

NOTES, CRITICAL AND INTERPRETATIVE, ON THE LETTERS OF SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY

SOME YEARS AGO I remarked in this periodical¹ that the Loeb edition of Sidonius' poems by W. B. Anderson (1936) is an ornament to its series. The volume also contained two Books of Sidonius' letters. The other seven appeared in a second volume in 1965, six years after Anderson's death. As explained by B. H. Warmington in the preface (viii), the greater part of Anderson's manuscript of Books 4–9 "was in pencil, full of tentative corrections and alternative phrases, roughly written—sometimes scribbled—as a first draft with marginal queries and reminders." It was revised for publication by Anderson's former Manchester colleague W. H. Semple.²

The only previous version of the letters which Anderson thought worth notice (lxx) is that of O. M. Dalton (Oxford 1915), which "does not profess to follow the Latin closely;" there are no commentaries to speak of since Sirmondi's (1652), which has practically nothing on the verbal side. As in the poems therefore, Anderson's work is mainly pioneer, the work of "an excellent Latinist, meticulous and clear-headed." It also succeeds perhaps as well as any version could in doing justice to Sidonius' fantastic notions of how to write Latin prose. But, partly no doubt because it lacked the author's finishing hand, errors of interpretation are not very rare. Occasionally these have been corrected in the Budé edition of A. Loyer (1970), which in general follows Anderson closely.

Warmington's view that Sidonius is in need of explanation rather than emendation is not to be disputed. His accompanying precept that "the common urge to emend should normally confine itself to suggestions" (xiv) seems to rest on a misconception. Sidonius is admittedly a difficult writer, who loved to wrap his usually quite straightforward meaning in pompous verbiage, but in the end he makes sense, not nonsense. His text is well-preserved, but certainly not perfect. Its emendation is subject to the usual criteria, its editors have the usual prerogatives and the usual obligations.

1.1.2 *nam de M. Tullio silere me<lius> puto, quem in stilo epistulari nec Iulius Titianus sub nominibus illustrium feminarum digna similitudine expressit; propter quod illum ceteri quique Frontonianorum utpote consecraneum aemulati, cur veternosum dicendi genus imitaretur, oratorum simiam nuncupaverunt.*

¹*Phoenix* 30 (1976) 242.

²On the title page Anderson is described as "formerly Hulme Professor of Latin in the University of Manchester." When Housman died in 1936, he was succeeded as Kennedy Professor of Latin in Cambridge by Anderson, who held the post until his retirement.

This Julius Titianus, then, was a follower of Fronto, a literary archaizer. He also produced a pastiche of Cicero's letters, which, however, could not have aped *veternosum*³ *dicendi genus*. For Titianus did not confine his mimicries to the antique authors cultivated by Fronto and his school. The only other reference to him is *HA Maximin.* 27.5 *dictus est simia temporis sui*,⁴ *quod cuncta esset imitatus*. But according to Sidonius, the name of "ape" was given to him by his jealous fellow-Frontonians "because he imitated archaic style;" *not*, therefore, because he imitated Cicero's letters. *Propter quod* has to be understood loosely as referring to his general imitative activity. Furthermore, a pastiche of Cicero's letters could hardly earn him the title of "ape of the orators." And so I suggest *barbatorum* = *antiquorum*. *Barbatus* "proverbialiter fere de antiquis Romanis" (*Thes.*) occurs as late as Juvenal (4.103 *facile est barbato imponere regi*; cf. 16.31 f. *dignum barba dignumque capillis/maiorum*). The usage disappeared after beards came back into fashion, but may well have been still current in Fronto's day. Apparently the Frontonians felt that Titianus carried archaism too far, to the point of absurdity.

1.2.5 *quidve cupias percuti prior admonet (ut eligas); eligis quid feriat; quod elegeris ferit.*

Anderson's supplement is excellent, but there is no need for *ut*; cf. *Thes.* 1.767.63⁵, Sidon. *Epist.* 1.9.7 *moneo . . . exaeques*. Put after *prior*, *metri causa*.

1.2.7 *secundas fastidit vel timere vel facere, quarum opportunitates spernit oblatas, transit oppositas.*

"This appears to mean that Theodoric would permit his opponent a second throw, if the first proved unlucky, but scorned to take advantage of such a concession himself. Possibly, as Anderson suggests in a footnote, the rules of the game allowed a player this licence at certain junctures." So I wrote in support of a novel interpretation of *per talos . . . secundos* in Prop. 4.8.45 (*Propertiana* [Cambridge 1956] 255). Two other passages seem to be connected with the gaming term *secundae* (*tesserae*) or *secundi tali*: Sen. *Dial.* 9.10.6 *praeparent multa ad secundos casus praesidia* (mauled by translators; the meaning is "let them prepare many supports for a second chance," i.e., against the day when they may need to try for one) and Suet. *Otho* 9.3 *quas (copias) secum ad secundos casus detinuerat*.

1.5.7 *hinc Ariminum Fanumque perveni, illud Iuliana rebellione memorabile, hoc Hasdrubaliano funere infectum.*

"The latter dyed with Hasdrubal's life-blood." Rather *funere* = *clade*, referring to the Carthaginian army. A similar point arises in Florus 2.

³"Antique" rather than "outworn" ("suranné"); cf. 8.16.4, 9.16.2.

⁴As, e.g., Joe Louis might be called "the bruiser of his generation."

⁵Where the citation from Cic. *Tull.* 17 should be replaced by one from *Fam.* 1.7.10 (see my note on the latter).

6(3.18).12, on which see *HSCP* 85 (1981) 174 (cf. also Luc. 1.104 *miserando funere Crassus/ Assyrias Latio maculavit sanguine Carrhas*).

1.10.1 *accepi per praefectum annonae litteras tuas, quibus eum tibi sodalem veterem mihi insinuas⁶ iudici novo. gratias ago magnas illi, maximas tibi, quod statuistis de amicitia mea vel praesumere tuta vel illaesa credere.*

"That you have both decided either to count on my friendship's being safe or at least to believe that nothing has yet impaired it." *credere* had been better understood by K. -Å. Mossberg: "lita på min vänskap såsom säker och tro på den såsom obruten (i.e., orubblig gentemot varje misstanka)." But *vel . . . vel* is not equivalent to *et . . . et* here (Anderson is right in that). There were two ways of looking at the matter. You could say that Campanianus took Sidonius' friendship for granted (*praesumere*), as safe from any possible interruption; or, more conservatively, that he trusted it, since nothing had happened to damage it so far.

3.7.1 *longum a litteris temperatis. igitur utrique nostrum mos suus agitur: ego garrio, vos tacetis. unde etiam, vir ad reliqua fidei officia insignis, genus reor esse virtutis tanto te otio non posse lassari.*

The vocative *vir . . . insignis*, side-stepped by the translators ("as you are conspicuously diligent . . .") is incredible, and *reor* makes wretched sense. I suggest: *anne etiam . . . genus rere esse virtutis . . . lassari?*

3.13.2 *est enim hic . . . tempora praesentia colens, praeterita carpens, futura fastidians; beneficii, si rogaturus est, importunus petendi derogator negati, aemulator accepti callidus reformandi, querulus flagitati garrulus restituti.*

The subject is a (doubtless imaginary) epitome of all the unpleasant characteristics Sidonius can think of. *Callidus reformandi* should follow *importunus petendi*, making a triad of internally balanced pairs. As for the meaning, Loyen is wrong ("madré quand il faut rendre") and Anderson not quite right ("cunning in amending the terms"). If his request is not granted in full, "Gnatho" will cunningly remodel it.

3.13.3 *sed sic quoque levitate parasitica, si invitetur, excusans; si vitetur, explorans; si excludatur, exprobrans; si admittatur, exsultans; si verberetur, exspectans.*

The last item is misunderstood by Anderson ("if he is beaten, he bides

⁶*insinuate* = "recommend" is regular in Sidonius. E. Fraenkel's unawareness of this post-classical use led him astray (see my *Profile of Horace* [London and Cambridge, Mass. 1982] 15).

⁷*Studia Sidoniana* (diss. Upsala 1934) 82: "that you decided both to rely on my friendship as secure and trust to it as unbroken (i.e., immovable against any suspicion)."

his time") and Loyen ("sait attendre si on le malmène"). This *vesicarum ruptor fractorque ferularum* (4) is patient under blows. For *expectans* = *sustinens* cf., e.g., Tac. *Dial.* 20.1 *quis quinque in Verrem libros expectabit?* (*Thes.* 5.2.1892.27). But I have little doubt that Sidonius wrote *exceptans*; cf. *Carm.* 2.546 *gaudentes exceptant verbera malae*. The passage recalls Epicharmus' parasite (Kaibel, fr. 35), who welcomes a beating from the police.

3.14.2 *atque in hunc modum scientia pompa proprietas linguae Latinae iudiciis otiosorum maximo spretui est, quorum scurrilitati negligentia comes hoc volens tantum legere, quod carpat, sic non utitur litteris quod abuitur.*

"Cannot, by their very abuse of literature, be making a proper use of it" (Anderson); "usent moins des lettres qu'ils en abusent" (Loyen). Elsewhere (403 n. 2) Semple remarks upon Sidonius' frequent use of *sic* . . . *quod* in "exactly the sense of the classical *ita* . . . *ut* in contrasting phrases." So in 3.13.6 (*nasus*) *sic patescit horrori quod angustatur olfactui* Anderson renders "gaping wide enough to give you the creeps, yet too narrow for the sense of smell." Sometimes *tamen* is found in the *quod* clause. In fact *sic* . . . *quod* always has this meaning in Sidonius except in 5.13.2 *at ille sic ira celer quod piger mole*, which seems to be careless writing, as though meant to mean *sic piger mole quod celer ira*.⁸ Here then render "does not use (i.e., cultivate) literature and yet abuses it."

4.3.8 *iam vero de hymno tuo si percontere quid sentiam, commaticus est copiosus, dulcis elatus, et quoslibet lyricos dithyrambos amoenitate poetica et historica veritate supereminet.*

"It combines the charm of a poet with the veracity of a historian to a degree not found in any lyrical dithyramb you care to name." And not likely to be found, lyrical dithyrambs being hardly the place to go for historical veracity. Read *et* *(historiam quamlibet)* *historica veritate*.

4.4.3 *porro autem cum vir bonus ab omnibus censeatur, non est homo peior, si non est optimus.*

"Since all rate him as a good man, he cannot be of less than average quality, even if he is not of the highest excellence" (Anderson, with a reference to Semple's *Quaestiones Exegeticae Sidoniana* [Cambridge 1930] 23.⁹ I should prefer: "suppose he is not the very best of men, he is still not a bad man," taking the comparative as equivalent to a positive—

⁸To the eight other examples in C. Luetjohann's index (Berlin 1887, p. 476) add 4.21.2 and 6.

⁹I have so far been unable to consult this work, which is not listed in the Library of Congress catalogue.

common late-Latin usage, as in Sidonius' favourite form of address, *domine maior*.

4.6.4 *quod tempus, quantum ad sectatores litium spectat, breve quidem saepe est audientiae sed diuturnum semper iniuriae.*

The season is winter: "a season which . . . is often indeed too short for a hearing but is always too long for a grievance." But Warmington in a footnote prefers: "often means a short hearing but always a prolonged grievance," which Loyen follows. But *iniuriae* refers to the physical rigours on which Sidonius has enlarged in the previous sentence. For litigants away from their homes, like the bearer of this letter, winter is often "too short to get a hearing, but long enough for hardship." Examples of *iniuria* in this sense are found in *Thes.* 7.1.1675. 56 ff. and include Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* 2.44.1 *iniuria hiemis et inopia confectis*, but not Symm. *Epist.* 1.100 *internus corporis dolor crescit hiemali iniuria* and 3.39 *sanitatis fides, quam plerumque sollicitat hiemis iniuria*.

4.7.2 *unde quamquam absens facile coniecto, quo repente stupore ferietur, cum intuitu nostri dignanter admissus intellexerit se paginam meam magis otiose flagitasse quam tradere.*

The bearer had besought Sidonius to give him a letter to take to Simplicius, not realizing that the two were on such affectionate terms that the former would have asked him to do this in any case. Sidonius imagines the honourable reception Simplicius will give the man, who would then realize that his request had been superfluous. I can make nothing of *quam tradere*. The attempts of the translators, including Warmington in a footnote, are really not worth setting down. I suggest *magis otiose flagitasse quam* (<*gratiose*>) *tradere*. *Gratiose* refers to the *gratia* which the bearer would hope to gain, and actually would gain, by presenting the letter. Cf. 5.15.1 *bybliopolam nostrum non gratiose* ("not for favour's sake," i.e., to oblige him) *sed iudicialiter expertus insinuo*, where Anderson has "not as a call upon your friendship" and Loyen takes *gratiose* with *expertus*; and cf. Symm. *Epist.* 4.46 *non graciosus laudator*. The sense is that the bearer's eagerness to curry favour in the delivery was only surpassed by the superfluity of his request in the first place.

4.9.2 *pomposus incessus, animus serius (iste publicam fidem, ille privatam asserit dignitatem).*

Incessus means "outer man" (*habitus*), rather than "gait;" cf. 4.24.3 *multum ab antiquo dissimilis incessu*, where Anderson has "in anything but his old style."

4.18.6 *obtulimus, ut cernis, quod cantilenae recentis obvium manui fuit; sed nec hoc minus, si moras nectis, astra quatiemus, versibus quoque satirographis, si res exegerit, usuri, quos huic carmini lenitate adaequandos falso putabis. namque efficacius citius ardentius natura mortalium culpat aliqua quam laudet.*

“And you will be wrong if you think my satiric verses will match this poem in mildness.” No doubt, but why think anything of the sort? The next sentence shows that Sidonius must mean that the satire would not be on a level (*adaequandos*) with the gentle elegy just presented, it would have more power. Read *huic carminis lenitati* (for the enallage cf. *Thes.* 6.2741.75). Also *laudat*?

4.20.3 *sed quid haec pluribus? spectaculo tali sola praesentia tua defuit. nam cum viderem quae tibi pulchra sunt non te videre, ipsam eo tempore desiderii tui impatientiam desideravi.*

The letter describes the martial splendour of a barbarian prince and his suite to a friend who delighted in such spectacles. The negative in Anderson’s “I wanted not to feel the want of you” is nowhere in the Latin, while Loyen’s “j’ai ressenti” for *desideravi* is licentious. Can *desiderii* mean “your eager craving (for such displays)”? Cf. Dalton: “I longed to have you with me in all the impatience of your longing soul.” We have to make allowance for Sidonius’ passion for verbal jingles.

4.22.5 *praecipue gloriam nobis parvam ab historia petere fixum, quia per homines clericalis officii temerarie nostra iactanter aliena . . . dicuntur.*

For *petere* Anderson conjectures *praeterire*; alternatively *parum* for *parvum*. Perhaps *parum . . . competere*: “it is my settled opinion that the fame of a historian is not for me.” *Temerarie* and *iactanter* must change places. It is boastful to write about oneself, dangerous to write about other people.

4.23.2 *cui fecisse me constat plurimum iniuriae, si tu tamen vel parum feceris, quam certe, ut spero, non facies, nisi scopulis durior duras aut adamantibus rigidior perseveras insecabilibus.*

Sidonius asks a father to forgive his peccant son. For *si . . . facies* Anderson has “if, in spite of my appeal, you find you have not caused him enough hurt,” and then has to render *quam . . . non facies* “but surely, I trust, you will not do any more.” Loyen seems right: “si de ton côté tu lui en infligeais même un léger”—except that I do not understand the imperfect tense. Sidonius is apparently trying to say that even a slight rebuff to the penitent will mean that he (Sidonius) has done him a great disservice in urging him to seek parental pardon.

5.4.1 *quod non recepi scripta qui miseram, imputo amicitiae, sed deputo plus pudori. nam, nisi praeter aequum autumo, ut salutatio mihi debita dissimularetur, non illud contumacia sed verecundia fuit.*

Imputo amicitiae means “I chalk it up to our friendship.” Simplicius’ failure to answer Sidonius’ letter would be debited to him in the friendship

account. Not “seems to me a discredit to your friendship,” still less “je ne mets point en cause notre amitié.” In the next sentence I am inclined to think that *ut . . . dissimularetur* means “in order that your owing me a letter should be kept from view” and *illud* refers to *quod non recepi scripta*. If Simplicius *had* written, he would have had to apologize for not writing sooner.

5.10.3 *sane ne videar tibi sub hoc quasi hyperbolico rhetorum catalogo blanditus quippiam gratificatusque, solam tibi acrimoniam Quintiliani pompamque Palladii comparari non ambigo sed potius adquiesco.*

But L, the oldest ms, has *ambio*, which is right. Sidonius means: “in putting you above the aforesaid rhetors I am not flattering you, and to prove it I shall not object to (though I do not solicit) a comparison with Quintilian and Palladius (but nobody else).” For the construction cf. 2.7.1 *quis enim se non ambiat arbitrum legi?* Dalton has: “and even that comparison I should not urge—I should merely yield acquiescence.”

5.15.2 *restat, ut exhortatio vestra seu sponsio famulum sic vel studentem placere vel meritum gratia competentis remuneretur; quae utique pro tali labore si solvitur, incipiet ad vestram respicere mercedem.*

Anderson’s version makes no sense: “it now remains that some encouragement or some promise on your part should recompense with an adequate mark of favour a servant who,” etc. The letter recommends a clerk (*bibliopola*)¹⁰ to Ruricius; as appears from the first sentence, the man had been doing some work for him (*in opere celeritatem circa dominum te mihi sibi que communem satis abunde probavi*).¹¹ *Exhortatio seu sponsio* refers to encouragement or promise already given by Ruricius. Anderson’s version of what follows, changed by Semple, was substantially correct: “should this (favour) at least be paid to him in return for his toil, he will begin to have hopes of doing business with you” (rather “he will begin to look to you for his reward”?).

5.16.5 *Roscia salutat, cura communis; quae in aviae amitarumque indulgentissimo sinu, quod raro nepotibus contingit alienis, et cum severitate nutritur.*

Anderson is quite astray here. He failed to see that the “rare advantage” is the touch of strictness which *this* grandmother (along with the aunts: *nepotibus* of course suits either relationship) exercises towards her charge. But instead of *alendis* (Wilamowitz) for the paradosis *alienis* I prefer <*nisi*> *alienis*: “an advantage which rarely comes to grandchildren—unless they are somebody else’s.” The average grandmother will spoil

¹⁰*bibliopola* (*byb-*), “bookseller” in Anderson, is the equivalent of classical *librarius*.

¹¹In his review (*Paideia* 21 [1966] 408 f.) S. Pricoco pointed out that *nostrum* (*bybliopolam*) should not be rendered “my” with Anderson. Loyen reads the ms variant *vestrum*.

her own grandchildren, but is quite capable of strictness when it comes to other children.

5.20.3 *redde te tamen expectantium votis expetentumque caritatem proba, qui iam probasti pudorem.*

“Prove the affection of the friends who invite you, having already given proof of your modesty.” So Anderson. Loyen with “leur délicatesse” makes matters worse. It is clear from the context that both *caritatem* and *pudorem* refer to the addressee, and the genitive after the former is objective, as is usually the case.

6.2.1 *venerabilis Eutropia matrona . . . maeroribus orbitatis necessitate litis adiecta in remedium mali duplicis perfectionem vestrae consolationis expetere festinat, gratanter habitura, sive istud tibi peregrinatio brevis seu longum computetur officium.*

The Bishop would not be asked to console the widow in her lawsuit but to help her (cf. 4). As far as concerns the lawsuit, *consolationis* will be a euphemism for *auxilii* (“comfort” Anderson). *solacium* is similarly used; see Luetjohann’s index. Anderson translates *sive . . . officium*: “whether you reckon her business as likely to involve merely a brief absence from home or a prolonged waiting on your pleasure.” *Peregrinatio* is not to be understood literally; even if the widow had to travel, the Bishop’s “reckoning” is nothing to the purpose and *seu longum officium* is unintelligible. I think the words mean that the Bishop’s intervention might be regarded as a brief excursion outside the normal range of his duties or as part of his regular function. *Longum* is used to balance *brevis*.

6.5 *causam meam nesciens agit qui ad vos a me litteras portat; nam, dum votivi mihi fit gerulus opportunus officii, beneficium praestat, quod se arbitrat accipere, sicuti nunc venerabilis Donidius dignus inter spectatissimos quosque numerari. cuius clientem puerosque commendo, profectos seu in patroni necessitate seu in domini. laborem peregrinantum qua potestis ope humanitate intercessione tutamini; ac, si in aliquo amicus ipse per imperitiam novitatemque publicae conversationis videbitur minus efficax, vos hoc potius aspiciate, quid absentis causa, non quid praesentis persona mereatur.*

Anderson and Loyen both have notes on this letter. Contrary to Loyen and to the apparent implication of the first sentence (with which cf. 4.7.1), Donidius cannot possibly be the bearer of the letter, for (a) if he were, there would be no need to recommend his client and slaves separately; (b) the terms used in the third sentence cannot conceivably apply to so eminent a personage, a *vir spectabilis* (cf. 2.9, 3.5); (c) the only viable interpretation of *quid . . . mereatur* is Anderson’s: “consider the merits of the absent Donidius’ cause rather than the demerits of his representative’s personality.” But since Donidius had asked Sidonius to send a letter by his client, the opening words point to him rather than to the actual bearer.

Amicus ipse has to be the latter, Donidius' client. But *amicus* is odd, and I wonder whether it may not have been an adscript by a reader who thought that *ipse* meant Donidius.

6.6.2 *est enim tibi nimis usui, ut exhortationibus tuis interioris hominis maciem saepe-numero mysticus adeps et spiritalis arvina distendat.*

Anderson renders "it is to your truest advantage," but notes: "one is tempted to read *nimis in usu* 'it is quite habitual.' " There was no cause to doubt the reading. In 7.9.17 *ita semper huiusce maioribus aut humanum aut divinum dictare ius usui fuit* Anderson notes that *usui fuit* "must surely (in this context) mean 'has been the custom.' " Whereas in 8.10.1 *esse tibi usui pariter et cordi litteras granditer gaudeo* "both profitable and congenial" is right, so too in 9.15.1.

6.9.2 *neque enim quisquam etiam sibi bene conscius plus facere praesumpsit, si quis tamen vestrae correptionis orbitam non reliquit, quippe cum ea ipsa, quae legimus, parentis verba censurae maxuma emendationis incitamenta sint. nam quid potest esse castigationis huiusce tenore pretiosius, in qua forte peccato animus aeger repperit intrinsecus remedium, cum non valeret extrinsecus invenire convicium?*

Bishop Lupus, the addressee, had sent a letter of mild rebuke to an erring brother, who repented and was kindly received by Sidonius. No one, Sidonius says, even if not a sinner himself (as Sidonius always professes to be), would presume to do anything more in such a case, unless indeed the delinquent had gone too far to respond to Lupus' censure. The indicative *praesumpsit*, the absurdity of which is not concealed in Anderson's translation, must yield to a subjunctive, *praesumpserit*. The words *cum . . . convicium* make sense if *invenire* is excluded: "while upbraiding from without would be ineffective." Professor Tarrant suggests an easier alternative: *quem* (sc. *animum*) *non valeret extrinsecus lenire convicium*.

7.7.5 *si vero tradimur, qui non potuimus viribus obtineri, invenisse vos certum est quid barbarum suaderetis ignavi.*

"I don't like Mommsen's *adiuvaretis*" Anderson. Neither do I, but Mommsen evidently saw what Dalton, Anderson, Sempke, and Loyen failed to see, that *barbarum* is not neuter ("the barbarous expedient" *vel sim.*) but masculine, as in 3.7.4 *etsi barbarus in hiberna concedat*. Translate: "it is certain that *you* have discovered what advice to give the barbarian in your cowardice," i.e., it is you who have shown him how to conquer us.

7.9.3 *neque [enim] valuissemus aliquid in commune consulere.*

enim is in most mss (see Loyen), but removed by editors. I see no good reason to follow them. *neque enim* = *etenim non*.

7.9.5 *ita fiebat, ut eosdem post longam taciturnitatem locutos quisque audire coeperat, non taceret quia, donec scientiam natura combiberit, non maior est gloria dixisse quod noveris quam siluisse quod nescias.*

This concerns the Pythagorean five-year vow of silence. Anderson takes *non taceret quia non maior est gloria* as equivalent to *diceret non maiorem esse gloriam*. Mommsen proposed *non tacere placeret*, meaning I am not sure what. Here for once I would follow Dalton: "when, after that long repression, these pupils spoke at last, the audience could not repress applause." Comma before *quia*; *ut* before *taceret*?

7.9.10 *si eligimus humilem, vocatur abiectus . . . si simplicem, despicitur ut brutus: si acrem, vitatur ut callidus.*

Anderson reads his conjecture *calidus*, translating "if energetic, he is avoided as a hot-head," and destroying the indispensable contrast with the preceding dicolon. His reason: "if *callidus* is right, then *acer* surely must mean 'clever'; but although *acre ingenium* has this sense, could *acer homo* mean a clever man?" I find the answer in the *Thesaurus* (Anderson's own copy, as it happens), 1.358.49 ff. Loyen restores *callidus* without comment.

7.9.18 *sed dicitis viro Eucherium et Pannychium illustres haberi superiores.*

Anderson reads *iure* (Mommsen) for *viro*, properly rejected by Mossberg ([above, n. 7] 49 "nullo modo aptum est; de concessione non agitur"), but conjectures *isti viro* (*spectabili viro* Wilamowitz). Loyen goes back to *viro*. Mossberg's objection to this reading is invalid: "cognoscendum est, utrum Sidonius verbo *vir* an [*sic*; aut?] aliis substantivis pro expectato pronomine utatur. sed apud eum nullum exemplum huius consuetudinis loquendi inveniri potest." An example can be found further on in this very letter (22): *vir est namque, ni fallor, totius popularitatis alienus*: others in 7.13.2 *deus bone, quae viro censura cum venustate . . . !* and 7.17.1 *cum . . . quid viro vellet lacrimis indicibus ostenderet*. Nor should Anderson have rendered "such a man" in 9.15.1, v. 42. At the same time, Mossberg may well have been right to advocate *viros*, read by one ms, since *illustris* as a title is usually, though not always, so accompanied. For the order he compares 7.6.9 *taceo vestros Crocum Simpliciumque collegas*.

7.9.23 *dicit aliquis: "unde tibi de illo tam cito tanta comperta sunt?" cui respondeo: prius Bituriges noveram quam Biturigas. multos in itinere, multos in commilitio . . . cognoscimus. plurima notitiae dantur et ex opinione compendia, quia non tam parvos terminos posuit famae natura quam patriae. quocirca si urbium status non tam murorum ambitu quam civium claritate taxandus est, non modo primum qui essetis, sed ubi essetis agnovi.*

This comes from Sidonius' address to the people of Bourges (Biturigae) in praise of his chosen candidate for the bishopric, whom, however, he

had not met until recently. Asked how he knows so much about him, he replies that he had heard it from citizens of Bourges whom he *did* know and from general report. The last words evidently bewildered Anderson: "I learned at the outset not only what you were like but where you stood" (evidently following Dalton). Loyen gets nearer: "j'ai commencé par savoir qui vous étiez avant de savoir où vous étiez." But he misses *modo* (= *nuper*) *primum*. Sidonius, who must be supposed to be visiting the town for the first time, had learned for the first time *where* its people lived (i.e., the exact locality from autopsy), though he had known for a long time *who* they were (i.e., how respectable).

7.13.4 *sermonem maximo temperamento cum colloquente dispensat, in quo non patitur ullam aut verecundiam externus aut familiaris iniuriam, aut credulus invidiam aut curiosus repulsam aut suspiciosus nequitiam, aut peritus calumniam aut imperitus infamiam.*

Himerius is a model of tact. He does not let strangers feel shy or take undue liberties with familiars. The gullible encounter no—what? "Jealousy," say the two recent translators. But what has jealousy or any other possible sense of *invidiam* to do with credulity? Read *perfidiam*. At this point the sense of *patitur* shifts a little. It is no longer a matter of how Himerius' conversation makes people feel but of what they find. The gullible encounter no deceit, the suspicious no villainy, the inquisitive no rebuff, the knowledgeable no covert aspersions (on third parties), the ignorant no open slanders. So I take *calumniam* and *infamiam*, not as "chicanery" and "humiliation" (!). Sophisticates who could detect *calumnia* if it were there find none; unsophisticates who could only recognize *infamia* ("i.q. vituperatio;" cf. *Thes.* 7.1.1338.36) find none of that either.

7.14.3–4 *quippe cum praebeat tamquam ab adverso bovi pilus, apro saeta, volucris pluma vestitum (quibus insuper, ut vim vel inferant vel repellant, cornu dens unguis arma genuina sunt), membra vero nostra in hunc mundum sola censeas eiecta, non edita; cumque gignendis artubus animalium ceterorum multifario natura praesidio quasi quaedam sinu patente mater occurrat, humana tantum corpora effudit, quorum imbecillitati quodam modo nocere caretur. nam illud, sicuti ego censeo, qui animum tuum membris duco potiore, non habet aequalitatem, quod statum nostrum supra pecudes veri falsique nescias ratiocinatio animae intellectualis evexit.*

At the start of this passage Anderson has: "as if in direct contrast, we find clothing supplied to the ox by its hair," etc. Presumably he was thinking of a contrast with man, than whom "no creature has been brought forth more miserable and helpless." But he was understandably unhappy about this, as his note indicates: "*tamquam ab adverso*: perhaps it may also be rendered 'almost at the other extreme,' 'almost in direct contrast,' 'as if in direct opposition.'" He pencilled the reference in the margin of his copy of the *Thesaurus* (1.869.24), where it cites Plin. *N. H.* 4.103 *infra*

(sc. *Britanniam sunt*) *insulae Samnis et Axanthos et ab adversa* (sc. *parte*) *in Germanicum mare sparsae Glaesiae*. Does not *tamquam ab adverso* mean "as though from some place opposite" ("across the counter," as it were)? It is as if the hair, etc., which supplied clothing were independent of the animals.

On *nam illud* Anderson's note, starting with the unpromising remark "*nam* seems = 'but' here" (Loyen actually translates with "*mais*"), is inconclusive. I think *corporeum* has dropped out before or after *illud*. Nature, as Sidonius has just said, gives other animals physical aid and protection at birth, but human bodies she simply casts forth. He goes on: "for that bodily part of our make-up (so I opine, believing as I do that mind is more important than members) lacks equality¹² (with the other animals) because the reasoning power of intellect has elevated our condition above that of the beasts who know not true from false." Behind *nam* is the idea that nature has endowed the other animals physically as some compensation for their lack of that intellect which makes man their superior.

I have not translated *tuum*, which seems to have no business in the text.

7.15.2 *quicquid illud est, iam venite, hac deinceps condicione discessum impetraturi, ut aut vicissim redeatis aut serius.*

The addressee and his brother visit Vienne too seldom, preferring their villas. As Loyen says, this passage has given rise to many hypotheses; altogether gratuitous, one may add. Anderson obelized *serius* after "several efforts to correct" it, Loyen inserts *ambo* before it. But given the latter's perception that *redeatis* means "go back to your villas," not "come back to Vienne," there is not the slightest occasion for textual interference. Sidonius will let the two go on one of two conditions: either one remains in the town while the other is away or they (both) leave only after making a long stay. *Ambo* does no harm, but is in no way required.

7.17.2 *et quia sibi maximas humandi funeris partes ipse praeripuit, totum apparatus supercurrentis impendii quod funerando sacerdoti competeret impertiens, saltem ad obsequium quae remanserunt verba conferimus, nihil aliud exaraturi stili scalpentis impressu quam testimonium mutuae dilectionis.*

"And the impress of my scratching style shall inscribe nothing but a testimony to our mutual love." I doubt if Anderson saw the point of *scalpentis*; certainly Dalton and Loyen did not. The verses which follow were to be inscribed on the dead man's tomb.

ibid. vv. 13 f. *expeteris cunctis, nec te capit ambitus ullus;
est tibi delatus plus onerosus honor.*

¹²Not "is of minor importance" (Anderson).

Anderson fails here: "thou art sought out by all, yet no self-seeking takes hold on thee; a more onerous kind of honour has been bestowed on thee." *Ambitus* refers to the efforts of various great cities to keep Abraham as a resident—Rome, Byzantium, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Carthage, Ravenna; none of them could hold him (15–20). Translate the pentameter: "honour bestowed on you is rather burdensome (than honourable)." The jingle *honorare / onerare* is a favourite with Sidonius.

8.8.2 *redde te patri, redde te patriae, redde te etiam fidelibus amicis, qui iure ponuntur inter affectus.*

"Tes amis fidèles, qui ont droit à une place dans l'affection." So Loyen. Semple has (we are not told what Anderson had): "friends, whom I hope I am justified in classing with such objects of affection," with the note: "as your father and your fatherland. I have ventured to use here a translation long ago given me by A. E. Housman." If so (I have my doubts), Housman must have overlooked what is clear enough from Luetjohann's index, that *affectus* is used as in 6.4.1 *unam feminam de affectibus suis* ("a kinswoman" Anderson). *Affectus* ("loved ones") primarily refers to family, but friends, says Sidonius, are justly included.

8.11.3 vv. 49–54 *hic cum festa dies ciere rivos
cantus coeperit et voluptuosam
scurrarum querimoniam crepare,
tunc, tunc carmina digniora vobis
vinosi hospitii excitus Camena
plus illis ego barbarus susurrem.*

If his cultured Bordeaux friends such as Lampridius, Leontius, and Rusticus refuse him hospitality, Sidonius' Muse must go to Bishop Gallicinus and beg a tiny room. Otherwise, he will have to put up at a common inn and compose his verses to the accompaniment of clattering plates and drunken songs. Translators do not make it clear that *tunc, tunc . . . susurrem* is heavily ironical.

8.11.8 *aleae et sphaerae non iuxta deditus; nam cum tesseriis ad laborem occuparetur, pila tantum ad voluptatem.*

The translators understand that Lampridius preferred playing ball to dicing ("il ne montrait pas pour les jeux de hasard le même intérêt que pour le jeu de paume"). It was the other way round. He enjoyed playing ball, but his gambling was compulsive, carried to the point where it became work instead of play. *ad* = *usque ad*; cf., e.g., Val. Max. 3.7.7 *a quo . . . ad multum odium dissidebat.*

9.14.3 *cuius te gloriae pariter ac famae capacem de orationis tuae qualitate coniecto, in qua te decentissime nuper pronuntiante quae quidem scripseras extemporaliter admirabantur benivoli, mirabuntur superbi, morabuntur periti.*

Editors read *mirabantur* and *morabantur*, the latter of which makes no sense: to render “and so you won . . . the delaying applause of the experts” or “dans lequel ce que tu avais écrit . . . provoqua . . . l’intérêt des connaisseurs” is hermeneutic license. Nobody can dwell upon a speech in the course of its delivery, only when it is in writing. The future tenses in the MSS are therefore in order and it is *admirabantur* which must be changed to *-buntur*. For the construction (*ad*)*mirari in aliquo*, found mainly in the vulgate, see the *Thesaurus*; here it is induced by *morabantur*.

The ablative absolute *te pronuntiante* has to be taken as only loosely connected with the main statement (cf. Kühner-Stegmann 1.788), without pressing the present tense: “which, delivered as it was by you . . .”

9.15.1 vv. 50–53 *ego corde et ore iure despicibilis*
quid inter hosce te rogante garriam,
loquacitatis impudentiam probans
animique vota destituta litteris?

Leo’s conjecture *approbans* appears gratuitous: cf. 5.20.3 *caritatem proba, qui iam probasti pudorem*. 53 means “(and proving) my heart’s desire left in the lurch by (the quality of my) writing” (“exposing my heart’s ambitions to be so destitute of literary skill” [Anderson]). *Animi vota* is the desire for literary fame.¹³

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

¹³I have again to thank Professor R. J. Tarrant for valuable comments and criticism.