

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE *PANEGYRICI LATINI*

TORE JANSON

FEW LATE Latin texts have occupied modern scholars as much as the collection of speeches known as the *Panegyrici Latini*. The texts have been published many times since the fifteenth century, and the five latest publications must be ranked as modern critical editions.¹ In addition, a host of articles and several monographs have dealt with problems concerning the language and the text of the panegyrics.²

It may not seem to be a very urgent task to look for new solutions to problems in a text upon which so much effort has been spent; and in fact I did not start out to do so. My plan was, and is, to make a study of the historical development of the oratorical style in the panegyrics. But when working with the details of style, I was again and again confronted with an interesting passage where the text was far from certain and where it was necessary to take a stand. In some cases, there seemed to be good reasons for disagreeing with the modern editions, or with the latest one of them. A selection of these cases is presented below.³

It should clearly be understood that there is little hope for finding new and convincing solutions to the many seriously corrupt passages in the *Panegyrici*. At least, I do not aspire to do so. My goal is more modest: to tidy up a little in places where there seem to be only minor slips in the tradition, or where the editors may have accepted unnecessary alterations. My reasons for proposing readings which differ from those traditionally accepted are mainly of three kinds. First, many editors and critics seem to have been so interested in language and style that they sometimes accepted a reading which yields a good Latin phrase but produces a meaning inappropriate in the wider context of the speech. Second, some new facts have emerged from a computer-made concordance which covers the *Panegyrici Latini* and several related texts.⁴ Third, I have checked the use of prose rhythm in the panegyrics, and have arrived at results which differ partly from the assumptions of Mynors, the editor who most often considers matters of rhythm in his establishment of the text. Only a few comments about rhythm can be made here; a full study will be published elsewhere.

1. Viz., the editions of Aemilius Baehrens (Teubner, 1874), his son Wilhelm Baehrens (Teubner, 1911), E. Galletier (Budé, 3 vols., 1949–55), R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1964), and V. Paladini and P. Fedeli (Acad. Lync., Rome, 1976).

2. For references to earlier research, see the introduction to the edition by Galletier.

3. This work has profited much from comments by the referee, Professor D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Naturally, I am alone responsible for errors that remain.

4. T. Janson, *A Concordance to the Latin Panegyrics* (Hildesheim, 1979).

A few words must be said about the manuscript tradition and the abbreviations used.⁵ Aurispa in 1433 found the text of the *Panegyrici Latini* in a codex Moguntinus (M), which is now lost. The extant manuscripts are grouped in two neatly differentiated classes. The smaller, and superior, family consists of the Harleianus (H), the Napocensis (N), and the Upsaliensis (A). The relationship among these manuscripts has been disputed; but the exhaustive examination by Lassandro has confirmed Mynors' opinion that A is a descendant of N and that N, in turn, is a descendant of H. It has generally been assumed that H is a direct copy of M. Although Lassandro rightly stresses that this relationship is by no means proved, the contention by Paladini and Fedeli that H belongs to an independent tradition is not supported by any valid arguments. There is no reason to believe that the scribe who wrote H had access to another ancient manuscript, separate from M; I therefore retain M as the symbol for the archetype and the *consensus codicum*.

The other, larger family of manuscripts is called X. In all probability it stems from the faulty copy of M which Aurispa brought with him back to Italy. X is primarily valuable as a repository of humanist emendations. Some of these emendations from the subfamily X2 and some suggested by w (the very shrewd corrector of the Vat. lat. 1775) will figure below. Finally, there are some readings from a codex Bertinensis, preserved through the edition of Livineius (1599). As Mynors says, Bertinensis seems to have been a cognate, but not a descendant of M. Paladini and Fedeli seem to regard Bertinensis as a cognate of H (see their stemma on p. xlix), but their reasons escape me.⁶

The texts are quoted from the edition of Paladini and Fedeli.

3. 16. 4 non modo nullum popularium deprecatus sum, sed ne te quidem ipsum, imperator, quem orare praeclarum, cui preces adhibere plenissimum dignitatis est, uerbo saltem adii. sponte in familiam meam diuinum istud a te munus infusum est.

The speaker, Mamertinus, harps on a theme which is a commonplace for late authors of *gratiarum actiones*: that it is better and more honorable to be chosen as consul by the emperor than to be elected to that office by the people. Similar passages may be found in Ausonius *Gratiarum actio* 13 (ed. Schenkl) and Symmachus *Or.* 4. 7–8. Evidently, these denunciations of the democratic principle were agreeable to the emperors and courts of the Dominate. Here, Mamertinus (like Ausonius) goes on to say that he has not even had to ask for the honor, as the emperor has granted it *sponte*. What is remarkable is that he should say that it is granted *in familiam meam*.

5. For fuller information, the reader is directed to the introductions of Mynors and of Paladini and Fedeli and to the article by D. Lassandro, "I manoscritti H N A nella tradizione dei *Panegyrici Latini*," *Bolletino del Comitato per la preparazione della Edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini* n.s. 15 (1967): 35–97.

6. Cf. M. Winterbottom's review, *CR* 29 (1979): 234–35.

Meam is found only in the Bertinensis, while M has simply *in familiam*. That reading is indefensible, and the editors therefore generally accept *meam*. But why should Mamertinus speak about his family here? He discusses the honor accorded to him repeatedly and in great detail in other passages, but nowhere else does he make any reference to his kin. As a matter of fact, although we know a great deal about Mamertinus from Ammianus and from several other sources (see *PLRE* I, s.n. "Mamertinus 2"), there is no mention of any relatives at all.

I would suggest that M is closer to the original text than Bertinensis, and that *familiam* should be emended to *familiarem*. The emendation is of course quite easy paleographically, and there are several examples of loss of a syllable with *r* in M.⁷ As for the sense, it may be shocking to us that the holder of an office takes pride in the fact that he has received it in the capacity of friend to the chief of state, but this was not shocking in the fourth century. Ausonius, for one, devotes most of his panegyric to celebrating the fact that the emperor has invested his old tutor and friend with the highest offices. Mamertinus himself praises Julianus' loyalty in friendship and even asserts that he puts up with unsatisfactory conduct on his friends' part (3. 26. 5): "in recipiendis amicis optimus iudex est; si aliqui sunt improbi, tolerandis familiarium uitiis immutabilis est amicus." That Mamertinus must be counted among the *familiares* of Julianus is quite clear from his own description of his career, and from his way of addressing the emperor. He represents the relation between himself and the emperor as *amicitia* in 3. 18. 4.⁸

4. 3. 4 nobilissimorum quoque Caesarum laudes exsequi uelle studium quidem dulce, sed non et cura mediocris est, quorum in annis pubescentibus non erupturae uirtutis tumens germen, non flos praecursor indolis bonae laetior quam uberior apparet, sed iam facta grandifera et contra rationem aetatis maximorum (quorum)que fructuum maturae perceptio.

Maximorum quorumque is a conjecture by Aemilius Baehrens, printed also by Mynors and by Paladini and Fedeli. M reads just *maximorumque*.

The guess of Baehrens is at least suspect. The genitive plural of *quisque* is an extremely unusual form. Neue-Wagener (vol. 2, p. 499) lists only our passage, one in Apuleius (really in the Pseudo-Apuleian *Asclepius* [18], a translation from the Greek of uncertain date; Scott proposes the emendation *quorumdam*), two in Cassianus (*Conl.* 9. 7. 1, 18. 2. 1), and one from Eugippius (*Exc. Aug.* 75; also in Augustine's original work, *Quaest. Gen.* 42). It seems rash to introduce such a remarkable form in this text without any compelling reason. No such reason is at hand.

If that conjecture must be discarded, then, we have to choose something else. Castiglioni suggested *uberrimorum maximorumque*, which is merely

7. E.g., *prouide* for *prouidere* in 12. 3. 1, *cognoscet* (H) and *recognoscet* (X) for *cognosceret* in 4. 13. 3, *fuīt* for *fuērit* in 1. 64. 1 and 11. 15. 3. Cf. also *peculia ter* (H) for *peculiariter* in 5. 9. 3.

8. Cf. Galletier, vol. 3, pp. 7–13.

fanciful. Galletier, following Eyssenhardt, simply deletes *que*. This gives excellent sense, and is certainly much better than Livineius' conjecture, *maximorum quoque*, but entails an assumption that *que* has been spuriously introduced. Now M was faulty in many respects, but it does not seem to have contained many additions to the original text. True, there are some other cases where *que* should be deleted, but they are different from our passage. In 1. 84. 4, *idemque utrique* for *idem utrique* is one of the common errors of repetition, as is *telisque missilibusque* for *telisque missilibus* in 12. 5. 6. A third case, *atque* for *at* in 1. 32. 2, is probably caused by *foueatque* a few words before. But here no such explanation is at hand.

Yet, the reading of the manuscripts is hard to defend because of the construction *facta grandifera et contra rationem aetatis*. Such a coordination of an adjective and a prepositional phrase after the noun is hard to find in similar texts (although it is of course fairly normal when the prepositional phrase is framed, as in 1. 58. 1 "longum quendam et sine discrimine annum"); and even if it is perhaps not entirely impossible, I dare not propose that it should be allowed to stand here. On balance, then, I think that the elimination of *que* is the least unattractive solution.

4. 16. 2 cum gloria tua humanum modum supergressa sit, *sqq.*

The reading of HNA is *superegressa*, while X has *supergressa*, and Berlinensis *egressa*. Previous editors (A. Baehrens, W. Baehrens, Galletier) adhere to the better manuscripts, while Mynors and Paladini and Fedeli follow X. The meanings of *supergridior* and *superegridior* are not different, in this context at least. The fact that *supergridior* is found in Tacitus and Quintilian while *superegridior* does not appear until the fourth century is hardly reason enough to prefer the former here: the choice has probably been made because of considerations of rhythm. *Superegressa* yields a double creticus at the end of the clause, but *super-egressa* is arrhythmical.

Although there is no doubt that Nazarius cared for rhythm even before minor pauses, it would be a mistake to believe that there are only canonical clausulae in that position. Counts show that around 80 percent of the major pauses have a favored clausula, but only 50 percent of the minor pauses. As for the form $\cup\cup--\cup\cup$, represented by *superegressa sit*, it is by no means unusual before minor pauses. Three examples occur in the first eight chapters of the speech: 4. 2. 7 *auida depascitur*, 4. 7. 1 *aliquid adglutinat*, 4. 8. 4 *uitia depromimus*. The net result here, then, is that Nazarius may well have written *superegressa sit* without qualms concerning the meter. *Superegressa*, the reading of the best manuscript, should be retained in the text.

4. 16. 6 ut Herculem ferunt adhuc tenerum atque lactantem duos angues manu elisisse, *sqq.*

The reading of H is *duo*, which has not found favor with the editors; they print *duos* with XNA. But *duo* is undoubtedly a *lectio difficilior* found in the best extant manuscript. The use of *duo* in the masculine accusative, although rare, is found in several texts: see *TLL* 5. 1. 2243, citing two passages of Ammianus, among others. The list of *TLL* is far from exhaustive: cf., e.g., Arnobius 3. 32, Columella 5. 6. 18. Still more important for our passage, Nazarius himself uses the form in another place, 4. 15. 4: "ferunt duo cum equis iuvenes exstitisse. . . ." I see no reason, therefore, why *duo* should be wrong here.

4. 32. 3 fraudari indulgentissimus princeps e(a) gratia neminem uoluit,
quominus omnia, quae odium [quam] eius peruaserat, specta-
culum tyrannici funeris expiaret.

After the battle of Pons Muluius, the severed head of Maxentius was not only carried through Rome but also sent on a tour through the cities of Italy and then dispatched to Africa. This nauseating procedure is here glorified by the panegyrist, in a contorted and obscure sentence.

First, *ea* is an emendation by Rhenanus which is generally printed for the *e* of M. I am not quite convinced that this *ea* is needed. E. Löfstedt has shown that the form of *is* usually present in phrases of this kind is sometimes missing in late Latin texts.⁹ Therefore, *e* may possibly just be spurious. See below on 7. 2. 4.

But the main difficulty resides with the clause after *omnia*. First, the verb in M is *persuaserat* (there is a misprint in the apparatus of Paladini and Fedeli). The emendation *peruaserat* was first made by the second hand in the Bruxellensis, a manuscript of the X family. This has met with general approval. On the other hand, opinions about the right way to start the clause differ. M has the intolerable *quam odium quam*. Langius proposed *quae odium*, printed by Paladini and Fedeli. Other solutions are *quaqua odium* (A. Baehrens, followed by Mynors) and *qua odium* (Bongarsius, followed by W. Baehrens and Galletier).

Of these possibilities, *qua* is of course the easiest paleographically. However, the resulting phrase is awkward, or at least unusual: it does not seem that *peruado* is combined with *qua* elsewhere. There is even less to commend *quaqua*. It seems easier to explain the second *quam* as a mere repetition (cf. above concerning 4. 3. 4 on *que*) than to suppose that *odium* has intruded into the midst of *quaqua*. Further, this adverb *qua* is quite rare, and does not yield appreciably better sense than the simple *qua*. Thus I prefer the solution *quae*, which is unobjectionable in terms of syntax and sense.

The second *quam* must not necessarily be deleted, however. One might read "omnia, quae odium usquam eius peruaserat. . . ." For *usquam* in this type of relative clause, cf., e.g., Seneca *Epist.* 71. 15 "omnes quae

9. *Coniectanea* (Uppsala, 1950), pp. 10–16.

usquam rerum potiuntur urbes.” For the placement of the adverb between a noun and its genitive, cf. Velleius 1. 12. 7 “si monimentum usquam stantis maneret Carthaginis. . . .”

5. 6. 1 habemus enim, ut dixi, et hominum numerum qui delati sunt et agrorum modum, sed utrumque ne(qui)quam hominum segnitia terraeque perfidia.

The speaker discusses the taxation of his home town Autun, conceding that it is formally correct, but maintaining that in reality, the quality of the land and its workers is so low that the tax becomes intolerable.

The text of M, *nequam*, was first challenged by Mynors, who conjectured *nequa(qua)m*. This produces a barely understandable expression: “We have . . . , but (sc. in reality we have) both not at all.” As Maguinness pointed out in his review of Mynors’ edition,¹⁰ “*nequa(qua)m* should be *ne(qui)quam*.” Paladini and Fedeli print this emendation of Mynors’ conjecture.

Obviously, Maguinness’ version is much better than Mynors’, which may perhaps be regarded as a mere slip. But what are the merits of this reading compared with the paradox? As far as meaning and syntax are concerned, none at all: the reading *nequam* is perfectly grammatical and gives excellent sense. The change does yield a better clausula. But the text is, after all, prose and not poetry. As was shown above, we are not certain to find rhythmical patterns before every minor pause.

6. 5. 2 exercitum illum qui Bononiensis oppidi litus insederat terra pariter ac mari saepsit, cum reciprocos aestus [sensus M] illius elementi iactis [-us M] inter undas uallis diremisset ut, quorum portas fluctus adluerat [-et M], mare ei quod tangerent perdidissent.

In this passage, where a number of corrections have to be made in order to make the text intelligible, the change from *et* in M to *ei* (first proposed by Ellis) may seem one of the more innocuous, and it has been accepted by all modern editors. But there is a problem: the form *ei* does not occur as a nominative plural in the *Panegyrici*, nor does *ii* or *i*. The feminine nominative plural *eae* is also conspicuously absent except for the dubious passage 7. 2. 4 (see below).

It is well known that the nominative forms of *is*, and especially *ii* and *eae*, are rare or absent in many late texts, and even in an earlier author like Petronius.¹¹ Thus, it is not particularly strange that the forms are lacking in the panegyric speeches, too. Still, it does show that although

10. CR 16 (1966): 65–66.

11. For discussion, see E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica* 2 (Lund, 1933), pp. 46–47, Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik* 2:186–87, B. Löfstedt, *Studien über die Sprache der langobardischen Gesetze* (Uppsala, 1961), p. 257, and the literature quoted in these works.

the panegyrists leaned heavily upon Cicero, Fronto, and other earlier orators, and were thus certainly writing a language which was archaic in many respects, they did avoid some of the traditional usages which had definitely disappeared from the spoken language.

As for the passage under discussion, it constitutes a close parallel to a description of the same incident in an earlier speech in the collection. That section, 8. 6. 2-3, runs as follows: ". . . omnem illum sinum portus, quem statis uicibus aestus alternat, defixis in aditu trabibus ingestisque saxis iniuium nauibus reddidisti atque ipsam loci naturam admirabili ratione superasti, cum mare frustra reciprocum prohibitis fuga quasi includere uideretur tamque nullo usu iuuaret inclusos, quasi redire desisset. quatenam umquam mirabimur ualla castrorum post hoc nouum in mari uallum?" This description was written in 297, only four years after the event (Constantius' siege of Boulogne in 293). The point made by the speaker is that although the sea reached the city, it was of no avail to those enclosed.

In 6. 5. 3, composed in 310, the same idea is expressed in a more compressed phrase. The most reasonable reading seems to be: ". . . ut, quorum portas fluctus adlueret, mare etiam quod tangerent perdidissent." This would mean: ". . . so that (those) whose gates the flood washed had lost the use of the sea even though they could touch it." The change to *adluerat*, suggested by Langius and accepted by all modern editors, seems to rest upon the assumption that the water in fact did not reach the city anymore. This is quite improbable, and contrary to the statement in speech number 8. The change of *et* in M to *etiam* is a conjecture by Livineius which may well be accepted.

7. 2. 4 quare si leges eae quae multa caelibes notauerunt, parentes praemiis honorarunt, uere dicuntur esse fundamenta rei publicae, *sqq.*

As was said above, *eae* is not used elsewhere in the *Panegyrici*. Here, *eae quae* (or rather *ee que*) is an emendation by w: the text of M had *eque*. X2 has the correction *he que*.

The form *eae* here seems less unlikely than the *ei* above, since *is* is so often found between a governing noun and a relative pronoun. In the *Panegyrici Latini*, this type of expression is found, except here, only in number 11, but at least three times there: *sermonis eius quem* (11. 1. 1), *honoris eius quem* (11. 1. 2), *orationis eius quam* (11. 1. 3), and probably also *uirtutes eas quibus* (so Bertinensis and the editors in 11. 2. 2: M has *uirtus eas quibus*, w emends to *uirtutes quibus*). The reading *hae* is most improbable. If one does not accept *eae*, the alternative is rather to delete the *e* altogether. Such operations are certainly necessary at other passages in M.¹² Here, too, the *e* might perhaps be only a duplication of the vowel of the adjacent syllables.

12. Cf. *quo cum euenissent* for *quo cum uenissent* in 12. 22. 6, *de te igitur* for *det igitur* in 8. 2. 2, and above on 4. 32. 3.

In 7. 2. 5 the speaker, delivering his oration at the occasion of Constantine's marriage to Maximianus' daughter, thinks it is a fine thing that ordinary people rear children and simply marvelous that the two emperors may do the same:

qui non (per) plebeia germina sed imperatoria stirpem rei publicae propagatis ut, quod millesimo anno post Urbem conditam euenisse tandem gratulabamur, ne mutatoria per nouas familias communis salutis gubernacula traderentur, idem omnibus duret aetatibus, imperatores semper Herculii.

The text of M is "qui non plebeia gemina sed imperatoria stirpe reip. propagatis." A number of emendations have been suggested. The text printed by Paladini and Fedeli involves an emendation by A. Baehrens. Mynors prefers "plebeio germine . . . imperatoria stirpe," which was suggested by Livineius. Galletier proposes "qui non plebeia, gemina sed imperatoria stirpe rem publicam propagatis."

The last-mentioned correction is no doubt the most ingenious, but hardly tenable. First, *gemina imperatoria stirpe* would most naturally be taken to refer to two imperial children, and could hardly have the meaning "descendance doublement impériale," as Galletier would have it and the context requires; at least I have not been able to find any parallels to such an adjectival use of *geminus*. Rather, this punctuation would necessitate a change from *gemina* to *genuina*.¹³ But there are other reasons for rejecting Galletier's placement of the comma, including the position of *sed*, which is quite suspect.

The solution of Livineius is less fanciful and so less open to attack. But it shares with that of Galletier the weakness that *propagare* is given the object *rem publicam*, an unusual phrase which recalls expressions like *propagare fines* (Cic. *Mur.* 22) or *imperium* (Suet. *Ner.* 18), implying enlargement of the empire rather than multiplication of its inhabitants. Certainly, *stirpem reipublicae propagare* gives better meaning (and is paleographically simpler).

Yet, I do not think that the emendation of Baehrens is unobjectionable either. *Per germina stirpem propagare* would mean something like "to increase the stock by sprouts," a somewhat strange phrase for which I have not found any parallel. I should much prefer the text of w, who writes "qui non plebeia germina sed imperatoriam stirpem rei publicae propagatis" ("You, who propagate not the plebeian sprouts but the imperial stock of the state"). L. C. Purser proposes a solution that is identical, except that he reads *imperatorias stirpes*.¹⁴ But the plural does not yield better meaning and presupposes a change that is more difficult to explain paleographically.

13. Cf. the change of *gemini natalis* in 11. 1. 1 and three related passages to *genuini* etc., convincingly argued by E. Wistrand, "A Note on the *geminus natalis* of Emperor Maximian," *Eranos* 62 (1964): 131–45, but neglected by Paladini and Fedeli.

14. "Notes on the *Panegyrici Latini*," *Hermathena* 46 (1931): 16–30.

Many years before, in the palace of Aquileia, Maximianus had a picture of Constantine and his own daughter, then children, now a married couple (7. 7. 1):

sed profecto hoc iam tunc, Maximiane, diuina mente praesumpseras; hoc, cum ferret aetas, ut rogareris optaueras, cum tibi in illa iucundissima sede laetitiae harum nuptiarum gaudia prae(de)stinabas, *sqq.*

The text of M has *praestinabas*, which is printed by Mynors. But how could an emperor "buy" a painting of the imperial children? Naturally, he ordered it to be painted. Thus, on the reasonable assumption that the panegyrist himself knew the meaning of the rare word, the text does not make very good sense as it stands.

The usual emendation is *praedestinabas*, printed by Paladini and Fedeli and originally suggested by Puteolanus. Galletier also chooses it, and translates: "au temps où, dans cette charmante demeure de la joie, tu te promettais les satisfactions de ces noces d'aujourd'hui." But "promise" is no known meaning of *praedestino*, which seems to exist exclusively in ecclesiastical Latin and mean only "predestinate."¹⁵

A better alternative might be *praesignabas*. Admittedly, this too is a fairly unusual word, but it exists in classical Latin: it is used by Pliny (*HN* 28. 36) in the sense "mark in advance" and by Frontinus (*Str.* 1. 2. 6) with the meaning "seal in advance." Here, it must be assumed to mean "represent beforehand," a sense close to the usual one in ecclesiastical writers from the fifth century on. An example is Augustine *Tractatus in Evangelium Iohannis* 25. 5 "naucula illa ecclesiam praesignabat." A number of examples are quoted by Blaise, s.v. "praesigno." The emendation may not be the obviously correct solution, but it has the advantage of giving a reasonable sense to the passage, and that is more than can be said about the other readings.

In 7. 11. 3 Rome personified entreats Maximianus to reassume the purple:

ut tu in suburbano otiis cedens usum dicatae mihi uirtutis amitteres?

The text of M is *sedens*, and *cedens* is a conjecture by Mynors, accepted by Paladini and Fedeli. W. Baehrens proposed *otio sedens*, which is also printed by Galletier. Puteolanus suggested *ociosus sedens*.

The conjecture by Mynors is clearly prompted by a wish to create a good clausula, creticus plus trochee. It has not much else to recommend it. First, it is not probable that the panegyrist would have Rome use a word as derogatory as *cedens* in her address to the hero Maximianus: she

15. The alleged instance in Livy 45. 40. 8 is a false reading.

should accuse him of a wish for rest, not of sloth or submissiveness. Further, the form *otiis* is exceedingly uncommon. Though the word is often used in the plural in dactylic poetry, that usage is *metri gratia*, as is pointed out in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, and thus occurs in the nominative and accusative only. In the few prose passages listed in Neue-Wagener 1. 632 for occurrences of the plural, those from Quintilian, Tacitus, Florus, Justin, and Boethius are also instances of *otia*. Only in Columella 1. 8. 2 do we find *otiis*, but then in a very special context: “socors et somniculosum genus id mancipiorum, otiis, campo, circo, theatris, aleae, popinae, lupanaribus consuetum.”

Here, it seems to me that *otiis* is used, exceptionally, as a comprehensive term for different specific pursuits, which are defined by the following terms. A rendering might be “accustomed to leisurely occupations, such as. . . .” No similar motivation for the plural can be found in our case. Thus, read *otio sedens*. Mistaken endings are very common in M even in cases where no obvious explanation is at hand; cf., for example, *multis* for *multo* in 2. 47. 5 by the first hand in H, or *illis annis* for *illi anni* in 3. 4. 6, found in the best manuscripts.

The raging ocean has not broken a barrier constructed by Constantius (8. 6. 4):

uno illo, ut res est, loco aut potentia uestrae maiestatis inferior aut pro debito uobis honore clementior.

Here, *potentia* (for *potentiae* in M) is an emendation by w, generally printed. But although *-a* for *-ae* is not an uncommon error in M,¹⁶ there is no need for a change here. As has been observed in TLL 7. 1. 1395 (which may not have been consulted by the editors), the problem is rather whether *potentiae* should be interpreted as genitive or dative. Both constructions are found after *inferior*. But the genitive is very clearly unclassical: it is found in the *Vulgata*, in Rufinus, in Cassiodorus, and in some later texts. I think we can be fairly certain, therefore, that in this text we have to do with the so-called *dativus comparationis*, which occurs mainly with the adjective *inferior*, from Sallust onwards.¹⁷

8. 9. 1 quod nunc vidimus et videmus: totis porticibus ciuitatum sedere captiua agmina barbarorum, viros attonita feritate trepidantes, respicientes anus ignauiam filiorum nuptas maritorum, uinculis copulatos pueros ac puellas familiari murmure blandientes, *sqq.*

16. To select examples from one oration only, cf. *conscientia* for *-ae* in 12. 11. 2, *uictoria* for *-ae* in 12. 23. 2, and *Graecia* for *-ae* in 12. 24. 1. Cf. below on 12. 19. 6 concerning other instances of *a* for *e*.

17. See Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik* 2:113–14, and for examples TLL, 7. 1. 1395.

Eyssenhardt conjectured *copulatos*, which has been generally accepted by the editors, instead of *copulatas*, which is the reading in M. But I do not see why one should not read "ignauiam filiorum, nuptas maritorum uinculis copulatas, pueros. . ." Of course, the expression is very pointed: *mariti uinculis copulata* certainly does not appear probable at first sight. It seems to me, however, that the phrase plays on the expression *aliquam* (*matrimonio, in coniugio, in uxorem, etc.*) *sibi copulare*, found, for example, in Ambrosius *Abr.* 2. 8. 49 *quae viro non fuerat copulata*. A large collection of examples is found in *TLL* 4. 922. 20–84. Here the wives, instead of being *maritis copulatae*, are *maritorum uinculis copulatae*.

If the text is thus allowed to remain as it is, the whole picture sketched by the speaker becomes more balanced and less peculiar. In Eyssenhardt's version, one wonders why only children are chained, and still are the only ones who keep up their spirits. But in the other version, the whole interest is focused, as is natural, on the terrible barbarian warriors, and their families are described so as to put their plight before our eyes. They themselves are stunned, their mothers witness their defeat, their wives are chained to them, and, to make the humiliation complete, their little children try to soothe them.

In 9. 20. 2 Eumenius describes a map in his school:

uideat praeterea in illis porticibus iuuentus et cotidie spectet omnes terras et cuncta maria et quidquid inuictissimi principes urbium gentium nationum aut pietate restitunt aut uirtute deuincunt aut terrore †deuincunt†.

Paladini and Fedeli are the first editors who athetize this passage. The second *deuincunt* is changed into *deuinciunt* in the Caroliruhensis 457, a manuscript of the X family. This humanist emendation is printed by A. and W. Baehrens and by Mynors. A number of modern scholars, however, have taken offense at the phrase *terrore deuinciunt* and have suggested various emendations. Thus, instead of the second *deuincunt*, Weyman proposed *defigunt*, which is printed by Galletier. Brandt preferred *domant*, Novák voted for *comprimunt*, and Maguinness thought of *compescunt*. No wonder that Fedeli could not make up his mind.

In my view, all modern scholars have been led astray by the existence of the original conjecture in the Caroliruhensis, and have attacked the wrong instance of the repeated verb. There is nothing wrong with the phrase *terrore deuincunt*; but *uirtute deuincunt* is much less satisfactory than *uirtute deuinciunt*, in this context and generally. Cf. 8. 20. 3 "nihil . . . non aut metu quietum est aut armis domitum aut pietate deuinctum"; 3. 24. 2 "(caritates) subita et fortuita beniuolentia prouocatae, non uirtutum admiratione deuinctae"; Fronto *Epist. ad M. Caes.* 4. 1. 1 (v.d. Hout) "qui plurimos uirtutum suarum . . . admiratione deuinxerit." The text here, then, should be "aut uirtute deuinciunt aut terrore deuincunt."

10. 5. 4 ita cuncti Chaibones Erulique cuncti tanta internecione caesi interfectique sunt ut extinctos eos . . . non profugus aliquis e proelio sed uictoriae tuae gloria[m] nuntiaret.

All earlier editors print *gloria nuntiaret*, but Mynors emends to *gloria adnuntiaret*. Although the change is not accepted by Paladini and Fedeli, a comment seems justifiable, since a matter of principle is involved. The proposal seems to be motivated by regard for the prose rhythm, as the meaning of the sentence is in no way improved. The text gives a creticus plus double trochee, if we accept elision. But in fact, vowel collisions are rather studiously avoided by the panegyrists,¹⁸ and this is especially true in the clausulae. Further, the simple deletion of the final nasal of *gloriam*, the sort of operation which is necessary in dozens of passages in M, gives us a clausula $\sim\sim / \sim\sim\sim$, which is in fact favored by the elder Mamerlinus, the author of orations 10 and 11. It is found before major pause in the following instances: 10. 2. 4 *uagitibus obstrepentes*; 11. 2. 4 *uirtutibus approbatis*; 11. 3. 3 *actionibus occupantur*; 11. 7. 4 *legibus imbuissent*; 11. 8. 3 *lumina commodasse*; 11. 12. 2 *uenerat imperator*. Thus, for the very reason of prose rhythm, the generally accepted text is better than Mynors' emendation.

12. 14. 4 pro pudor, intra parietum custodias imperator! non ille adspirare in campum, non exerceri armis, non puluerem pati; astutus quidem, ne uirorum officia temptantem [-e M] contemnerent qui uiderent deambulantem tantum in illo palatio marmoratis parietibus incedere; nam in Salustianos hortos ire peregrinatio et expeditio putabatur.

The reading *deambulantem tantum* is found only in the edition of Paladini and Fedeli. M has *deambularent tantum*, which W. Baehrens changed to *deambulantem*. Mynors followed W. Baehrens. Galletier, following older editors, prints *uiderent. deambulare et tantum* . . . , while A. Baehrens has the similar *uiderent. deambulare aut tantum*. . . .

There should certainly be a major pause after *contemnerent qui uiderent*, a terse phrase with good sense, which also makes a nice clausula. After that, no doubt, the construction is the historical infinitive, as in what precedes.

But it is neither necessary nor appropriate to insert a coordinating particle between *deambulare* and *tantum*. The reason for the insertion, it would appear, is the editors' desire to account for the letters *nt* in M. But they are just as well explained as a thoughtless repetition of the ending of the preceding verb, of the same type as, for example, *ordiar commemorabor for ordiar commemorabo* in 10. 2. Here, *tantum* is needed with the first verb for contrast with what precedes. Thus, the text

18. And not only by them: see T. Janson, *Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin* (Stockholm, 1975), p. 32; idem, "Word, Syllable, and Letter in Latin," *Eranos* 65 (1967): 49-64.

should be: ". . . uiderent. deambulare tantum in illo palatio, marmoratis parietibus incedere; nam. . . ."

12. 19. 6 nec quidquam aliud homines diebus munerum aeternorumque ludorum quam te ipsum spectare potuerunt, *sqq.*

Aeternorum is the reading of Bertinensis, printed by Paladini and Fedeli and by Mynors, as well as by A. and W. Baehrens, instead of the impossible *etrorumque* in M. But which are these "eternal" games? Galletier, who had to present a translation, prudently chose another reading, *ceterorumque*, suggested by w. That is quite satisfactory as for the meaning, but somewhat hard to explain paleographically.

An alternative is *aliorumque*, which is similar in sense, but closer to the enigmatic *etrorumque*. M rather often has an *e* which is mistaken for correct *a*. Some examples: 1. 54. 4 *dicebamus* for *dicabamus*; 2. 25. 2 *uetebamur* for *uetabamur*; 3. 2. 6 *proprie* for *propria*; 9. 17. 2 *quidem* for *quidam*; 12. 5. 6 *bello* for *uallo*. The reverse error also occurs, as 8. 6. 2 *affectus* for *effectus*, as well as combinations like 12. 19. 4 *optares parere* for *optare sperare*. And it does not seem very improbable that a badly written *li* could be misread as *tr*.

Stockholms Universitet