

## THE TEXT OF AUSONIUS: FIFTY EMENDATIONS AND TWELVE

This article presents fifty emendations of the text of Ausonius, and appends twelve suggestions of which seven are transpositions and five substantial improvements to the text by re-punctuation. References are given in the first place to the edition of Schenkl<sup>1</sup>), which is the most logically ordered, precisely numbered and clearly arranged edition currently available, and secondly to the edition of Peiper<sup>2</sup>), by poem number, line and page. (At the time of writing the new and eagerly awaited Teubner edition is not available.) Schenkl is followed by Pastorino<sup>3</sup>) in the main – but his few divergences occur near the beginning so that the entire numbering is dislocated – and the text in the Loeb Library<sup>4</sup>) is with very rare exceptions a reproduction of Peiper's.

In IV. 3. 85 (II. 3. 85, p. 11) the mss., with one exception, a ms. of the sixteenth century, read *ferit aera*, followed by editors. Theological considerations, which must carry great weight in this carefully orthodox poem, make this a dubious reading, since in contemporary Christian writing *aer* refers not to heaven but the lower air, the abode of the Devil (e.g. Aug. *Civ. Dei* 14.3, Paul *ad Eph.* 2.2 (*Vulg.*)); in another prayer of Ausonius it is distinguished from heaven (IX 6/7: III. 2. 6/7 *cui terra et pontus et aer | Tartaraque et picti servit plaga lactea caeli*, where the second line modifies the familiar triad). The writer's sensitivity is further shown in *Moselle*, 12, where for Vergil's *aether* in *A.* 6.640, which he is closely following, he substitutes *aer*, of an earthly landscape. *Aethera* in our passage would be a purposeful reinterpretation of Verg. *A.* 5.140<sup>5</sup>).

In XII. 2. 25 (III. 1. 25, p. 17) we read *fons propter puteusque brevis, tum purus et amnis* in the description of the poet's *heredium*. One would have expected, in a description of the villa's

---

1) *D. Magni Ausonii Opuscula*, M.G.H. Auct. Ant. V. 2. Berlin, 1883.

2) *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis Opuscula*, Leipzig, 1886.

3) *Opere di Decimo Magno Ausonio*, Turin, 1971.

4) *Ausonius, with an English Translation*, H.G. Evelyn White, London and New York, 1919.

5) This suggestion was originally made to me by Professor G.W. Williams.

amenities, to find the well, the source of drinking water, to be described as clear, and P. Grimal, (R. E. A. LV (1953), p. 125, n. 1) suggested a stop after *purus*, joining *et amnis* with the next line, *naviger hic refluxus me vehit ac revehit*. The objection to this is that *hic* must then be demonstrative, not anaphoric; but the impression that we are being shown the estate is not supported by the rest of the poem. If *tam* is read for *tum*, then both stream (cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.120) and well are so described (cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.16. 12/13, where, although the epithet refers to rivers, the poet is thinking equally of the *fons*).

XIII. 2. 1 (*Ep.* XXII. 1, p. 261). Ausonius' *Protrepticus* to his grandson, a careful and impressive composition, urging him at length and in various ways to derive full benefit from his schooldays, begins abruptly, in the middle of an argument for enjoying one's schooling, and with the briefest of addresses, *mellite nepos* (line 2), which also occurs in the middle of the similar *Genethliacos* (XIV. 16 (*Ep.* XXI. 16)). There is no introduction of the theme for the reader, as there is in the *Genethliacos*, a poem perhaps intended for the same boy at a later age; the prose introduction to the poem is a covering letter sent to the boy's uncle (Ausonius' son), who was to pass on the poem, or perhaps read or explain it, but it contains nothing to explain the sudden opening of the poem. While the beginning of the *Moselle* may be defended (against H. Fuchs, *Mus. Helv.* 32 (1975), 173/4) on artistic grounds as a suitable introduction to the valley and as a foil to the poet's later admiration (on a smaller scale one may compare *de Rosis Nascentibus* (Appendix 2 (XXII. 2. p. 409))), whether by Ausonius, as I believe, or not), there seems no justification here, and a lacuna should be postulated (of a few lines only, for Ausonius wrote few continuous poems of more than 100 lines).

*ibid.* line 63. Ausonius, imagining himself to be reading Salust's *Histories* with his grandson, says... *bis senos seriem conecto per annos*, according to editors and V; PH and CKT have *connecto*<sup>6</sup>). There are good grounds for preferring the very similar *coniecto* which would mean 'imaginatively reconstruct' in this context: a reader of the *Histories* would hardly have needed to fit together the account of these twelve years, for it would be already in order. This is the meaning in line 53, where *conexa*

6) I follow the *sigla*, and the advice, of M.D. Reeve in his valuable article in *Rh. Mus.* n. f. 121 (1978), 350-66.

*historiae* refers to the series of available historical accounts, which regularly supplemented each other, or to the chronological arrangement within a single history. This phrase may have caused the error here, but it is palaeographically a small one. (The argument from repetition is not a good one, especially in Ausonius: see E. Norden on Verg. *A.* 6. 423, and below).

In XV. 2. 6 (IV Pref. 6, p. 29) (the *Parentalia*), *tacitus* of V, our only ms., has rightly attracted critical attention, since the transition to the 'ideal' second person after an apostrophe to the *nenia* is most awkward. Rather than *tacita* (Brandes) – metrically doubtful, see Schenkl's index s.v. *brevis syllaba* and add Shackleton Bailey's<sup>7</sup>) emendation of XVI. 9. 7 (V. 8. 7) – or *tacitis* (Peiper), which makes a poor contrast with *funereis*, or is unique if a euphemism for 'dead' (Evelyn White), the correct reading is probably *tacitum*, an adverbial form much affected by the poet: there are ten examples in Schenkl's index (s.v. *accusativus...*), including two of *tacitum* so used (IV. 3. 55, *Mos.* 370).

*ibid.* line 9: *hoc satis et tumulis, satis et telluris egenis V*; but the repeated *et* with anaphora of *satis* is not likely. Peiper offered a double *est*, but *est... et* gives better sense in the context, with *et* as 'even'; the unburied are not relevant to Ausonius' present task, but an illustration of the efficacy of such *pietas*. Cf. line 13, where a couplet devoted to them is introduced by *etiam*.

Par. 5 (3) 8: *tu frater genetricis et unanimes genitori (sic Gronovius, -oris V) et mihi qui fueris quod pater et genetrix*. Here *qui* (V) is hardly to be taken as introducing all the attributes in the couplet; it may be taken either as introducing a third description of Arborius – 'my mother's brother, close friend of my father, and (who were) to me both a father and a mother' – which is an awkward tricolon, or with *mihi*, as 'and a close friend to me, who were...'. This interpretation, which fits the subjunctive well, would be neater with *cui*, as Schenkl realised when he suggested *quoi*, a form apparently not used by Ausonius. (The *qui* (with indicative) in the following line does not affect this couplet; it is an example of a characteristically loose form of connexion, such as we find in *Par.* 3 (1) 5 and 9.)

Par. 6 (4) 25. *fletu* (V) is certainly corrupt; *flesti* (Scaliger) is the usual correction. There is much to be said for *flebas*, however; not only the following verbs (*cassus eras, dicebas*), but also the fact that a verb is necessary to express continuous action ('he

<sup>7</sup>) D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *AJP* 97 (1976), 251.

had been lamenting for thirty years'). This picture, rather than that of a nonagenarian father lamenting a thirty year old son, should be chosen to suit the historical probabilities of the passage: a suitable context for the prophecy of Ausonius' elevation, the likely gap in age between the father and his son, and the meaning of *solacia longa fovere* (line 27), matters which I discuss at appropriate length elsewhere<sup>8</sup>).

Par. 7 (5) 7. Editors have followed V, ascribing to the charges of Ausonius' aunt 'shameful delights', which aroused her wrath. But she was not entirely a kill-joy: *blanda sub austeris imbuit imperiis* (line 10). *Deliciis* is uncharacteristically vivid (and not confirmed elsewhere for Ausonius, who was one of the children referred to), as well as being rather an unusual word for the japes of the young (*luxuria, voluptas, libido* are its commonest synonyms); *delictis* is more suitable. (It is used with *pudor* in Sen. *Ben.* 3. 16. 4.)

In the following poem the heading *virgo devota* is probably an interpolation, for the headings to the *Parentalia* are sparing (a contrast with the more varied and informative headings of the *Professores* may be observed, but the latter are not free of interpolation, as will be seen).

Par. 25 (23) 17. The sense of this line is that Megentira had given birth to four children (of whom two died). *Nunc* (V) is impossible with the pluperfect verb *ediderat*, while the detail that would be offered by *nunc fracta* or *nunc functa*, meaning that her childbearing is over, is out of place since the father is dead. *Tunc* (Heinsius) is no easier, because the reference is to the present situation. I suggest *haec* (allowable metrically, cf. Schenkl's index, s. v. 'h'), to mark the change of subject and make clear the reference to the mother (mentioned already in lines 3, 7, 13). The corruption would be explained if *functa*, now acceptable in sense, is a correct restoration of the following word, but *facta* cannot be rejected from such a context merely because it is colourless.

Par. 29 (27) 3 and 4. Not all editors have realised, with Scaliger, that the lines of this poem are composed entirely of short syllables (with a final '*anceps*'): Peiper's text misled Raven, *Latin Metre* (London 1965), 117. In line 3 Scaliger's *supera* was adopted by Axt, Schenkl and L. Mueller<sup>9</sup>), but V's reading points to *operiat*, and accordingly I suggest *cinis uti placidulus operiat*

8) See now *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 25 (1978), 19/20.

9) L. Mueller, *de Re Metrica Poetarum Latinorum* (Leipzig, 1894), 410.

*amitam*, with the last word a replacement of V's *viguit*, a commonplace in the context but not typical of Ausonius. The repetition may be justified by that in *Mos.* 198/9 (*amnis*), Par. 20 (18) (*ago*); the scansion of *uti* by the example of *ubi, nisi, quasi* and Ausonius' treatment of other final vowels, and perhaps Vict. *Aleth.* 3.192. The notion of ash as a covering is also found in *Carm. Epigr.* 1017.1/2 *Hoc Epios tumulo Cinipest cum fratre sepultus, ante suos annos quos tegit atra cinis*, where *quos* may refer to the persons in the first line, given the loose syntax often found in this type of composition, although the point is not essential to the validity of the parallel. Like *Erebus*, it is an unusual concept in an unusual poem.

In line 4 it may be wise to observe the system of breaks in the line which Ausonius and his model Serenus seem to be following (cf. now the Greek examples collected by A. Cameron in H.S.C.P. 84 [1980], 152); the correct reading may be *celeripes et adeat anima loca Erebi*, with *anima* for *tacita* and a comparatively economical transposition of *tacita* and *loca*, and the retention of V's *et*, deleted by Scaliger, Peiper and Mueller. In line 2 the true reading may be *cui mela brevicula modifica recino*.

*Ibid.* 31 (29) 4. There seems to be no reason for preferring the unusual and untypical *uno quamvis tu* (V) to *uno tu quamvis*.

XVI. 7. 48f. (V. 6. 39f.) (the *Professores*). V reads *utriusque domus sine herede tuo*, which would probably have been prosodically unacceptable to Ausonius. Scaliger suggested the deletion of *domus*, unnecessary to the sense, for *utriusque* refers to *soceris* and *patris* immediately preceding, but insisted upon *suo* 'the riches of each man without his heir' or 'an heir to enjoy them'. But although Alethius Minervius was shortlived he could have been their heir, and V's *tuo* may be retained – 'without any heir of your own'.

*Prof.* 8 (7) 11. In this line *possit* would give a more suitable sequence of tenses: Ausonius is debating, as elsewhere (11 (10), *fin.* 23 (22)) whether Leontius is rightfully admitted to his series. The question is not, as *posset* would suggest, whether Leontius in his lifetime could be seen as a member of the professorate – a point which in his careful periphrasis Ausonius leaves, perhaps tactfully, unclear by saying that Leontius had sufficient reputation for a poorly paid chair. Cf. Cic. *Verr.* 1.12 *ita vexavit et perdidit ut ea restitui... nullo modo possit*, (although *tantum* in our passage is explained by *quantus*, not *ut*).

*Prof.* 11 (10). In the heading of the poem the word *Philologis*



is suspicious, for after *Grammaticis* it is unnecessary; it is found nowhere else in the titles of the *Professores* and only twice in Ausonius' whole work. After entering the text it may have caused by homoearchon the ousting of the names Macrinus, Sucuro, Concordius and Phoebeius, which Scaliger rightly restored to accompany Ammonius. Peiper's reading, which omits the names of the *grammatici* from Bordeaux, is based on the argument that the name Ammonius, which is now lacking from the text, had accidentally become incorporated into the title, when it was written at the top of the second column: an argument which supposes an earlier copy in which *Ammonium*, in exactly the same position, was taken out of a complete hemiepes and fitted into a pre-existing title. It is perhaps more likely that there was damage in the exemplar of V, as indicated by the loss of a word after *commemorare* (line 30 of V, 33 of Peiper's text), which caused the loss of the essential line containing Ammonius' name.

*Prof.* 13 (12) 3. *qua forma aut merito fueris*. Ausonius can hardly recall Thalassus (*sic*), and no other source can assist his faint memory. References to men's *forma* are rare in these poems, and such a feature might well have escaped his memory entirely in the sixty years or more since Thalassus' lifetime. *Fama*, notwithstanding the repetition, may well be correct: the connexion of *fama* and *meritum* is found in *Prof.* 7 (6) 16 and 11 (10) 40/1, and the word is more relevant here.

*Prof.* 17–23 (16–22) are missing from V, and the editor depends on the Lyons edition of 1558; but lines 7 to 14 of *Prof.* 21 (20) are also offered by two apographa of V, to which greater authority should be conceded. In 12 they offer *nec cunctator erat nec properator erat*; the Lyons ed. *nec cunctator eras, nec properante sono*. The second person should be restored after *tibi* in the previous line and punctuation placed after *quietus*, so that *cunctator* refers, as it regularly does, to a person, not *sermo*. *Properante sono* makes the line rather more awkward than the examples of adjective combined with ablative phrase collected by S. Blomgren, (*Erano*s 67 (1969) 66–7) from Ausonius, and is perhaps a gloss on the unique *properator* (which, if read, is one of some eighty words unique to Ausonius). The structure of the line may be defended by appeal to Ovid (*Her.* 4.144, 15.40 and 184, *Am.* 3.6.48).

*Prof.* 22 (21) 19. *Ut* is difficult to translate, and highly doubtful: Ausonius is listing the famous triad of Homeric orators (as he does in VIII. 19 (XX. 19, p. 358) and *Ep.* XVI. 2. 11 ff. (*Ep.* XII. 11 ff., p. 239)), and is not choosing examples. An original *et* may

have been corrupted by *ceu* in the next line. The comparison of a single modern with several ancient *exempla* is common: cf. XXIII 11/12 (VII. 1. 11/12), *Ep.* XVII. 12 (*Ep.* II. 20 ff.) (The same argument supports Schenkl's *tris* or Peiper's *simul* in 16, where a word has fallen out.)

In line 23 of the same poem *dulcia fatu verba canentem*, *fatu* is awkward with both *verba* and *canentem*, and otiose, (unlike *fando* above: 'recalled, when speaking'). The correct reading might be *dulce fluentia* or *dulcisfluentia* (the latter a *hapax legomenon*, cf. the rare *dulcisfluus*). If the rare double dactyl in this metre requires justification, the sense of the words and the context of fluent oratory may provide it.

In line 26 it may be that the words *mython plasmata* should be written in Greek, as suggested by de la Ville de Mirmont<sup>10</sup>; they are rare in Latin, (unlike *historiam*) and one may compare, besides the word in line 12 (perhaps made from *elegeon*), the Greek word (or words, see below) in *Ep.* XXII (XXVI) – a (sarcastic) tribute to another Greek – and snatches of Greek in the letters to Paulus. The scribes are often unequal to this practice: cf. *aulica* in *Ep.* X. 10 (VI. 10). But it may further be argued that V's *mythoplasmata* was an error by a copyist who had before him *μύθους πλάσματα* and was unsure about the Greek ending. Doubts about the genuineness of Scaliger's correction *mython* were first expressed by Colson in his commentary on Quintilian I.O. 1. 8.18, citing the traditional *narrationum tres species* as *μῦθοι, πλάσματα, ἱστορία* from Sextus Empiricus *adv. gramm.* 263–4 (cf. Quint. I.O. 2.4.2.) As a teacher Ausonius would no doubt have been aware of this distinction.

*Prof.* 25 (24) 4. *Glabrio Aquilini, Dardana progenies* is read by V, and by Vinet and Schenkl with an obelos. It is unlikely that there is an identification of the Aquilini and the Acilii, who are referred to in the title (which is probably the poet's work although the uncharacteristic abbreviation *Iun.* should be omitted, as in the 1558 and 1568 editions.) Heinsius suggested the implausible *Acilini*, to be followed by Pastorino and Peiper. G.W. Williams has suggested to me a possible emendation in *Glabrio Acili, olim Dardana progenies*: 'Acilius Glabrio, scion of ancient Troy'. For the adjectival use of *olim*, a parallel offers itself in *Ep.* XXII. 2.46 (*Ep.* XXVI. 47, p. 275): *Triptolemon olim*, 'Triptolemus of old'.

10) H. de la Ville de Mirmont, *Le Manuscrit de l'Ile Barbe*, (Paris and Bordeaux, 1917–9), 2. 183.

The final poem of the *Professores* bears the title *Poeta*. This at first sight appears to be Ausonius' epitaph written in preparation for his own death, a farewell to those whom he expected to outlive him, (including experts in medicine and philosophy such as are not mentioned in the previous elegies); but it is clear that Ausonius identifies himself with *cura viventum* and *honor superstitum* (7/8). He is still the poet commemorating dead colleagues, and this poem is no more personal than the foregoing poems. It might be more correct to see this short epode as the second half of a polymetric *Coronis*, the first half addressed to the reader, the second to the dead, and the title *Poetas* an interpolated heading to fill an apparent vacuum.

XVIII. 2.51f. (X. 51f., p. 120) (the *Moselle*).

naturae mirabor opus, non cura nepotum  
laetaque iacturis ubi luxuriatur egestas.

*Cura* has often been emended, usually to an adjective – *dira* was suggested by Peiper, *certa* by Lachmann, *secura* anew by H. Tränkle (*Mus. Helv.* 31 (1974) 157–8), *vana* by H. Fuchs (*ibid.* 32 (1975), 175) – and correction is necessary, for a translation such as 'lusso' (Pastorino), 'Vergnügungssucht' (Hosius) is difficult. *Cara* (found by de la Ville de Mirmont in a manuscript note in N. Heinsius' copy (*Annales de la Faculté de Bordeaux* 4 (1887), p. 3, but rejected) is a neat replacement, palaeographically and syntactically; 'hard-won, costly, poverty', describing the spend-thrift at the end of the day, reinforces the oxymoron of *laeta iacturis* ('enjoying its losses'). In this sentence *non* should probably be taken as '... the world of Nature, not the world in which...'. In *Mos.* 253 *dum trepidant* is generally read, referring to all the fishes (*turba* (250) with *invasit*), or the *fauces* of the fish being caught, which are mentioned immediately before. The latter interpretation would make the poet a little imprecise, while the first is vulnerable to the question, why should the whole shoal fear, when only one member is aware of the danger in the bait? *Dum trepidat*, moving the focus onto the single fish which is caught, may be correct. Vergilian parallels offer for both phrases, and are therefore of no help. (*A.* 9. 418, 12. 737).

In 327 *quin* may owe its appearance here to the common collocation *quin etiam*: all the other villas are introduced by *haec* or *illa*, and the anomaly would remain even if *aliam* were read in the next line. If it is argued that an element of surprise was desired,



it is strange that only one villa among many notable ones is selected.

*Ep.* IV. 31 (*Ep.* XIV. 31, p. 246). *Fero* is suspicious; the accusative *ferum* is to be expected. From the unpublished material of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* I have kindly been supplied with six other examples of *subsido* (or *-eo*), all with the accusative; two of these are from the contemporary Ammianus (16.8.3, 28.4.22), and two from poets well known to Ausonius (*Verg. A.* 11.268 and *Lucan* 5.226). Although Servius rejects the accusative in the Vergil passage, his reasons do not bear on the usage of the word.

In *Ep.* IV. 54 (*Ep.* XIV. 54), *Ep.* V. 15 and 31 (*Ep.* XVI. 15 and 31) and *Ep.* VII. 2.55 (*Ep.* XV 55) a variety of spellings is offered by V for the place-name usually given as *Dumnotini* (-ae). In his *Inscriptions Romaines de Bordeaux* (Bordeaux, 1890), II, 132, C. Jullian argued for the spelling *Dumnotoni*, on the analogy of other Gallic names, and this reading should be accepted (with *Dumnotonae*, an adjective like *Arpinae* (*Mart.* 10.20.17) from *Arpinum*, in the last-mentioned place). This correction was anticipated, in the first passage only, in Toll's second edition (1671), but it is uncertain for what reason.

*Ep.* VII. 2.8 (*Ep.* XV. 8, p. 250). The ms. gives *ter ut eolidi*, which Vinet and Pastorino have defended by reference to Canace's pregnancy in Ovid *Her.* 11.46, but it is an unexpected illustration of a common point. Heinsius' *iter ut solidi* has won considerable favour, whether *ut* functions as *quot*, as the punctuation of Peiper and Schenkl suggests, or is to be taken closely with *solidi mensis* ('as of a whole month'). We do not find in this or in other series of riddling equations such a departure from normal expression, and I suggest *quotve dies solidi*, supposing the corruption to have been begun by repetition of *ter* from the previous line.

*Ibid.*, 13. *regno quot protulit annos* is rather unlikely Latin, with *proferre* used of a clearly defined period; *regnum* would restore good sense, either with *annos* (cf. *Par.* 6 (4) 23 *tu novies denos vitam cum duxeris annos*) or *annis* to express time 'how long'.

*Ibid.* 27. V has *adde unum et unum*, with a hiatus which although not entirely anomalous in Ausonius, would be unusual, and has attracted many corrections: *addito* (Heinsius), *iam* (Schenkl), *et* (Peiper). The last mentioned may be accepted as the most straightforward, but another change is necessary, as seen by Toll: the change of *unum* to *unam*, for Ausonius is calculating throughout in feminine numbers with reference to

*ostreae*. This combination of earlier changes is also read by J. Coleman in his Ph.D. dissertation on the Letters of Ausonius, kindly supplied to me by University Microfilms.

*Ep.* IX. 50 (*Ep.* V. 50, p. 228). V's *coniugioque* makes awkward Latin with *dapes*; the construction is not comparable to that of *amico* in the previous line, for the meaning is not 'if there perchance was a feast at a wedding' but simply 'if there was a wedding-feast'. *Coniugii* is therefore more likely, with *amico* perhaps having caused the corruption. *-ve* for *-que*, as suggested in the copy of Sebisius, may also be needed, but Ausonius does not always seem to be particular in his use of these words.

*Ep.* X. 2 (*Ep.* VI. 2, p. 228). This letter is written to Paulus, who also received the egregious macaronic mixture of *Ep.* XII (*Ep.* VIII). It is clear there that the manuscripts are unequal to Ausonius' changes from Latin to Greek, and some Greek words are omitted or written as Latin. Here one may suspect the word *plasma* in line 2, which I have argued above should be written as Greek in *Prof.* 22 (21) 26, and *plateas* (22), scanned unusually, of which the literal meaning is emphasised. (*Pascha* (17), as Church Latin, probably escaped such trifling, *echo* (23) is found in the *Moselle*, 297).

Unlikely also is *Automedon* in *Ep.* XIV. 10 (*Ep.* X. 10, p. 235), where CKM write it in Greek letters and T omits the word altogether. I am, however, less confident about the emendation of Shackleton Bailey in *Ep.* IX. 34 (V. 34), where for *farris* he suggests *σαρκός*; there is no other Greek in this letter (also to Paulus), and this is probably because the poem is a parody of a didactic work, in which we should not expect Greek, unless it is technical, which *σαρκός* is not.

In *Ep.* XI. 12f. (*Ep.* VII. 19f., p. 231) Ausonius, again writing to Paulus, speaks of *pisonem, quem tollenonem* (*tolleno* in T, *tollono inde* K, *tolle nomen* CM) *existimo proprie a philologis appellatum*. The equation is most puzzling; it is a matter not of a private joke (as Pastorino, in the course of a note of unusual length (pp. 236-8) argues) but technical terminology, as *philologis* shows. The solution may perhaps be found in a line quoted by Festus (p. 274 M) from the *Astraba* (regarded as perhaps not Plautine by Gellius (11.7.5)): *quasi tolleno aut pilum Graecum reciprocas plana via*, where someone is compared to a mechanical reciprocating device. (Cf. in *Ep.* VII. 1.2 (*Ep.* XV. 3) *munus reciprocum* denoting the exchange of letters.) *Pilum Graecum* (literally, 'Greek pestle') may be a humorous euphemism for a military object that

was originally terrifying (perhaps in the second Punic War, cf. Livy 24.34.10), like *bos Luca*; here I suggest that it has been ousted by the gloss *pisonem*. *Pilum Graecum* would be then be one of Ausonius' armoury of private words to describe the exchange of eccentric Greco-Latin poetry in which he and his friend Paulus indulged: in *Ep.* X. 42 (VI. 42) the phrase *Graeca fides* indicates this as well as its usual meaning of 'barter'.

*Ep.* XVIII. 19/20 (*Ep.* XIII. 19/20, p. 244). Schenkl suggested *qui* for *quot* in his apparatus, and this is surely right, as Ausonius turns from quantity to number: six is (variously) maintained as the first and the only perfect number. In the next line also *qui* is needed for the sense: 'the number which distributes equally odd and even among its factors' (the number one is *medium*, cf. XXVI. 2. 54), with *aequipero* used as in Palladius 3.25.16 *ut alimentum ceteris sucus aequiperet*. The traditional reading *quot* requires either the sense 'the number which distributes', with *quot* as a strange subject with a singular verb (Evelyn White), or the sense 'in how many parts even and odd are equal' (Pastorino, apparently) – for which Digest 50.17.104 *ubi aequiperant actiones* seems the only example in the sense of 'equalling each other', and the text is doubtful: Mommsen's correction gives a different usage. Since *quot* throughout must be 'six', *partibus* here would be 'units', not 'factors', and the latter meaning therefore commonplace. The source of the corruption is obvious; the scribe changed from *quot* (6–17) to *qui* (21–22) two lines too late. The reading *aut* for *atque* (M) is probably an error and does not affect the problem.

In *Ep.* XXI. 1.8 (*Ep.* XXV. 12, p. 270) CM's *apalaria* has generally been banished in favour of Scaliger's *applaria* from T's *appalaria*, (K has *appallaria*), which is variously explained: as a corruption of the Greek ἐπονύλαρια (Lydus *de mens.* 1.29), as 'baskets'; as *genus cochlearis* (G. L. 5.589.1, 4.472.35) or as derived from *appia* (TLL, s.v. (*applar*)). The meaning of the first two in this context and the formation of the third are not entirely satisfactory; I propose that the word be derived from *apala* (*ova*) which in Apicius 7.327–9 (André) are recommended to be eaten with *liquamen*, and be translated 'eggs' or 'egg-dishes', like *phase-laria* (Hist. Aug. *Elag.* 20.7) – 'beans'.

At the end of *Ep.* XXI. 1. (*Ep.* XXV, p. 270) *vale* may be incorrectly inserted. It is not usual for Ausonius to take his leave when a verse portion is still to come: cf. *Epp.* VII. 1 (to Theon), XI. 1 (to Paulus), XXII. 1 (to Paulinus); the only exception is

*Ep.* XVI. 1. to Probus, a less familiar friend. The letters of dedication sent with examples of Ausonius' writing, where the verse is not an integral part of the correspondence, are a different case.

In *Ep.* XXI. 2.8 (*Ep.* XXV. 8, p. 271) *si vera fama est Hippocrene* (Peiper) – 'if H. is a true story' – is anomalous Latin; nor can *Hippocrene* be a vocative (Schenkl, and Pastorino apparently in his text, though not his translation), for the whole poem is an address to the *iambus*. *Hippocrenes* (G. W. Williams) may well be correct.

*Ibid.* 12. The first word of the line is corrupt (*hicque* KT, *hic* M, *hic quod* C) and various replacements have been offered (*illicque* Schenkl, *sanctisque* Peiper, *iisque* Hartel, *idemque* Baehrens). There would be more point to *sociisque*, alluding to the pact of Apollo and the Muses mentioned in *Ep.* X. 11 (*Ep.* VI. 11) *te quoque ne pigeat consponsi foederis*, after ten lines concerning Apollo and the Muses. (Cf. *Epigr.* 1. 6/7, 95. 7, Hom. *Iliad* 1. 603–4, Plut. *Pyth.* 17 (*Mor.* 402 D)).

*Ep.* XXII. 2. 26 and 28 (*Ep.* XXVI. 26 and 28, p. 274). In line 2 of this letter Ausonius sarcastically defers to Philo's preference for a Greek title. This may be true also in 26 (*sophos*) and 28 (*emporus*), for the words are not common in Latin, and a diffident scribe might have chosen an easier orthography. The derivation of 26 from Horace (S. 2. 3. 296) is no objection; in *Ep.* XII (*Ep.* VIII) the poem ends with a partial translation of Horace into Greek.

*Ibid.* 31. In such a rococo line as this the final singular, *rate*, appears anomalous, and the original word might have been *rati-bus*, a resolved iamb. Although no parallel to this exists in Ausonius or his pupil Paulinus, they are both free with resolutions (in the fifth foot in Paulinus 10.75 and 24.175), and this egregious example may be intended as an aspect of Ausonius' *poeticus character*, which, as he tells us above, is impressed on this poem.

*Ibid.* 47 (48) *Tullianum* was changed to *viliconum* by Peiper, comparing Apul. *Apol.* 87 and rejecting a possible tenuous (but irrelevant) reference to Cicero (*de Off.* 3.54, after Haupt, *Opuscula*, 3.506) or an unusually obscure one to *Tylus/Tullus*. Instead of his 'Buzyges, the bailiffs' friend', of little point in this letter, I suggest *viliconem* 'Buzyges the bailiff', a mocking reference to a famous figure as in *Ep.* IV. 70 (XIV. 70) 'the Samian nabob' (Evelyn White's translation of *Samii Lucumonis*).

*Ep.* XXIV. 5 1/2 (*Ep.* XXIX. 5 1/2, p. 287): the couplet

Vasconis hoc saltus et ninguida Pyrenaei  
hospitia et nostri facit hoc oblivio caeli

has found general favour, on the basis of a majority among the mss., but the repeated *hoc* is awkward: *Vasconei saltus* (Parisinus 7558) gives a sonorous impressive line, echoed with but slight alteration in Paulinus' reply *Vasconiae saltus et ninguida Pyrenaei* (Peiper, *Ep.* XXXI. 203, p. 301, Hartel<sup>11</sup>) 10.203). The phrase *Vascone saltu* in *Ep.* XXXI.212 may have caused the error.

*Ep.* XXV.65 (*Ep.* XXVII.36, p. 277): *te suadente fugam Pylades liquisset Oresten*, Ausonius complains, according to mss. and editors, with Martial 7.24.3 ff. in mind. Ausonius in spite of considerable care in his borrowings of classical authors (see 'Ausonius' Use of the Classical Latin Poets...', CQ n.s. 27 (1977), 441-452), seems to have framed a hypothesis unsuitable to the present case, for Paulinus has 'fled', perhaps at the instigation of another, not caused another's flight. Moreover it ill suits the following line, for the point about Damon and Phintias is not that the latter refused to depart but that he faithfully returned so that Damon retained his security (which was his life). These difficulties would be removed if the reading was *te suadente, fugax*, for then *te suadente* need mean no more than 'under your influence' or 'following your example', matching the vague *disiungere...posses* of line 63. *Fugax*, a common charge in anti-Christian polemic (cf. Min. Felix, *Octavius*, 8.4) would balance *impie* two lines earlier. It may further be argued that the new rhythm is more faithful to Martial, whose text perhaps should be punctuated *te fingente - nefas - Pyladen odisset Orestes*, for *nefas* is rather a difficult object for *fingo*, 'fashion', 'modify', 'invent', 'fabricate'.

*Ibid.*, 85 *tunc ego te ut nostris aptum complecterer ulnis*, after PH, is generally read, as Ausonius describes his longing for words from Paulinus after a long silence (caused partly by the loss of letters, *pace* Shackleton Bailey, p. 260); he realises that there is no question of actual meeting. *Actum* (V) is not suitable, being too strong for 'brought to'; *aptum* ('united to') here is unusual especially in the singular (cf. *TLL* II. 327.76 ff.), and like Oudendorp's *artum* is not the sentiment of a man who has set his hopes no higher than successful correspondence with his friend; the next line suggests a weaker sentiment. I offer tentatively *tactum*, or *te nostris tamquam* 'as if in my arms'; a letter, if reliably conveyed, would be an adequate substitute.

<sup>11</sup>) C.S.E.L. vol. 30: Schenkl does not print the letters of Paulinus.



The last three passages come from Paulinus' first reply (10 in Hartel).

*Ep.* XXXI. 41 f., p. 294 Peiper. The final correction to this difficult couplet should be *aut* (SB) for *quod* in 42, with *detegant*, giving *nil afferentes ut salutem conferant | aut veritatem detegant*. *Quod* in 42 seems to derive from the next line, where VIISB read *quod; non tegant* (SB) is a gloss for *detegant*, preserving the plural after *aut* was corrupted. In 41 *nil* is more likely to have been corrupted than *nihil* (cf. *Prof.* 7 (6) 53, a quotation).

*Ibid.* 213. The echo of Horace C. 1. 22. 1 in this line becomes more characteristically exact if we read *vitae* (for *vitam*, *vita*) *integer*; from the difficult *aequo* of the mss. (except P, who omits it), *aevum*, an object of *agit*, may be restored (cf. 1.83 *neque* for *neve* in SB, and *Ep.* XXX. 20 *liquor* for *livor* in V). Peiper's *aeque* ('as before', Evelyn White), Zechmeister's *aequus* (used by Walsh), and Heinsius' *aevi*, (albeit Vergilian), are less elegant for the line as a whole.

*Ibid.* 221 ff. A long sentence begins with *nam quod...* and is taken up with *an credis...* in 226. The sense is dubious, for Paulinus is not taking up a new point, as the construction implies, but harping upon an old one; moreover, *velut...* in 225 f. is not appropriate to a restatement of an adversary's position. Parallels (*TLL.* II. 3. 32 ff. offers two, from Cicero), are few, and much shorter. *Nam quid* ('but why...?') would give excellent sense: for adversative *nam*, cf. *Par* 26 (24) 7.

The first two of my transpositions relate to the two poems in the *Professores* (7 (6) and 11 (10)) in which the manuscript order is totally confused and the correct text restored only by Herculean labours of rearrangement, mainly by Scaliger and Toll. In 7 (6) 11 f. I suggest the neat *praetextate | et praeceptor*, to sum up Alethius' precocious promotion. The line *et praeceptor* has no other obviously suitable context either in V (where it is line 25 if the columns are read as in Schenkl, or line 14 according to Peiper) or in editors' texts (line 23 in Schenkl, 14 Peiper), or elsewhere.

In *Prof.* 11 (10) it is a corollary of my explanation of the title (above) that we do not need to fix the position of the essential line containing Ammonius' name in the same way as it was done by Peiper and Schenkl; this line should be placed adjacent to the existing damage (line 33, Peiper), and close to the begin-

ning of the notice, as is usual. Line 33 therefore seems the rightful position for <Ammonium...>. Evelyn White placed it at the very beginning, after *series* (31), but *etenim* is against this.

In poems where the order of verses has survived in a more settled form, the following additions are suggested to the transpositions necessarily adopted by previous editors.

*Mos.* 370-1 *nec minor hoc, tacitum qui per sola pingua labens  
sternit frugiferas felix Alisontia ripas.*

In the mss. this couplet follows the honorific mention of the Saar in the list of tributaries, and there is an obvious difficulty: whether the Alzette or Elz is referred to – it is probably the latter, for the Alzette is a tributary of a tributary (the Sauer), and far distant – the river is a considerably smaller one, and detracts from the honour of the Saar, which joins the Moselle by the imperial *castrum* at Conz (where Ausonius may have composed the poem). Neither ignorance nor exaggeration, suggested by Hosius in his commentary, is likely to have contributed to the error, for Ausonius seems well informed about the other rivers, and there is no motive in the context for such exaggeration as we find in Symmachus *Or.* 2.24, where the orator describes the Neckar, newly made known to Roman soldiers, as *par maximis*. If the couplet is placed after line 364, which mentions the Kyll and Ruwer, the difficulties are removed: the comparison is apt, and the Saar is allowed to form a climax (signalled by the imitation of Verg. *A.* 8.712).

*Ep.* XVI. 2.63f. (*Ep.* XII. 63f., p. 241). The letter to Probus is built around a refrain *perge o libelle et utere | felicitate intermina*. This is here preceded by *quaecumque fortuna est tibi*, 'whatever your destined happy condition is'. This is a little strange after the detailed description of the warm welcome which the letter will receive from the great man. If line 63 follows the refrain, it is then preceded by words of more general import, and the phrase has more point in that it provides connexion and contrast with *dic me valere et vivere*, which is then less sudden (cf. 40, where after the refrain *quin et* takes up the argument). This change is supported to some extent by Evelyn White, who begins a new paragraph with 63, including the refrain; but it is much more likely that the refrain is used to separate paragraphs.

*Ep.* XXII 2.14ff. (*Ep.* XXVI. 14ff., p. 274). In this sentence, as given by the mss., the ablatives in lines 15/6 are inelegant

and of uncertain syntax, and *et* in 16 is otiose; and his ignorance, rather improbably, is made the point of his accusation, not the turn of events. The sentence is far more fluent if read as follows, assuming confusion of the shorter lines: *hic saepe falsus messibus vegrandibus / et siderali inscitia / semente sera sive multum praecoqua / reos peregit caelites / caelum lacessens seque culpae subtrahens / nomen perosus vilici...* followed by other titles that he disowned or forfeited.

*Ep.* XXIV. 13 ff. (*Ep.* XXIX. 13 ff., p. 285). Line 16 *Dindyma Gargarico* (or *-que Idaeo*) *respondent cantica luco* seems out of place, for stylistic reasons. Line 15, if a new sentence is begun there (as in Peiper's punctuation), or line 16, if 15 is taken with 14, is abrupt (as perhaps was evident when correction was made to *Dindymaque Idaeo*). Moreover, lines 9-19 concentrate on the sounds of nature, while those of human civilisation (mainly religious: including the wind-operated artifice of Dodona) enter in line 20. The correct position of line 16 may therefore be after line 19, where there is no offence at all to style or structure. There is a similar passage in Claudian's *de Raptu Proserpinae* (1.202 ff.), which may have been written with knowledge of this passage (Claudian certainly knew parts of the correspondence of Ausonius and Paulinus), but cannot be used as evidence for the text here: for in Claudian there is no wind, and the woods of Gargara follow the noise of the revels, the opposite of the situation here described, where *cantica* are probably revels and not the *carmina* of the pine, mentioned in Claudian.

The last transposition relates to two poems of the *Parentalia* which seem to be in the wrong position in relation to each other: 25 (23) and 26 (24). Paulinus the father is referred to in 25 (23) 6 and 19 with familiarity, which is easier to understand if he has already been commemorated; 26 (24) is introduced with the flourish that Ausonius uses when turning to another part of the family, the appeal to the moral sympathy of the general reader (cf. *Par.* 20 (18), *Prof.* 8 (7)); and it is usual for Ausonius to address a parent before his or her departed children (*Par.* 10 (8) and 11 (9); 14 (12) and 19 (17); 20 (18), 21 (19) and 22 (20)), irrespective of the order of death. These are clear indications from Ausonius' manner of writing of his intentions, and can hardly be ascribed to haste, carelessness or incompleteness. (*Par.* 32 (30), commemorating the wife of the gentleman in 24 (22), and perhaps 31 (29), on his sister, are different cases; there is no evidence in the text that they were intended to stand elsewhere,

In the following passages the sense is considerably improved by major alterations in the accepted punctuation.

I read                    numquam horrida forma magistri,  
ille licet tristis senio nec voce serenus  
aspera contractae minitetur iurgia frontis.  
numquam immanis erit, placida suetudine vultus  
qui semel imbuerit:

In *Par.* 19 (17) 11 *eben quem, Maxime, fructum* should follow, as a second object, *vis percudit invida fati*, and the line be ended with a full stop: it is neither an independent exclamation nor connected grammatically with the following list of tributes in nominative and vocative, which are to be taken with *cape...* (line 16).

XXIV. I. I (VIII. I, p. 109) (*Cupido Cruciatu*s, pref.) The mss. read *enumquam vidisti nebulam pictam in pariete*?, in which *nebulam* is pointless and cannot be justified by the dark background of the fascinating picture or by anything else. The correction *tabulam* (Vinet) might be attacked on the grounds that such pictures would be so common in a Roman city that the question is a stupid one: but the writer expects his reader to ask (remembering Plautus, *Men.* 143, or even if he does not): ‘a pic-

ture of what?'. Hence the question should be written *enumquam vidisti tabulam pictam in pariete...?*

A similar device should be used in Ep. XIX. 17ff. (Ep. XXIII 21ff., p. 267) where Ausonius is quoting Paulinus' metrical version of Suetonius' *de Regibus*. It is not easy to see from what single context the varied lines cited might have come, since they mention in close proximity kings from diverse times and places. I believe that we have here to do with a pastiche, consisting of lines taken from various parts of the work in order to illustrate various virtues of the writer. This is confirmed by T's *collegi* in 16; the alternative reading of the mss., *cognovi*, gives poor sense, for Ausonius is hardly quoting only those names that he already knows. Accordingly I would write *linguae...* in line 21. Line 22 is probably made up from different portions of hexameters; 23 was probably separate from 24 and 25, and should be marked similarly. In the last line, if *moxque Sesostris* is read, the same punctuation should be used, as in Walsh's translation<sup>12</sup>), Pastorino and Evelyn White; but it is doubtful if Ausonius would end his long sentence in this way, and the true reading may be *mox Sesostris* of CM and Souchay, making Sesostris the 'nameless king' (an allusion to the difficulty of finding a place for him in the regnal lists?), and offering a final excellent example of Paulinus' careful treatment of exotic names.

A couplet in the first reply of Paulinus (Peiper Ep. XXXI. 9/10, p. 292; Hartel 10.9/10) has caused difficulties to translators. Souiry<sup>13</sup>), takes *dulcia* as 'douceurs', *quaedam submara* as 'des expressions un peu amères', and *multimodis... querellis* as 'beaucoup de plaintes', omitting *censoe*; Evelyn White translates 'things sweet, though somewhat soured with manifold complaints, troubled affection had mingled with criticism'; Walsh with *sub amara* 'beneath the bitter sweetness of your manifold complaints, troubled love merged with rebuke'. Peiper's punctuation is difficult to understand. This difficult and ungainly couplet is made distinctly easier by the acceptance of Sacchinus' *multa modis* (so VII) for *multimodis* and re-punctuation thus:

*dulcia multa modis, quaedam subamara querellis,  
anxia censoe, miscuerat pietas.*

12) P.G. Walsh, *The Poems of Paulinus of Nola*, ACW 40 (New York 1975), 33.

13) F. Souiry, *Études sur Paulin de Nole* (Paris and Bordeaux 1854), II 57.



with a neat tricolon echoing the points just made about the 'three-fold poem'. There is a comparable construction in Paulinus, c. 18. 253 *miscetque precantia verba querellis*.

Swallowgate,  
St. Andrews

R. P. H. Green