NOTES ON PAULINUS OF NOLA, *CARMINA*

Among the Christian Latin poets Paulinus, Bishop of Nola in the early fifth century and for Gronovius the 'swan' of that city, occupies a prominent place and his work throws important light on contemporary tendencies in language and literature as well as on religious customs. In editing both his epistles and poems (*C.S.E.L.* xxix–xxx, 1894) W. von Hartel performed a valuable service. Yet, great as was the improvement upon the Migne edition (*Patrologia Latina* lxi, 1847), numerous questions of text and interpretation have remained to be dealt with and these have received comparatively small attention. The passages discussed below are a sample of those that call for elucidation or amendment. The text quoted at the head of each note is that of Hartel. At or near the beginning of the first note on a new poem, where a point of reading is considered, the manuscripts available are specified. I have used the following abbreviations: P. = Paulinus of Nola; H. = Hartel or his edition; *Epist.* 428.29 = Paul. Nol. *Epist.* ed. Hartel p.428 line 29; *P.S.* = *Patristische Studien* vi, *Zu den Gedichten des h. P. von Nola*, 1895 (critical notes by Hartel); Mur. = Muratori; M. = the Migne edition; Wiman = G. Wiman, *Eranos* 32 (1934), 98–130, *Till P. Nolanus' carmina* (critical notes). A recent contribution has been P. G. Walsh's translation entitled *The Poems of St. Paulinus of Nola*, A. C. W. xl, 1975.[1]

> 6.81–3 ergo ad condignas tanto pro munere grates
> ne dubiam suspende fidem, ne mota fauentis
> ira dei meritam statuat post praemia poenam.

The angel has announced to Zacharias the coming birth of John the Baptist (Luke 1). N only. For *neu dubiam* (N) Hartel reads *ne d.* (so M.), the source of which is not stated. The priest is thus counselled to show fitting thanks to God by abstaining from a suspension of belief, surely strange advice from a being who goes on to say that disbelief will be punished. The giving of thanks and the abstention from disbelief are separate ideas and N's *neu* duly separates them; there can be little doubt that *neu* must be retained. The words *ad condignas . . . grates* are now left without apparent construction and it may be reasonable to conjecture that *ad* has ousted the imperative of some verb. Here it is pertinent to note that 81 has a close affinity with Mart. 12.9.3 'ergo agimus laeti tanto pro munere grates' (H. 380)[2] and a solution to our problem seems at hand; for *ad* we should read *age* (the error perhaps developed from the omission by haplography of one of the similar letters *e* and *c*).

> 6.236–9 quis locus hic uitiis? aditum quem praua cupido
> inuenit haec inter sacrae ad penetralia mentis?
> quo peccet qui nil cupiat? quo tendat iniqui
> in latebras sensus quisquis non indiget ullo?

---

[2] Cf. 20.255 'quas illi referam tanto pro munere digne [E, *dignet* AD, *dignas* M.] . . . grates?' and 21.718 'sed redeam ad grates operis pro munere habendas'.

238 f. The sentence *quo tendat . . . ullo* is obscure: can a man be said *in latebras iniqui sensus tendere* ('head into the darkness of wicked thoughts' Walsh)? It looks very much like a rhetorical variation of the preceding sentence *aditum quem . . . mentis*: thus *quo tendat = aditum quem inuenit, in latebras sensus = ad penetralia mentis*, and *quisquis non indiget ullo* corresponds to *sacrae*. The small alteration *iniquū* (i.e. *iniquum*) for *iniqui* (N only) would provide a subject parallel to *praua cupido*, i.e. 'How could wrongdoing make its way into the secret places of his faculties [sc. *ei*] whoso needs nothing?' P.'s fondness for repeating a thought in different words is characteristic of his diffuse style: cf. 15.87 f. 'fecundam pugnas uteri doluisse Rebeccam / conquestamque deo grauidi luctamina uentris', 20.176–9 and 21.318 f. commented on below, etc. For *iniquum* cf. 22.74 'uitiis inuictus et osor iniqui', and for *latebras sensus* Lact. *Inst.* 5.19.32 '[deus] latebras cordis uidet', etc. (see *T.L.L.* s.v. *latebra* 993.79 ff.).

> 6.255–7   at postquam inuictam firmans per talia mentem
>   exegit largum tempus statuitque reperta
>   quae fuerant quaerenda, sibi uox edita caelo est.

There is no justification for ascribing (so M.) to P. such an abnormal use of *sibi* for *ei* (cf. Hofm.-Sz. 175): *sibi* goes naturally with *fuerant quaerenda* and the comma must be placed after *sibi*. The words *reperta* [*esse*] *quae fuerant quaerenda sibi* refer to 221 f. 'illa *sibi* iam tum statuit *discenda*, docere / quae nequeunt homines'. With *edita est* no pronoun is needed.

> 9.24–8   si tamen ut captis dominus uiolentior instas,
>   et si tantus amor Sion pia noscere uobis
>   cantica, si pergis me cogere non tua fari
>   et diuina tibi quaenam sint cantica Sion,
>   accipe quid captae deus ultor spondeat urbi.

The poem is an expansion of Psalm 136 (137): cf. Ps. 136:3 'hymnum cantate nobis de canticis Sion'.[1] These rhetorical lines have no equivalent in the original.[2] Vv. 25–7 are not intelligible either as above or as in M. (comma after both *fari* and *Sion*). Punctuate:

>   si pergis me cogere non tua fari
>   et diuina tibi, quaenam sint cantica Sion
>   accipe, quid captae deus ultor spondeat urbi.

accipe is placed between the two indirect questions which it governs (cf. Ov. *Trist.* 2.270 'quaeque iuuet monstrat [medicina], quaeque sit herba nocens', etc.). Cf. 31 'ecce quis est hymnus domini, quae cantica Sion'. *fari* is used as in 15.33 'sanctum et caelestia fari', 45 'tua non queo fari / te sine'.

> 10.128–30   quid me accusas? si displicet actus
>   quem gero agente deo, prius est, si fas, reus auctor,
>   cui placet aut formare meos aut uertere sensus.

---

[1] Here and elsewhere I quote the Bible according to the Vulgate. It should be noted, however, that P. is believed to have followed the Old Latin versions or something closer to them than to the Vulgate (cf. M. Philipp, *Zum Sprachgebrauch des P. von Nola*, pp. 70 ff.).

[2] For 25 cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.10 'sed si tantus amor casus cognoscere nostros'.

BHNOVn. 'Die Lesart in VNH *fiat* (*ut fiat* n)', writes H. (*P.S.* 6), 'beruht sichtlich auf einer willkürlichen Änderung, während BO *si fas* eine passende Äusserung aus dem frommen Sinne des Dichters ist' (cf. H. xix). On the contrary, I suggest, the corruption is rather that of the idiomatic *fiat* ('first should its author be arraigned') into the easy *si fas*, the work of a scribe whose piety exceeded his Latin. The subjunctive after *prius est* is cited for Tert. *Adu. Marc.* 4.10.4 'prius est igitur neges' (Hofm.-Sz. 531 give instances of the subjunctive after various impersonal expressions); cf. *prius est ut* common in late Latin (H.-Sz. 645). *prius est* is read by Peiper (ed. Auson., *Epist.* 31) and by White (Auson., Loeb), but misunderstood by the latter (placing a colon after *est*).

> 14.29–35 . . . et multo praesentem [Felicem] numine produnt [daemones],
> cum captiua intra deprensi corpora Christum
> in sancto fulgere suo clamantque probantque,
> membrorum incussu tremuli capitumque rotatu
> tormentisque suis. sed non sua corpora torquent,
> clamantes proprios aliena per ora dolores
> orantum ueniam; latet ultor, poena uidetur.

ABDEQT. Vv. 33–5 have been subject to misunderstanding. H. (*P.S.* 52) inter-prets 'sie quälen nicht die von ihnen eingenommenen Körper (*sua corpora*), sondern empfinden selber die Qual', thus assigning to *sua corpora* an impossible sense. There is a clear contrast between *tormentis suis* and *non sua corpora torquent* (cf. 34 *proprios aliena*), and this is obscured by the full stop after *suis* (so Zechmeister;[1] M. has a comma). Remove the stop and interpret (*corpora*) *sed non sua corpora*: i.e. the bodies which they torture are not their own, but it is they, not the owners of the bodies, who feel the pain. A fuller version, with corresponding contrasts, is 23.68 ff. 'per non sua quamuis / corpora uexatos hostes sua poena fatigat. / soluuntur poenis, cum poenas ferre uidentur / corpore, et inmunes animae spectant aliena / in membris tormenta suis; homo daemone capto / liber agit, species poenarum in corpore tantum est'; cf. too 94 and 19.256 ff. The use of *sed* is exceptional: a precise parallel is Drac. *Romul.* 10.526 'et flentes sed non sua funera plangunt'; cf. id. *Laud. dei* 3.237 'imitatorem sed non imitabilis ignis'.

35 *orantum* does not depend on *ora*, as claimed by H.: those who pray for pardon are the evil *daemones*. Zechmeister's alteration *orant tum* is also deleteri-ous. All that is necessary is to place the semicolon after *dolores* instead of after *ueniam*: cf. 26.329 f. 'igneus ultor / agminis igniferi Felix'. Thus vv. 32–5 run (with comma after *rotatu*):

> membrorum incussu tremuli capitumque rotatu,
> tormentisque suis sed non sua corpora torquent,
> clamantes proprios aliena per ora dolores;
> orantum ueniam latet ultor, poena uidetur.

> 16.140–2 omnibus exitii sua gloria, qua tumuerunt,
> causa fuit, neque herois uirtutibus ista,
> sed magis infirmis diuina potentia fregit.

ABDEGQRT. 141 *herois* H.,[2] *uero suis* codd. H. has altered a sound text. Wiman

[1] *Wien. Stud.* 2 (1880), 308.
[2] Later (*P.S.* 58), visited by metrical

qualms, he rejects *herois* in favour of more extensive alterations.

(p.104) rightly rejects H.'s view that *suis* (= *diuinis*) *uirtutibus*[1] is an inadequate antithesis to *infirmis*,[2] but, less rightly, takes *infirmis* as = *infirmorum*. The line has a biblical source, I Corinthians 1:27 'infirma mundi elegit deus, ut confundat fortia', and this (not referred to by H. or Wiman) has already been echoed, more closely, in 130 'semper ab infirmis confundens fortia mundi'; with the above cf. 15.47 f. 'qui facis omnipotens homines diuina ualere / fortiaque infirmis superas', 24.458 ff., 31.523 f. Wiman suggests *neruosis* as a reasonable reading for *uero suis*, but considers the latter possible enough; he well cites as examples of *uerŏ* 19.464 and 21.643. The passage is typical of P. and admits no tampering of any kind.

>   18.19—21   . . . et niueo tellus uelatur amictu,
>   quae niue tecta, solum niue siluas culmina colles
>   compta senis sancti canos testatur honores.

Omnia laetus candor habet (17 f.). ABDEGQRT. *quae . . . compta*: H.'s text, following the majority of the manuscripts, is doubtless right, but the comma should be placed after *solum*, not *tecta.* We now have two parallel clauses, *niue tecta solum* and *niue siluas culmina colles compta*; each is emphasized by the introductory *niue*, each of the two participles *tecta* and *compta* has its accusative(s), and the sequence of nouns in the second clause is not interrupted. A feature of interest is the characteristic turn *(tellus) tecta solum.* P. has a passion for the use, often pleonastic, of synonyms or near-synonyms in the same clause. Here *solum* helps out *tecta* ('its surface covered with snow') and gives symmetry to the clauses. Cf. cases like 10.5 'salutifero felix . . . charta libello', 14.103 'dies . . . lucem geminata', 21.791 'hoc pensabo tibi pretium mercedis honore', 27.109—13 'ut pigra . . . ingenia [nom.] . . . sollemnia . . . agant residesque . . . mentes [accus.] . . . parent domino', 28.139 'optatumque reduxit lux operosa diem', 31.200 'redeant tersis lumina pura oculis', etc. Cf. Housman on Luc. 1.102.

>   18.110—12   namque sacerdotem sacris annisque parentem
>   perdiderat, sed eum caelis habitura patronum
>   urbs deuota pium; spe solabatur amorem.

sed . . . amorem: the semicolon (M. has colon) after *pium* is entirely artificial and clearly due to a perverse desire to separate *pium* from *amorem*. Shorn of the punctuation-mark, the sentence runs naturally and in harmony with the poet's style: the idea of devotion (*deuota*) and affection (*amorem*), further enhanced by *pium* ('loving' or 'dutiful'), is typical of his fullness of language (cf. the further references to the people's *pietas* in 115 f. *dolor et pietas . . .*, 122). The expression *pius amor* is Virgilian, *Aen.* 5.296 '[insignis] amore pio pueri'; so Drac. *Laud. dei* 3.138 'cuius [dei] amore pio' (both genitives objective).

>   19.728—30   esto columna piis tu semper et anchora nobis,
>   ut bene nostra domus maneat, bene classis agatur
>   in cruce nixa, fide et de cruce nancta coronam.

ADEΔ. 730 *nixa* AD, *fixa* ΔE; *fide* H. for *fidem* codd., *nixa* <*ad*> *finem* Wiman (p.119); *et* AD, *uel* ΔE. These last three lines of the hymn to the cross are care-

---

[1] Cf. Prud. *Symm.* 2.237 'quae [numina] simules parere meis [sc. *diuinis*] uirtutibus'.
[2] H. adds unaptly 'zumal *diuina potentia*

folgt': for the type of sentence *ista suis uirtutibus diuina potentia fregit* see next passage.

fully constructed and show close attention to balance: the metaphor of *columna* is continued in *domus*, that of *anchora* in *classis* (= *nauis*); in the final line the manuscript tradition has two precisely parallel clauses joined by *et* or *uel*, each embodying the introductory prepositional phrase *in cruce / de cruce* (cf. the pentameter in *Epist.* 287.10 'pro cruce ut occisis in cruce sit requies') followed by a past participle and a noun in the accusative. This symmetry is ruined by H. and impaired by Wiman.

   If we accept (with M.) the reading of ΔE, the line runs:

> in cruce fixa fidem uel de cruce nancta coronam.

The accusative with a passive participle is much favoured by P. (see H. 413 f.) and it is employed with freedom: *fidem* is indeed an unusual type of noun (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 11.507 'oculos . . . in uirgine fixus'), but note 14.103 '[dies] innumeris lucem geminata lucernis'. *fixa* glances, of course, at *anchora* in 728, though the metaphor is altered; cf. 13.35 f. 'hoc bene subductam religaui litore classem, / in te conpositae mihi fixa sit anchora uitae', Aug. *Serm.* 177.8 (38.958 M.) 'ibi [in deo] fige spem, ibi ancoram cordis tui'. The allusive language is no accident:[1] cf. Prud. *Cath.* 5.96 'nam praefixa cruci spes hominum uiget'. In P. hiatus is rare (cf. Green 126 f.)[2] and *uel* (= *et*)[3] seems a more likely reading than *et*. For the occasional superiority of E's readings cf. note on 20.176–9. The poem ends with a well-planned and triumphant verse.

20.59 f.   tot Christi chelys aurea mundo
          personat innumeris uno modulamine linguis.

ADE. *uno* E, *lino* AD. H. (*P.S.* 80) toys with the bizarre notion of reading *pleno* for *uno*, suggesting that *uno* may be but an improvement on *lino*, which developed from *pleno*. To resist so tempting an antithesis as *innumeris uno* (noted by H.) P. would have been quite unable; nothing could be more in keeping with his style: cf. 55 f. 'composuit citharam *uariis* ex gentibus *unam*, / *omnigenas* populos conpingens corpus in *unum*', 21.328 f. '*unum* carmen *diuersis* . . . fidibus', 277 ff., 27.64 f., etc. With the above cf. Orient. 1.484 '*unius innumerum* crimen auaritiae'. The poets had not studied rhetoric in vain.

20.122 f.   nunc ipse redux alienis
                infertur pedibus, subuecto corpore pendens.

A sinner becomes paralysed and is unable to walk. '*subrecto* fort.' H. *subuecto* is characteristic of P.'s redundant and repetitive style: cf. 108 'manibus graue *subuectantibus* aegri / corpus' and 113 *uectatum* (16.30 'quem . . . proprio *subuexit* corpore').

20.164–6   occultasset enim meriti discrimen iniquo
                corporis inlaesi uigor et uinxisset inertem
                mens durata reum, nisi lapsum poena ligasset.

The sinner, though paralysed, is glad that his conscience has been awakened. 164 *iniquo* AD (*iniqui* E) sc. *mihi* (cf. 214 *iniquo*). H. (*P.S.* 80) assigns to *meriti*

discrimen the far-fetched meaning 'die Gefahr der Schuld'. Chatelain[1] saw what must be the general sense of 164, but misunderstood the Latin: 'j'ignorerais la différence du bien (*meriti*) avec le mal (*iniquo*)'. *meritum* can be used of both good and bad performance: cf. 26.218 'uique boni meriti meritum superare sinistrum', Tert. *Apol.* 18.3 'ad utriusque meriti dispunctionem' ('recompense');[2] and *meriti discrimen* must mean 'the distinction between *bonum meritum* and *malum m.*' (cf. 159–63); cf. the longer type of expression, e.g. Quint. *Inst.* 12.3.7 'in recti prauique discrimine'.[3] The expression *meriti discrimen* occurs in a similar sense also in Alc. Avit. *Carm.* 4.394 '[Noe] finem cunctis, sibi ferre salutem / diuersam cernens meriti discrimine sortem' (cf. Prud. *Symm.* 2.795 f. 'nec habet discernere dispar / uiuentum meritum'); for the use of *discrimen* cf. cases like Liv. 21.15.1 'uix ullum discrimen aetatis', Luc. 10.91 'nullo discrimine sexus', Plin. *N.H.* 7.117 '[tribus] notatas . . . discrimine sedis [in theatro] '.

20.176–9   [haec] me miserum reliquis documento ferre uidetis.
              numquid enim hoc errore carent aliqui? sed in uno
              exemplum fieri placuit, quo sit mea poena
              et praeiudicium quibus emendatio non est.

In spite of its youthfulness (fourteenth cent.), H. views the *Cod. Bononiensis* 2671 (E) with respect: it offers, he says (*P.S.* 49·f.), many good readings not easily attainable by conjecture and he considers that it preserves a strain of independent tradition. The above passage, I believe, provides an example of E's occasional superiority (cf. 19.730 *fixa - uel*, 20.60 *uno*, discussed above).

    179 *et* AD, *in* E, 'ut fort.' H. The words *documento*, *exemplum*, and *praeiudicium* ('warning precedent') all mean much the same thing. It is hard to believe that the idiomatic *in praeiudicium* (so M.) ousted the routine *et p.*, where *et* is otiose: for this well-attested use of *in* cf. Avian. 40.6 '[pardus] solus in exemplum nobilitatis erat', etc.; an interesting comparison is Tert. *Adu. Marc.* 3.13.4 'quod in signum esset futura [res]' and *Adu. Iud.* 9.7 'quod signum esset futurum'.[4] P.'s use of *in* is somewhat advanced: cf. such noteworthy instances as 25.182 'quibus Christus corporis in caput est' (but 187 'commune caput stet . . . Christus'), 24.702 'distractus in seruum puer', 780 'sumatur in regni ducem', etc. (see H. 431). Striking is his use of *in* with ablative = 'as' in *Epist.* (poet.) 292.13 'niueo stat Christus in agno' (Hofm.-Sz. 275).

21.318–21   prima parens Christi sub nomine murmura soluit,
                 et domini nomen prima loquella fuit,
               iamque parente deo regnis caelestibus ortus
                  sidereo pariter nomine et ore micat.

Cf. 314 f. 'parentes / infantem Christo constituere sacrum [sc. Asterium]'. 318 *parens* Zechmeister[5] for *parente* AD, *parente dei* Mur. It is reasonable to assume that the unmetrical and meaningless *parente* is an error, induced by *parente* in

---

[1] *Notice sur les manuscrits des poésies de P.*, 1880, p.93.·

[2] Sedulius has a neat illustrative couplet in the so-called *Hymn* 1.5 f. 'unius ob meritum cuncti periere minores; / saluantur cuncti unius ob meritum'.

[3] For the sense cf. 6.279 'das genti sensum, quo uel bona uel mala noscant, 24.509 ff. 'antequam . . . bonumue saperet aut malum discerneret, / beatus elegit bonum'.

[4] See *T.L.L.* s.v. *in* 766.69 ff., 767.83 ff., *exemplum* 1339.71 ff., Hofm.-Sz. 274 f.

[5] *Wien. Stud.* 1 (1879), 121.

320, which has ousted the original word (cf. 756 and 820 discussed below); less reasonable to assume that the ousted word is *parens*. Z. curiously objects to Asterius being made the subject of *murmura soluit*, maintaining that the action is better ascribed to the father or mother.[1] How, we may ask, is either parent in a position *prima Christi sub nomine murmura [paruuli] soluere*? And what is the operation envisaged? In the expression *ora, linguam, uocem soluere* (virtually = 'speak')[2] and kindred expressions (e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 11.604 'suspiria soluit') the subject is the person who speaks or emits the sound, and Asterius must be the subject here.[3] Comparable, but not parallel, is Auson. *Parent.* 10.3 '[puerum] murmura . . . primis meditantem absoluere [= *perficere*] uerbis'; cf. Claud. *Eutrop.* 2.254 '[puer] in Phrygiam primum laxauit murmura uocem'.[4] Read, accordingly, *prima puer* as in the cognate passage 6.210 f. 'inde ubi prima puer stabili uestigia nisu / fixerat et certam signarant uerba loquelam' (Virg. *Ecl.* 4.18 'at tibi prima, puer . . .'). Vv. 318 and 319, in accordance with the poet's manner, say the same thing in different words.

21.754—7 hic ego te modo iure ream, mea Nola, patrono
            communi statuam et blandae pietatis ab ira
            mente manens placida motum simulabo patronum,
            filiolam increpitans ueteris sub uoce querelae.

Nola is rebuked for denying to Felix, her patron, a share of her water-supply. 756 *patronum* A, *paterna* D. The general meaning must be that P., though affectionate and abstaining from wrath, will feign anger and scold her. A's *patronum* is hard to defend. Zechmeister[5] finds 'die Ausdrucksweise "ich will den erregten, erzürnten Patron vorstellen" zum mindesten etwas gesucht'. Indeed, it seems incredible that P. should propose to impersonate anybody; for we cannot really suppose that, while he is busy arraigning and scolding Nola very much in his own *persona* (cf. 760 ff. 'diuinaque iura / respicere oblita humanis mea uota putabas / usibus et mihi te, Felicem oblita, daturam / credebas'), he is all the time impersonating the saint; why should such perverse behaviour ever enter his head? There is the additional problem that the acceptance of *patronum* leaves the reading of D, *paterna*, unaccounted for. Instead of *patronum* we miss a word bringing out the father-daughter relationship, already hinted at in *pietatis* ('parental affection'). There is everything to be said for Zechmeister's compromise between the two readings, viz. *paternum*, which H. regrettably fails to record; *patronum* must be due to *patrono* in 754 (cf. 318 and 820 also discussed in this paper), *paterna* perhaps to *ira*. Cf. 10.107 f. (P. deprecates the wrath of Ausonius), 'amplector patrio uenerandos pectore motus / et mihi gratandas saluis affectibus iras'. We thus have a satisfying picture of P., the affectionate father, pretending to be angry as he gently chides his wayward daughter.[6] Unfortunately, Z. sub-

---

[1] 'während doch besser von dem Vater oder der Mutter gesagt wird, dass sie dem Kinde die Zunge lösen, in ihm die ersten Laute wecken'.

[2] e.g. Virg. *G.* 4.452 (*ora*, *Aen.* 3.457, Ov. *Met.* 13.126, etc.), Ov. *Met.* 3.261 (*linguam*), Sen. *Thyest.* 682 (*uocem*), etc.

[3] Where divinity is concerned, the case is of course different: cf. 15.34 'nec tibi difficile, omnipotens, mea soluere doctis / ora modis'.

[4] Quite different is Auson. *Epist.* 22.68 p.264 P. 'gremioque [paruulos] fouens et murmura soluens' ('sedans eorum uagitus' Delph.).

[5] *Wien. Stud.* 1 (1879), 118.

[6] Cf. 754 'mea Nola'. Poem 21 is thought to have been written in 407, where P. was a leading church dignitary and benefactor, two years before his elevation to the bishopric.

sequently (loc. cit. 314) discards his good work in favour of D's highly improbable *paterna*, which he takes with *uoce*, placing the comma after *simulabo*.

21.791−4   hoc pensabo tibi pretium mercedis honore,
           Felicis sancti scribaris ut addita semper
           laudibus et tanti memoreris alumna patroni,
           cuius donorum <tibi> maxima portio facta est.

Inspired by Felix, Abella (here addressed) has restored Nola's failing water-supply and merits signal praise. 794 *tibi* suppl. Mur.; *est* in *es* corr. D. *tibi* is unclear and unsatisfying. D's correction *es* reveals the clue: read <*tu*> . . . *es*. We now have a variation of the idiomatic expression *rei pars magna esse*, 'to be an important element, play a great part, in a thing': cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.6 '[miserrima] quorum pars magna fui', 10.427 'Lausus, pars ingens belli', *Georg.* 2.40 'o decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae, / Maecenas'; and, in P., 14.129 'tu [Felix] quoque, magna piorum portio', 21.35 '[Felix] his . . . in precibus pars magna fuit',[1] 24.85 'de more noluit suo, / ut esset onerum portio', *Epist.* 118.21 'omnia operum dei, in quibus consistimus et quorum pars sumus'; cf. too 6.315 'tu . . . donum summi patris, alme Iohannes'.

21.819−21 cuius ab indigenis tibi montibus adfluet omnis
           copia, qua fueras felicibus ante superba
           et qua post studio meliore ministra fuisti.

cuius sc. *Abellae*; *tibi* sc. *o Nola*; *copia* sc. *aquae*. Wiman's suggestion (p.126), *adfluit* for *adfluet*, in view of the preceding presents, is plausible. H. (426) understands *felicibus* (*temporibus*), but conjectures *Felice arente*; Wiman conjectures *Felicis era ante*. It is certainly probable that in this context *felicibus* conceals the name of the saint: if the ending *bus* is deleted, the words *fueras Felici ante superba* are naturally linked together and provide the desired sense;[2] the addition of *tu* completes the line and offers an effective antithesis. I suggest, accordingly, *tu Felici* for *felicibus* (caused by *montibus* almost immediately above[3] and *tu* omitted metri gr.): cf. 754 'hic ego te modo iure ream, mea Nola, patrono / communi statuam', 762 '[Nola] Felicem oblita', 775 f. 'quam [rem] tu eius [dei] amico . . . negabas'.

22.20−8   si decus e falsis aliquod nomenque tulisti   20
           de uacuis magnum rebus, cum ficta uetustis
           carminibus caneres uel cum terrena referres
           gesta, triumphantum laudans insignia regum:
           non equidem ex illis tu laudem sumere dignus,
           quos magis ornabas opulenti munere uerbi.   25
           quanto maior ab his cedet tibi gloria coeptis,
           in quibus et linguam exercens mentem quoque sanctam
           erudies laudemque simul uitamque capesses?

The poet Jovius is counselled to exchange pagan for Christian themes. The passage has been wrongly punctuated (M. as above but full stop after *regum* in

---

[1] In v. 34 the confusing comma after *eorum* in H.'s text should be deleted.

[2] Cf. H. (*P.S.* 89) 'Nola hat zwar Felix das Wasser vorenthalten (*fuerat Felici ante superba*), aber nicht *felicibus*. Ich habe

dafür *Felice arente* vermutet . . .'.

[3] Cf. 318 *parente* due to *parente* in 320, 756 *patronum* due to *patrono* in 754 (discussed above).

23). It is certain that the apodosis to the *si*-clause (20 ff.) begins at 26, as the contrast (*aliquod . . . magnum - quanto maior*), clearly linking them, shows. Replace by a comma both the colon in 23 and the full stop in 25, making the passage a single period. For the emphasizing use of *tu* in 24 cf. 6.50 'cur tamen addubitas, mortali tu quoque sensu . . .?', 24.689 ff. 'coniux . . . tua . . . exundat . . . costa fortis *haec* tibi . . .', 31.22 *ille*. 27–8 *et - [laudem] que = et - et*. 26–8 *quanto* does not here introduce a question: after *capesses* place an exclamation-mark.

24.547–8   sed ab hoc triumpho caueat exemplo sibi
         aliena adire foedera.

As Samson laid low the lion (Judges 14:6), so may the son of Cytherius overcome his spiritual opponent; but thenceforth he should guard against the subsequent fate of S. 547 as above ed. Colon. in marg., *ab hoc exemplo triumpho caueat ui* O, *ab hoc exemplo triumpho caueat exemplo ui* B, *hoc ab exemplo monitus caueat sibi* ed. princ. The above reading satisfies apart from *sibi*: we miss a genitive, designating Samson, following on *exemplo* (cf. 761 'doceat exemplo suo', 23.245 'exemploque boni', etc.), and Zechmeister is on the right track with *illius* ('from the time of, after, this triumph he should be warned by the example of S. and beware of associating with a foreign woman'); but the word must rather be *ui <ri>* (either = 'hero' or merely = *illius*, as often in the poets).[1]

24.689–96   et ecce coniux in iugo Christi tua
         ut uitis exundat bona,   690
       domi deoque costa fortis haec tibi
         lateribus in domus tuae,
       curas mariti sustinens, curans fidem,
         sancti corona coniugis,
       in castitate liberos enutriens   695
         uitam nouellantes deo.

A revealing glimpse of the poet's originality in exploiting a biblical source: Psalm 127 (128):3 'uxor tua sicut uitis abundans, in lateribus domus tuae. filii tui, sicut nouellae oliuarum, in circuitu mensae tuae'. 691 The words *domi deoque* are very awkward in their clause and clearly belong to the preceding (so M.): place the comma after *deoque*, not *bona*, comparing the neighbouring 688 'ut palma florescas deo', 696 'uitam nouellantes deo', 698 'palmitem . . . firmandum deo' (so 21.310). *domi deoque* seems an inelegant combination and *domui* ed. princ. (so M.), though a rare form in verse,[2] is tempting. For the emphasizing use of *haec* cf. note on 22.24. A fascinating feature is the introduction of *costa*. This, of course, glances at Genesis 2:21 f.,[3] but its function does not end here. Confronted with the original, P. may have been puzzled by the words *in lateribus domus tuae*, which should refer to the wife, not the vine (as the words *in c. mensae tuae* refer to *filii t.*), and, intrigued by the possibilities offered by *lateribus*, audaciously brought in *costa*, to accord with his own ideas of sense: the wife-rib is

---

[1] Cf. 16.81 'perque ipsa uiri uestigia currunt', 20.345 'hospes homo egreditur tecto notumque suem uir / conspicit' (*uir = homo*).

[2] *T.L.L.* 1950.3.

[3] 'costam appellat uxorem Cytherii μετωνυμικῶς, eo quod primi hominis uxor ex ipsius costa procreata sit' M.

an integral part of the house structure. His handiwork would have been different, had he been dependent on Jerome's translation from the Hebrew, where in place of *in lateribus* (= ἐν τοῖς κλίτεσι LXX) we find *in penetralibus*.[1]

Further innovation is shown in 696, where *liberos . . . uitam nouellantes deo* echoes but faintly the psalm's *filii t., sicut nouellae oliuarum.* The verb *nouello* is particularly used of viticulture;[2] for the figurative use, cf. Cypr. *Epist.* 31.7 'in secretis cordis fidelis nouellandus et conserendus est animus'; comparable in P. is 21.310 'iamque [puer] deo plantatus agit'.

26.288–90   diuersa est gratia uobis,
            gloria par, quoniam sanctis fons omnibus unus
            et regnum commune dei.

ABDET. 290 om. BT. H., apparently misled by the common expression *regnum dei* (cf. 24.652, Matth. 6:33, etc.), alters *dš* (*deus*) codd. to *dei*: but cf. 369 'Christus erit cunctis regnum lux uita corona', 24.479 f. 'commune regnum, sanguis unus omnibus / . . . Christus est'. Its position gives *deus* especial force.

26.390–7   testantes ualidis conlisa naue procellis   390
           se raptos miserante deo Felicis et ipsa
           educente manu maris emersisse profundo
           et desperatam placidos cepisse salutem,
           Felicis meritis et aquas et cedere flammas.
           praeterita ut taceam meriti documenta potentis,   395
           nouimus experti, pauor e terrore recenti
           uibrat adhuc memores animos . . .

390 sc. 'cernimus et multos peregrino a litore uectos (387) . . .'. Shipwrecked voyagers from foreign parts testify to their rescue from the sea by Felix. The arrangement of this passage has been misunderstood. 394 hangs abruptly and awkwardly after 393; the saint's power over fire (*flammas*) has nothing to do with sea rescues; and in 396 *nouimus* is left in suspense. 394 cannot form part of the men's testimony, but alludes to events recent and personal to Nola, viz. two threats to the church buildings, one of fire and one of flooding, which were circumvented by Felix and which are now about to be described; they are alluded to again in similar terms in the poem's last line (429) 'nec cruor haec uiolet quae *flamma uel unda* refugit'. 394 supplies the necessary object to *nouimus* and begins the new passage: place a full stop after *salutem* (393), a comma after both *flammas* (394) and *potentis* (395), and a colon after *experti* (396). Transl. 'That both water and flame give way to the great deeds of Felix, to omit past evidence of his potent service, we know from our own experience . . .'. The description of the fire (dwelt on at greater length in 28.75 ff.) follows immediately in 397 ff., that of the flooding in 417 ff.

27.387–90   ecce uides quantus splendor uelut aede renata
            rideat insculptum camera crispante lacunar.
            in ligno mentitur ebur, tectoque superne
            pendentes lychni spiris retinentur aēnis . . .

---

[1] Cf. 'by the sides of thine house' A.V., 'in the innermost parts . . .' R.V.

[2] Cf. Suet. *Dom.* 7.2 'ne quis in Italia [uineas] nouellaret' ('plant new vines or vineyards'), Arnob. Iun. *Euang.* 143.15

(on Matth. 21:33 'qui plantauit uineam') 'uinea quam dixit nouellasse, lex noua est', Isid. *Quaest. in 4 reg.* 8. 1 and 3; so *renouello* Colum. *Arb.* 6.1.

aede (387) = *aula* (383), the church. The passage has been misunderstood.
H. presumably takes *lacunar* as the subject of *rideat* and *quantus splendor* in
predicative apposition to it, *crispante* being intransitive.[1] This is strange and
awkward Latin for *quanto splendore rideat l.* Moreover, the ceiling is but one
element in the *splendor*: there are also the *lychni* (390 = *lumina* 391).
Goldschmidt (ad loc.)[2] takes *quantus splendor* as subject of *rideat*, *lacunar* as
the object of *crispante* (transitive), thus leaving *mentitur* without an apparent
subject. *T.L.L.* (s.v. *mentior* 781.31) finds in *mentitur* a passive sense, the only
example (apart from past part.) of such a use of *mentior* cited from poetry
(three exx. in prose). M. seems to have yet another idea, printing a comma after
splendor (sc. *sit? uelut* = *u. si?*). The trouble is due to wrong punctuation: in
388 place the stop, a colon, after *rideat*, not *lacunar*. Thus the clause *quantus
splendor* [now subject] . . . *rideat* refers generally to the church's *splendor*, and
the two details then naturally follow, *lacunar* ('the engraved panelling on the
glittering ceiling counterfeits ivory')[3] and *lychni* (*lumina*).[4] For *splendor rideat*
cf. Lucr. 2.502 *ridenti lepore* [*pauonum*].

28.53—9   parte alia patet exterior quae cingitur aeque
           area porticibus, cultu minor, aequore maior.
           ante sacras aedes longe spectabile pandit
           uestibulum, duplici quae extructis tegmine cellis
           per contextarum coeuntia tigna domorum
           castelli speciem meditatur imagine muri
           conciliisque forum late spatiabile pandit.

ABDEGRT. 54 Print colon (so Goldschmidt), instead of full stop, after *maior*:
the subject of *pandit* (55), surprisingly taken by H. (p.440) as = *panditur*, is, of
course, *area*, the object *uestibulum*, i.e. 'provides a spacious forecourt'. The
sentence *longe spectabile pandit uestibulum* closely corresponds to *forum late
spatiabile pandit* (59); cf. 8 f. 'uestibula . . . reserantur . . . et . . . ingressibus
atria pandunt'. 56 *quae* is uncouth and can be ruled out: it is an obvious error
for *que*; read *duplicique*. The layout of the buildings is discussed by Goldschmidt.

28.229—31   haec eadem species ueterem deponere formam
             et gestare nouam monet et retro acta abolere
             inque futura dei conuersam intendere mentem.

299 species sc. *tectorum*. The expression *futura dei* is unclear and open to mis-
understanding: cf. 'what God will do' Goldschmidt. For *dei* we should rather
expect *deo* (with *conuersam*),[5] *futura* being a direct contrast to *retro acta*. Here
(*retro - mentem*) P. is reflecting a biblical source and it appears that his language
has been unduly compressed:[6] Philippians 3:13—14 'quae quidem retro sunt
obliuiscens, ad ea uero quae sunt priora extendens meipsum, ad destinatum

---

[1] Ind. 422 'crispans camera 27.388'.
Cf. *T.L.L.* 1208.25 (*crispo = splendeo*).
[2] *Paulinus' Churches at Nola, Texts,
Translations and Commentary*, 1940.
[3] Cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.18.1—2 'non ebur neque
aureum / mea renidet in domo lacunar',
Prop. 3.2.11 f. 'quod non Taenariis domus
est mihi fulta columnis, / nec camera auratas
inter eburna trabes'.

[4] Cf. 18.35 ff., 19.412 ff.
[5] Cf. 27.550 'tandem conuertitur aduena
Christo' etc.
[6] The previous words *ueterem deponere
formam et gestare nouam* reflect Ephes.
4:22 'deponere . . . ueterem hominem' and
24 'et induite nouum hominem'; cf. too
Coloss. 3:9—10.

persequor, ad brauium supernae uocationis dei'.[1] It will be seen that *in futura* reflects *ad ea, quae sunt priora*, while *dei*, apparently inspired by the words *ad brauium . . . dei*, has with singular compression been tacked on to *futura*, 'the things to come which are God's' (cf. 10.69 'futurae cum deo uitae fides' etc.).

31.55—8 cuius amore meos suscepit filius artus,
          uirgine conceptus, uirgine natus homo,
        cuncta gerens hominum, cunctos et corpore in uno
          cunctorum dominus suscipiens famulus.

BOT. In *P.S.* 39 H. has second thoughts and very properly rejects *hominum* T in favour of *hominem* BO ed. princ. (so M.), 'assuming man in all respects'; though the general sense of the two readings is much the same, the latter is unquestionably the superior as yielding 'die seltenere, für P. charakteristische Construction'. H. is interested in *cuncta*. comparing 19.643 'deus omnia Christus' etc. (see too H. 414, Hofm.-Sz. 38), and does not illustrate the usage *gerens hominem*. Cf. *Epist.* 159.8 '[deus] in ipso illo homine, quem gessit', Prud. *Cath.* 3.139 'deus ipse gerens hominem'. Very similar is 20.35 'adsumens hominem [Christus]'; so 25.160, 27.45.[2]

In 58 H. again prefers the less obvious reading, in this case that of the untrustworthy T, *famulus*, which is certainly more effective than *famulos* BO: i.e. 'all men in His one body sustaining, the Lord of all, their servant' (cf. 59 ff.).

31.351—4   finis enim legis Christus, quia lege fideli
            praedictus legi lex ueniendo fuit,
        praescribens ueteri finem legemque fidei,
            legem prophetae gentibus instituens.

Cf. 22.155 'euangelici . . . lex noua testamenti'. H. cites no biblical sources. 351 Over half the line is supplied by Romans 10:4 'finis enim legis Christus'. 353 f. Cf. Rom. 3:27 ff. '. . . per legem fidei. arbitramur enim iustificari hominem per fidem sine operibus legis. . . . legem ergo destruimus per fidem? absit; sed legem statuimus'. 354 *profetae gentibus* O, *propheta tegentibus* B, *prophetante g.* T, *perfectam g.* ed. princ. A difficulty arises: how can the *lex noua* be termed *lex prophetae*, and who is the prophet? Christ himself was sometimes viewed as a prophet (cf. Deuteronomy 18:15, Acts 3:22, 7:37),[3] but it would be far-fetched to suppose that *prophetae* can here refer to Christ. Suspicions of the text are increased by the abnormal prosody *prōphetae*, which among about thirty instances of the word in P. occurs here only. We need a very convincing defence of the manuscript reading before rejecting the attractive *perfectam* (so M.) of the ed. princ.; *perfectam*, through confusion of *per* and *pro* and the influence of the expression *lex et prophetae* (Luke 16:16),[4] could well degenerate into *profetae*. P. uses *perfectus* with various nouns: e.g. 15.37 *laus*, 66 *fides*, 21.130 *uirtus*, 337 *sensus*, *Epist.* (poet.) 277.21 *uita*.

---

[1] So Vulg.; the old versions have their variations, which include the omission of *dei* (= τοῦ θεοῦ); cf. *Epist.* 70.22, 79.25, 215.16 'quae retro sunt obliuiscens et in priora se extendens'.

[2] For this type of accusative see Löfst. *Synt.* i. 244 ff. (espec. 247), *T.L.L.* s.v. *gero* 1940.74 ff.; note Stat. *Theb.* 9.13 'mitis

adhuc hominemque gerit' (here = 'shows humanity').

[3] Cf. Ps.-Damas. *Epigr.* 67 (*De cognomentis saluatoris*).2 'iudex porta gigas rex gemma propheta sacerdos'.

[4] Cf. *Epist.* 410.7 '[Christus] qui et legis et prophetarum finis est'.

31.539—42   utimini uestris opibus pietate benigna
            radicemque mali uellite pectoribus.
          corde inopum uestrae pretium concludite uitae
          et capita expensis ungite uestra piis.

541 *pretium uitae = pretiosam uitam* (cf. *pretium uestis* 468 = *pretiosa uestis*
503); this the addressed are exhorted to limit *corde inopum*. Following H. (422),
T.L.L. (s.v. *cor* 934.29) interprets the puzzling *corde* as 'paene i.q. *misericordia*',
but gives no other instance of *cor* used in this sense nor refers to the genitive
inopum. If *corde inopum* is being taken to mean 'the compassion felt by the poor',
the interpretation, in the context 'Give to the poor', is excluded on grounds of
sense. If the words are being taken to mean 'compassion for the poor', we are
being asked to believe that *cor*, though the meaning *misericordia* is cited for this
passage only, here possesses this meaning so strongly as to be capable of governing
an objective genitive.[1] P. surely wrote *sorde inopum*, which yields a satisfying
contrast with *uestrae pretium uitae*: i.e. 'confine, limit, your extravagant mode
of life by assuming the squalor of the poor'; cf. 501 'tu, cui sordet inops' (517),
503 f. 'qui te miraris *pretiosa* ueste nitentem / nec *sordere* uides interiore habitu',
506 'sordidior pannis diues', 461—70. *corde* is read for *sorde* also by B (so ed.
princ.) in 28.239; above, *pectoribus* may have had its influence.
      542 'and anoint your heads [not with luxurious unguents, but spiritually] with
compassionate alms' (cf. 539). For the figurative language cf. 25.37 f. (35
peregrinis nidoribus) 'unguentum sanctis unum est, quod nomine Christi /
diffusum casto spirat odore deum', and the elaborate passage 21.66—71 '. . .
mentis caput uncta pudicum . . .'. For the use of *expensae* see *T.L.L.* 1646.68 ff.

Appendix. Carm.   ut, pars si qua meis membris male firma uacillet,
     3.105 f.   ceu patulum populans intret ouile lupus . . .

The devil tempts the body with various allurements. T only. H. unaccountably
adopts Mai's *male firma* in place of the manuscript's admirable *male fida* =
'untrustworthy', 'treacherous': cf. 16.94 'paries male fidus', Virg. *Aen.* 2.23
'statio male fida carinis', Sil. 5.496 'male fida fefellerat arbor', etc.

Aberystwyth   A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

  [1] Cf. Daniel 4:24 'peccata tua eleemosynis   pauperum'. *corde* for *m*. would not be intelli-
redime et iniquitates tuas misericordiis   gible.

Addendum
D. R. Shackleton Bailey's article, 'Critical Notes on the Poems of Paulinus
Nolanus', *AJP* 97 (1976), 3 ff., which deals with some of the above passages,
unfortunately appeared too late for me to see. In 6.255—7, 14.29—34, 16.140—2,
and 22.20—8 he reaches conclusions very similar to mine; he conjectures in
21.318 *infans*, 794 *tua*, 31.541 *laude*, and in 21.820 defends *felicibus* as = 'to
saints'; for the puzzling Virgilian echo in 16.222 cf. my note in *CQ* 53 (1959),
71 f.