bibliography.

## 1. NOTES ON THE FABLES OF AVIANUS

### 5. 9-12

Ast ubi terribilis mimo circumstetit horror  
pigræque praesumptus venit in ossa vigor,  
mitibus ille feris communia pabula calcans  
turbabat pavidas per sua rura boves.

*Line 9: mimo Cannegieter: animo codd.*

A donkey once discovered a lion's skin and put it on. He then frightened the other animals. Cannegieter<sup>1</sup> printed the reading *mimo* in line 9. I would like to point

---

<sup>1</sup> Cannegieter used manuscripts in order to correct the text of Avianus: *cf.* my note on 36.11.

out, however, that the mss. reading *animo* makes good sense. The poet states that grim horror surrounded the donkey due to his reason (*animo*<sup>2</sup>). Gaide<sup>3</sup> compared Virgil., Aen. 2.559 *me ... circumstetit horror*. Avianus means that the donkey's reason (or intellect) had enabled him to frighten the other animals by disguising himself as a lion and consequently to emit *terribilis horror* owing to his disguise<sup>4</sup>.

### 8. 5-10

Corporis immensi fertur pecus isse per auras  
 et magnum precibus sollicitasse Iouem:  
 turpe nimis cunctis inridendumque uideri,  
 insignes geminis cornibus ire boues  
 et solum nulla munitum parte camelum  
 obiectum cunctis expositumque feris.

*Line 5: auras: arua v.l.: cf. Duff's apparatus ad loc.*

In this fable a camel is said to have asked Jupiter for help. The reader will note that Baehrens printed the reading *auras* in line 5. I would like to point out, however, that the reading *arua* makes better sense. The camel is said to have travelled through the plains of the desert (*per arua*<sup>5</sup>) in order to visit the shrine of Jupiter Ammon in Libya<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, s.v. *animus* II, A, 1: "The general power of perception and thought, the reason, the intellect, mind".

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Gaide (1980) 49. Prof. Gaide has produced an excellent edition of Avianus' *Fables*.

<sup>4</sup> Gaide defends *animo*, interpreting it as "son coeur", and mistakenly believes that the *terribilis horror* filled the heart of the donkey, but Avianus has elegantly modified the sense of Virgil's *circumstetit*. In Virgil, Aeneas is overcome by *horror*, whereas in Avianus the donkey is surrounded by the *horror* which he emits in order to terrify the other animals.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, s.v. *aruum* B, 2, b: *arua deserti*, HIER., Vulg. 23.10.

<sup>6</sup> For Jupiter Ammon cf. White (2002) 125 and 137. Withof's reading *per Afros* supports my interpretation. At 7.2 Withof provided the reading *verberibus*, which makes good sense. Gaide does not record the reading *arua*.

12. 1-4

Rusticus inpresso molitus uomere terram  
 Thensaurum sulcis prosiluisse uidet.  
 Mox indigna animo properante reliquit aratra,  
 gramina compellens ad meliora boues.

*Line 4: gramina Cannegieter: semina codd.*

The reading *semina* is correct. The rustic stops ploughing (*reliquit aratra*) the bare soil (*terram*), and sends the oxen to graze the crop (*cf.* O.L.D., s.v. *semen*, 3, and Lewis and Short, s.v. *semen*, I, B) in another field. Such a crop is better (*meliora*) than what had been sown and had not germinated in the bare soil he had been ploughing.

19. 1-4

Horrentes dumos abies pulcherrima risit,  
 cum facerent formae iurgia magna suae,  
 indignum referens cum istis certamen haberi,  
 quod meriti nullus consociaret honor.

*Line 3: cum istis Baehrens: cunctis codd.*

*Line 4: quod: quos v.l.*

The reader will note that Baehrens suggested the alteration *cum istis* in line 3. Textual alteration is, however, not necessary. The pine tree said that it was unfair that it should contend with “al those (*cunctis*) whom (*quos*) no title brought by merit into its own class”.

Gaide defends *cunctis*, interpreting it as “de l’avis de tous”, which is not convincing because “l’avis de tous” is not needed by the tree to support his assertion.

21. 1-6

Paruola progeniem terrae mandauerat ales,  
 qua stabat uiridi cespite flaua seges.  
 Rusticus hanc fragili cupiens decerpere culmo  
 uicinam supplex forte petebat opem.  
 Haec uox implumes turbauit credita nidos,

suaserat et laribus continuare fugam.

*Line 5: credita Withof; sedula b: cf. Duff's apparatus.*

The poet describes how a farmer's voice frightened some nestlings. Baehrens printed the reading *credita*<sup>7</sup> in line 5. It should be noted, however, that the variant *sedula*<sup>8</sup> makes good sense. The farmer's sedulous words disturbed the nestlings. The farmer is said, in line 4, to have prayed strongly (*forte*) for help.

### 23. 11-12

Subdita namque tibi est magni reuerentia fani  
atque eadem retines funera nostra manu.

*Line 11: fani Baehrens: fati codd.*

The poet describes how a craftsman made a statue of Bacchus which a nobleman wanted to place on his tomb. Baehrens printed the alteration *fani* in line 11. It should be noted, however, that the mss. reading *fati* makes perfect sense. The statue says that reverence for an important death (*magni*<sup>9</sup> *reuerentia fati*) is submitted to the judgement of the craftsman. He means that the craftsman must decide whether or not he wishes to allow the nobleman to place the statue on his tomb.

### 29. 15-18

Optulit et calido plenum cratera Lyaeo,  
laxet ut infusus frigida membra tepor.  
Ille ubi feruentem labris contingere testam  
horruit, argenti rursus ab ore sufflat.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. VERG., *Aen.* 2.247 (Cassandra) *non unquam credita* ("believed") *Teucris*.

<sup>8</sup> Note the use of adjectival *enallage*. The adjective *sedula* refers to the fact that the farmer is sedulous in asking for help. Cf. my note on 23.11. Gaide does not mention the variant *sedula* and accepts the reading *credula*, which she interprets as "paroles naïves".

<sup>9</sup> Note the use of adjectival *enallage*. The adjective *magni* refers to the nobleman. For other cases of adjectival *enallage*, cf. White (2002) 164. Gaide defends *fati*, which she interprets as the "grand destin" of the statue.

A satyr is said to have invited a traveller into his cave and offered him hospitality. This poem is a version of the story which, in many variants, is found in Aesop, *fab.* 60 (cf. *Aesopi Fabulae*, rec. Aem. Chambry, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1925, p. 131-134). In the version edited on p. 133 f. Chambry, we read that the satyr gave warm food and warm drink to the traveller:

θερμὰ μὲν φαγεῖν δέδωκε καὶ θερμὰ πειν

And we are told that satyrs are amorous (οὐ λέγουσι παίκτα: cf. παίζω, “make love”).

We know that satyrs were “fond of wine (cf. A. P. 6, 44) and of [...] sensual pleasure”, and that they made love to nymphs (cf., e. g., Smith, *Dict. Gr. Rom. Mythol.*, s. v. *Satyrus*). The traveller in *fab.* 29 had already warmed up his *gelidos artus* (v. 9), *depulso frigore* (v. 11): therefore the warm wine in line 16 cannot serve to warm up the already warm limbs (*membra*) of the traveller.

We know that *sine Cerere et Libero friget Venus*, as the saying goes (Ter. Eun. 732). The warm wine offered to the traveller, therefore, was meant to excite him sexually, i. e. to extend (*laxet*) his *membrum uirile*, which was inert (*frigida membra*). The satyr wanted the traveller to enjoy *agrestem uitam* and tried to offer to him all the good things found in the woods (*silvarum optima quaeque*), i. e. to offer him Dryads<sup>10</sup> in a rustic symposium. The traveller, however, refuses to drink the warm wine, and annoys the satyr, who sent him away with a pretext. The words *duplici monstro perterritus*, in line 19, are patently written in jest<sup>11</sup>.

### 31. 7-12

Tunc indignantem mus hoc sermone fatigans  
 dispulit hostiles calliditate minas:  
 ‘Non quia magna tibi tribuerunt membra parentes,  
 uiribus effectum constituere tuis.  
 Disce tamen breuibus quae sit fiducia monstis,  
 ut faciat quicquid paruula turba cupit’.

*Line 7: mus hoc Cannegieter, Withof: iusto codd.*

<sup>10</sup> Cf. e. g. Smith, *loc. cit.* and Murray (1988) 153.

<sup>11</sup> *Frigida membra* is -I need hardly add- a poetic plural: cf. White (2002) 142. On the Hamadryads being notoriously *faciles*, cf. White (2006) 175.

*Line 12: faciat: facias Apol.*<sup>12</sup>

In this fable, a mouse attacks an ox. The conjecture *mus hoc* is not justified, because we are faced with a normal case of *Subjektswechsel*: this has been understood by Gaide.

I would like to suggest that we should print the reading *facias* in line 12 and translate as follows: “Learn, however, the courage that tiny monsters have, so that you will do whatever our little band wants”<sup>13</sup>.

### 36. 11-12

Mox uitulum sertis innexum respicit aris  
admotum cultro comminus ire popae.

*Line 11: sertis Cannegieter: sacris codd.*

In this passage the poet describes the sacrifice of a calf. I would like to point out that Cannegieter<sup>14</sup> has preserved the correct reading in line 11. The calf is imagined to have been garlanded<sup>15</sup>: *uitulum sertis innexum*. Cf. Ovid. Tr. 5, 3, 3 *innectunt tempora sertis*.

### 37. 1-4

Pinguior exhausto canis occurrisse leoni  
fertur et insertis uerba dedisse iocis.  
‘Nonne uides duplici tendantur ut ilia tergo  
Luxurietque toris nobile pectus?’ ait.

<sup>12</sup> For the readings of the *Apologi Auiani*, cf. my note on 38.5.

<sup>13</sup> Gaide prefers the variant *faciat*, but the imperative *disce* supports *facias*: the ox must learn how courageous mice are, so that he will -this is of course said in jest- have to take orders from them.

<sup>14</sup> It should be noted that Cannegieter used manuscripts in order to correct the text: cf. 32.5 victor B, Cannegieter (cf. Gaide’s *apparatus*). Cf. also 7.8 notam Pc, Cannegieter; 9.5 incertum T, Cannegieter.

<sup>15</sup> Gaide does not accept Cannegieter’s conjecture, whereas Baehrens does. Victims of sacrifice were, as is well known, often garlanded. There would have been no need for Cannegieter to alter *sacris* unless he found the variant *sertis*.

Scholars have been puzzled by the meaning of the words *duplici tergo*<sup>16</sup>. The transmitted text is, however, perfectly sound. The dog is imagined to be standing on a double ridge<sup>17</sup>. Note also the employment of a pun. The noun *ilia* means both ‘flanks’ and *membrum uirile*<sup>18</sup>. The dog states that his *membrum uirile* is erect (*tendantur*<sup>19</sup>) as he stands on the ridge (*tergo*).

38. 1-6

Dulcibus e stagnis fluuio torrente coactus  
 aequoreas praeceps piscis obibat aquas.  
 Illic squamigerum despectans inprobis agmen  
 eximium sese nobilitate refert.  
 Non tulit expulsum patrio sub gurgite phycis  
 verbaque cum salibus asperiora dedit:

*Line 5: phycis: phoca Apol.: cf. Gaide's apparatus.*<sup>20</sup>

*Line 6: salibus: sociis G*

Baehrens printed the reading *phycis* in line 5. I would like to suggest, however, that the correct reading in this passage is *phoca*. The seal (*phoca*) states that it is better than the fish since it would command a higher price if it were caught and sold.

The variant reading *sociis* also makes good sense. The seal speaks surrounded by his companions<sup>21</sup>, i. e. other seals<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Duff's note *ad loc.*

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *tergum* II, B: “The back of any thing spread out horizontally, as land or water”. Cf. also Virgil, G. I, 97.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *ile* II, c: “Sing., the private parts”.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *tendo* I, A, 2: “In partic.: *nervum tendere*, in mal. part.”.

<sup>20</sup> For the *Apologi Auiani*, cf. Gaide (1980) 55, who notes that the *Apologi* “fournissent des variantes pour l'établissement du texte antique”. Cf. also 8.2 *fabula nostra C2, Apol.* and 13.10 *insequiturque Apol., Cabel.* (cf. also Baehrens *ad loc.*). Cf., moreover, 19.4 *quos TO, Apol.* and 26.8 *instimulare b2 et paraphr.*

<sup>21</sup> Cf. VERG., *Georg.*, 4.432 *sternunt se somno diuersae in litore phocae*.

<sup>22</sup> The skin of seals was very valuable. The varians *salibus* is accepted by Gaide in the sense ‘railleries’, but there is no sarcasm in the seal's speech. It is possible that the reading *salibus* refers to the sea. The seal is said to be in the midst of the sea: cf. Ov., *Met.* 15.286 *salibus [...] amaris*. For *cum*, cf. Lewis and Short, s. v., II B.

## 39. 7-16

Tunc lituus rauco deflectens murmure culpam  
 inmeritum flammis se pretium esse docet.  
 'Nulla tuos' inquit 'petierunt tela lacertos,  
 uiribus adfirmes quae tamen acta meis;  
 sed tantum suetis ex cantibus arma coegi,  
 hoc quoque submisso (testor ut astra) sono'.  
 Ille reluctantem flammis crepitantibus addens  
 'Hoc te maior' ait 'poena dolorque rapit;  
 nam licet ipse nihil possis temptare nec ausis,  
 saeuior hoc, alios quod facis esse malos'.

*Line 8: se pretium esse docet Baehrens: se docet esse prius codd.*

*Line 15: ausis B, Wopkens: ausus codd.; cf. Gaide's apparatus*

This fable describes how a soldier decided to burn all his weapons. However, his trumpet declared that it was innocent and should not be burnt. The reader will note that Baehrens suggested the alteration *se pretium esse docet* in line 8. Textual alteration is nevertheless not necessary. We should place a full stop after *esse* and translate as follows: "Then a trumpet with a loud blare, deprecating all guilt, declared that it did not deserve the flames. 'In former times (*prius*), never', it said, 'were your arms struck by missiles which you could say were hurled by strength of mine'".

In line 15 Wopkens printed the reading *ausis*. The reader will note that Wopkens used manuscripts in order to correct the text of Avianus.

## 40. 1-2

Distinctus maculis et pulchro corpore pardus  
 inter consimiles ibat in arua feras.

*Line 2: in arua: inire codd.*



In line 2 Baehrens printed the reading *in arua*. I would like to suggest, however, that the correct reading in this passage is *inire*. The poet states that a leopard was about to mate (*ibat*<sup>23</sup> *inire*<sup>24</sup>) among similar beasts<sup>25</sup>.

41. 15-16

Infelix, quae magna sibi cognomina sumens  
 ausa foret tantis nubibus ista loqui.

*Line 16:* foret tantis: pharetratis v. l..

The poet describes how a jar is washed away by rain. It should be noted that the variant reading *pharetratis* makes perfect sense. The clouds are described as “quivered”. There is an allusion here to the constellation of *Sagittarius*, i. e. the Archer<sup>26</sup>. This constellation is connected with winter storms: cf. Aratus 300 ff. Avianus states in line 2 that the storm occurred in winter: *hibernis* [...] *aquis*.

2. NOTES ON THE SILVAE OF STATIUS

1, 1, 63-65

strepit ardua pulsu  
 machina; continuus septem per culmina montis  
 it fragor et magnae fingit vaga murmura Romae.

S. Bailey<sup>27</sup> noted that this poem was written “in honor of Domitian’s colossal equestrian statue”. He argued that the mss. reading *fingit*<sup>28</sup>, in line 65, “is nonsense”, and suggested that we should accept the alteration *frangit*. I would like to point out,

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *eo* II, 5: “[...] to be about to do any thing [...] Poet. also with inf.”

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s.v. *ineo* I, A, 2: “In partic., to know, in mal. part. [...] so of animals, to pair”. *Inire* is here used absolutely; cf. *O.L.D.*, s. v. *ineo*, 3.

<sup>25</sup> *Consimiles* refers to the fact that leopards mixed with lions; cf. *O.L.D.*, s. v. *pardalis*.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *Sagittarius*, C.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Shackleton Bailey (1987) 273. I have used S. Bailey’s learned and interesting article as the starting-point of my paper.

<sup>28</sup> S. Bailey stated that “the popular *vincit* (Heinsius) makes the right sense”. It should be noted that Heinsius used manuscripts in order to correct the text of Propertius and Tibullus: cf. *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 58, 2006, 90.

however, that textual alteration is not necessary, since the mss. reading makes perfect sense. The loud noise made by the “hammering” (so S. Bailey) “makes an imitation of”, “counterfeits” (*cf.* *O.L.D.* s. v. *tingo*, 1, b) the loud noise made by Rome *Murmura* denotes here the loud noise made by Rome (synonymous with *fragor*: *cf.* Lewis and Short, s. v. *murmur*); *vaga* means here not “rumeurs, incertaines” (so Frère-Izaac), but “ranging around”, “roaming”, “reverberating”: for *vagus* so used, *cf.* Deferrari-Egan, *Conc. Stat.*, s. v.<sup>29</sup>

To sum up: S. Bailey believed that *tingit* was “nonsense” because he took *vaga murmura* to mean that “the noise of the city comes through faintly and fitfully”. In reality, *vaga murmura* means “thundering noises” (*murmura* is synonymous with *fragor*) “that reverberate (*vaga*)”, wherefrom it follows that; *murmura* and *fragor* being synonyms in line 65, *tingit* is *le mot juste*.

### 1, 3, 29-33

Hic aeterna quies, nullis hic iura procellis,  
 nunquam feruor aquis. Datur hic transmittere uisus  
 et uoces et paene manus. Sic Chalcida fluctus  
 expellunt reflui, sic dissociata profundo  
 Bruttia Sicanium circumspicit ora Pelorum.

S. Bailey<sup>30</sup> notes that “the river Anio flows between the two parts of Vopiscus’ villa but does not sunder them”. S. Bailey is, however, puzzled by the comparison “with the Euripus and the Straits of Messina”. He concludes his argument as follows: “Read *nec . . . nec*. No Euripus or Straits of Messina here (*hic* 30)”. Textual alteration is, however, not warranted. Statius means that the river Anio is very narrow where it

<sup>29</sup> It is also worth noting that prof. G. Giangrande has pointed out to me that the mss. reading *montis*, in line 64, is correct. The seven hills of Rome (*septem culmina*) are considered to be the *culmina* of one single mountain: *cf.* I, 1, 58 *Alpini culmina dorsi*.

Note the elegant hyperbole expressed by *tingit*: the *fragor* made by the hammering in the yard was just as loud as the proverbially loud noise produced by Rome. The conjecture *vincit* introduces a truism absolutely unworthy of Statius, i. e. would state that the noise produced by outlying Rome was, within the yard, made inaudible by the loud hammering. For the “noises or Rome” *cf.* the material collected by Friedländer and Courtney in their commentaries *ad IUV.*, 3, 232 ff.

<sup>30</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 273 f.

flows through the villa. Thus the river Anio is compared to the narrow stretch of water which flows between Chalcis and Boeotia, and to the straits of Messina<sup>31</sup>.

1, 3, 70-74

Illic ipse antris Anien et fonte relicto  
 nocte sub arcana glaucos exutus amictus  
 huc illuc fragili *prosternit* pectora musco,  
 aut ingens in stagna cadit uitreasque natatu  
 plaudit aquas.

S. Bailey<sup>32</sup> points out that scholars have been puzzled by the meaning of line 72. Textual alteration is once again not necessary. The river-god is said to lay (*prosternit*) his chest on fragile moss<sup>33</sup>, after he has taken his clothes off and cast them here and there (*huc illuc*) in his cave (*antris*)<sup>34</sup>.

1, 6, 70-71

Hoc plaudunt grege Lydiae *timentes*,  
 illic cymbala tinnulaeque Gades.

S. Bailey commented as follows: “What *timentes* represents I do not know, but surely anything would be better than the vulgate *tumentes*: cf. Ovid. Her. 11. 39 *tumescebant vitiati pondera ventris*”. It should be noted, however, that the reading *tumentes* makes perfect sense. The Lydian women are said to be excited (*tumentes*)<sup>35</sup>.

<sup>31</sup> On *refluus* used by Statius, cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *Sic* is defended by Frère-Izaak in their Budé edition: however, they are puzzled by the variant *fluuii*.

<sup>32</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 274.

<sup>33</sup> For soft moss, cf. Ov., *Met.* 8, 563 *molli tellus erat umida musco*. For a bed made of grass, cf. White (2002) 104.

<sup>34</sup> Note that Statius has employed the poetic plural: cf. White (2002) 142. We must put a comma after *illuc*. For *exutus amictus*, cf. STAT., *Theb.* 6, 836 *amictus exuitur* (“fait tomber”: Lesueur in his Budé edition).

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *tumeo* II, A: “To swell, be swollen with passionate excitement, to be excited”. Cf. also *O.L.D.* s. v. *tumeo*, 3. For *tumens*, cf. *Theb.* 3, 600 and 7, 23.

1, 6, 70-71

placido lunata recessu  
hinc atque hinc *curuas* perrumpunt aequora rupes.

S. Bailey<sup>36</sup> says that “Stattius describes a crescent-shaped bay formed by two cliffs, one at either side of the entrance”. He then suggests that *curuas* should be altered into *curuae*. Textual alteration is, however, not necessary. Stattius has employed adjectival *enallage*<sup>37</sup>. Thus the rocks are said to be curved (*curuas*<sup>38</sup>) in that they are arranged in a curve constituting the shore.

2, 2, 150-153

Non tibi sepositas infelix strangulat arca  
diuitias audique animum dispendia torquent  
faenoris: expositi census et docta fruendi  
temperies.

S. Bailey<sup>39</sup> noted that scholars have been puzzled by the meaning of this passage. I would like to suggest that perfect sense can be restored to the transmitted text if we understand that Stattius means that the loss of money (*dispendia ... faenoris*) torments the mind of a greedy man (*audi*).

2, 3, 27-30

Depromit pharetra telum breue, quod neque flexis  
cornibus aut solito torquet stridore, sed una  
emisit contenta manu laeuamque soporae  
Naidos auersa fertur tetigisse sagitta.

*Line 29: soporae Krohn: -rem M laeuumque soporem v. l.*

<sup>36</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 275.

<sup>37</sup> For another case of adjectival *enallage*, cf. White (2002) 164.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *curuus* I: “litora Cat. 64, 74”. The bay is crescent-shaped (*lunata aequora = curui litoris ora* III, 1, 100). S. Bailey, in the *Appendix* to his Loeb edition, accepts *curuas* without being aware of the *enallage*.

<sup>39</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 275.

S. Bailey<sup>40</sup> notes that “Diana woke Pholoe up from her ill-timed and dangerous drowse”. I would like to point out that the variant reading *laeuumque soporem* makes perfect sense. An arrow hit the left temple<sup>41</sup> of the Naiad.

3, 3, 76-78

Praecipuos sed enim merito surrexit in actus  
nondum stelligerum senior dimissus in axem  
Claudius et longo transmittit habere *nepoti*.

S. Bailey explained that “Etruscus’ father had begun his service under Tiberius”. He added that Gaius retained him and “Claudius promoted him and handed him on to Nero”. Vollmer followed Barth in explaining *nepoti* as a collective singular<sup>42</sup>. This makes good sense. Etruscus’ father was passed on to distant (*longo*<sup>43</sup>) descendants (*nepoti*).

3, 3, 179-180

Haud aliter gemuit †peiruria† Theseus.  
litora *qui* falsis deceperat Aegea uelis.

S. Bailey<sup>44</sup> notes that “per Sunia (Polster) seems the best correction of *periuria*”. I would like to point out that textual alteration is not necessary. Theseus is said to have lamented his broken oath (*periuria*), since he had deceived the Aegean shore (*litora ... Aegea*<sup>45</sup>) with false sails.

<sup>40</sup> (1987) 275.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *sopor* II, E: “The temple of the head . . . *laeuus*, Stat. 2, 3, 29”. The passage is correctly understood in Forcellini, s. v. *sopor* II 4. For mistaken hypotheses, cf. the *apparatus criticus* in the edition by Frère-Izaac.

<sup>42</sup> For other examples of the collective singular, cf. White (2002) 141.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *longus* I, B: “In partic., far off, remote, distant”. S. Bailey stated that Markland read *Neroni* instead of *nepoti*. It should be noted that Markland used manuscripts in order to correct the text of Propertius: cf. White (2002) 71, n. 3.

<sup>44</sup> *Op. cit.*, 277.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *Aegeus* (2): “adj. i.q. *Aegaeus*”. Theseus’ father, on the Aegean shore, died because of the false sails.

## 4, 1, 25-35

Moribus atque tuis gaudent turmaeque tribusque  
 purpureique patres, lucemque a consule ducit  
 omnis honos. Quid tale, precor, prior annus habebat?  
 Dic age, Roma potens, et mecum, longa Vetustas,  
 dinumera fastos nec parua exempla recense,  
 sed quae sola meus dignetur uincere Caesar:  
 ter Latio deciesque tulit labentibus annis  
 Augustus fascas, sed coepit sero mereri:  
 tu iuuenis praegressus auos. Et quanta recusas,  
 quanta vetas! Flectere tamen precibusque senatus  
 promittes hunc saepe diem.

S. Bailey noted that this “poem celebrates Domitian’s seventeenth consulship in 95”. He added that *auos*<sup>46</sup> in l. 33 is usually understood as “forefathers”. This makes perfect sense. Domitian is said to have surpassed his ancestors while he was still a young man.

## 4, 4, 70-73

propriis tu pulcher in armis  
 ipse canenda geras paruoque exempla parabis  
 magna Getae, dignos quem iam nunc belliger actus  
 poscit auus praestatque domi novisse triumphos.

S. Bailey takes *domi* to be a locative (“lets him get acquainted with triumphs at home”). However, those who take *domi* “as genitive” (S. Bailey *ad loc.*) are right, on account of the context: *domi triumphos* would mean “the triumphs of his family”<sup>47</sup>: cf. lines 74 f. *parentem, stemmate materno*: “famille patricienne”, Frère-Izaac *ad loc.* The genitive *domi* re-appears in later Latin: cf. *Thesurus Lingua Latinae*, s. v., 1949, 52 ff. Here in Statius it is evidently an archaism or colloquialism: cf. H. J. van Dam, *Staius, Silvae Book II*, Leiden 1984, *Index*, s. v. *Archaisms*.

## 4, 5, 9-12

nunc cuncta ueris frondibus annuis  
 crinitur arbor, nunc uolucrum noui

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *auus* II, A: “Ancestor, forefather”. Cf. also White (2002) 168. Cornelia states that the kingdoms of Africa speak about her Numantine ancestors (*Numantinos ... auos*).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *domus* II, B: “A household, family, race”.

questus inexpertumque carmen  
quod tacita statuere bruma.

S. Bailey noted that scholars have been puzzled by the meaning of *statuere*. I would like to point out that *statuere*<sup>48</sup> means here “stopped”. The birds are said to have stopped their song during winter. Statius is referring to the song of the nightingale<sup>49</sup>.

4, 5, 25-28

Cum tu sodalis dulce periculum  
conisus omni pectore tolleres,  
ut Castor ad cunctos tremebat  
Bebryciae strepitus harenae.

S. Bailey noted that scholars have been puzzled by the meaning of *tolleres*. I would like to suggest that *tolleres* means here “removed”<sup>50</sup>. Statius states that Septimius removed the burden of “sweet risk”.

4, 8, 14-16

Macte, o iuuenis, qui tanta merenti  
das patriae! *Dulcis* tremit ecce *tumultus*  
tot dominis clamata domus.

S. Bailey noted that scholars have been puzzled by the meaning of this passage. Textual alteration is, however, not necessary. The house is said to tremble at the sweet noise (*dulcis*<sup>51</sup> ... *tumultus*) made by the children.

Ennius stated that Africa trembled at the terrible tumult: *Africa terribili tremit horrida terra tumultu* (= Ann. v. 311 Vahl.)<sup>52</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> Vollmer explains the word as “ersonnen”; “ont composé”: Frère-Izaac; cf. Forcellini, s. v. *statuo* I, 4 (“*sistere*”, “*intermittere*”). Cf. also Lewis and Short, s. v. *statuo*, I, B.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. White (1979) 9 ff. The nightingale was imagined to have sung a beautiful lament.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. *tollo* II: “To take up a thing from its place, to take away, remove”. S. Bailey translates *tolleres* as “strove to buoy up”, “lifted”.

<sup>51</sup> Note the use of the adjectival *enallage*. The adjective *dulcis* refers to the children.

<sup>52</sup> For this passage cf. S. Bailey’s Loeb edition, *Appendix, ad loc.* Statius (*oppositio in imitando*) has humorously and pointedly reversed Ennius’ *terribili* into *dulcis*. *Dulcis tumultus* is of course an

## 5, 2, 107-110

haud unquam tales aspexit Romulus annos  
 Dardaniusque senex medii bellare togata  
 strage fori. Stupuere patres temptamina tanta  
 conatusque tuos *nec* te reus ipse timebat.

S. Bailey explained that “*reus* is the friend whom young Crispinus is defending”. I would like to suggest that Statius has employed the ablative of cause<sup>53</sup>. We should translate as follows: “and due to you (*te*) the defendant himself was not afraid”.

## 5, 2, 165-167

Quique aquilas tibi nunc et castra recludit,  
 idem omnes *perferre* gradus cingique superbis  
 fascibus et patrias dabit insedis curules.

S. Bailey explained that “the emperor will put Crispinus through all the stages of civilian advancement up to the consulship”. I would like to suggest that the verb *perferre* means here “go through” (*cf. O.L.D., s.v., 5, b*) all the different career grades<sup>54</sup>.

S. Bailey changes *perferre* into *properare* in his Loeb edition. Frère-Izaak take *perferre* to mean “franchir”.

## 5, 3, 231-233

nam quod me mixta quercus non pressit oliua  
 et fugit speratus honos, quam *dulce* parentis  
 inuida Tarpei caperes!

S. Bailey explained that Statius is referring here to the Capitoline festival.

---

accusative plural. Statius’ pointedly allusive humour is lost in S. Bailey. In Statius, *tremis* means “is terrified at”, whereas in Ennius it signifies “is shaken by”.

<sup>53</sup> At Ovid. Her. 2.104 *nobis* means “due to me”: *cf. White (2006) 193. Cf. Kühner-Stegmann, I, p. 380 and 394 f.* S. Bailey cannot understand the meaning of *te*, which changes into *et* in his Loeb edition, and which was altered into *tunc* by Leo, followed by Frère-Izaak.

<sup>54</sup> *Cf. Lewis and Short, s. v. gradus II, B, 2: “Trop, a step, degree in tones, in age, relationship, rank ... a senatorio gradu longe abesse”.*



Too many conjectures (see S. Bailey, *art. cit.* and lastly Gibson *ad loc.*) have desfigured this passage, which is correct, as Frère-Izaac have understood. It remains to be added that the adverbial *dulce* (often used by Statius) is ironical, and that *caperes*, misunderstood by Frère-Izaac, means “would have taken”, as S. Bailey correctly understood (*cf.* Lewis and Short, s. v. *capiro*, I, 11).

#### 4. BIBLIOGRAPHY

GAIDE, F. (1980), *Avianus. Fables*, París.

MURRAY, A.S. (1988), *Who's Who in Mythology*, London.

SHACKLETON BAILEY, D.R. (1987), "The *Silvae* of Statius", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 91, 273.

WHITE, H. (1979), *Studies in Theocritus and other Hellenistic Poets*, Amsterdam.

WHITE, H. (2002) *Studies in the Text of Propertius*, Athens.

WHITE, H. (2006), "Studies in the Thext of Latin Poets of the Golden Age", *Minerva* 19, 175-192.

WHITE, H. (2006), "Further Notes on Ovid's *Heroides*", *Minerva* 19, 193-198.