THREE PROBLEMS IN LATE LATIN TEXTS

For Robert Renehan

The passages treated in this paper are from the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*, ed. G. Schmeling (Leipzig, 1988), the *Epitoma Rerum Gestarum Alexandri Magni*, ed. P. H. Thomas (Leipzig, 1960, 1966), and the *Aegritudo Perdicae*, ed. L. Zurli (Leipzig, 1987).[1] All are late works of uncertain authorship. In the *Historia Apollonii*, which comes to us in separate versions called redactions, our goal is to restore or explain the text according to the stylistic habits of the individual redactor. The so-called *Metz Epitome* often requires us to bring other sources of the Alexander tradition—Arrian, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, and Quintus Curtius—to bear on questions of the epitomator's style and presentation. The *Aegritudo Perdicae*, a poem of 290 hexameters, still challenges us to make new, or re-evaluate old, corrections of its multifariously corrupted fifteenth-century manuscript.

Rex ait: 'diem nuptiarum sine mora statuam.' Postera vero die vocantur amici, invocantur vicinarum urbium potestates, viri magni atque nobiles. Quibus convocatis in unum pariter rex ait: 'amici, scitis quare vos in unum congregaverim?' (*Hist. Apollon.*16.17–20)

In this passage of Redaction A (RA) King Archistrates sets the day for his daughter's marriage to Apollonius, the hero. *Invocantur* is questionable in meaning. Usually one invokes gods, not men. And what sort of style is it, in a passage having two clear stages, *vocantur*, 'they are called', and *convocatis*, 'now that they have been called together', to interrupt the sequence with *invocantur*? *Invocantur* varies *vocantur* precisely where we want gemination, not variation—to wit, in a proclamation ('hear ye, hear ye', 'come one, come all'). Nor is it any matter that *invoco* can sometimes mean 'summon to aid,' as applied to powerful men (*TLL* VII.256.40–62): such a meaning is simply irrelevant to the wedding invitation here extended to 'friends' and 'neighbours'. Here *vocantur* and *invocantur* should mean the same thing: 'summon' in the sense of 'invite.'

FG, two MSS of Redaction Alpha (Rα), a version with a tendency to 'correct' or 'improve' RA, do indeed give *invitantur*. We might call the resultant *vocantur amici, invitantur vicinarum urbium potestates* a 'theme and variation' and defend it by 16.27–8 *gaudet universa civitas; exultant cives, peregrini, et hospites*.

But it would be equally good to emend *invocantur* to *vocantur*. The asyndetic repeat is effective: *vocantur amici, vocantur vicinarum urbium potestates*. We might compare 16.25–6 *gaudet rex cum filia, gaudet et Tyrius Apollonius*, not to mention 9.29 *audite, cives, audite, peregrini, ingenui et servi*, 24.18–19 *salva coniugem, salva filiam nostram*, and 77.12 (RB) *currite famuli, currite amici*. In each case the repeat marks a distinction in the individuals involved, and the repeated word is merely another way of saying 'and'. Consider 2.21–3 *plurimi undique reges, undique patriae principes propter incredibilem puellae speciem contempta morte properabant* as against 46.17–18 (RB)

[1] See my review of Schmeling's *Apollonius* in *Gnomon* 66 (1994), 304–20. For the allowance of characteristic differences of style in redactions of *Apollonius*, see also my 'Readings in *Apollonius of Tyre*', *HSCP* 99 (1999), 343–5, 352–3. For work on the text of the *Epitoma Metensis*, see my articles 'An emendation in the *Epitoma Metensis*', *CP* 67 (1972), 287–8; 'Notes sur l'*Epitoma Metensis*', *AC* 41 (1972), 242–4; and 'More emendations in the *Epitoma Metensis*', *CP* 80 (1985), 335–7. For a survey of Zurli's *Aegritudo*, see my review article, '*Aegritudo Perdicae* revisited', *CP* 85 (1990), 132–47.

Citation is by the page and line of the editions of Schmeling and Thomas.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.323 Published online by Cambridge University Press

undique reges ac principes patriae. . . . See also Cic. *Fin.* 4.24 *levantur vitiis, levantur erroribus.*

Hinc re divina facta fossas pro castris maiores lecticarumque vestigia ampliora, quam hominis status postulabat, scutaque omnium generum maiora frenosque item equorum ampliores, quam usus postulabat, fieri atque in castris pauca relinqui iussit.
(*Epit. Rer. Gest. Alex. Magn.* 22.19–23.5)

Curtius and Plutarch similarly relate that Alexander, when abandoning camp, left objects *larger than usual* there, in the hope that those who later visited the site would be impressed by his greatness. *Pauca* in the Epitome, *in castris pauca relinqui iussit*, fatally understates. To put it another way, why would the writer, having two infinitive phrases with *iussit*, say in the first *maiores . . . ampliora . . . maiora . . . ampliores fieri* and in the second *in castris pauca relinqui*? It is not number that we seek in *pauca*, nor size (Wagner conjectured *aucta*), the notion of *augere* having already been competently conveyed by *maiores . . . ampliora . . . maiora . . . ampliores . . . fieri*. Nor is *pauca* consistent with *scuta . . . omnium generum*.

Wagner thought his *aucta* to be supported by Curt. 9.3.19: *erigique duodecim aras ex quadrato saxo, monumentum expeditionis suae, munimenta quoque castrorum iussit extendi cubiliaque amplioris formae quam pro corporum habitu relinqui, ut speciem omnium augeret, posteritati fallax miraculum praeparans*. Not so. Prospective *ut . . . augeret* is no parallel to anterior *aucta* as proposed for the Epitome; the *ut*-clause casts its effect not merely on *iussit . . . relinqui*, but also on the emphatic addendum *posteritati fallax miraculum praeparans*, without which Curtius would never have included it. Rolfe translates in the Loeb edition: 'in order that by exaggerating the proportion of everything he might prepare a deceptive wonder for posterity'.

The only available conjecture worth considering is Reuss's *passim*, accepted by Thomas in his Teubner edition. A word expressing distribution is indeed in order, and it is possible that *passim*, written in the margin as a correction of *pauca*, was understood to be a correction of *passis* in line 13 below, which it has falsely replaced in the text.

But one might also consider *sparsa* or *dispersa*, comparing Plut. *Alex*. 62 καὶ γὰρ ὅπλα μείζονα καὶ φάλαγγας ἵππων καὶ χαλινοὺς βαρυτέρους κατασκευάσας ἀπέλιπέ τε καὶ διέρριψεν.[2] The word order in *in castris sparsa relinqui* is exactly that of 22.2–3 *his canes feminas solere noctu in silvis alligatas relinqui . . . demonstravit*.

Another approach would be to delete the ruinously superfluous word: *fieri atque in castris [pauca] relinqui iussit*. Although this gives a plausible result, and derives some support from Curtius' *iussit . . . cubilia . . . relinqui*, it lacks a convincing *ratio corruptelae*. We mention it to complete the critical picture.

It is perfectly legitimate, in seeking to correct *pauca*, to produce the sense 'scattered' or 'all about' without worrying about the applicability of this or of *in castris relinqui* to *fossas pro castris*. The contradiction *in front of the camp ~ in the camp* is inherent in all interpretations. It cannot be removed by writing *fossas <quam> pro castris* (*pro* = in proportion to), since Latin style requires that *<quam> pro castris* follow, not precede, the comparative *maiores*.[3] The fault here is due to the epitomator. He expressed the first of four elements, *fossas . . . maiores*, without a *quam*-clause, but then applied two

[2] The distributive value in the preverb *dis-* makes *dispersa* the superior choice (*disiecta* would also fit the sense). In the case of *dispersa*, the scribe's eye conceivably jumped from *castrIS* to *dISpersa*, with *persa* or *psa* as the residue.

[3] See *TLL* X^2.1433.61ff., and Kuehner–Stegmann II.474–5.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.323 Published online by Cambridge University Press

parallel *quam*-clauses, *quam hominis status postulabat* and *quam usus postulabat*, to the remaining three elements, *lecticarum vestigia ampliora*, *scuta . . . maiora*, and *frenos . . . ampliores*. (That the latter *quam*-clause serves both *scuta* and *frenos* is proved by *item*.) Preoccupied as he was with these *quam*-clauses, when he came to write *in castris relinqui*, he simply lost sight of the construction.

> nox sceleris secreta mei, nox conscia cladis,
> soli me commendo tibi nostrumque furorem.
> tu nosti quid possit Amor: sine te nihil ille,
> seu Veneris pars es seu tu Venus aut Venus in te est:
> *des* requiem miserando, precor, et posse fateri. (*Aegr. Perd.* 117–21)

120 es seu tu *Hunt* (*HSCP* 86 [1982] 118–19): est seu *H (saec. xv)*: es tu seu *edd.* 121 des *Baehrens*: dis *H*

Here the youth Perdica, falling in love with his mother, prays to Night. Baehrens, the *editor princeps*, emended *dis* to *des* in line 121. Although all editors have followed him, no doubt for palaeographical reasons, palaeography should not carry the day when style has a word to utter. We are dealing, after all, with only one syllable, the first letter of which, *d-*, is correct as transmitted; and we know that the word in question must be a form of *do*. Thus, if the MS had a gap between *d-* and *requiem*, we might as well stop it with *da* as with *des*.

The imperative *da*, stronger than *des*, comes well in the first position of the line, the place of strength and stress. Compare 286 *da laqueum collo vel sic cum corpore nostro* and *Anth. Lat.* (Shackleton Bailey) 14.1 *da sensus mihi, Phoebe, precor; nam poena puellae*.

When the form *precor* appears elsewhere in the *Aegr. Perd.* it is always parenthetical, and the imperative, not the second person of the present subjunctive, is the rule. See 7 *muta, precor, flammas*, 178 *nate, precor, miserere mei*, 188 *mater, ait, discede, precor*, and 267 *cerne, precor, quid agas*. Parallels from Ovid highlight the usage: *Met.* 13.598 *da, precor, hic aliquem, solacia mortis, / honorem*; *Trist.* 3.11(12).50 *da, precor, ingenio praemia digna meo*; *Pont.* 2.2.41 *da, precor, accessum lacrimis*, *Met.* 10.411 *discede, precor* (= *Aegr. Perd.* 188 above), 11.133 *miserere, precor* (= *Aegr. Perd.* 178 above), and many more.[4]

Da requiem miserando in our passage constitutes a formula in its own right. Compare Ov. *Met.* 1.667 *da requiem terrae*, 1.668 *da requiem . . . viris*; *Ars Am.* 2.351 *da requiem: requietus ager bene credita reddit*, 2.29 *da reditum puero*; *Pont.* 4.2.23 *da veniam fasso*. Nor is the further infinitive construction *da . . . posse fateri*, 'grant the power to confess', strange to the imperative *da*. It is in fact a common occurrence: Hor. *Epist.* 1.16.61 *da mihi fallere, da iusto sanctoque videri*; Ov. *Ars Am.* 2.28 *da mihi posse mori*; *Met.* 1.486 *da mihi perpetua, genitor carissime, dixit / virginitate frui*; 8.351 *da*

[4] Kuehner–Stegmann II.200b call the usage 'dichterisch', but specifically quote only Hor. *Carm.* 4.1.2 *parce, precor*. In Virgil we find a few examples (*Aen.* 6.117 *alma, precor, miserere*; 9.525 *vos, o Calliope, precor, aspirate canenti*; 12.777). It is Ovid who exploits the usage and carries it forward to successors, among them, significantly, the fifth-century A.D. poet Dracontius, who, having certain affinities with our author, has in some quarters actually been regarded as our author. See *Satisf.* 311 *da veniam, miserere, precor, succurre roganti*; *Orest. Trag.* 94 *pignora redde, precor*, 350 *dic mihi, Musa, precor*, 744 *da veniam, miserere, precor, miserere parentis*, *Romul.* 8.337, 9.142, 10.416, and so on. In fact, Dracontius resembles our author in using always the imperative, never the second person of the present subjunctive, with *precor*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.323 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mihi, quod petitur, certo contingere telo; Luc. 1.693 *da mihi cernere litora ponti*; *Priap.* 3.9 *da pedicare*; Stat. *Theb.* 11.96 *da iungere viris*; *Ach.* 1.74 *da tollere fluctus*. It is true that these parallels often offer *da mihi*; but that option was not open to our poet, who, busy producing a line with an amalgam of traditional elements, expressed *his* dative through *miserando* (=*mihi*).[5]

Villanova University JOHN HUNT
louisaruth@aol.com

[5] It seems natural to take *miserando* as an adjective equal in sense to *misero*, as at *Aegr.* 219 *talia per noctem iuvenis miserandus agebat*, 273 *cur, miserande, petis (frustra) potare venena?* By understanding *mihi* (that is, Perdica, the speaker) we have the expected dative of person after *da requiem (reditum, veniam)*, as in the parallels; note further Drac. *Satisf.* 119 *da dextram misero*.

There is no call to follow Zurli, who would transpose to *des requiem precor et miserando posse fateri* in an effort to evade *precŏr et* and *miserandŏ*, when the result is an inferior position for *miserando*. (For *precŏr et*, a lengthening in arsis, see *Anth. Lat.* Rs. 24.5 *haec metuas exempla precŏr et semper amanti*; for *miserandŏ*, see *Aegr.* 131 *et proprium miserandŏ* [Baehrens: *miseranda* H] *nefas fit causa* [Baehrens: *incesta* H] *laboris* [=*morbi*].)

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.323 Published online by Cambridge University Press