

Avitus' death, especially in sources like Sidonius to which Gregory had ready access.<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, Gregory's tale that Avitus planned to seek sanctuary at the shrine of St. Julian at Brioude seems preposterous. But it is in fact very similar to the claim of John of Antioch that Avitus did seek sanctuary in Italy; and once one notes that Gregory himself also reports that Avitus ultimately was interred in this same shrine of St. Julian (*H.F.* 2. 11), it becomes clear how a pious, but improbable, fiction that he was seeking refuge there, rather than in Italy, could have arisen.<sup>38</sup> The "multa munera" which Gregory claims Avitus was bringing to Gaul were perhaps intended to fund another revolt and only later acquired their ecclesiastical odor. Finally, this reconstruction also explains the seemingly harsh response of the otherwise conciliatory Majorian, for a deposed emperor on his way back to Gaul to raise yet another revolt could not be allowed to proceed, especially by a man with imperial ambitions of his own.<sup>39</sup>

RALPH W. MATHISEN  
University of South Carolina

37. See Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 3–5, 13, *Epist.* 1. 11, 9. 13. 4; and Mathisen, "Resistance," pp. 611–20, and "Sidonius," *passim*. For Gregory's use of Sidonius, see *H.F.* 2. 24–25, 34. 4. 12, *Vit. pat.* 3. 1.

38. On St. Julian, see P. Franchi de'Cavalieri, "S. Genesio di Arelate, S. Ferreolo di Vienna, S. Giuliano di Brivas," *Studi e Testi* 65 (1935): 203–29. On Avitus' burial, see L. Bréhier, "Un empereur romain à Brioude, Flavius Eparchius Avitus," *Almanach de Brioude* (1930): 39–55. One might even speculate that it was Majorian himself who returned Avitus' body to Gaul, perhaps in conjunction with his visits of 458–60.

39. This article has benefited from the helpful suggestions of F. M. Clover and the two anonymous referees for *CP*.

## MORE EMENDATIONS IN THE *EPITOMA METENSIS*

42–43 [sc. Cleophis] ceteros . . . amicos convocat; cohortatur, ut oppidum Alexandro dedant, mercennarii contra reclamantes impedire ac seditionem facere coeperunt. postero die Cleophis clam legatos ad Alexandrum <de> *deditione*[m] mittit oratum, uti ignosceret ipsis: vi conductorum adactos. quae fecerint se fecisse. id mercennarii suspicati de suo numero ad Alexandrum legatos miserunt oratum, uti ex oppido exire suaue exportare liceret. his utrisque quod postulaverunt concessit.

<de> *deditione*[m] Volkmann, Wagner: *deditionem* D (codex solus)  
quae fecerint se fecisse Reitzenstein: quae fecerunt referre D

So P. H. Thomas in his Teubner edition.<sup>1</sup> One stumbles, however. In point of Latin style one would expect either "legatos *de deditione* mittit"<sup>2</sup> or "legatos mittit *oratum uti ignosceret ipsis*," but not both. The fault lies with *de deditione*, which, as the passage goes, ineptly anticipates the specific appeal to Alexander,

1. *Epitoma rerum gestarum Alexandri et liber de morte eius*<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig, 1966). The other available edition (with commentary) is by O. Wagner in *Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.*, Suppl. 26 (1901): 91–167.

2. In the epitome itself compare 56 "non multis post diebus Abisares fratrem suum legatum ad Alexandrum de amicitia misit" (complete sentence). In Caesar one finds, e.g., *BGall.* 1. 27. 1 "Helvetii . . . legatos de deditione ad eum miserunt," 5. 22. 3 "Cassivellaunus . . . legatos . . . de deditione ad Caesarem mittit." No doubt Volkmann was conscious of passages like these when, in the editio princeps (1886), he corrected to *de deditione*.

an appeal for *venia*: Curtius 8. 10. 33 [same incident] “inde, quia nihil obsessis praeter deditionem patebat, legati ad regem descenderunt, *veniam petitori*.” Read therefore:

... *legatos ad Alexandrum* [deditionem] *mittit oratum uti* ignosceret ipsis: vi conductorum adactos <se fecisse> quae fecerint. [referre] id mercennarii suspicati. . . .<sup>3</sup>

In this form the passage will be parallel to Caesar *De Bello Gallico* 6. 32. 1 “... *legatos ad Caesarem miserunt oratum ne* se in hostium numero duceret neve omnium Germanorum qui essent citra Rhenum unam esse causam iudicaret: nihil se de bello cogitavisse, nulla Ambiorigi auxilia misisse” and Livy 24. 12. 2 “... *legatos ad Hannibalem oratum miserunt ut* Capuam exercitum admoveret: ad eam oppugnandam novos exercitus scribi Romae nec ullius urbis defectioni magis infensos eorum animos esse.” Note that Caesar and Livy have the same transition, unheralded by a verb of speaking, to indirect statement.

The mischief then is easily undone, but what caused it in the first place? It may be that *de deditione* arose as a scribal explanation based on “ut oppidum Alexandro *dedant*” two sentences above. Ordinary haplography accounts for the loss of *de* to *dedi*-.; it does not greatly matter whether it was dittography (gain of *-m* from *mittit*) or the attractive force of *seditionem* in the preceding sentence which transformed *deditione* into the accusative. The accusative is the paradoxis; because this, and not *de deditione*, is what we must in principle delete, another *ratio corruptelae* is needed. Consider the following. Suppose that in the preceding sentence *seditionem* generated a variant reading *deditionem* by reason of the same “ut oppidum Alexandro *dedant*”: in the process of restoring *seditionem*, some scribe, faced with the false *deditionem* (which perhaps he found in the margin), made bold to introduce it where best he could—where the manuscript now has it: “. . . sent envoys to Alexander to ask for (permission to) surrender that he might pardon them.”<sup>4</sup> Nonsense, of course; but what was he in his perplexity to do?

This is not the only passage in the epitome where two constructions of purpose compete, one to the detriment of the other. Six chapters later, in 49, Thomas nods again: “quidam Mophis . . . *legatos ad Alexandrum misit oratum*, qui renuntiarent, quid vellet.” In this journal, more than a decade ago, I deleted *oratum*, which is patently impossible with *qui renuntiarent*; the scribe who intruded it here after *legatos ad Alexandrum misit* was acting, it is clear, under the influence of *legatos ad Alexandrum mittit oratum* and *ad Alexandrum legatos miserunt oratum* in 42–43.<sup>5</sup>

Something more can be said about “vi conductorum adactos <se fecisse> quae fecerint. [referre],” as R. Renehan suggests we present the passage. Our aim here is plausibility, not certitude. The sense seems clear and proper: “it was under pressure exerted by the *conducti* (= *mercennarii*) that they did what they did (i.e., that they resisted Alexander).” Whether the language is Latin or Greek or English, when the same verb is used both in main and relative clause (“*did*

3. On “vi conductorum . . . fecerint,” see below.

4. I owe this suggestion to R. Renehan.

5. “An Emendation in the *Epitoma Metensis*,” *CP* 67 (1972): 287–88. Wagner’s *iterum* for *oratum*, cited by Thomas in his apparatus, is here given its quietus.

what they *did*," "said what they *said*"), the relative clause regularly follows. Word order is therefore against Reitzenstein's *quae fecerint se fecisse*.<sup>6</sup> Renehan compares Herodotus 2. 49. 1 ἀπὸ τούτου μαθόντες ποιεῦσι τὰ ποιεῦσι Ἑλλήνες, 3. 16. 1 βουλόμενος ποιῆσαι τὰ δὴ καὶ ἐποίησε, 3. 156. 2, and Valerius Maximus 4. 8. 5 "homines percussi primo, velut non audisse se quae audierant credentes, obticuerunt." Compare also Cicero *Pro Milone* 95 "negat enim se, negat ingratum civibus fecisse quae fecerit," where, in the words of A. C. Clark, "se om. P. qui deficit in verbo insequenti," hence "se post fecisse inser. Baiter." Had Baiter inserted so as to produce <se> fecisse, the parallel would be exact to the detail, with *se* in second (enclitic) position: *ingratum civibus ~ vi conductorum adactos, se fecisse ~ se fecisse, quae fecerit ~ quae fecerint*. The position of *se* is important. Reitzenstein's sorting of the paradosis, "vi conductorum adactos. quae fecerint se fecisse," never belonged in the text; and although it was perfectly natural for C. L. Howard, in his review of Thomas' edition, to improve this to "vi conductorum adactos, quae fecerint se fecisse,"<sup>7</sup> in the doing he has unfortunately relegated *se* to an untenable position. Renehan's conjecture rights matters, offers indeed, for the first time, Latin which our epitomator *can* have written.

J. M. HUNT  
Villanova University

6. Rather than extract *se fecisse* from *referre*, Renehan simply adds the phrase (*se FEC-* dropped out before *quE FEC-*). *Referre* he judges to be a separate problem—an additamentum, perhaps it was, created with an eye to the following *id mercennarii suspicati*.

7. *CP* 58 (1963): 131. Howard thought he was correcting a misprint: "the only misprint I observed is the full stop, which should obviously be a comma, after *adactos*." There is no misprint here. Thomas was following Wagner, and not only does Wagner's text have the stop, but a note in his commentary bidding us supply *fuisse* with *adactos* makes his intention painfully manifest.

## THE ETYMOLOGY OF UMBRIAN AND PAELIGNIAN *BIO*

There are two good indications that the Umbrian and Paelignian word *bio* cannot refer to "running water, spring water," as is customarily believed.<sup>1</sup> First, in all inscriptions in which this word occurs the predicate contains either a verb

1. The inscriptions which contain *bio* can be found in any handbook on the Oscan-Umbrian languages (see, e.g., V. Pisani, *Manuale storico della lingua latina*, vol. 4 [Turin, 1964], pp. 117 and 220). Umbrian attests one nominative case form, *bio* (Pisani, *Manuale*, p. 220, no. 62 A), and one accusative form, *bia* (Pisani, *Manuale*, p. 220, no. 62 B) (for a different interpretation of this form, see M. Lejeune, "Noms osco-ombriens des eaux, des sources, et des fontaines," in *Mélanges J. Heurgon* [Rome, 1976], p. 563). In Paelignian two accusatives are attested, *biam* (Pisani, *Manuale*, p. 117, no. 49 A) and *bea* (Pisani, *Manuale*, p. 117, no. 49 B) (for lowering of \*ī to *e* in Paelignian, compare *pes*, "pious" [Pisani, *Manuale*, p. 117, no. 48] < \*pīos). I have used the nominative singular form *bio*, which occurs in the Umbrian inscription from Fossato di Vico, as a citation form. At this point it is convenient to note that this word may be attested in South Picene, i.e., *bie*. For discussion of this word, see A. Morandi, *Le iscrizioni medio-adriatiche* (Florence, 1974), p. 97. According to M. Durante, "I dialetti medio-italici," in *Popoli e civiltà dell'Italia*, vol. 6, ed. M. Cristofani (Rome, 1978), p. 818, n. 13, *bio* forms an isogloss among the Oscan-Umbrian languages of eastern Italy. For the translation of *bio* as "running water, spring water," see J. Grienberger, "Italica 5. Das Kupferblatt von Fossato di Vico," *KZ* 56 (1928): 24; G. Bottigliani, *Manuale dei dialetti italiani* (Bologna, 1954), p. 356; and Pisani, *Manuale*, p. 117.