

## NOTES ON THE TEXT OF PRUDENTIUS

MAURICE P. CUNNINGHAM

*Lawrence University*

Opportunities for fruitful dialogue on matters of text and interpretation of Classical authors are less frequent than one might hope for. For this reason I welcome an especially timely opportunity to take up some problems of the text of Prudentius which reviewers have done me the honor of disputing with me. In some instances, I am persuaded; in some, I hope to persuade or to elicit further discussion.

In this paper familiarity with the following items is assumed:

Maurice P. Cunningham, *Aurelii Prudentii Clementis Carmina* (Turnholt, 1966=Corpus Christianorum, series latina, vol. 126).

———, "The Problem of Interpolation in the Textual Tradition of Prudentius," *TAPA* 99 (1968) 119-41.<sup>1</sup>

Reviews:

Jacques Fontaine, *REL* 44 (1966) 469-71.

J.-C. Fredouille, *Latomus* 26 (1967) 888.

A. Hudson-Williams, *CR* n.s. 17 (1967) 293-96.

Paolo Frassinetti, *Paideia* 22 (1967) 175-76.

Paul Antin, *RBPh* 45 (1967) 990.

Raoul Verdère, *RSC* 16 (1968) 122-24.

Klaus Thraede, *Gnomon* 40 (1968) 681-91.<sup>2</sup>

A. F. Norman, *CP* 63 (1968) 215-16.

<sup>1</sup> Certain misprints and other errors which failed to receive correction in the volume of Prudentius as printed are listed in this article on pages 140-41.

From Thraede's review (see below) I am able to add the following:

p. xxxvii, line 14: Plutones -δ-: delete.

p. 148, ad subscr. *H.*: *scripta sit a scriba*.

p. 190, ad S. 1.122: *reperiatur*.

Also see below on *Pe.* 10.87.

<sup>2</sup> Thraede's review will become more valuable if account is taken of the following misprints and other errors:

(Here and elsewhere, I standardize to my system of abbreviation.)

p. 682, line 10, note 2, and elsewhere: Jannaccone (not -aco).

Frequent reference is also made to the following:

Christian Gnlika, "Zwei Textprobleme bei Prudentius," *Philologus* 109 (1965) 246-58.

———, "Notizen zu Prudentius," *RhM* 109 (1966) 84-94.

———, Review of R. Herzog, *Die allegorische etc.*, *Gnomon* 40 (1968) 361-70.

- p. 682, line 21: read *A.* 218 (not 918); also note that Bergman's primary authority was *A*, not *E*.
- p. 683, line 19: *H.* 581 (not 681).
- p. 683, line 21: *Pe.* 5.77 at sunt *E* (not assunt).
- p. 683, line 22: *A.* 370 caelo lex *E*<sup>c</sup>, lex caelo *E*. This is correct and confirmed by autopsy. Perhaps I should have added "*sic*."
- p. 683, line 23: on spelling of *robur* see my Index Orthographicus, p. xxxiii.
- p. 683, line 24: *Ps.* 421 (not 412).
- p. 683, lines 25-26: Thraede misses the very information contained in my note.
- p. 683, lines 28-30: spelling of *ephebus*, see my Index Orthographicus, p. xxx.
- p. 683, lines 32-34: Thraede omits a manuscript symbol and a period in quoting my note on *Ps.* 515. I do not know what he is trying to say in his comment, which seems directed to the misquoted version of the note rather than to the original.
- p. 684, note 1: Here and elsewhere the suprascript number 11 is not in fact the number of Meyer's note.
- p. 684, note 3: *inpendet* and *inpendit* (not *imp-* bis).
- p. 684, note 4: *A.* 666: Collins did not conjecture *sale*. It is the reading of *S*<sup>2</sup>, which he preferred.
- p. 684, note 5: *Pe.* 2.463 (not *S*).
- p. 685, line 3: *Pe.* 1.97 *domantur* is the reading of *BTS* (not *donatur*). I do not know which of these words he really means to comment on.
- p. 685, line 32: I do not report the reading of *E* as certain.
- p. 685, note 2: Thraede's paraphrase does not seem to represent accurately the physical facts about *A* as I reported them.
- p. 686, note 1, line 10: Something is amiss. I do not understand the expression "dem Leidensis U."
- p. 688, line 7: *C.* 12.50 *iesse editus TES* (aeditus *J*) is right. Thraede reverses the readings.
- p. 688, line 21: *obstetrix* *T*<sup>1</sup> (not *T*).
- p. 688, line 24: *C.* 5.134 (not 4).
- p. 688, note 1: Some of Thraede's complaints are so hard to understand that one suspects an occasional misprint in the references given. In line 24, *S.* 1.482 should be 483.
- p. 689, line 11: *Pe.* 2.32 (not *C*).
- p. 689, line 12: All the manuscripts do not have *saenitia*.
- p. 689, lines 36-38: I think that *potest* and *potes* have changed places, since Thraede seems to disapprove of my reading.
- p. 689, line 38: *Pe.* 5.362 (not 361).
- p. 689, line 50: I think he means 'Begriff.'
- p. 691, note 1: pr. 74 (not 75), and correct the misquotation to "de solo carmine decimo" etc.

F. Klingner, Review of Bergman's text of Prudentius in *Gnomon* 6 (1930) 39-52.

Gustav Meyer, "Prudentiana," *Philologus* 87 (1932) 249-60 and 332-57.  
 ———, "Zu Prudentius," *Philologus* 93 (1938) 377-403.

Hereafter reference to the above items will be by author's name and page, with date or other brief identification when necessary.

This paper concentrates on matters of text and closely related items. I leave to another time discussion of the interrelation of manuscripts,<sup>3</sup> most problems of punctuation,<sup>4</sup> and the whole matter of imitation of earlier and contemporary Latin authors by Prudentius.<sup>5</sup>

C. 1.9-12: R. Herzog, *Die allegorische Dichtkunst des Prudentius* (Munich 1966) 58 (see Thraede 688) takes these lines as a continuation of the direct address in lines 5-8. He points to the continuation of

<sup>3</sup> Maas' theory of stemmatics is not well adapted to deal with a tradition that includes two sixth century manuscripts, one in rustic capitals and one in uncials, a situation that is unique for Prudentius among authors for whom manuscripts in *scriptura continua* are extant. See Paul Maas, *Textkritik* (3d ed. Leipzig 1957). Thraede seems to appeal to this theory (e.g., on pages 685 and 686). More satisfactory is the position of L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford 1968) 140-47, especially page 144.

Among other things, a theory or hypothesis about the interrelationships of manuscripts in a tradition ought to permit one to predict the readings of specific manuscripts in specific passages with a high degree of probability.

<sup>4</sup> The whole set of problems involved in punctuating a Latin text in printed form is put into a better perspective, if one spends a considerable time reading his author in a manuscript written in *scriptura continua* with little or no pointing. With specific reference to the problem of words or other short items in series, see my paper "Some Phonetic Aspects of Word Order Patterns in Latin," *Proceedings of the American Philological Society* 101 (1957) 481-505, especially page 503 on certain types of *pronuntiatio* and the passage there cited from Quintilian (9.4.108). Contrast Thraede 688, note 1. Certainly the mechanical application of a style sheet for some modern language to Latin leads to quite anomalous results.

<sup>5</sup> In many ways, the problem of the use of earlier Latin authors by Prudentius and his contemporaries is comparable to the alleged use of Greek authors by the Classical Latin poets. In that field we are beginning to realize that simplistic assertions are often misleading, even when in a strict sense they are true. I am deeply suspicious of Fontaine's conception of Prudentius as "*poète mosaïste*." See Klaus Thraede, "Untersuchungen zum Ursprung und zur Geschichte der christlichen Poesie II," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 5 (1962) 136.

It will take us some time to assimilate the implications of the new approach to Prudentius suggested by Fr. Solmsen, "The Powers of Darkness in Prudentius' 'Contra Symmachum': A Study of his poetic Imagination," *Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1965) 237-57. See also, Manfred Fuhrmann, "Die lateinische Literatur der Spätantike: Ein literarhistorischer Beitrag zum Continuitätsproblem," *A. & A.* 13 (1967) 56-79.

second person verbs, although there is a shift from plural to singular, and says it involves a clear contrast with line 13 (*uox ista*). This is possible, of course. But I rejected it, because lines 5–8 have the tone of a Biblical message, which suits the word *clamat* that accompanies them. Lines 9–12 sound more like the poet's rephrasing of the Biblical message as he applies it to the specific and present situation. *Adieceris* (12) is easily taken as an "ideal second person"; Lavarenne translates with *on*. Apparently Solmsen also takes the passage in this way in his remarkably perceptive paragraph on the poem in "The Powers of Darkness in Prudentius' 'Contra Symmachum': a Study of his poetic Imagination," *Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1965) 237–57 at 251–52.

**C. 2.21:** Thraede (683) desiderates a note "frons C<sup>1</sup>." "frons et callida C<sup>1</sup> in ras." would be more accurate; G would be a better authority. However, I regard the variant as a medieval one.

**C. 3.18:** Hudson-Williams conjectures *acerba*.

**C. 3.16–20:** Gnilkka (*Gnomon* 40 [1968] 366) rightly sees reference to 1 Cor. 10.31 and Col. 3.17.

**C. 3.100:** Now see *TAPA* 99 (1968) 134–35.

**C. 5.122:** Meyer (1938, 395) argues for *parili*, adding that *pariles* is meaningless ("was keinen Sinn ergibt"). Lavarenne, Thomson, and Pellegrino do not agree. Thraede (688) seems too confident that only *parili* can be right.

**C. 5.135:** *umbrarum AS, functorum TE*: Verdère with diffidence and Thraede (688–89) with vigor prefer *functorum*.

**C. 5.161–64:** I bracket these lines, first because they seem to be a sort of doxology added to the one in 157–60. An example of a somewhat similar addition is the line added in B at the end of *Pe.* 1. Second, the stichometric note in S says that the poem contains 160 verses, thus confirming one's suspicion. However, Hudson-Williams says "on seemingly inadequate grounds"; Thraede (690) is shocked.

**C. 6.6:** See *TAPA* 99 (1968) 135.

**C. 7.124:** Thraede (688), following Meyer (1932, 343, note 55) is certain that *recessus* (TES) is right. Verdère, while sharing my uncertainty, also favors *meandros* (A).

**C. 7.134:** Thraede (684, note 3) is right; *inpendit* is probably impossible.

**C. 9.74** *repulso* etc.: The facts are unusually complicated. Bergman prints *reculso* and his note reads as follows:

*reculso B a.c. repulso D, C a.c. P (mg. reculso) reuulso A reclusa (mg. al. repulso) V recluso NEMOSU, CBp.c.*

My note reads:

*repulso A probat Pellegrino, reuuiso B, reuulso B<sup>1</sup>, reclusa T, recluso B<sup>2</sup>ES, probat Meyer. Sortiendum est.*

The correct reading of A was reported by Jannaccone, *REL* 26 (1948) 228–34 on 233. In a footnote she says the reading is confirmed by autopsy and that there are other errors in Bergman's report of the readings of A. Thraede erroneously says (682, note 2): "Für den Puteanus waren viele von Bg.s Lesungen bereits berechtigt durch Silvia Jannaccone" (*sic*), with reference to this article. Lavarenne had already corrected some errors in Bergman's readings from A in the *Psychomachia*.

Meyer (1932, 337) naturally bases his discussion on Bergman's note. In addition he cites the quotation in the treatise *De Dubiis Nominibus* (*GLK* 5.585.30–31): *obice extrorsum recluso* as providing independent confirmation for *recluso*. Thraede (682) agrees. The most recent editor of this treatise, Fr. Glorie (*Corpus Christianorum*, series latina, vol. 133A [Turnholti 1968] 750) says that the manuscript of Prudentius used by the author of this work most clearly resembles E. Thus this citation is not independent of textual witnesses already available to us. The citation only confirms what we knew already, that E is a witness to readings extant in the fifth and sixth centuries (see my introduction §110, p. xxvii).

Meyer, with some hesitation, prefers *recluso*. He rejects *repulso* "als 'Glättung' des Ausdrucks," claiming that *repellere* and *reuellere* are more normal in such a context (with citation of Juvenius 4.707 and 4.384). But the passage of Juvenius with *repellere* stands by itself in the article of Lumpe, *ThLL* 9.2.1 (1968), s.v. *obiex*. From that article one also learns that *claudere* is the normal word for fastening or closing an *obex* or *obices*. I infer that *recludere* would be the simple,

ordinary expression for 'to open.' That it is not found in the article cited says more about the nature of our extant texts than it does about the usage of *recludere*.

Meyer also says "aber von *repulso* führt kein Weg zu *recluso* oder *reculso*." It is clear that the phantom reading *reculso* is a complication. As for the corruption of *repulso* to *recluso*, one route would be a metathesis: -PLU- for -PUL-, with simple correction of *P* to *C*.

In any case, I feel certain that Meyer would have tried to rethink the problem as a whole, if he had had the current evidence before him. My suggestion that one might flip a coin for the correct reading is perhaps too flippant. I now prefer *repulso* but may be influenced by the fact that I chose it once before.

*Apotheosis* and *Hamartigenia*: Thraede in *RAC* lief. 39 (1962) 1020, s.v. Epos, says that the *Apotheosis* and *Hamartigenia* form a single work in two books, to which *A.* 1 pr. is the common preface.

*Apotheosis*, title: Gnllka (*RhM* 109 [1966] 92-94) cites *A.* 164-65 and 176-77 as interpreting the title. I cite 166.

*Apotheosis*, subtitles: Norman approves retaining them.

**A. 160:** Thraede (690) says I keep the line because I misunderstand the passage; and in a footnote (note 3) he adds that the right reading in the 'false' line is *artus*. As for meaning, with the substitution of "actions" for "body," Thomson's version gives good sense:

ever did He of his own love cause his own being to take on humanity, that the flesh which was to be associated with Him and filled with the everlasting Lord, but was then animal in its nature and leading a debased life, might [change it after its Master's example and in like body] learn to recognize Him as sharer of its earthly features, etc.

The context clearly shows how easily *artus* could be substituted for *actus*; the reverse seems much less likely. For possible lacunae in our manuscript traditions, see *TAPA* 99 (1968) 137-38.

**A. 673:** Verdière has a note on the passage. He considers accepting *quod* for *quae* and *negantur* for *negator*.

**A. 895:** Meyer (1932, 255-56, note 17) followed by Thraede (684) finds *agenitus*, especially with a long *a*, impossibly anomalous. Perhaps

it is. But one can hardly agree with Thraede: “*at genitor* S<sup>c</sup> erst den Weg zum falschen *agenitus* erklärt.” *agenitus* M shows that the corruption in S is the extra *g* in *aggenitus*, which a later user of the manuscript tried to make into sense for himself by writing *at genitor* (i.e., *at genitor genitusque*); a corrector of the Tours manuscript (t) writes *ac genitus genitorque*.

*Hamartigenia*, title: Verdière approves my adoption of normal fourth and fifth century spelling of such words without an *H*, as apparently does Norman. Hudson-Williams thinks it “horrid.”

**H. 12-13:** Gnilka (*RhM* 109 [1966] 90-91) adds a reference to 2 Cor. 4.16.

**H. 887-91:** Gnilka (*Philologus* 109 [1965] 252-58) argues that these lines are an interpolation. For a defense, see *TAPA* 99 (1968) 127-30.

**Ps. 421:** Thraede (683) desiderates a note “*ut om. S*” here. I re-examined portions of S in 1970. Lines 418-21 (among others) are completely rewritten by a second later hand in S in such a way as completely to obliterate the original script.

**Ps. 454-60:** Thraede (688, note, lines 25 ff., and 690, note 1) calls attention to Chr. Gnilka, *Studien zur Psychomachie des Prudentius* (Wiesbaden 1963 = *Klassisch-Philologische Studien* 27) 129-33. Gnilka wishes to bracket 456 *pulchra* to 458 *harenarum*. I do not find his arguments convincing.

**Ps. 515** *formauit*: Hudson-Williams hazards a conjecture *firmauit*. For Thraede, see above, note 2.

**Ps. 545** *generis*: Thraede (688) prefers *ueneris A*.

**Ps. 624:** Thraede (683) wants to omit *est*. If S is not an authority for it, he would follow U. But the leaves of U which contain Ps. 521-640 are part of an entirely different and later manuscript; see my introduction §50, pp. xvii-xviii and Otto Hamburger, *Die illustrierten Handschriften der Burgerbibliothek, Bern* (Bern 1962) pages 137 (where 540 is a misprint for 640) and 139.

**S. 1.54:** Thraede (685, note 1) is right. I did not understand the passage. Nor do I know now what is the correct reading.

**S. 1.483:** Thraede complains (688, note 1, lines 23–24) that I do not remove a comma as recommended by Klingner (50). Klingner says that with the comma only one interpretation is possible and that it is wrong. This interpretation is in fact offered by Chamillard in his Latin paraphrase. But Lavarenne, Guillen, Thomson, and Eagan all offer the interpretation Klingner favors, although the text they translate in each instance actually has the comma.

**S. 1.497** *olido*] *TQ*, *solito E*, *stolido S*: Hudson-Williams prefers the neutral *stolido* of *S* (cf. *S.* 2.819). But it seems appropriate that Prudentius should mention the simple fact that statues which were the object of Roman cult ritual (497 *cultu*) smelled. In fact, they stank. One function of the ritual washing of statues (mentioned in 501–5) was to remove the grime, grease, and blood deposited on them during the sacrificial rituals.

The following passages of Ambrose seem to confirm the appropriateness of *olido* (I quote from Lavarenne's convenient text).

Ambrose, *epist.* 17.9: Si hodie gentilis aliquis imperator, quod absit, aram statueret simulacris, et eo conuenire cogeret christianos, ut sacrificantibus interessent, ut oppleret anhelitus et ora fidelium cinis ex ara, fauilla de sacrilegio, fumus ex busto, . . .

*epist.* 18.7: sacrificium uestrum ritus est bestiarum cruore respergi.

*epist.* 18.31: hauriant uel inuiti fumum oculis, symphoniam auribus, cinerem faucibus, thus naribus, etc.

In addition to the other items, the incense of course smelled.

**S. 2.** Inclusion of quotations from Symmachus: Quotations from the *Relatio* of Symmachus are regularly found in the manuscripts of *S.* 2. Since a *prima facie* case can be made for retaining them, I did so, especially since the literature contains no arguments to the contrary. Norman approves; Thraede (682, note 4) disapproves and offers the first positive arguments I have seen for omitting the quotations. No doubt further discussion will clarify the problem.

**S. 2.143 and 142 a, b:** See *TAPA* 99 (1968) 132–34.

**S. 2.423–27:** Gnllka (*Philologus* 109 [1965] 247–52) argues that these lines are an interpolation. See also *TAPA* 99 (1968) 121–27.



**S. 2.817-18** loquenti / quantum TEQ or loquenti / tantum StM, with Klingner's (50) punctuation. The second *loquenti* is strongly favored by Thraede (688).

**S. 2.868** orchin] *coniecit Verdière*, serapen *codd.*: If I had been aware of this suggestion I would most certainly have printed it. It is as brilliant and satisfying an emendation as I have ever seen, and it renders all earlier discussions of the passage (e.g., Thraede 688) obsolete. In support Verdière cites Pliny, *N.H.* 26.95: *sed inter pauca mirabilis est orchis herba siue serapias*.

**S. 2.914** Hinc ait et steriles frugescere rarius agros. rarius] TE, parcius *t ut uid.*, M, rarios Q: Thraede (688) cites Meyer (1932, 356) who argues in favor of *parcius*, claiming that it echoes *parcissimi* in Symm. *Rel.* 3.11: *sub largissimis imperatoribus denegetur, quod parcissimi praestiterunt?* But the subject matter of S. 2.914 corresponds to Symm. *Rel.* 3.15: *secuta est hoc fames publica et spem provinciarum omnium messis aegra decepit* (as quoted in the manuscripts of Prudentius). Here there is no verbal echo.

I prefer *rarius* for two reasons. 1. It is better attested. 2. The passage from Symm. *Rel.* 3.11 is included in the quotation that immediately precedes this passage in the manuscripts. The word *parcissimi* may thus (perhaps unconsciously) have suggested *parcius* as a gloss on *rarius*.

**S. 2.1016** censu: Since the reading *censu* lacks manuscript authority, Verdière asks to whom the conjecture should be credited. From Arévalo's note, I infer that the answer is Cauchius. The fact that Heinsius' own note says that *censu* is in J has confused matters. The true reading of J is *sensū*; from the wording I incline to think that Heinsius' note involves a misprint.

**Pe. 2.134** laetus tumescit gaudio / praefectus ac spem deuorat. spem ABTES, spe V<sup>c</sup> N<sup>r</sup> E<sup>r</sup> S<sup>r</sup> b: Heinsius, Meyer (1938, 399-400), and Thraede (688), among others, favor *spe*. Meyer rejects *spem* as involving an unusual expression. But the parallels he cites seem sufficient to support *spem*, e.g., Verg. *Aen.* 10.648: *spem turbidus hausit inanem*. Thomson's translation seems to give adequate sense: "the delighted prefect, ready to burst with joy, greedily enjoys his hope."

**Pe. 2.567** iocantur: To Antin the reading is "discutable." Thraede (684) twice disapproves of my note, while managing to misunderstand it (he explains my *ei*, "sc. poetae," despite the occurrence of *Laurentio* in the preceding sentence). The point, of course, is that *ioci* form an essential part of the character of St. Lawrence as he appears in cult at the time.

This precise point is, I believe, confirmed by Augustine, *serm.* 302.1, recently published by Dom Cyril Lambot in *Sancti Augustini sermones selecti duodeviginti* (Ultraieci & Bruxellis 1950 = *Stromata Patristica et Medievalia*, 1). Compare, *Quis ibi orauit et non impetrauit?* with Prud. *Pe.* 2.565–66: *quod quisque supplex postulat / fert inpetratum prospere*. The ideas in the next line (*poscunt iocantur indicant*) seem to find a parallel in this same passage of Augustine: *Quaedam enim . . . parua et ludicra concedit pater paruulis filiis . . . Ludentibus et de quibusdam ludicris se oblectantibus cedit paterna pietas, ne deficiat aetatis infirmitas*. Compare also Prud. *Pe.* 2.572 *paterno amore nutrias*. The passage in Augustine does indeed pose other problems, but they need not concern us here.

**Pe. 3.21** *flere rosas*] *flore B*, *flare U*: Thraede (686, note 1, 688) says *flare* is right, citing Meyer (1932, 346). Meyer himself said that the reading of *U* may very well be a conjecture (348): "*flare . . . kann ja selber bereits Konjektur sein*."

**Pe. 5.362** *erutam*] *S*, *elutam BTE*: To Hudson-Williams *erutam* "is very obscure"; to Thraede (689, lines 38–39) "verfehlte Interpretation" led to accepting it. Admittedly *elutam* is possible and could be supported by one parallel, [Paulinus Nol.] *carm.* 33.45: *et nunc mortificis eluta sordibus*.

But *erutam* 'rescued' also seems possible; Cic. *Att.* 10.14.1 is cited for this sense. The difference is not all that great between 'rescued' or 'saved' and 'washed' in a context that mentions baptism, and *elutam* is more likely to be the gloss.

I not only admit to uncertainty here, but insist upon it in the present state of our knowledge. I am grateful for Norman's encouragement to uncertainty *in re incerta*.

**Pe. 8.17**: As for my suggestion of *potes* for *potest*, all who mention it disapprove: Hudson-Williams, Verdière, and apparently Thraede (see note 2 above).

**Pe. 10.87:** *necandis* S<sup>c</sup>, *negandis* S should be added to the apparatus (Thraede 683).

**Pe. 223** *sedet*] *scripsi*, *sedes codd.*, *dies U*: Verdière approves. Reading *sedet* for *sedes* distinguishes the (222) *pontifex summus* from Romanus' addressee, Asclepiades, who ought, in fact, not to be referred to by such a title. Hudson-Williams, who disapproves of the conjecture, refers to line 226 to refute it. Surely, line 224 *ridesque et ipse* would be as suitable and nearer to line 223. But *et ipse* in 224 in fact helps to support the suggestion that the *pontifex summus* (222) and the *tu* (224) are not the same but different persons.

**Pe. 10.483** *saeuia*: Verdière approves. Thraede (689) disapproves, since there already exists a generally accepted solution to the problem (*saevitas*).

The above items admittedly comprise only a portion of the readings which have been called into question by one reviewer or another. But they are the ones on which it seems possible to engage in fruitful dialogue at this time. Other items can be taken up later.