

## SOME NOTES ON CORIPPUS' *IOHANNIS*

On the following pages Corippus' text is quoted according to the edition of J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear (D.-G.).<sup>1</sup> Even after the publication of that admirable edition there remain not a few passages of the *Iohannis* that are doubtful and worth discussing, because the only extant manuscript (the Codex Trivultianus, T) appears to give a very corrupt text of the epos, and Corippus' Latin usage is not always easy to cope with.

1.27 ff.

Africa sub magno nutabat fessa periclo.  
nam fera barbaricis rabies exarserat armis,  
insidiis ferro flammis *populisque* superba,  
omnia succendens direptae moenia terrae  
captiveque trahens cunctis e partibus Afros:

Although *populis* (in the sense of *hominum multitudine*) is quite possible in itself, this ablative is undeniably rather curious together with *insidiis*, *ferro*, and *flammis*. Reading the two following lines I suspect the right reading to be <s>*poliisque superba*; cf. 3.138 f. 'nostris praesumptus (= superbus) ab arvis/en spoliis oneratus abit'; Ov. *Met.* 7.156 'spolioque superbus'; Verg. *Aen.* 2.504 '(postes) spoliisque superbi' (though somewhat different). When *s-* had dropped out after *flammis*, the change of *poliis* into *populis* was near at hand.

1.116 ff. The emperor has summoned Johannes:

recurrens  
aurea Romanae tetigit mox limina portae.  
principis ante pedes gaudens stetit ore sereno.  
respexit famulum. pedibus celer ille benignis  
oscula laeta dedit.

This punctuation recurs in all editions, but, if I am not mistaken, one ought to punctuate before, not after, *ore sereno* which probably goes with *respexit*; cf. e.g. Ov. *Fasti* 4.161 f. 'semper ad Aeneadas placido, pulcherrima, vultu/respice'. The punctuation after the fourth foot occurs at e.g. 1.212, where, as here, the clause ends at the penthemimeres of the next verse.

1.561 ff. Johannes is addressing his soldiers:

nam timidos fortuna premit cautosque iuvabit  
audacesque simul: *multos* nam saepe revisit,  
et quanti ex ipsis palmam sumpsero periclis:

D.-G. comment; '*multos* friget: *victos* Goodyear (coll. 7,47–8): *meritos* Diggle (cf. 133).' But *multos* is due to a reminiscence of Vergil, and in cases of reminiscence the method of expression is sometimes a bit odd. Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 11.424 ff., where Turnus is speaking:

<sup>1</sup> *Flavii Cresconii Corippi Iohannidos Libri VIII*, edited by J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear (Cambridge 1970). As to older

editions quoted in this article, I refer to D-G's bibliography (x–xii).

cur ante tubam tremor occupat artus?  
 multa dies variique labor mutabilis aevi  
 rettulit in melius; *multos* alterna *revisens*  
 lusit et in solido rursus *fortuna* locavit.<sup>2</sup>

2.26 f.

temperet [sc. Musa] insuetis nutant quae carmina verbis,  
*tam* fera barbaricae *latrantia* nomina linguae.

Thus Goodyear (*CR* N.S. 18 (1968), 15) and D.-G. for 'nam fera barbaricae latrant sua nomina linguae'. 'palma dignus correxit Goodyearius', says Cazzaniga (*RFIC* 100 (1972), 57 note), but I cannot help hesitating in front of this emendation; first, *nam* seems to me very apt, second, *carmina latrantia* is not attractive. As to *nam*, I will not lay too much stress upon the fact that this verse immediately recalls 1.28 'nam fera barbaricis rabies exarserat armis', this cannot of course prove that *nam* is right at 2.27. But, as the *nam*-clause at 1.28 explains *magno periculo* in the preceding verse, in the same way, I think, it explains here *insuetis verbis*. Therefore it does not seem, after all, recommendable to change this *nam*. Further, the instances quoted in *TLL* (7<sup>2</sup>, 1014,53 f.) support the very natural thought that *linguae* is the subject of *latrant*, whereas *carmina latrantia* is hard to accept without any parallel. 'The clumsiness of expression' (Goodyear, loc. cit.) I cannot find extraordinary in this case, and Goodyear admits that it 'is not *per se* a cogent objection to the paradosis'; instead he finds the sense unsatisfactory: 'the fact that the tongues of the barbarians bark out their uncouth names does not explain why Corippus' verse should falter. What makes it falter is that he tries to include these names in it, ill-adapted though they are to the hexameter.' But v.27 means of course that these names are uncouth and barbarian and *therefore* ill adapted to the hexameter; they are *insueta verba*, and that Corippus tries to include them in his verses is already hinted at in 26. I think we are too severe with the poet, if we change his text here for logical reasons.

3.81 ff.

namque Ammonis ipse  
 templa petit simulata pater. tunc prolis iniquae  
 fata *tremenda* rogans mactat de more profano  
 horrida sacra Iovi . . .

T has *tenenda*. Diggle (*CQ* N.S. 18 (1968), 135) suggested *verenda*, Shackleton Bailey *timenda*, *tegenda*, and *tacenda*. I would read *canenda*, the sense being *rogans, ut prolis fata canantur* (= *detegantur*). As to this usage of the gerundive, cf. 6.263 *signa movenda canit* or 4.19 *signa movenda damus*; Hofmann-Szantyr 371 f. with further literature.

3.256 f.

ceu glaucam *veniens* grando destringit olivam  
 arboris excutiens concusso vertice fructus . . .

Perhaps *vehemens* or *vemens*?

3.431 ff.

(Guntarith) vertens mente maligna  
 signa refert fingitque fugam. quem vidit ut omnis

<sup>2</sup> This Vergil passage is echoed by Corippus also at 4.419 f.

versa cohors trepidum, sequitur campisque magistrum  
deserit in mediis miscentem proelia fossis.

The context and *omnis* seem to require the following punctuation: 'quem vidit ut, omnis versa cohors: trepidum sequitur' etc.; as to the comma before the last word of the verse, cf. e.g. 4.74 'voluit quicumque, remansit.'

4.399 ff.

imperat erecta *motaque* silentia dextra  
ductor. conticuere citi intentique magistrum  
susperere viri.

T reads *motaque*. 'Mommsemi coniecturam haesitans recepi, quamvis orationem paene absurde abundantem efficiat' say D.-G. and mention that Diggle thought of *mandatque*. The epithet *mota* is in itself good with *silentia* (Ov. *M.* 4.443; 7.184, and elsewhere), and if we suppose that *mota* is correct, only *-que* can be corrupt. I would suggest 'imperat erecta *mota* ecce silentia dextra'.

4.444 f.

cernite sub quantis *nutant* nunc signa periclis  
et vigilate, viri.

*nutant* is Diggle's change of T's *iactant*. D.-G. admit ad loc. that they would prefer the subjunctive, since a similar subjunctive (*sit*) is found at 443. Bekker (and Petschenig) read *iaceant*, and D.-G. quote the parallel 1.138 f. 'Africa sub quantis iaceat miseranda periclis/auribus in nostris sonuit'. It need not be pointed out that this decidedly speaks in favour of Bekker's *iaceant*, but why do D.-G. reject it? Possibly because they find *signa* awkward as the subject of *iacere sub* and consider *Africa* at 1.138 different. But the two lines are quite parallel, if I am not mistaken, and *sub* + ablative + *iacere* = *subiacere alicui rei*, 'be exposed to something', an idiom which is not infrequent in late Latin (e.g. Sacram. Leon. 44.7 [Feltoe] 'nec eos ullis mentis et corporis patiaris subiacere periculis'.

5.366 ff.

funera mille cadunt: sanguis perfundit harenas.  
*contiguus rivus* pedibus calcatur et amnis  
purpureus rubroque madent vestigia luto.<sup>3</sup>

Thus Petschenig and D.-G. (*contiguos viros* T), but Mazzucchelli's text and punctuation is stylistically superior and most probably right: 'sanguis perfundit harenas/contiguo rivo, pedibus calcatur et amnis/purpureus.' In the text of the later edd. the clause *sanguis perfundit harenas* seems too short, on the other hand the words *et amnis purpureus* form a somewhat strange addition to what has already been said. Further, *contiguo* (= *continuo*, as often in late Latin) *rivo* is more natural with *perfundit* than *contiguus rivus* would be as the subject of *calcatur*: then one would expect *altus* or the like, not exactly *contiguus*. As to the trajection of *et* (frequent in this author), cf. Petschenig's index s.v. 'et traiectionum'.

6.128 ff.

pater optime, dixit,  
ingeminans bellum nostro reparare labore  
uxores natosque potes: *nam fundere vitam*

<sup>3</sup> This *luto* is supported by *Iust.* 2.23.

et bellis finire placet. quae fama per omnes  
gentis erit populos, si nostrae iniuria caedis  
indefensa manens latum referatur in orbem?

D.-G. read *nam fundere* for T's *cum funere*, following Petschenig (*nam*) and Schenkl (*fundere*). Mommsen read *nunc ponere*. But I do not think it is necessary to consider *placet vitam cum funere et bellis finire* corrupt: *funere* (= *caede*, referring to the losses of both sides in the new war) seems to be supported by the following lines. As to *funere et bellis*, cf. 7.151 *proelia . . . et funera*. 6.686 ff.

sequitur quicumque magistrum  
vulnera converso redeuntia suscipit arcu.  
adversus quis forte petit: per pectus anhelum  
longius erecta transfixus funditur hasta.  
qui lateri iungunt, iaculis volitantibus acres  
dant animas: utrumque latus *diffindit* arundo.

Thus Mazzucchelli and later edd. (*defundit* T), but what does *utrumque latus* mean, if it is the object of *diffindit*? It cannot mean 'the enemies on both sides (of Johannes)', and 'both sides (of the enemies)' is nonsense. Certainly *latus* means the same as the preceding *lateri*, that is, *latus Iohannis*, and it follows that not *diffindit* but *defendit* is the right reading: Johannes defends himself from attacks at the back (686 f.), the front (688 f.), and the sides (690 f.). Cf. 684 f. 'arcetque sagittis/Massylas acies [sc. Iohannes]'; 742 f. 'dextrumque latus sibi vindicat undis/aequoreis, laevum gradiens umbone tuetur'.