

country and devotion to one's family; Constantius, as emperor and *paterfamilias*, was the epitome of both.

All this theory fully accounts for the facts. Being extremely wary of subversion and threats to his rule, Constantius would very well appreciate a wife who had aided him in eliminating potential rivals. Why would Eusebia protect Julian against detractors at court and support, if not actually propose, Julian as Caesar unless it was ultimately for Constantius' benefit? The emperor had no regard for family when it came to treason. Constantius had his own cousin, Gallus, executed on such grounds.¹³ If Eusebia was as wise as all our sources say, then she certainly would not court her husband's wrath by supporting a rival. Eusebia's kindness toward Julian will have been based on Constantius' policy to use and control his cousin. He used Eusebia to bring Julian into harness; he used such characters as Gaudentius and Florentius to keep him there.¹⁴ The renaming of the Pontic diocese was then a compliment and a description of Eusebia's part in the restoration of the Gauls.

Eusebia did not live to see the fruit of the seed she planted. Julian's phenomenal success in the field and care for the provincials at home was to inspire his soldiers to proclaim him Augustus in 360, but Eusebia had probably already died. In the end, civil war between Julian and Constantius was only averted by the latter's sudden death in the following year. Eusebia's efforts to aid her husband only served eventually to make Julian sole Augustus of the empire.

Loyola University, New Orleans

J. JUNEAU

how often Constantius campaigned on the Eastern and Danube frontiers, his decision, as recorded in Ammianus, not to go personally to Gaul because of its remoteness seems false.

¹³ Amm. Marc. 14.9.11.

¹⁴ On Gaudentius and Florentius, see Amm. Marc. 16.12.14, 17.3.2, and 17.9.7. Gaudentius was an *agens* used to spy on Julian; Florentius was praetorian prefect for the Gauls. He and Julian had frequent disagreements on administrative issues.

AUSONIUS, *EP.* 4 AND HORACE, *EP.* 1.14.9*

Bentley's emendation in Horace, *Ep.* 1.14.9 (*avet* for *amat*)¹ has been accepted by many scholars as correct² and harmonizes with the tone of Horace's letter, in which he expresses his impatience to go back to the countryside and at the same time his inability to fulfil his desire (*Ep.* 1.14.6–9: *Me quamvis Lamiae pietas et cura moratur, / fratrem maerentis, raptō de fratre dolentis / insolabiliter, tamen istuc mens animusque / fert et avet spatiis obstantia rumpere claustra*). This article suggests a parallel with an epistle by Ausonius which corroborates Bentley's emendation, *Ep.* 4 (Green = 10 Schenkl, 6 Peiper, 4 Prete),³ and in particular lines 17–18: *Nos etenim primis sanctum*

* I wish to thank the former editor of *CQ*, Dr Stephen Heyworth, for his suggestions, and my supervisor and friend, Dr Duncan F. Kennedy, who read a first version of this article and, with his advice, improved it. This work is dedicated to the memory of Prof. Mario Martina.

¹ R. Bentley (ed.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (London, 1714), 2, 46.

² Among the others by Kießling and Heinze (edd.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Opera*, 3, Briefe, re-edited by Erich Burck (Berlin, 1957); E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957); F. Klingner (ed.), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Lipsiae, 1959); D. R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Stuttgartiae, 1985); R. Mayer (ed.), *Horace. Epistles Book I* (Cambridge, 1994).

³ R. P. H. Green (ed.), *The Works of Ausonius* (Oxford, 1991); C. Schenkl (ed.), *D. Magni Ausonii Opuscula* (Berolini, 1883); R. Peiper (ed.), *D. Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis Opuscula* (Lipsiae, 1886); S. Prete (ed.), *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis Opuscula* (Leipzig, 1978);

post pascha diebus / *avemus agrum visere*, where Ausonius, who like Horace is in the city, expresses his desire to go to his estate after Easter.

Ausonius's letter, addressed to Axius Paulus around A.D. 370,⁴ is an invitation to his friend to visit the poet on his estate, written in a Horatian metre (the first Pythiambic system of *Epod.* 14 and 15⁵) and bearing several allusions to Horace's works. It is possible to divide the epistle into two parts: the second one starts rather abruptly at line 17, and it is mainly here that the Horatian echoes can be found, and have been widely noticed.⁶ They are:

lines 25–6 (*Sus lutulenta fugit, rabidus canis impete saevo / et impares plaustro boves*), which recall lines 74–5 of Horace's *Ep.* 2.2 (*tristia robustis luctantur funera plaustreis, / hac rabiosa fugit canis, hac lutulenta ruit sus*), in inverted order (A, B, C—c, b, a); line 29 (*haec et quae possunt placidos offendere mores*), a possible echo of *Epod.* 16.35 (*haec et quae poterunt reditus abscondere dulcis*), in a similar context (departure from the city);

lines 35–6 (*Ad quae si properas, tota cum merce tuarum / veni Camenarum citus*), an allusion to *C.* 4.12.21–22a (*Ad quae si properas gaudia, cum tua / velox merce veni*); line 37 (*dactylicos, elegos, choriambum carmen, epodos*), perhaps a memory of *A.P.* 73–85 (also a catalogue of various poetic forms);

line 38 (*socci et cothurni musicam*), an echo of *A.P.* 80 (*hunc socci cepere pedem grandesque cothurni*).

There are more contacts that have not been noticed so far, but seem nevertheless interesting, even though they sometimes involve more the concepts conveyed than verbal echoes (but involve some of these, too). Firstly, lines 19–20 (*Nam populi coetus et compita sordida rixis / fastidientes cernimus*) could recall *Ep.* 1.1.49 (*Quis circum pagum et circum compita pugnax*), with the same situation depicted, the same word *compita* in both passages and the adjective *pugnax* substituted, in the same position, by the noun *rixis* which nevertheless retains the harsh sound 'x', evocative of the fights described. Secondly, lines 21–2a (*angustas fervere vias et congrege volgo / nomen plateas perdere*) bear probably an allusion to *Ep.* 2.2, especially to lines 70b–71 (*Verum / purae sunt plateae, nihil ut meditantibus obster*), a statement that Horace immediately denies, as he describes how crowded the squares of Rome are. In both Ausonius' and Horace's poems, this reference to the squares of Rome comes near the distich about the pig, the dog, and the carriage, and is actually divided from it by 2 lines. Thirdly,⁷ lines 5–6 (*[...] ut fuit olim / Tartesiorum regulus*) recall Horace's *Serm.* 1.3.46–7 (*[...] ut abortivus fuit olim / Sisyphus*) and *Ep.* 1.6.57–8 (*[...] ut olim / Gargilius*): in all three passages, the comparison occurs at the end of the line, and is followed by a proper name at the beginning of the following line; furthermore, the

H. G. Evelyn White (ed.), *Ausonius* (London and New York, 1919) follows Peiper, and A. Pastorino (ed.), *Opere di Decimo Magno Ausonio* (Torino, 1971) follows Schenkl.

⁴ See Pastorino (n. 3), 98.

⁵ It is a distich formed by a dactylic hexameter and an iambic acatalectic dimeter, which Ausonius also employs in *Ep.* 1 Green (= 3 Schenkl, 18 Peiper, 16 Prete), to his son Esperius.

⁶ See the lists of *loci similes* in Schenkl (n. 3), and in Peiper (n. 3); and R. P. H. Green, 'Ausonius's use of the classical Latin poets: some new examples and observations', *CQ* 27 (1977), 441–52; R. E. Colton, 'Some echoes of Horace in Ausonius's *Epistulae*', *CB* 54 (1977), 27–30; and id., 'Vergil and Horace in Ausonius, *Epist.* 4', *CB* 58 (1982), 40–2.

⁷ I owe this remark to the referee of this article.

tone is in each case comic and satiric.⁸ Lastly, in the two lines with which the second half begins (lines 17–18: *Nos etenim primis sanctum post pascha diebus / avemus agrum visere*) it is possible, as we have anticipated, to see a sort of paraphrase of the passage of Horace's *Ep.* 1.14 which Bentley emended (lines 6–9: *Me quamvis Lamiae pietas et cura moratur, / fratrem maerentis, raptō de fratre dolentis / insolabiliter, tamen istuc mens animusque / fert et avet spatiis obstantia rumpere claustra*): the pronoun in the first person is changed from singular into plural, and from the accusative case into the nominative, but still occupies the first position in the hexameter and in the sentence, is separated by some incidental expressions from the rest of the period (by a concessive clause in Horace, by a temporal clause in Ausonius), and emphasizes the separation between the poet and the addressee. In both passages, if we accept Bentley's conjecture, the verb *aveo* is employed to express the poet's desire to visit the countryside, whilst some circumstances keep him in the city.

In Horace's epistle, the cause which prevents him (*quamvis Lamiae pietas et cura moratur, / fratrem maerentis, raptō de fratre dolentis / insolabiliter*) is expressed in a sentence that seems to overextend itself more and more, since the verb *moratur* could mark its ending. Instead it goes on for more than a line; thus, 'the repetition [*fratrem . . . fratre*] and the rhyme between *maerentis* and *dolentis* imitate the pathetic cries of the grieving'⁹ on one side, but also emphasize on the other how Lamia's mourning seems to have no end, at least to the impatient poet who had not perhaps planned to stay so long (*moratur* could suggest that), and who finds his own attempts to comfort his friend not very successful.¹⁰ The poet is therefore powerless, at the mercy of Lamia's unending mourning, and his condition is reflected grammatically by the personal pronoun, which is in the accusative case; it is not that Horace chooses to stay in Rome: *Lamiae pietas et cura* keep him there, the poet is a helpless object.

The situation of Ausonius is more simple and linear than that of Horace; he too is impatient to leave the city, but he only suggests this in the temporal clause (*primis sanctum post pascha diebus*, where the *primis* seems to imply that, as soon as Easter will be over, he will make his way to the country), and by employing the two verbs *avemus* and *visere*. Not only is Ausonius thus not as openly impatient as Horace; he also seems to be much more in charge of his own situation: rather than being an object (of social constraints and of his own impulses), Ausonius is a subject, who can proclaim his desires and take his decisions. Therefore, he already knows when he will go to the countryside, because he can choose the date. In short, life in the countryside is both obtained more easily and enjoyed with a lighter heart by Ausonius. This different condition is expressed not only in the different cases of the two personal pronouns (accusative for Horace, nominative for Ausonius), but also in their number: whereas Horace employs the singular (*me*), Ausonius chooses a (here) more assertive plural (*nos*). Nevertheless, these differences in tone and attitude do not blur the basic analogy of the situations depicted.

The verb *aveo* does not appear anywhere else in Ausonius, except in *Ep.* 12 (Green = 17 Schenkl, 2 Peiper, 1 Prete).39: *Cetera quae noscere aves, / compendi faciam* (where

⁸ This is up to the present moment the only allusion to Horace that has been found in the first half of the poem, but, like the ring composition (see n. 12), it contributes to softening the division of the letter into two parts.

⁹ Mayer (n. 2), 207.

¹⁰ A learned and profound analysis of these lines is in P. Mastandrea, 'Lucrezio e Orazio (*Epist.* I 14, 6–9)', *GIF* 10 (1979), 275–92, who, nevertheless, does not stress enough Horace's criticism of Lamia.

Vinet corrected in this way the *habes* of the manuscripts). In fact, as Gratwick explains,¹¹ the word *aveo*, which (perhaps because of its homophony with *habeo*) had disappeared from literature at the beginning of the first century A.D., was recovered in late Latin literature, in learned and refined contexts (often in imitations of Cicero or Livy), though it remained rare. And, as we have seen, it is extremely rare in Ausonius. It therefore seems probable that its presence in this passage is not casual, and could not remain unnoticed by ancient readers, especially because its appearance coincides with the division of the letter into two halves, the second one being much more clearly Horatian in its theme (the annoyance of urban life—lines 19–28—vs. the pleasure of the *otia ruris*—lines 29–34), and especially for the strong presence of Horatian echoes.¹²

University of Bristol

ANNA DE PRETIS

a.de-pretis@bris.ac.uk

¹¹ A. Gratwick, 'Habeo and aveo: the Romance future', *CQ* 22 (1972), 391–8.

¹² It is worth noticing, though, the ring-composition of Ausonius's letter: l. 36 (*veni* [...] *citius*) is repeated with inversion in the invitation of l. 12 (*citius veni remo aut rota*); Paulus's poetry is mentioned both at the beginning and at the end of the poem (especially l. 3: *Camenarum* [...] *Castaliarum*, and ll. 35–6: *tuarum* [...] *Camenarum*), and both in the first and in the last line there is a reference to loyalty: l. 1 (*Si qua fides* [...]) and l. 42 (*non Poena, sed Graeca fide*).

A NOTE ON THE *VITA AESOPI*, RECENSION G, 69–70*

The recension G of the *Vita Aesopi* has received a fair amount of attention after the *editio princeps* by Perry. In recent years, Papathomopoulos and Ferrari have emended scores of corrupt passages in their fine editions. I will offer only one note, dealing with a section that has been left unclear.

Xanthos, drunk at a party, bets the whole of his fortune that he will 'drink up the sea', and gives his ring as a pledge. His servant Aesopus, present at the party, vainly tries to dissuade him from making the foolish bet. The next morning, Xanthos' mind is free from wine, and clear of the memory of what happened the night before. He notices that the ring is missing, and asks Aesopus (§ 70, lines 5–12 Ferrari):

‘Αἴσωπε, τί μου γέγονε ὁ δακτύλιος;’ Αἴσωπος· ‘οὐκ οἶδα.’ Ξάνθος· ‘οὐά.’ Αἴσωπος· ‘τοιγαροῦν ὅσα δύνασαι τοῦ βίου σου λαθὼν αἶρε καὶ ἀπόθου εἰς δευτέρας τύχας· οὐκ ἐτι γὰρ ὁ βίος σός ἐστι.’ ὁ δὲ Ξάνθος· ‘τί λέγεις;’ Αἴσωπος· ‘παρὰ τὸν ἐχθές πότον συνθήκας τέθηκας τὴν θάλασσαν ἐκπιεῖν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ βίου σου τὸ δακτυλίδιον προβαλὼν.’

The dialogue is very surprising. Aesopus obviously knows very well what has happened, but denies all knowledge of it in his first answer, only to admit in his next two sentences that he in fact knows what Xanthos has pledged to do and why the ring is missing. If Aesopus wanted to pretend not to know anything about it, why did he change his attitude in the next sentence? Consider the following dialogue:

* Bibliography: E. Δημητριάδου-Τουφεξή, 'Index verborum Vitae Aesopi Perrianae', *EEThess* 20 (1981), 69–153; *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 53, edited with translations and notes by M. W. Haslam (London, 1986); *Romanzo di Esopo*, Introduzione e testo critico a cura di F. Ferrari, traduzione e note di G. Bonelli e G. Sandrolini (Milano, 1997); M. Papathomopoulos, *Aesopus revisitatus. Recherches sur le texte des vies ésopiques. Volume I. La critique textuelle* (Ioannina, 1989); M. Παπαθωμόπουλος, 'Ο Βίος τοῦ Αἰσώπου. Ἡ παραλλαγή G. Κριτική ἔκδοση μεῖ εἰσαγωγή καὶ μετάφραση (Ioannina, 1990); B. E. Perry, *Aesopica I* (Urbana, IL, 1952).