

NOTES ON EUGENIUS OF TOLEDO*

1. Eug. *carm.* 70 (Vollmer)

ITEM AD IOHANNEM

O IO-uersiculos nexos quia despicias-HANNES,
 excipe DI-sollers si nosti iungere-VISOS.
 cerne CA-pascentes dumoso in litore-MELOS,
 et POR-triticea uerrentes germina-CELLOS.
 AR-sitibunda petunt lympharum pocula-MENTA
 atque BV-glandiferae recubant sub tegmine-BVLICI.
 nunc PAS-lanigeras ducunt ad pascua-TORES
 et FE-consumunt fraudantes munera-TVRAE.
 PRO-tibi ut nostro ueniat ex carmine-FECTVS,
 instar Lucili cogor disrumpere uersus.

5

10

At the end of line 3, all the extant manuscripts offer -MELOS. This has been accepted by the editors without discussion.¹ But is it plausible to accept camels in this bucolic landscape?

Poem 70 is a poetic *ludus*. Here, as in several other compositions, Eugenius is playing a sophisticated game with poetic conventions. And this game works on several levels.

First, the form. Eugenius' poem is one of the few examples from antiquity and the early Middle Ages of a composition totally made out of tmesis.² This interest in the form recalls other poetic exercises such as Ausonius' *technopaegnia* and Venantius Fortunatus' pictorial poems in the tradition of Optatianus Porphyrius. Eugenius

* It is a pleasure to thank Professor James Diggle and Professor Michael D. Reeve for helpful criticisms and comments on this paper. I am also grateful to Dr Stephen Heyworth and Dr Charles Burnett for suggestions which improved the overall presentation.

¹ F. Vollmer, *Fl. Merobaudis reliquiae, Blossii Aemilii Dracontii carmina, Eugenii Toletani episcopi carmina et epistolae*, MGH, AA 14 (Berlin, 1905), p. 262. This is the standard edition, from which I take the sigla of manuscripts. The poem is to be found in the more important manuscripts of Eugenius: *F*, *P*, *R*, *C*, *T*, and *M*. It occurs also in Paris, BN lat. 13029, added to the margin of f. 28v together with Eug. 38, a volume from the middle of the ninth century, written in France (it comes from Corbie), containing Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel's *Liber in partibus Donati*; Silos, BA *fragm. visig.* 18, dated to the end of the tenth century, which comprises an anthology of Eugenius (M. C. Díaz y Díaz, *Libros y Librerías en la Rioja altomedieval* [Logroño, 1979]). *C* bears in the margin IN FIGURA TEMESIS. It is not implausible that John, to whom this poem is addressed, might be Braulion's brother and bishop of Zaragoza during 619–31 (Ildeph. Tol. *uir.* 5, ed. Codoñer [Salamanca, 1972]; L. A. García Moreno, *Prosopografía del Reino Visigodo de Toledo* [Salamanca, 1974], no. 590). He is probably the same John who is remembered in poem 21 (see below). If this is true, we may infer that this poem was written before 631, probably during Eugenius' stay in Zaragoza.

² On tmesis in Latin poetry, see L. Müller, *De re metrica* (Leipzig, 1894, repr. Hildesheim, 1967), pp. 457ff. (Eugenius' poem is mentioned on p. 458); in medieval poetry, see D. Norberg, *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale* (Stockholm, 1958), pp. 58–9. Tmetric composition was dealt with by Virgil the Grammarian, *epit.* 10, ed. G. Polara and L. Caruso (Napoli, 1979), pp. 128–45. The examples provided are always short (two or four verses) and sometimes most extraordinary (for instance, *epit.* 10.5.3: 'hostes proponunt, o ciues, DA dextras uestro / uersa iure RE uice gubernante fato'; 10.5.4: 'omne uisum ab homine CU delectabile / natura stigante PI ipsi indita, / ex qui non potest TUR cupidine carere'; 10.6.1: 'fortis ensem Aeneas / forti portabat in NU / pelta fidens MA tuta tela uirum uincebat' (i.e. *manu*). In another case, the first syllables of each verse produce 'laudabilis' (10.5.4).

himself favoured this kind of poetic procedures, represented by his epanaleptic compositions (*carm.* 10 and 29) and his acrostichs and telestichs (*carm.* 16 and 28). Some decades later, we find in Spain further examples of compositional exercises: for instance, Valerius of Bierzo's poetry, in which some pieces offer all lines starting with the same letter, and even lines exclusively composed of words starting with the same letter.³ Very soon, Eugenius' poem joined the conventional set of examples of tmesis used in the grammatical tradition, as the *ars grammatica* attributed to Julian of Toledo illustrates.⁴

Secondly, the poem explicitly intends to be an intellectual challenge: 'since you despise my little verses, John, accept segmented verses, if you have the ability to assemble them'. And the last verses add a 'reason' that leads the poet to do it in this way: 'I am forced to segment (*cogor disrumpere*) the verses, so that they may be useful to you.' It is thus John's 'contempt' that provides the motivation underlying the choice of the unusual compositional process. This places the poem within a literary and cultivated society where poets exchange learned verses and enjoy poetical rivalry. It evokes, then, the first aim provided by Virgil the Grammarian for tmetic poems.⁵

Thirdly, the game is reinforced by placing the *paegnion* within a tradition, which allegedly derives from Lucilius. Here Eugenius is citing Ausonius,⁶ who echoes information presumably also found in Porphyryon.⁷

However, the playful character of Eugenius' poem is not confined to these three aspects. The most remarkable element is the central section, which consists of a surprising pastiche of a bucolic description. Basically, it is a *congeries* of generic patterns, without a real aim other than to present a series of mere descriptive *topoi*. The vocabulary is illustrative of this: *armenta*, *pascua*, *pastores*, *feturae*,⁸ *dumoso*,⁹ *lanigeras*.¹⁰ As for *pocula lympharum*, we find a similar expression in didactic poetry (Verg. *georg.* 3.529 *pocula sunt fontes liquidi*). There is even the quotation of the beginning of Vergil's first eclogue (verse 6 *recubant sub tegmine*), a very popular line in late poetry.¹¹

³ Poems 5 and 7, ed. in M. C. Díaz y Díaz, *Anecdota Wisigothica* I (Salamanca, 1958), pp. 89–116.

⁴ Ps.-Julian, *ars gramm.*, ed. M. A. H. Maestre Yenes (Toledo, 1973), p. 211.240: 'Item: "O io uersiculos nexos quia despicias ANNES" pro "Ioannes"'.
⁵ This is the first reason given by 'Aeneas' at the beginning of the chapter 'De scindatione fonorum' (*epit.* 10.1): 'Aeneas . . . "o fili", inquit, "ob tres causas fona finduntur: prima est ut sagacitatem discentium nostrorum in inquirendis atque inueniendis hiiis quae obscura sunt approbemus; secunda est propter decorem aedificationemque eloquentiae; tertia ne mystica quaeque, et quae solis gnaris pandi debent . . ."'

⁶ Aus. *epist.* 15.36–8 Green: 'uilla LVCANI mox potieris ACO. / Resciso disces componere nomine uersum; / Lucili uatis sic imitator eris'. The fact is that, as far as we can see, Lucilius offers very few tmeses, and of a very common type (basically, in compound words); for instance, *conque . . . tubernalem* (fr. 1137 Marx), cited by Consentius, *G. L.*, V, p. 391.1–2 K.
⁷ Porphyryon, *ad. Hor. epist.* 2.2.93–4, on the division of *circumspectemus* (ed. A. Holder [Innsbruck, 1894, repr. Hildesheim, 1967]): 'una pars orationis est diuisa in duos uersos Luci< > i more et antiquorum'. See C. O. Brink, *Epistles. Book II* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 321; R. P. H. Green, *The Works of Ausonius* (Oxford, 1991), p. 636.

⁸ Verg. *ecl.* 7.36 (also *georg.* 3.62); Calp. Sic. 2.47, 5.38.

⁹ Verg. *ecl.* 1.76.

¹⁰ Calp. Sic. 2.2; also Verg. *georg.* 3.287. In late poetry, e.g. Aus. *epigr.* 80.2 Green; Drac. *laud. dei* 2.455; Coripp. *Iust.* 4.199. As a noun, it is not uncommon: TLL, s.v. 930.55–65; Verg. *Aen.* 7.93; Juvenc. 4.266.

¹¹ Sidonius Apollinaris, *carm.* 4.1 'Tityrus ut quondam patulae sub tegmine fagi'; Hosidius Geta, *Medea* 1.131; *Versus ad gratiam domini* (AL 719a R); Damasus (?), *carm.* 2.1 Ferrua: 'Tityre, tu fido recubans sub tegmine Christi'; Mavortius *Iudicium Paridis* (AL 10.2 R) 'forte recenset numerum sub tegmine fagi'.

Some other terms, although not attested in the generic models, are in keeping with a bucolic atmosphere. This is the case of *glandifera* (replacing the Vergilian *quercus*), which is not unknown to the poetical tradition since Lucretius,¹² and of *triticea*, which occurs in the *Georgics* and Ovid, as well as in poets well known in Visigothic poetry.¹³ *Bubulcus* does not occur in the extant classical eclogues, although cows, oxen, and heifers are the basic props of bucolic poetry. The same applies to the word *porcellus*. It may not be a poetic word, nor are pigs usually found in the idyllic setting;¹⁴ however, pigs would look not too unrealistic in a country landscape. Even a word as rare as *sitibunda*, which occurs also in Venantius Fortunatus, is not inconsistent.¹⁵

This last point calls our attention to the set of learned terms used by Eugenius, unusual in the generic models: *sitibunda*, *lympharum pocula*, *glandiferae*, *lanigeras*. It is as if Eugenius intended to emphasize his lexical erudition and his extensive knowledge of the literary tradition. Thus, the very lexicon becomes part of the poetic game.¹⁶

In short, whatever its playful character, this section evokes a bucolic setting through an exhibition of lexical erudition. Therefore, camels appear to be an unwelcome interference from another, more grotesque universe.¹⁷ And if indeed *hoc erat in uotis*, we would expect other disparate elements, not one single and isolated word. I wonder whether Eugenius wrote CA-PELLAS rather than CA-MELOS.¹⁸ The end of the hexameter is, in fact, the natural position to place 'capellae': all the fifteen occurrences of the term in Vergil are at the end of the line. Some parallels are striking: set 'cerne CAPAScentes dumoso in litore -PELLAS' against *ecl.* 1.76–7: '*dumosa . . . de rupe uidebo*; 1 . . . non me *pascente, capellae*'; 3.96: '*Tityre, pascentis a flumine reice capellas*'.¹⁹

2. Eug. *carm.* 21 (Vollmer)

<Compesce> lacrimas, subduc suspiria lector,
non iacet in tumulto res lacrimanda <nimis>
hic raptus recubat felici sorte sacerdos,
quem laetum caelis intulit alma fides,
nomine baptistam referens et mente Iohannem
doctrina pollens, uirginitate nitens,
corde pius, uultu placidus et mente benignus,

5

¹² Lucr. 5.939; Ov. *met.* 12.328. The noun form (*glandifera, ae*) is not found elsewhere in poetry, but occurs sometimes in Pliny (see *TLL* s.v. 'glandifer', 2029.17–26).

¹³ Verg. *georg.* 1.219; Ov. *met.* 5.486; *fast.* 1.693. In late poetry, e.g. Juvenc. 1.377, 2.805; Prud. *ham.* 218; c. *Symm.* 2.939; Ven. Fort. *carm.* 2.9.63. The word occurs also in the biblical texts: Genesis 30.14; Exodus 34.22; Judges 15.1.

¹⁴ See, however, Verg. *ecl.* 10.19 (also *georg.* 2.520). *Porcellus* occurs only in Phaedrus and *AL* 230.2 R.

¹⁵ Ven. Fort. *Vita S. Radegundis*, 51. The *topos* is found in Calp. Sic. 2.5, 4.168, 5.57; Nemes. 1.87.

¹⁶ Word position evokes the poetical tradition. For instance, *litore* is in a conventional position: cf. P. Mastandrea, *De fine versus. Repertorio di clausole ricorrenti nella poesia dattilica latina* (Hildesheim/Zürich/New York, 1993), pp. 449–55; on *pocula*, see *ibid.*, p. 670; on *carmine*, pp. 103–9.

¹⁷ This is the case for the other occurrence of the word in Eugenius: a didactic poem on the 'voices of the animals' (41.3 *quod bos mugitu fingit blateratque camelus*).

¹⁸ Professor Reeve reminds me that in the textual tradition of *Culex*, *camelo* (-ae) at verse 1 appears as a corruption of *camenae* in some late manuscripts (Walther, *Initia*, 17414, from Paris lat. 8027, f. 6; see the edition of E. Giomini [Firenze, 1962], p. 5).

¹⁹ Prisc. *G.L.* II, p. 14.19 K.

prudenter simplex, simpliciter sapiens.	
omnibus in studiis tantum celebratus habetur,	
cedat ut ingenio Graecia docta suo	10
<non uerbo aut facto hic quemquam la>esit iniquo	
<c>um boni<ta>te pius, cum pietate bonus.	
<non sibi mul>tiplices auri congesit aceruos	
<s>ed <praestans> miseris largus ubique fuit	
<e>t b<reuis immo>dicum tenuit sic corpore mundum,	15
u>t semper animo cerneret ille deum. [. . .]	

John of Zaragoza's epitaph (d. 631) is to be found in two manuscripts. One of them is *A* (León, AC fr. 8), now a disordered set of leaves written in the second half of the ninth century in the south of Spain.²⁰ It was once a carefully written volume containing a copy of Juvenecus' poem and Eugenius' *Libellus diuersi carminis*, as Ildephonsus of Toledo named it (*De uiris illustribus* 13, ed. Codoñer). On f. 10, it offers verses 5–30 of John's epitaph. A hole in the vellum mutilated, on the recto of the leaf, the left hand side of verses 5–11, and, on the verso, the right hand side of verses 25–30; the remaining text is difficult to read. The other surviving manuscript is *M* (Madrid, BN 10029), a volume composed of several ninth-century sections copied by scribes from the south of Spain, with some additions from the tenth century. On the whole, it preserves a noteworthy anthology of poetry comprising very important ninth-century copies of late authors, such as Corippus, Juvenecus, Dracontius, and Verecundus.²¹ *M* contains two anthologies of Eugenius. John's epitaph on f. 68v is today the last poem of the second anthology. Unfortunately, it contains only verses 1–10, since the poem is at the very end of quire VIII and the following one is lost. The initial words of the first line are missing, for the upper part of the leaf was torn off.

There is something that Vollmer did not know. In the eleventh century, the first sixteen lines of Eugenius' poem were actually reused in the epitaph of bishop Ordoño of Astorga (d. 1066), which was carved in stone.²² This is not totally surprising, as there is further evidence that Eugenius' poetry was popular in the eleventh century in the region around León. León AC 8, for instance, written in León in the second half of the tenth century, offers a *prologus* composed sometime around 1050–1060, consisting of a re-creation of Eugenius' poem 41.²³ This poem of Eugenius occurs in León AC 22, dated to the ninth century, which at this period was in the monastery of St Cosmas and St Damian of Abellar, near León.²⁴ Secondly, it is very plausible that our *A* arrived in the tenth century at the region of León, where it has remained ever since, as the presence of some neumata of the 'northern' type seems to imply (see f. 10). Finally, we should also notice that, among the books Cixila offered to the monastery of Abellar (November 927), there was one *Eugenii et Marci Catonis liber I* and one *diuersos libellos* [sic!] *omni Eugenii liber I* (Tumbo de León, ff. 384–6). Ordoño's

²⁰ M. C. Díaz y Díaz, *Códices visigóticos en la Monarquía Leonesa* (León, 1983), pp. 257–68.

²¹ Described in M. C. Díaz y Díaz, *Manuscritos visigóticos del sur de la Península. Ensayo de distribución regional* (Sevilla, 1995), pp. 130–4.

²² On Ordoño, see A. Quintana Prieto, *El obispado de Astorga en el siglo XI* (Astorga, 1977), pp. 255–341.

²³ See Díaz y Díaz (n. 20), pp. 308–9. The *prologi* were published in id., *Archivos Leoneses* 8 (1954), 228–34.

²⁴ On León AC 22, see Díaz y Díaz (n. 20), pp. 55–88; id. (n. 21), pp. 69–77. The central part, in which Eugenius' poems are to be found (they occur on f. 30v–32v), was produced in Córdoba around A.D. 820–35; at the end of the ninth century it was moved to León by a certain 'Samuel', and at the beginning of the tenth century it was already in the monastery of Abellar, where it remained until the beginning of the twelfth century, when it was moved to the Cathedral of León.

epitaph was published by Henrique Flórez (*España Sagrada*, 16 [Madrid, 1762], p. 182), who claims that the stone could be seen in Astorga, embedded in the main altar of the church of St Martha. Some years ago, the inscription was found, and it is at present an exhibit in the Museo de los Caminos in Astorga.²⁵

The inscription is damaged. On the right upper part, the ends of the lines are missing; on the right hand side, two holes have mutilated the text.²⁶ In the first seven lines, the characters are artistically arranged: sometimes, the letters are placed one above the other; in most of the cases, each syllable has to be read vertically. I transcribe below the text corresponding to Eugenius' poem, keeping the division of lines offered by the inscription.

† TOLLE PRECOR LACRIMAS SVBDV [
LECTOR NON IACET IN TVMVLO RES LACRIMA . DA DIV	
HIC RAPTVS RECVBAT FELICI SORTES SA . . . D [
LETVM CELIS INTVLIT ALMA FIDES N . MINE OR[
POLLENS VIRGINITATE NITENS CORDE PIVS VVL[5
BENIGNVS PRVDENTER SIMPLEX SIMPLICITER SAPIENS OM . I B . . . N . VDI . S	
TANTVM CELEBRATVS HABETVR CEDAT VT INGENIO ROMA DOCTA SVO	
NON ALIQVEM VERBO NON FACTO LESIT INICO BONITATE	
PIVS CVM PIETATE BONVS NON QVAVM MVLTIPLICES	
AVRI CONGESSIT ACERBOS SET DAND[10
LARGVS VBIQVE FVIT VT BR[
TENVIT SIC CORPORE MVNDV[
O CERNERET ILLE D [

4 INTVLIT in margine sinistro additum cum signo responsionis ante ALMA

The transcription of the text of the inscription given by Flórez is not totally accurate. Ostensible inaccuracies are (I refer to Eugenius' verse numbering): in verse 1, he presents a mistaken *cessent* against the reading *subduc* found in both *M* and the inscription; as verse 5, Flórez presents a wild invention (*Ordonius cui nomen erat, sed episcopus, alta*), for it is impossible that it was ever in the stone;²⁷ in verse 8, *simpliciter* must be the original reading, not Flórez's unmetrical *simplicitate*; *habetur* (verse 9) in both manuscripts is also the reading in the inscription (against *ut illi* in Flórez's text); the line in the inscription which corresponds to Eugenius' verse 10 reads *cedat ut ingenio Roma docta*, not *cederet eloquio Roma diserta* as given by Flórez; in verse 12 there is no *cum* preceding *bonitate* and in verse 13 the inscription has not *non qui*, as in Flórez's edition, but something like *non quau*; verse 16 is partly missing in the inscription and consequently there is no way of knowing whether Flórez's *ut corde atque animo cerneret ille deum* was in the original medieval text, but there are no sound reasons to infer that it was substantially different from what we find in the manuscript. Therefore, Flórez's text is far from being reliable; but, considering that the part of the text at present mutilated by the holes on the

²⁵ Díaz y Díaz (n. 3), pp. 117–22 (a study published before the rediscovery of the stone); also id. (n. 20), p. 267, n. 32. I am deeply grateful to Professor Díaz y Díaz for having shared his notes with me.

²⁶ The lower left part of the stone, corresponding to lines 10–14 of Ordoño's epitaph, is a little damaged, but apparently this did not affect the text of the inscription.

²⁷ Considering the number of missing letters and the text in the manuscripts, it is very likely that there was something like *Or<donius doctrina> pollens*.

²⁷ Possibly, Flórez's text derives not directly from the inscription itself, but from a late sixteenth- or early seventeenth-century copy in vellum which was on a wall of the church of St Martha (see Quintana Prieto [n. 22], pp. 325–6).

right-hand side might still have been read by his source, we should not ignore it completely.²⁸

Ordoño's epitaph was very closely modelled on Eugenius' poem. The only visible changes were inevitable: the identification of the deceased (though we have only the first two letters in the inscription, OR[, they seem to confirm Flórez's *Ordonius*); the replacement of *Graecia* by *Roma*, most likely because the reference to Ordoño's Greek culture would strike an unrealistic note. Besides, in verse 12 the first *cum* is missing, which is not very significant, especially after *inico*.²⁹ Therefore, the medieval inscription sheds light on several lacunae in the manuscript tradition.

Verse 1. In *M*, the upper part of the leaf was torn off, eliminating the initial words. However, the lower part of the vertical lines of the letters of these words are still visible. The first vertical line corresponds to something like a capital I, P, F, or even a T, if the curved upper line on the left-hand side did not start at the lower part of the letter but higher, which is not uncommon for a Visigothic capital *t*. Clearly, the initial letter is not a C, against Vollmer's conjecture (*compesce*, which implies a lengthening in the *arsis* of the second foot, something not improbable, however, in Eugenius). In addition, the other vertical lines might correspond to the *p* and *r* of *precor*. Consequently, TOLLE PRECOR should be accepted, though this verb is not commonly found in the context of tears (see, however, Hor. *epod.* 16.39 *muliebrem tollite luctum*).³⁰ *Tolle precor* is not unusual (Ov. *met.* 5.218; Juv. 6.170; Ven. Fort. *carm.* 3.9.71), and *tollo* in the sense of 'to eliminate', 'to remove', is found in Eugenius (16.4 *elue probra, pater, et uitae crimina tolle*; 77.4 *tolle monstra, stringe fibras et soporem tempera*; 101.25 *tolle tot monstra, deus, imprecanti*).

Verse 2. The second lacuna in the manuscript tradition occurs at the end of the first pentameter. In *M* there is a sequence that is difficult to read: it looks like *lacrimā diu* (cf. Heller's conjecture, *lacrimanda diu*). The inscription offers DIV, which is perfectly acceptable. In this context, *diu* is not uncommon (for instance, Ven. Fort. *Mart.* 4.555 *non apud hunc opus ecce diu lacrimando rigari*; CLE 1401.6 *nam quae grata forent, sunt modo flenda diu*).

Verse 11. The inscription bears NON ALIQVEM VERBO, NON FACTO LESIT INICO. It is very close to Vollmer's conjecture <*non uerbo aut facto hic quemquam la>esit iniquo*, and should be accepted.

Verse 13. The meaning of the distich must be 'John did not enrich himself, but always distributed wealth to the poor.' This was also in Vollmer's mind (<*non sibi mul>tiplices auri conguessit acruos*; cf. CLE 1436.6 *prodiga pauperibus, nam sibi parca nimis*). The only readable words in the manuscript are: [*lacuna c. 10–11 litt.*] *ti* [*lacuna 3 litt.*] *ces auri conguessit acruos*; the first part of the line, corresponding to ten or eleven letters, is unreadable, although remains of the first three letters are visible (possibly *non* or *nun*). Now, the inscription offers NON QVVM MVLTIPLEX (. . .). Below the first V we can make out an A. My impression is that the model presented something like '*nonquum*'; this is *numquam* written by a Visigothic scribe. A possible explanation for the 'mixed' *nonquum* is that, after having written QVA, the agent who

²⁸ I may add that the number of letters erased by the lower hole at the right margin of the epigraphic text corresponds precisely to the number of letters given in the text of the manuscript. For the upper hole, it is difficult to make an accurate calculation since the words are not written horizontally.

³⁰ See also Paul. Nola, *carm.* 18.456–7 '*dempisti causam lacrimarum, tolle modo orta/ uulnera de lacrimis*'.

prepared the text for the engraver wrongly added a V, misreading the Visigothic open *a*.³¹ The sense then is 'Ordoño never accumulated piles of gold, but . . .'.

Verse 14. The inscription supplements the lacuna in the manuscript: *sed dando miseris largus ubique fuit*.³²

Verse 15. At present, we can only read in the manuscript '[lacuna 1 litt.] t bre [8–9 litt. om.] m tenuit sic corpore mundum'. Vollmer's conjecture is <e>t b<reuis immo> dicum . . . mundum. The inscription shows only VT BR[, but this seems good enough to accept *ut breuiter dicam* which is the reading in Flórez's transcription.³³ The brevity *topos* is very common in *carmina epigraphica funebria* (see Damasus, *carm.* 1.25; 40.7 Ferrua); in Eugenius, we find it concluding Basila's epitaph (22.30 *quodque loquor breuiter*). Therefore, the line would have been the conclusion of the *elogium* section, preceding the family *topos*. Thus, 'mundum' would remain without attribute, which is not surprising since it is a Christian term (Eug. 1.19 *da, precor, auxilium, possim quo uincere mundum*);³⁴ and the parallelism *corpore–animo, mundum–deum* is underlined. The repetition of *ut* in consecutive lines is inelegant, but not impossible.

Other improvements in the subsequent verses may be suggested without the support provided by Ordoño's epitaph. In verse 22, *animam* is in the manuscript instead of *animum*. In the last two lines, I propose an epanaleptic distich: *digna tuis me<riti>s non <. . .>:/ sint peto quae cecini digna <tuis meritis>*, a solution suggested by the repetition of *digna*. This is one of the most remarkable features of Eugenius' versification: there are complete epanaleptic poems (10 and 29), and a wide use of epanaleptic distichs as a rhetorical device (4.11–12, 9.21–2, 22.29–30, 25.9–10, 36.9–10, 97.23–4). Excepting *carm.* 25 and 36, the epanalepsis is always in the concluding distich.

3. Eug. *carm.* 14 (Vollmer) and 14b

In Vollmer's edition, the poem numbered as 14 (*Lamentum de aduentu propriae senectutis*) comprises four sections: (A) introduction (elegiacs; 6 verses); (B) *lamentatio* on old age (iambic trimeters in six five-line stanzas: see Prud. *cath.* 7 and *perist.* 10); (C) *lamentatio* on death, repentance and prayer (elegiacs; 44 verses); (D) an episode pertaining to an illness which once befell the poet (five sapphic stanzas). I suggest that in Vollmer's *carm.* 14 we have two poems: A + B + C, a much more common tripartite structure; and D, a piece which I call *carm.* 14b, which is very likely to refer to the previous poem 14. I shall consider two kinds of arguments.³⁵

(i) Literary evidence. I see three points to support my view. First, it seems clear to

³¹ Another possible explanation is that the agent wrote NONQVVM, misreading the Visigothic *a*; and when he realized his mistake, an *a* was added to the first *u*. This, however, seems more unlikely because of the height of the 'vv'. Probably the second 'v' was not erased since that would totally destroy the layout he had so carefully arranged. One should note that in line 4, the engraver added in the left margin *intulit*, which had been forgotten.

³² For *dando* in poetry, see Ven. Fort. *carm.* 3.9.60, 3.14.20, 7.14.25, 8.3.298, 8.12.8. In the context of 'richness', see Ov. *trist.* 5.14.11: *non ego diuitias dando tibi plura dedissem*; Pont. 2.8.7: *non mihi diuitias dando maiora dedisses*; Commod. *instr.* 2.14.24: *in dando diuitias uestras ostendite totas*.

³³ Sen. *Phoen.* 297: *breuiter ut dicam*; Mart. 12.22.2.

³⁴ See also Prud. *perist.* 10.545; Ven. Fort. *carm.* 8.5.3, 9.11.6.

³⁵ On this issue, see S. J. Heyworth, 'Dividing poems', in O. Pecere and M. D. Reeve (edd.), *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Spoleto, 1995), pp. 117–48.

me that the content of section D is very distinct from A + B + C. It deals with an 'occasional' episode (an illness which once befell the poet); prayers, references to repentance, topics such as illness, old age, or death used as paraenetic or eschatological elements, which are so common in A + B + C and in Eugenius' poetry in general, are absent here. Moreover, D appears to be complete in itself.

Secondly, it is common for Eugenius to conclude poems with a prayer.³⁶ Sometimes, the poems seem to be composed simply to reach this final point. Now, in Vollmer's *carm.* 14, the climax is at the end of section C. There is no other example in Eugenius' poetry in which the prayer to God stands in the middle of the composition. The clausular flavour of the end of C is quite obvious.

Thirdly, one should note that A + B + C may be a unit by itself. A is linked to B (verse 5 *ante tamen nostris ipsa pandetur iambis/ quam noceat . . .*). C might be linked to B (see the last line of B *iam mors cruenta nostra pulsat limina*, and the first line of C, *o mors omniuorax, ad te nunc uerto querellam*). In addition, we should note that A + B + C offers a coherent progression from a general introduction to the prayer which begs God to accept the poet in Heaven. D is unnecessary and looks illogical.³⁷

(ii) Manuscript indications. The poem occurs in *FPM* A. The two Spanish manuscripts present a small detail which passed unnoticed by Vollmer: both *M* and *A* bear in the left margin a symbol like a $\sqrt{}$, which is frequently found in Visigothic manuscripts as a 'signe de renvoi'. The right hand stroke continues in a long horizontal line which enters the text, separating the last line of C from the first line of D. No such sign occurs between A, B, and C. In *A*, the sign was painted in the same red ink as that of the titles and of the initials of poems. In *M*, after the final line of C, the copyist wrote also METRO SAFICO as the heading of D. Obviously, this is not conclusive. There is no way of knowing whether this derived from the original poet's text, or was introduced into the textual tradition sometime later. Unfortunately, the other manuscripts containing Eugenius' poems do not offer further help. In *P* there is no distinctive mark separating the sections (Eugenius' anthology presents no painted titles nor painted capitals). In *F*, the first word of D (*Nosse*) was written in the same red ink as that of the titles (like the initial O in C).

4. Eug. *carm.* *praef.* 15 (Vollmer)

at tu, qui nostras tranquillo pectore nugas
perlegis et blande rustica uerba foues,

³⁶ See, for instance, poems 5, 13, 19, 35, and 101.

³⁷ This polymetric structure reminds us of Paulinus of Nola's *carm.* 21. The first section in dactylic hexameters is followed by a second in iambic trimeters, after which there is a section in elegiacs and one in dactylic hexameters. The way Paulinus links the sections is not very different from Eugenius. At the end of the first section, we find 'iamque intertextis elegus succedat iambis/ sit caput herous fundamentumque libello' (21.103-4); at the beginning of section 4, we have expressions similar to Eugenius' (21.344; 346): 'nunc ad te, uenerande parens, aeternae patrone,/ . . . gratificas uerso referam sermone loquellas'. See also Paul. Nola 10.15-17. Paulinus was known in Visigothic Spain: Hydatius, *chron. Olimp.* 301, ed. Burgess (Oxford, 1993), p. 88; Isid. *orig.* 9.2.90-1 ~ Paul. Nola 17.17; 250-2; see M. C. Díaz y Díaz, 'La transmisión de los textos antiguos en la Península Ibérica en los siglos VII-XI', in *XXIIª Settimana di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo* (Spoleto, 1975), p. 150; N. Messina, 'Le citazioni classiche nelle *Etymologiae* di Isidoro di Siviglia', *Archivos Leoneses* 34 (1980), 224. Vollmer suggests a parallel in Eugenius precisely with *carm.* 21 (compare Eug. 23.5 *uirtutum gemmis et morum flore uenusta* with Paul. 21.75-6 *uirtutum uarias ut uiua monilia gemmas/ . . . gestant*), but it seems rather superficial, for it is a conventional association (Prud. *psych.* 911: *uirtutum gemmas*; Jer. *epist.* 64.22.1: *gemmis floribusque uirtutum*).

sis uita locuples et Christi munere diues
 sermone pollens ingenioque uigens
 suauibus effingens at . . .
 nec uereare libris aemula flabra tuis.

Eug. *carm. praef.* 11–16

PCTRRe, the extant manuscripts containing the first poem of Eugenius' *libellus*, most probably descend from a single corrupt archetype: verse 15 reads *suauibus effinge* (*effinge PR: effinges C effingens TRe*) *sat duo pentametrus*. The second part of the verse as offered by the manuscripts is syntactically and metrically unacceptable. Vollmer therefore marked a lacuna and explained away *duo pentametrus* as an intrusive marginal annotation.³⁸ In *RFIC* 105 (1977), 320–1, Luigi Munzi opened a fresh line of attack on the problem by pointing out that the line is to be found in an *ars grammatica* written around 680–690 (some thirty years after Eugenius' death) and conventionally ascribed to Julian of Toledo, in a context where *sat* for *satis* is exemplified (pp. 192.45–193.49, ed. Maestre Yenes): 'Apocope est ablatio de fine dictionis, . . . sicut 'sat' pro 'satis', ut est illud: *suauibus effingas sat dia poemata metris*.' Considering Ps.-Julian's usual accuracy in quoting Eugenius, there are no sound reasons to refuse the verse.³⁹ This shows that Bücheler was on the right track with his proposal to read *suauibus effingas sat pulcra poemata metris* (which, incidentally, would be far preferable to Vollmer's *suauibus effingas et florida carmina dictis*, suggested in his apparatus). *Sat dia* appears to be an unusual collocation, but it is attested as early as Ps.-Julian, when the line was considered precisely an example of the use of *sat*.⁴⁰ It might mean something like 'poems which are thoroughly *dia*, i.e. "divine", inspired by, and suited to, God'.⁴¹

Munzi missed an important point. The phraseology of *dia poemata* is a quotation of Persius (1.31).⁴² And Persius is an important literary source underlying this very poem of Eugenius. Consider, for instance, verse 3 *quamuis rancidulum rugata fronte susurres*, which strikingly evokes Pers. 1.33 (cf. also Mart. 7.34.7),⁴³ and compare

³⁸ It should be noted that Vollmer's apparatus is inaccurate. I have added Reims BM 431, f. 168v (*Re*) datable to the late twelfth century, which derives from a model close to *T. B* (Bern 36) is omitted as it is a copy of *C*. In the manuscripts of Eugenius, there is no parallel for a marginal 'comment' of this kind.

³⁹ Eugenius is cited sixteen times. Only two quotations are slightly divergent from what we find in the surviving manuscripts: Eug. 13.1 *ue mihi ue misero* ~ Ps.-Jul., ed. Maestre Yenes, pp. 129.48–9 *hei mihi misero*; Ps.-Jul., *De partibus orationis*, ed. L. Munzi, *Ann. Ist. Univ. Or. Napoli* 2–3 (1980–1), 183.5, quotes Eug. 55.1 in a version divergent from that in *M*, which is found in Vat. lat. 5330.

⁴⁰ Ps.-Julian reproduced verbatim the definition and the two examples given by Donatus, *ars G.L.* IV, p. 396.12 *K* and supplemented them with three additional examples; the last one is *sat*, found in Isidore who presents no exemplification (*orig.* 1.35.3: *apocope abscisio de fine, ut 'sat' pro 'satis'*).

⁴¹ *Sat* with the meaning of 'very' is found elsewhere in Eugenius: 9.1 'incolit hoc templum sat felix turba piorum' (cf. *CLE* 1085.4); 89.7. In the case the line should be emended, I am tempted to suggest *effingas ut* which would produce an acceptable meaning: 'with the result that you may produce poems inspired by, or worthy of, God . . .'. Then the corruption would have occurred very early in the textual tradition.

⁴² Professor Diggle reminds me also of Juv. 3.207 *diuina . . . carmina* and Hor. *ars* 416 *mira poemata*. *Diuina poemata* occurs twice in Venantius Fortunatus, an influential poet in Visigothic literature (*carm.* 2.9.19, 8.3.7).

⁴³ The term *rancidulum* is used by medieval poets, possibly imitating Eugenius: Albarus of Cordoba, *carm.* 4.22, ed. J. Gil, *Corpus scriptorum muzarabicorum* I (Madrid, 1973), p. 346: 'sic rancide sanna[s]/ . . . pangit'; perhaps also Engelmodus, *carm.* 1.13 (MGH Poetae III, p. 55) 'nec non rancidulum resones cum pene querelam' (Engelmodus might echo another line of Eugenius: *carm.* 1.114 [MGH Poetae III, p. 58] ~ Eug. 97.19).

nasutas fingere sannas in verse 5 with Pers. 5.91 (cf. also Pers. 1.62; Juv. 6.306).⁴⁴ This is unexceptional. According to Isidore's *Versus in bibliotheca*, Persius' works actually existed in the library at Seville (in fact, Isidore quotes Persius' first satire);⁴⁵ and two pieces probably composed in Visigothic Spain to be found in a ninth-century section of Madrid BN 10029, sandwiched between the poems of Martin of Braga and an anthology of Eugenius (f. 61v–62r), appear to be based on Persius.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, we should be wary of imagining a widespread, first-hand knowledge of Persius. Visigothic acquaintance with classical authors is far more likely to have been formed indirectly, by means of commentaries and scholia.⁴⁷

But what of Eugenius? The above-mentioned parallels are probably not enough to clinch a decision as to whether Eugenius had direct acquaintance with Persius, especially when we need go no further than a possible second-hand acquaintance with him to explain the term *rancidulum* in verse 3 (Pers. 1.33). The reason for this is that Pers. 1.32–3 and 35 was a conventional quotation, found for instance in Jerome (*epist.* 54.5), an author to whom many classical quotations by Visigothic writers are due.⁴⁸ The same quotation was still circulating in Spain two hundred years after Eugenius' death (cf. Albarus of Cordoba, *epist.* 18.14).⁴⁹ Moreover, *rugata fronte* in the same verse is a very common *iunctura* in Jerome, denoting a contemptuous facial expression.⁵⁰

⁴⁴ Mart. Cap. *nupt.* 5.566, verse 8. Eugenius' line was imitated by Albarus of Cordoba (10.29, ed. Gil, I, p. 355).

⁴⁵ Isid. *carmin.* 10.1. See C. Beeson, *Isidor-Studien* (München, 1913), p. 161; A. Ortega, *Helmantica* 12 (1961), 279. The final line of poem 10 quotes the final line of Persius' first satire (*uers.* Isid. 10.10 ~ Pers. 1.134). For a list of quotations of Persius in Isidore's *Etymologies*, see Messina (n. 37), n. 53. Vollmer suggested another echo in Eugenius, also from satire 1: Eug. 33.17 *porrige dulcisonas attentis auribus escas* ~ Pers. 1.22 *tun, uetule, auriculis alienis colligis escas*.

⁴⁶ Ps.-Eug. 27 ~ Pers. 4.23–4; Ps.-Eug. 28 ~ Pers. 4.13.

⁴⁷ Díaz y Díaz (n. 37), pp. 136–42; J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne Wisigothique* II (Paris, 1983), pp. 742–62. The grammatical examples from Persius found in Ps.-Julian's *ars* come from Isidore's *Etymologies*: Pers. 3.11 in Ps.-Jul., ed. Maestre Yenes, p. 205.76, derives from *orig.* 1.37.7 (also found in 'Isidorus Iunior', ed. U. Schindel, *Die lateinischen Figurenlehren des 5. bis 7. Jahrhunderts und Donats Vergilkommentar* [Göttingen, 1975], p. 223.390); Pers. 3.84 and 5.79–81 in Ps.-Jul., p. 201.145–8, are found in *orig.* 1.36.17 (the last one is also in 'Isid. Iunior', p. 215.225).

⁴⁸ In this letter addressed to Furia, Jerome uses Pers. 1.32–3 and 35 to caricature nurses. In this way, he tries to comfort Furia, who has recently become a widow, because she will never have children. The fact that Persius' lines are out of context and far from the original sense suggests that, in Jerome's day, they constituted a popular quotation. For Jerome as a source of classical quotations in Spain, see J. Madoz, 'Fuentes jeronimianas en el epistolario de S. Braulio de Zaragoza', *Gregorianum* 20 (1939), 407–22; id., *Epistolario de Braulio de Zaragoza* (Madrid, 1941), pp. 57ff.; id., 'Citas e reminiscencias clásicas en los Padres españoles', *Sacris Erudiri* 5 (1953), 105–132; M. C. Díaz y Díaz, *De Isidoro al siglo XI. Ocho estudios sobre la vida literaria peninsular* (Barcelona, 1976), p. 31. L. Riesco Terrero suggests that one expression in Braulion might have been modelled on this very same epistle of Jerome (*Epistolario de San Braulio* [Sevilla, 1975], p. 170: Braul. *epist.* 44.83 ~ Jer. *epist.* 54.18; see also Jer. *epist.* 3.6).

⁴⁹ Albarus of Cordoba quotes Pers. 1.33 and 35 in a dispute on religious subjects (ed. Gil, I, p. 257): 'Set dicis: numquid tu maiores domos Ihesu tuo facis quam illi diis suis fecerunt, quum hunus ex his ita sue delubris defeat causa: *Ei mici, iam uideo subitis lapsura ruinis! condita fana diu templi quoque nobilis edem?* Pro quod nos ista subiungimus: *Rancidulum quiddam ualba de nare locutus! prestrepis ac tenero supplantas uerba palato*'. The citation derives perhaps from Jerome, a very influential model in Albarus' epistles (cf. J. Madoz, 'Fuentes jeronimianas en el Epistolario de Albaro de Cordoba', *RET* 4 [1944], 211–27 [the problem I present here is not considered]).

⁵⁰ C. Ioh. 4 ('*rugata fronte et obliquis oculis despicias?*': cf. Eugenius' first verse '*obliquo memet uisu qui figis, ocelle?*'); in *psalm.* 2.17; in *Zach.* 2.7; in *Eph.* 2.525; *ad Tit.* col. 601, 1; *epist.* 117.9, 125.18. As a sign of great inner pain motivating repentance, it is to be found, in the same metrical position, in a poem popular in Visigothic authors and possibly well known to Eugenius:

A hitherto overlooked point should now be mentioned: *dia poemata* occurs solely in Persius (1.31) and Eugenius. This makes the hypothesis of knowledge of Pers. 1.33 through this particular quotation in Jerome implausible, since Pers. 1.31 is absent from Jerome. Furthermore, the contexts in which Persius' lines appear in Eugenius and Jerome tell a significant story of their own. Eugenius is the only writer who follows Persius in using the expressions in a context that refers to literary criticism. This is not the case for Jerome and Albarus of Cordoba. To me, this suggests that Eugenius read these lines of the Roman satirist in the original context, either in a larger section or even in the complete text of Persius' poem rather than in Jerome or any other writer.

Universidade de Lisboa

PAULO F. ALBERTO
pfa@iltec.itec.pt

Verecundus, *satisfact.* 4: 'pectore conpuncto, *rugata fronte* rigare?' (with commentary by M. G. Bianco [Napoli, 1984], pp. 86–7).