

CRITICISMS AND ELUCIDATIONS OF THE *SILVAE* OF STATIUS

E. COURTNEY
Stanford University

The faults of current texts of and commentaries on the *Silvae* are grave and manifold, though not always as clearly appreciated as they should be; this does not of course mean that these works do not often provide useful material, but I think that the following notes will show that many passages will only yield their meaning to a new approach. Luckily the picture is not all black; in particular, L. Håkanson's treatise *Statius' Silvae* (Lund 1969) sets a standard of learning and judgment which can claim an honourable place in the tradition of Gronovius and Markland; it is a paradoxical tribute to the eminence of this work that I feel it necessary to take issue with it in some passages where I consider that it has come to erroneous conclusions. At the opposite extreme is the Teubner edition of A. Marastoni (Leipzig 1970²); in my discussion of 1.4.4 I have drawn attention to some shortcomings in it which might impose on the unwary.¹

In the following lemmata the text quoted in the area of dispute is that of M (Matritensis 3678; some corrections by the first hand are adduced as M¹), unless I indicate otherwise. Outside the area of dispute which I discuss I have presented the surrounding context as I think it should be read, silently adopting such corrections as I consider necessary. On two of the following passages, which the reader will easily identify, bold suggestions are offered not so much because I feel confident that I have hit the target as in the hope that a new line of approach to these intractable problems may one day lead to a solution. My best thanks are due to Marsh McCall for his benevolent advice.

¹ Apart from the standard editions of the *Silvae*, referred to simply by author's name, all references to secondary literature where I give no further detail can be elucidated from the second Teubner edition of A. Klotz (Leipzig 1911), still indispensable for the abundant information which it provides. Of the older editions, I refer to those of Domitius Calderini (1475; this is what Marastoni calls Calderini's second edition because he wrongly attributes the 1472 editio princeps of the *Silvae* to him) and J. Bernartius (1595 and 1599). Twice I have occasion to refer to a collective paper by a group of Tübingen scholars in *Glotta* 50 (1972) 97, "Zur Elision anapästischer Wörter bei Vergil und Statius."

I *praef.* Stella iuvenis optime et in studiis nostris eminentissime qua parte (peste M) et (*del. fort.* M¹) voluisti.

If we read as above, the second *et* correlates Stella's ambition and his attainment of it; *qua parte* will refer to *studiis* and mean that poetry is the area in which he desired distinction. One might translate "most eminent in the pursuits of us poets, which was the field in which you actually (*et*) desired <eminence>." However the deletion of *et* produces such an attractive clausula-rhythm that it must be taken seriously. The meaning then might be unaffected, but it more probably would be that within the general area of poetry Stella excels in one particular branch, elegy; cf. Tac. *Dial.* 10.3 *in hac studiorum parte*, meaning poetry as one department of the general field of literary pursuit. It is true that this might seem to limit the compliment, but Stella would probably actually welcome the implication that he was a specialist in elegy.

I *praef.* centum hos versus, quos in ecum maximum feci, indulgentissimo imperatori postero die quam dedicaverat opus tradere ausus sum (*Sandstroem*: iussum M). "potuisti illud" dicet aliquis "et ante vidisse." respondebis illi tu, Stella carissime, qui epithalamium tuum, quod mihi iniunxeras, scis biduo scriptum audacter mehercules sed tantum tamen hexametros habet et fortasse tu pro collega mentieris. Manilius certe Vopiscus . . . solet ultro quoque nomine meo gloriari villam Tiburtinam suam descriptam a nobis uno die.

What I believe to be the correct reading of this passage has been advocated by Håkanson 19, but a more detailed discussion than he has given is needed. In M's reading *tantum tamen* is an impossible word-order; if *tantum* is to go with *hexametros*, it will be necessary to delete *tamen* with Leo or to transpose to *tamen tantum* with Klotz. The sense will then be "it only has hexameters, not the more difficult elegiacs which you, Stella, write and I never write, or the other metres envisaged in the epithalamium (1.2.247–50)." But there is no reason why Stella should have expected anything else; Statius could not have written an epithalamium in hendecasyllables, which is the only metre other than hexameters used by him until Book IV. Moreover *et fortasse tu pro collega mentieris* must then mean that Stella will support a false claim by Statius to celerity of composition (which is the central point of the context), and that makes no sense when Statius is proclaiming, not denying, this celerity. No, these words must be an attack on Stella's credibility as a witness by the *aliquis* who claims that Statius had advance warning of the topics before he started his presto composition; it is necessary to signal this by altering *et* to *at* with Bernartius so that the phrase will now mean "the objection will be raised that perhaps, when you are asked to state whether I had advance warning, you will give

false witness favourable to me.” This is then a final retort by the adversary which is refuted by the following corroborative evidence introduced by *certe*. Therefore what precedes *at fortasse* . . . must produce *prima facie* evidence of the veracity of Statius’ claims. If we begin a sentence with *audacter*, this can only be achieved by adopting the interpretation rejected at the beginning of this note. It follows therefore that the evidence impugned by the adversary must be *scis biduo scriptum*, and *audacter* . . . *habet* must contain only an incidental comment. We should therefore read and punctuate thus: . . . *scriptum (audacter mehercules, sed ter centum tamen hexametros habet)*. *At fortasse* . . . *Ter centum*, which is due to Elter, is fully justified by Håkanson. The parenthesis will mean that this was a bold enterprise, but Statius carried it off.

1.1.22 par operi sedes. hinc obvia limina pandit . . .

The statue’s site is as imposing as itself. In front it has the temple of Divus Iulius, on either side (*hinc* . . . *illinc* 29–30) the basilica Iulia and the basilica Aemilia, behind (*terga* . . . *videt* 31) the temples of Divus Vespasianus and Concord. In 22 *hinc* was altered to *huic* by Pomponius Laetus (Reeve *CQ* 27 [1977] 217) and Havet (*RPh* 1 [1877] 165), and that is a considerable improvement. Havet did not fully argue the case for his emendation, and it has not been generally accepted. The adverbs in 29–30 correspond to each other, not to this; this contrasts rather with *terga* in 31. The contrasts between left and right and between face and rear (*obvia* . . . *terga*) are only obscured by an adverb in 22.

1.1.53 (hunc) pavet aspiciens Ledaeus ab aede propinqua
Cyllarus: hic domini numquam mutabit habenas;
perpetuus frenis atque uni serviet astro.

The horse of Domitian’s statue is so imposing that it makes the neighbouring one of the horse of the Dioscuri quake. There are two main versions (with minor variations not essential for the present purpose) of the heavenly destiny of the Dioscuri: first, that on the death of Castor his brother shared immortality with him, so that on alternate days they dwelt in Hades and heaven; second, that they were both raised to heaven as the constellation Gemini. The alternation of owner implied for Cyllarus suggests the first version; actually he is usually Castor’s horse, while Pollux has his own Xanthus, but he is given to Pollux by Vergil *Georg.* 3.89, where the notes of the ancient commentators should be consulted (Alcman fr. 25 Page). On the other hand *astro* seems to imply the second; but in this, when Castor and Pollux are stars, they are both stars (cf. 3.2.8–12, which refers to the so-called St. Elmo’s Fire). However Statius in 4.6.15–16 refers to another version of their legend (not known from any other literary source, though found in Servius’ note on *Aen.* 6.121; see C. Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage* [Berlin 1920] 323)

Leo's proposal to read *sed . . . sed* (contrasting with the Hellespont 27; the cure is worse than the malady) and Phillimore's to punctuate 31–33 as two questions, not a statement. The logic of these scholars is impeccable, but they press Statius' exactitude too far. *Doctrina*, in this case geographical, more often mythological, is a striking feature of the *Silvae*, and Statius is sometimes content with the superficial ornament which it provides and not enough concerned with its inherent appropriateness. Here are two examples.

1.1.11 hunc neque discissis cepissent Pergama muris
nec grege permixto pueri innuptaeque puellae
ipse nec Aeneas nec magnus duceret Hector.

Statius of course has in mind Vergil's account, *Aen.* 2.238 *pueri circum innuptaeque puellae / sacra canunt funemque manu contingere gaudent* (while others actually pull the horse). Statius, in order to represent Domitian's horse as great and the Trojan one as small, alludes to the event as if the boys and girls did pull the Trojan horse, and says that if they were alive now they could not pull this horse; but does he properly impress on us the mass of the statue when he says that boys and girls could not pull it, as if they were specially strong? The addition of line 13 shows that Statius was aware of this flaw in his argument, but it appeared to him a small price to pay for the introduction of a Vergilian allusion, even when one adds to the price the elision of *pueri*, which is of a type alien to him, 5.2.117 being corrupt (see *Glotta* 50 [1972] 110 and 114).

1.5.11 discede Laborque
Curaque, dum nitidis canimus gemmantia saxis
balnea dumque procax vittis hederisque, soluta
fronte verecunda, Clio mea ludit Etrusco.

What is Clio doing here when in line 2 Statius has dismissed the Muses from this poem and informed us that on this occasion he is seeking inspiration from the Naiads and Vulcan instead? He cannot emancipate himself from the tired old clichés and express the notion of writing light verse in simple direct language.

It should be added that occasional actual mistakes, such as the attribution of a wife Meliboea to Philoctetes (3.5.48), are venial in comparison; and that, like any other writer, Statius must be granted the right to refer to versions of legends not otherwise known to us (see on 1.1.53).

1.3.40 ad silvas quae respicis, aula, tacentes,
qua tibi tota quies offensaque turbine nullo
nox silet et pigros mutantia murmura somnos.

I have here accepted the emendation *pigros* for M's *nigros* and its decipherment as *mutantia* rather than *imitantia*, so that the meaning of

the last part will be "the darkness is silent, unmarred by any breeze, and silent too are the noises which break restful sleep"; these problems have been much discussed (e.g. by Howard, *TAPA* 90 [1959] 120), and I have nothing in particular to add. What I want to consider is *tota*. This has been defended by Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge 1966) 93, but most of the instances quoted in defence are ineffective; things which have parts or are marked by growth and development are not properly parallel (and that formulation covers, I think, *Theb.* 8.257 *necdum tota fides*). At Florus 1.13.11 *tota victoria* is contrasted with the partial victory described immediately before, cf. *bellum . . . victoria multiplex* at the beginning of the chapter. *Pan. Lat.* 7 = 6.9.3 (p. 210 Mynors) *totam excusationem* seems rather remote from this. Until something better can be found I think that we should follow Politian's *tuta*, which goes well with what follows.

1.3.48 labor est auri memorare figuras
aut ebur aut dignas digitis contingere gemmas,
quicquid et argento primum vel in aere minori
lusit et enormes manus expertura colossos.

expertura *Phillimore*: est experta M

This excellent emendation (briefly commended by me in *BICS* 13 [1966] 99) means that minor preparatory works in silver or bronze were first executed by the hand destined to essay great colossi as well. For *et* (and) . . . *et* (also) cf. 3.3.56–58 *et . . . / pertulit et saevi Tiryntius horrida regis / pacta* (another displaced *et* meaning *etiam*, see above on 1.2.180; it means "Hercules also"). For the sequence "gold or ivory or gems AND minor works in silver or bronze" see my note on Juvenal 10.170; in such lists Latin does not hesitate to interchange "and" and "or." In M's reading *quicquid* is the object of *lusit* but has no grammatical relationship with *est experta*; this is legitimate enough, since Latin idiom allows relative clauses to drift away from the relative pronoun (see Kühner-Stegmann 2.325), but in this context the phrase *et* (which would have to mean "and," not, as with *Phillimore*'s emendation, "also") *enormes manus est experta colossos* would have no sense or function.

1.3.57 quid nunc iungentia mirer
aut quid partitis distantia tecta trichoris?

Editors here mostly adopt *iungentia* from Calderini, seduced by the seeming antithesis with 58. But this cannot mean *iuncta*, and no proper antithesis is left if it means *tecta quae iungunt trichora*. Either the word is corrupt for something else (*laquearia* Baehrens, not plausibly), or a verse has been lost after 57 giving it a noun, e.g. *atria* (so Otto, *RhM* 42 [1887] 370). I might add that loss of a line is a frequent cause of error in

these poems; so after 1.2.183 (Postgate and Saenger; one cannot simply alter to *iugavi*, since *iugavi face* would be a terrible mixed metaphor), 1.3.9 (Calderini), 1.4.73 (Housman), 5.3.129 (Markland), 268 (Housman), 272 (Heinsius [on Ovid *Fasti* 1.257] and Postgate), 5.5.46 (Baehrens), to name only cases which seem quite certain. Not one line, but two half-lines seem to have been lost at 4.4.102 (Markland and Leo). This list may cause us to favour emendation of some corrupt passages on this hypothesis. To take the second type first, see 5.1.18:

sed cum plaga recens et adhuc in vulnere primo
nigra domus questu miseramque accessus ad aurem
coniugis orbat.

Statius must here be saying that Abascantus would not have listened to consolation in the immediate aftermath of the loss of Priscilla. But one cannot alter to *miseram qui* (interrogative), an elision which Statius would not have permitted (Vollmer 559), and other suggestions lack plausibility. It seems much more probable that two hemistichs have dropped out, something like

questu<que sonant cuncta undique maesto,
quae via solandi> miseramque . . . / . . . orbat?

What way was there to console Abascantus, what access to his ears, while the house was in mourning and everywhere was echoing with sad lamentations?

Again, at 5.3.12:

quis sterili mea corda situ, quis Apolline merso
frigida damnatae praeduxit nubila menti?

no assumption of “zeugma” or anything else will dissuade me from postulating a gap of two half-lines after *situ*, something like this:

situ <perfudit et omne
eripuit studium misero>.

There is a very difficult passage at 1.4.58:

tunc deus, Alpini qui iuxta culmina dorsi
signat Apollineos sancto cognomine lucos,
respicit heu tanti pridem securus alumni,
progressusque moras, “hinc mecum, Epidauria proles . . .”

Alteration to *praegressus* achieves exactly nothing; but there is no fault of sense in *moras*, which is confirmed both by *pridem* and by the imitation in Claudian *Carm. Min.* 25.56. The only suggestion so far made which deserves a moment’s thought is Postgate’s *progressusque* “*morast?* . . .,” but *progressus* needs definition, and it would seem unjustified for Apollo to accuse Aesculapius of dawdling when it is he himself who

is open to this reproach. I suggest that something on these lines has fallen out:

progressus <tandem est e silva maestus opaca
abrumpens>que moras . . .

To turn back to losses of complete lines, contemplate 5.1.92:

omnia nam laetas pila attollentia frondes
nullaque famosa signatur lancea penna.

With *attollentia* one has to understand *sunt*, the so-called *σχῆμα Χαλκιδικόν*; but this is not found in Statius (it is not at 1.3.42, briefly discussed above) and appears very unlikely here. It seems probable that a verse has been lost after 92, something like

<victrices monstrant aquilas per proelia fausta>.

I should add, for it is sometimes misunderstood (as by Maurach on Germanicus 59), that when one composes verses to fill postulated gaps, the point is solely to show that it is possible to say something that suits the context in the space available.

1.3.79 quod ni templa darent alias Tirynthia sortes,
et Praenestinae poterant migrare sorores.

Fortuna had a temple at Praeneste where lot-oracles were given; Statius evidently makes her plural through confusing her in a moment of aberration with the Fortuna of Antium. This passage is usually taken to imply that the temple of Hercules at Tibur also gave lot-oracles (*alias* meaning “other than those of Praeneste”), but we do not hear of this elsewhere, and it is not so. The villa of Manilius Vopiscus at Tibur is so attractive that it could tempt Diana from Nemi, the Dryads from Taygetus, and Pan from Arcadia (76–78). Statius crowns this by saying that Fortuna too would have come from Praeneste (a fit visitant for this Epicurean), but the god of the local temple, coupled with that of Fortuna at Praeneste by Juvenal (14.90) too, has “other ideas” and wants to preserve his independence. So, taking a leaf from his adversary’s book, for this occasion and this occasion only he issues an oracle forbidding the move. I would be the first to agree that the humour of this is forced and the point frigid.

1.4.4 es caelo dives Germanice cordi.

Of course *dis es* (Calderini and other Renaissance scholars) is right here, but a note is called for since Politian’s *dive es* has not yet been consigned to oblivion. The word *divus* is never applied to a living emperor, its vocative is not used to address people, and Statius never employs it in the singular. Editors like Marastoni would do well to take a

little more care to ascertain Latin and Statian usage. With reference to Marastoni's reading at 5.1.84 it is not hard to find out that Statius applies the word *pensum* only to wool (often that of the Fates). Twice within two lines usage is ignored at 5.1.51–53:

laudantur proavi seu pulchrae munere formae
quae morum caruere bonis falsoque potentes
laudis egent verae.

False word-division has clearly caused the error in 51, where *proavis* is called for; but we should read *proavis et* (Politian), not *proavis seu*, since Statius does not use *seu* to mean simply "or." Again in 52 *falsaeque* is usually adopted from Heinsius, though a genitive only follows *potens* when it means "master of," which is quite unsuitable here. Read *falsaque* with Meursius² and compare *Theb.* 6.153 *pietate potens*.

(cohortes legesque urbesque)
1.4.13 certent laetitia, nosteque ex ordine collis
confremat, et sileant peioris murmura famae.

Håkanson here proposes to read *nostrique . . . colles / confremite*, and this is certainly better than swallowing the reading of M with the change to *nosterque* or than any other emendation. But it is a rather extensive alteration, and the subjunctive *confremat* fits in too well to be lightly discarded. I tentatively suggest *septemplexque ordine*; *septēplex* could readily have been reduced to *septex*, though I admit that the further corruption is not easy to explain, and for *septemplex collis* meaning *septem colles* compare *Theb.* 7.310 *clipei septemplici tauro*, *Silv.* 4.1.6 *septemgemino iugo*, and the use of *duplex* at Ovid AA 3.327, Manil. 1.723 and 4.740, Mart. 2.77.6.

1.4.28 seu plana solutis
cum struis orsa modis seu cum tibi dulcis in artem
frangitur et nostras curat facundia leges.

"Whether you are writing prose or poetry." But I cannot find any good parallel for either *artem* (even to understand *nostram* with this is difficult) or *frangitur* in a context like this, nor do I detect any metaphor behind them. I propose to take *artum* from Barth and combine it with *angitur*; then we will have the metaphor of equestrian exercise often applied by Statius to poetry (see for example 4.7.3–4). Compare Val. Fl. 2.387 (*equus*) *vix* (Thilo: *brevis* V) *in laevos piger angitur orbes*; the reference is to the "confined" (*artus*) *gyrus* within which the horse has to tread, as the poet is confined by the constraints of metre.

² *Exercitationes Criticae* 2 (1599) 4.7.

1.4.68 genus ipse suis permissaque retro / nobilitas.

Rutilius Gallicus is his own nobility and indeed ennobles his ignoble ancestors. I discuss this passage because Håkanson 99 shows misguided sympathy for Sandstroem's *sui*, which is refuted out of hand by *retro*. For the bestowal of glory on one's ancestors cf. Tibull. 2.1.34, Thucydides 6.16.1; Norden explains Vergil *Aen.* 6.875–76 similarly. The genitive which Håkanson quotes from *Theb.* 2.63 *principiumque sui* is of the nature of partitive (Kühner-Stegmann 1.598–99).

1.5.10 iunge, puer, cyathos et enumerare labora.

This is usually emended to *et ne numerare*, but neither at *Ach.* 1.534 nor at Val. Fl. 8.436 (quoted by *TLL* 5.2.905.12) do we find *et ne* beside each other giving a prohibition, and I do not recall it happening in classical poetry. So I think that we should stick with *set* (or *sed*) *ne numerare* (so Scriverius on Martial 4.40).

2.1.219 immensis urnam quatit Aeacus umbris.

Immensis "innumerable" is certainly odd, but seems to be correct; see Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Uppsala 1911) 149.

2.3.9 ille quidem it cunctas tamquam velit et tamen unam
 in Pholoen.

This is usually emended by altering *et* to *it* with the Renaissance copies, but there is much to be said for Markland's version *quidem cunctas quamquam velit it*; after the corruption to *et*, *it* will have been noted as a marginal correction and restored to the wrong place. One commendation of this solution is the elimination of *tamquam*, a word not used elsewhere by Statius and not popular in poetry (B. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter* [Lund 1945] 88–89).

3.2.78 fugit ecce vagas ratis acta per undas

80 . . . tot gracili ligno complexa timores
 quaque super reliquos te, nostri pignus amoris,
 portatura, Celer.

This is usually altered with Politian to *quaeque*, but the whole form of expression, *complexa quaeque portatura* <est>, remains extraordinarily harsh, though no single detail in it is impossible in itself; *portat dura* (Leo and Saenger) does not mend matters much and makes it necessary to assume two independent corruptions. Much preferable is Ziehen's (GGA 1904, 647) *quique*, with which the meaning is *tot complexa timores portaturaque te, qui timor super reliquos est*; this integrates

3.3.76 praecipuos sed enim merito subrexit in actus . . .
78 Claudius et longo transmittit habere nepoti.

3.3.143 atque idem in cuneos populo seduxit equestres
mutavitque genus laevaeque ignobile ferrum
exuit et celso natorum aequavit honore.

145 is usually emended to *honorem* with Krohn, but an ellipse such as *aequavit honorem celso <honori> natorum* would need a good parallel, which is not forthcoming. We must, I think, accept *honori* from Salmasius³ (and Politian also seems to quote this in his lemma, *Comento Inedito alle Selve di Stazio*, ed. L. C. Martinelli [Florence 1978] 601). The implication will then be that Domitian's bestowal of equestrian rank (a very rare honour for a freedman) had been preceded by its conferment on his sons, the issue of his marriage to a Roman lady of some status, sister of a consul; for *celso*, the traditional epithet of the *equites*, cf. 1.4.42.

³ On *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* 15.4.4.

ab his *Schwartz*: aliis M; pulset *O. Mueller*: -em M;
in iusta *Boxhorn* Epistulae (1562) 65 et *Barth*: iniusta M.

ausum contraria Phoebo
carmina nec fida gavisam Pallada buxo.

First I briefly recapitulate the interpretation of the last words given by Leo. They mean "and Athena, who rejoiced at the treachery of the pipes." She had made them and thrown them away; she then cursed them, praying that whoever picked them should suffer, and was pleased when they ensnared Marsyas. But I want to consider the relevance of this to the context, which puzzled Vollmer and Frère. Statius has said (80 sqq.) that his lamentations for his father will not be of the conventional type, and first of all he lists bird-laments, that of the swan or the Sirens

(who lament the rape of Proserpine; see Ovid referred to below) or the swallow Philomela (Claudius Etruscus has the same precedents, 3.3.173 sqq.). These were all birds produced by metamorphosis (for the Sirens see Ovid *Met.* 5.551–63), and from them Statius passes to inanimate objects produced by metamorphosis also and flowing with “tears,” the amber of the Heliades, Niobe turned into the rock on Sipylus (at [Sen.] *Herc. Oet.* 181 sqq. she also appears in company with the Heliades, the Sirens, and Philomela or Procne), and Marsyas. In this context he must have in mind the idea that the river Marsyas sprang from the tears of those who mourned the satyr Marsyas (Ovid *Met.* 6.392–400); one notices that in Ovid this legend is preceded by that of Niobe and followed by that of Philomela.

5.2.112 ille tuis totiens pressit sua tempora sertis
 cum stata laudato caneret quinquennia versu
 ora supergressus Pylīi gregis oraque regis
 Dulichii speciemque comam subnexus utroque.

Postgate emended 114 to *regis Pylīi*, but this would involve an improbable elision (see *Glotta* 50 [1972] 104 note 25, 110, 114). It is better with Håkanson 145 to take *Pylīi senis* from Renaissance sources or to follow Slater with *Pylīi ducis*. The elder Papinius, these lines suggest, will have contended at the Neapolitan Augustalia both in verse (113) and prose (114–15; cf. 102–3, which adapts the Homeric passage *Iliad* 3.222 about Odysseus, and *Laus Pisonis* 57–64), just as the Capitoline games, with which the Augustalia are compared at 3.5.92, had contests in both; admittedly we should have expected the two to be more clearly set off from each other. But the main problem is presented by *utroque*, which is not defended by Hor. *Serm.* 2.4.7 or Grattius 158 or *Anth. Lat.* 742.28 (none of these is even worth quoting). *Speciemque* too (taken with *supergressus*) seems irrelevant and unstylish (as if Odysseus had *species* but not Nestor), and I suggest that we should eliminate all the problems of the line by following Saenger in altering it to *pretioque*, meaning that the elder Papinius wore both prizes (for verse and prose) on his hair; cf. *Theb.* 6.531 *huic pretium palmae gemini cratera ferebant / Herculeum iuvenes*.

5.2.231 nam quod me mixta quercus non pressit oliva
 et fugit speratus honos, qua dusce parentis
 invida Tarpei caperes.

dulce M¹

Invida needs a noun, and this is most convincingly supplied by altering *dusce* to *lustra* (Markland), which will refer to the quadriennial Capitoline games, spoken of as usual as if quinquennial, cf. 2.2.6, 2.6.72,

3.5.92, 5.3.134. If we then alter *qua* to *quam* (Itali, R. Unger) and *caperes* to *caneres*, we will have the totally apt statement "you would have bewailed how grudging was the festival of Jupiter"; being the father of Statius he would have put his lamentations in verse, whence *caneres* (for the imperfect subjunctive cf. 5.1.23–28 etc.).

5.5.69 tellure cadentem
 aspexi atque unctum genitali carmine fovi
 poscentemque novas tremulis ululatibus auras
 inserui vitae.

This passage, which describes Statius' activities at the birth of the boy, is discussed by Håkanson 162, who proposes to adopt Axelson's suggestion *geniali* and couple it with *gramine* to mean "anointed with festal oil." I am certain that this is wrong. In the first place *genitali* seems highly appropriate to the context, as appropriate as the same word is at 2.7.132, where Markland's wholly convincing defence of it has been ignored by subsequent editors in favour of the Renaissance conjecture *genialis*. Secondly, when *gramen* or *germen* means *unguentum* they normally have a geographical epithet; this is so in the two Statian passages quoted by Håkanson and in others as well, and Ovid *Met.* 7.152 *Lethaei gramine suci* also provides a definition to clarify the meaning. The objections which Håkanson brings against the reading of M are perfectly valid, and if Statius wrote *carmine* he is saying something very odd; but we must not emend it to something equally unsatisfactory.