NOTES ON CLAUDIAN *

(A) Carmina maiora

1.36-38

\textit{audit et gelido si quem Maeotica pascit}
\textit{sub Iove vel calido si quis coniunctus in axe}
\textit{nascentem te, Nile, bibit.}

“[The name of Probus] has been heard of both by those who are nurtured by the land of Maeotis under the frozen sky and by those near neighbours(?) who in the region of heat drink the Nile at its source.”

It is very difficult to make sense of \textit{coniunctus}, whether one supplies \textit{axi calido} (so Delphin and Platnauer) or \textit{Nilo nascenti} (so Heinsius and Birt). In “CQ” 33, 1939, 8, W.H. Semple suggests that the inhabitants of the far north of the temperate zone and those of the far south are “conjoined” by their mutual interest in hearing about Probus; this is an incredible explanation of the word. Nor are the available conjectures (\textit{cognatus}; \textit{contentus}; \textit{calidum si quis coniectus in axem}) worthy of consideration. I suggest \textit{confectus} (a word used by Claudian at 15.446), “worn out”, “exhausted”, by the excessive heat, which causes thirst (at \textit{Carm. min.} 28.37 \textit{defectis cultoribus} is used of the inhabitants of the Nile region in summer). “It was an old poetic way of identifying the inhabitants of a country to mention the river which they drank” (Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. \textit{Carm.} 2.20.20); if \textit{confectus} is right, Claudian here injects new life into a hackneyed geographical expression (which is copiously illustrated in \textit{TLL} 2.1964.39 ff.).

1.150-153

\textit{Pieriis pollent studiis multoque redundant}
\textit{eloquio; nec desidiis dapibusve paratis}
\textit{indulgere iuvat nec tanta licentia vitae}
\textit{arririt aut mores aetas lasciva relaxat.}

Praise of the brothers Olybrius and Probinus (coss. 395). “They excel in their devotion to the Muses and abound in great eloquence; it gives them no pleasure to indulge in idleness or splendid banquets, nor does such great licentiousness of life attract them or unbridled youth relax their morals.”

The demonstrative \textit{tanta} is not appropriate here. This was realized by Birt, who conjectured \textit{blanda}, a feeble word in the context. Perhaps \textit{laxa}, as at Prud. \textit{Ham.} 245 \textit{laxa licentia rerum}.

* The latest and by far the best edition of Claudian is that of J. B. Hall (Leipzig 1985). Other editions referred to are the Valpy ‘Delphin’ edition (London 1821) and those of Th. Birt (Berlin 1892), J. Koch (Leipzig 1893), and M. Platnauer (Loeb edition 1922). Occasional reference is made to J. B. Hall, \textit{Prolegomena to Claudian}, “BICS” Suppl. 45 (1986).
5.476-480  
conspicuus solio pertemptat crimina Minos  
et iustis dirimit sones. quos nolle fateri  
viderit, ad ìmalaì transmitit verbera fratris;  
nam iuxta Rhadamanthus agit.

“Seen afar on his lofty throne the judge Minos examines the charges and separates the wicked from the righteous. Those whom he sees unwilling to confess their sins he remits to the lash of his... brother; for he, Rhadamanthus, is busy close at hand” (Platnauer).

Hall makes the point that, of the various readings offered by the manuscripts (mala, mala mox, mali mox, saevi, saeva, duri, rigidì), the oldest is mala; he therefore conjectures validi. I agree that an epithet of fratris seems to be the only possible solution, but preferable to validi would be magni; forms of magnus and malus have, I believe, been interchanged at [Quint.] Decl. mai. 2.6 (p. 25.24 H.), Decl. min. 302.1, Sen. Nat. 3.28.3, Anth. 193.7.

5.498-499  
huc superum labes, huc insatiabilis aurì  
prolavies pretioque nihil non ause parato, ...

Rhadamanthus begins to pronounce sentence on Rufinus. “Hither, scourge of the world, bottomless sink of gold who wouldst dare aught for money, ...” (Platnauer).

Parato makes sense (he had been paid in advance), but parando (dative of purpose) would make possibly better sense.

5.523-526  
infra Titanum tenebras infraque recessus  
Tartareos nostrumque Chaos, qua noctis opacae  
fundamenta latent.

Rhadamanthus sentences Rufinus. “Thrust him down into the empty pit beneath the lightless prison of the Titans, below the depths of Tartarus and Chaos’... realm, where lie the foundations of thickest midnight” (Platnauer).

Nostrum is not an impossible epithet of Chaos in the mouth of Rhadamanthus, but it is a very feeble one. Hall puts in his text a conjecture of H.L. Levy, ipsum; this looks like an emendation not of the paradosis nostrum but of Birt’s conjecture ipsum. I think that Burman’s vastum is indubitably right; it is palaeographically excellent, and a very appropriate epithet of Chaos (cf. Ov. Met. 10.30, TLL 3.991.50, 992.15); similar epithets of Chaos are ingens, immane, immensum.

8.244-247  
cumque omnia secum  
duceret et requiem membris vesana negaret,  
invent pulmonis opem madidumque furenti
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praebuit, ut tumidae ruerent in mollia fibrae.

“Then, since anger swept everything away with it and in its fury gave the limbs no rest, Prometheus invented the lungs to aid the body and applied their humidity to the raging of anger to soothe our wrath-swollen flesh” (Platnauer).

Hall reports that Goodyear suggested praesuit in place of praebuit, and indeed, even if some sense can be wrung from it, praebuit is extremely feeble. But praesuo is a very rare word and quite unsuitable in sense. That could not be said of praestruit, a word which Claudian uses three times elsewhere.

17.193-194 †nitidis† quisquis te sensibus hausit

inruet intrepidus flammis.

“Whosoever has drunk of thee [Justice] with pure heart will rush fearless through flames” (Platnauer). But nitidis cannot mean “pure”; that is puris or mundis, both of which are found as variants. Palaeographically mundis would be a good emendation of nitidis; at Manil. 1.848 the two words are variants, and at 1.739 nitido is accepted for the manuscript reading mondo. The word is common in Christian Latin; for its use as an epithet of spiritus, pectus, cor, see TLL 8.1632.41 ff.

18.229-230 iamque oblita sui nec sobria divitiis mens

in miseris leges hominumque negotia ludit.

“And now his [Eutropius’s] mind, forgetful of its true nature and drunken with riches, makes sport of wretched law and the affairs of men” (Platnauer).

It is difficult to accept miserias as an epithet of leges. Hall reads his own conjecture inversas, “overturned”, for which one could adduce 20.556, totas vertere leges, but there is no reason why the preposition in should not be sound; it is true that Birt (p. CV, n. 5) says that in is certainly wrong because ludere always governs a direct accusative, but he is adequately refuted by the passages listed in TLL 7.2.1778.56 ff. However, rather than in versas I should read in nostras, and attribute the corruption to a confusion of abbreviations; both noster and miser were regularly abbreviated. For noster = Romanus see 383 below, nostris signis (“Roman standards”), and other passages listed in Birt’s Index; for the plural leges in the sense of “constitution” see OLD 3 (at 26.38 Platnauer translates leges by “civilization”).

18.263-264 perque suam tremula testatur voce sororem
defecisse vagas ad publica commoda vires.

“In tremulous tones he [sc. Eutropius] calls his sister to witness that he has spent his strength for his country’s need” (Platnauer).

This translation just ignores vagas; not surprisingly, because it is difficult
to see its meaning. Birt suspected the word and tentatively proposed *avidas* or *datas*, neither of which deserves consideration. *Suas* would suit the context, and the supposed corruption could be explained (initial *s* lost after *se* and the remnant *uas* expanded to mend the metre), but whether Claudian would have repeated *suus* here so soon after *suam* in 263 I do not know.

18.500-502  *quid trahor ulterius? Stilicho, quid vincere differs, dum certare pudet? nescis quod turpior hostis laetitia maiore cadit?*

“What need of further words? Why, Stilicho, doest thou delay to conquer because ashamed to fight? Knowest thou not that the viler the foe the greater the rejoicing at his overthrow?” (Platnauer).

*Dum certare pudet* is one possible answer to the question *quid vincere differs?* There ought therefore to be a question-mark after *differs* as well as after *pudet*.

22.400-402  *spectabunt cupidae matres, spargentur et omnes flore viae, superes cum Pincia culmina consul arbua, antiqui species Romana senatus.*

“Eager mothers will watch, and all the roads will be strewn with flowers, when you [Stilicho], a majestic consul, the Roman image of the ancient senate, climb the summit of the Pincian hill.”

It is impossible to believe that the ‘transferred’ epithet *Romana* is genuine, and I have no doubt that König’s conjecture *germana* is what the author wrote. The same corruption has occurred at *Carm. min. app. 2 (= Anth. 494b).10 f.*, addressed to Hercules, *germana Tonantis / progenies*, where the transmitted reading is *Romana*; in our passage the natural association of *Romanus* with *senatus* would help the corruption. The only point made against *germana* is that of Birt (Index p. 517), that Claudian does not use *germanus* in the sense of *genuinus*; I think that he undoubtedly does so here.

24.125-129  *per quem fracta diu translataque paene potestas, non oblita sui, servilibus exulat arvis, in proprium sed ducta larem victricia reddit fata solo fruturque iterum, quibus haeserat olim, auspiciis capitaque errantia membra reponit.*

“Thanks to him [sc. Stilicho] power, long degraded and all but transferred [sc. to Constantinople], no longer, forgetful of itself, is exiled in lands of servitude but, returned to its rightful home, restores to Italy its victorious destiny, enjoys *the promised auspices of its foundation* and gives back its scattered limbs to the head of the empire” (Platnauer).

This rendering of *quibus haeserat olim* is a translation not of Claudian’s
Latin but of the Delphin paraphrase thereof, “quibus quondam constituta fuerat”; *haeserat* cannot possibly refer to the foundation of Rome. Equally impossible is Birt’s idea that *haeserat* means “is halted” (as at Verg. *Aen.* 11.289 f. *victoria Graium / haesit*). The only possible meaning of *haeserat* is “infixa fuerat” (Barth), but then *auspicis haerere* is a scarcely intelligible phrase. I suggest that *haeserat* should be *arserat*, “was roused”, “was inspired with enthusiasm”, equivalent to *animata erat*; just below, at 166 f., it is said of Rome that she was *auguriis firmata Sibyllae* and *sacris animata Numae*.

24.264-267  

*cernitis ... laudi quod nulla canendae fratrius plectra vacent?*

Diana speaking. “Mark you... how none of my brother Apollo’s lyres can refrain from singing the praises of Stilicho?” (Platnauer). Hall points out that this gives to *vacare laudi* (dative) the sense of *vacare laude* (ablative). He thinks that the variant *quam* (for *quod*) may be right; combine this with Gesner’s conjecture *multa* (for *nulla*) and the problem is solved. Forms of *multus* and *nullus* are variants at (e.g.) Lucr. 2.95, Lucan 6.632.

28.557-559  

*haec sibi cura senum maturaque comprobat aetas idque inter veteris speciem praesentis et aulae iudicat, hunc civem, dominos venisse priores.*

“These actions [of Honorius] are approved of by careful (?) old men and men of mature age, who recognize this difference between the appearance of the ancient and the present courts, that Honorius is a true citizen, his predecessors were tyrants.”

Since *cura* has no relevant meaning, Birt conjectured *curva* (sc. *aetas*), “bent” (old age), which has been adopted by Koch and by Platnauer. But such a picturesque epithet is not wanted here; all that is wanted is an unadorned expression for “old men”, corresponding to *matura aetas*. I therefore suggest *tur<b>a*, which can be used in poetry to denote nothing more than a plurality; the two words are variants at Ov. *Ars* 3.417. For the reflexive *sibi* “bei den verba sentiendi und dicendi” see Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lat. Syntax u. Stilistik* (München 1965), 294; for *venisse = fuisse* p. 395.

(B) *Carmina minora*

2.1-3  

*urbs in conspectu montana cacumina velat tranquillo praetenta mari, ducentia portum cornua pacatas removent Aquilonibus undas.*

Description of the harbour at Smyrna. “The city that meets our gaze veils the mountain peaks, fronting a tranquil sea. The two headlands that enclose
the harbour protect the quiet water from the north wind” (Platnauer).

_Vrbs in conspectu_ seems dubious Latin for “the city that meets our gaze”; Hall (Prolegomena 196) tentatively suggests _a conspectu_, which is a decided improvement (cf. _TLL_ 4.491.20 ff.). But we should expect the poet to say that the peaks veil the sight of the city rather than that the city veils the peaks; this result can be obtained by reading _urbis conspectum_ (so both John Price and Heinsius), with _velant_ for _velat_.

One can say with confidence that _ducentia_ cannot mean “enclosing”; that is _cl(a)udentia_, which would be a credible emendation were it not that _clauditur_ (_aequor_) is used in the next sentence. Birt (Index p. 501) takes _ducentia_ to mean “praecedentia”, adducing 15.498 f. _Taurum / ducat Hyas_, and _Carm. min._ 23.3 _noctem ducentibus Haedis_; but constellations differ from harbour headlands in that they move and the headlands do not. I suggest _tutantia_, a verb which Claudian uses more than once elsewhere.

25.21-23

$subito varius vicina clamor ab urbe
et fausti iuvenum plausus mixtaeque choreis
audita per rura lyrae.$

From an epithalamium. “Suddenly there arose cries and shoutings from the neighbouring city; joyous acclamations of youth and the strains of the lyre accompanying dancing were heard in the countryside” (Platnauer adapted).

“Cries and shoutings”, as a rendering of _varius clamor_, disguises the fact that _varius_ is not an appropriate epithet of the cries that accompany the celebration of a marriage. Birt realized this; in his Index (p. 597) he says that _varius_ here means _laetus_. This is surely impossible, but “joyful” is nevertheless the only sense which fits the context, and I should emend _varius_ to _laetus_; the interchange of initial _l_ and _u_ (as in _libro/vibro_, _loco/voco_, _luctus/vultus_) is quite common. And I believe that this same corruption, of _laetus_ to _varius_, has occurred at _Carm. mai_. 26.407 _singultus varios lacrimosaque gaudia miscent_, where only Koch’s conjecture _laetos_ will complete the double oxymoron which is called for (“happy sobs and tearful joys”); Koch adds the point that the resulting alliteration _laetos lacrimosaque_ is “non iniuunda”.

27.89-93

_clara per Aegyptum placidis notissima sacris
urbs Titana colit, centumque adcline columnis
invehitur templum Thebaeo monte revulsis.
illic, ut perhibent, patriam de more reponit congeriem._

“Celebrated throughout Egypt and most renowned for its peaceful rites is a city [sc. Heliopolis] which worships the sun, and [the phoenix] enters a
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temple resting on a hundred columns hewn from the mountain of Thebes. Here, as the story goes, he is wont to deposit the pile of his father’s ashes.”

Hall rightly points out that it is very difficult to supply phoenix as the subject of invehitur and reports the view of Goodyear that either there is a lacuna after colit or invehitur is corrupt. I have no doubt that the latter is the right alternative, and I think that a solution is not far to seek: read evehitur, in the sense of erigitur or surgit, with templum as its subject; then it is only in the next sentence that the narrative is resumed (phoenix reponit patriam congeriem).

53.57-59 ergo quot dederit natos, tot funera matri reddamus. longo maneat per saecula luctu, tanto pro numero paribus damnata sepulchris.

Jupiter exhorts the assembly of the gods to defeat the giants, the offspring of Tellus. “Wherefore, for all the sons she bore, let us give back to their mother as many dead; let her mourning last through the ages as she weeps by as many graves as she now has children” (Platnauer).

Maneat luctu must mean maneat in luctu (so explicitly Birt, Index, p. 537), but the omission of the preposition is questionable. There may be a parallel for the omission at 15.155 f., nostris iam luctibus ille / consenuit, but in that line Hall’s proposed insertion of in before luctibus is tempting. Birt’s conjecture iaceat is not much of an improvement, and Heinsius’s longi... maneant luctus is far too violent a change. If any change is needed, perhaps one should consider madear; for madere or madescere used of weeping see TLL 8.33.15 ff. and 49 ff., 8.35.26 ff. and 45 ff.; here luctu would take the place of such ablatives as lacrimis, fletu, imribus (20.303; Rapt. Pros. 1.268, 3.311 and 442).

53.73-74 horrendus ubique it fragor, et pugnae spatium discriminat aer.

“On all sides a horrid din resounds and only the air divides the rival armies [of gods and giants]” (Platnauer). This is the traditional interpretation of the latter clause, but it is little more than nonsense: how can pugnae spatium mean “the rival armies”, and what is meant by saying that the air divides them? Birt reports an excellent conjecture of his own: for spatium read strepitum, a word which is common in battle-contexts; for the corruption cf. Manil. 5.729, where Bentley wrote stipatum for spatium. To complete the emendation I would write disseminat for discriminat; “the air scatters abroad the din of battle” follows very convincingly on ubique it fragor.

53.83-84 tum superinsultans avidus languentia curru membra terit multumque rotae sparsere cruorem.
In the battle between the gods and the giants Mars despatches Pelorus.
“Then exulting in his victory he drives his chariot over the dying giant’s limbs till the wheels ran red with blood” (Platnauer).

This translation ignores avidus, which has aroused justified suspicion. The available replacements are avido, rapido, gravido (the last presumably in its very rare sense of gravi). The easiest change (involving little more than the insertion of an initial letter) would be rabidus, which would suit both the immediately preceding narrative and the gruesome content of these two lines; Birt’s Index lists five occurrences of the word.

(C) Carminum minorum appendix

The poems which editors of Claudian print as an appendix appear also in fasc. 2 of Riese’s edition of the Anthologia Latina (Leipzig 1906), whose numbering I give in brackets. In an article published in “Class. et Med.” 47, 1996, I have proposed the following emendations: 2 (Anth. 494b).66 taetris (for totis), 106 fulvoque (for soloque), 135 occupat (for accipit); 5 (Anth. 742).2 placido... pectore (for tacito... carmine); 15 (Anth. 747).2 non reor est (for at); Chloris.

2 (Anth. 494b).48-51
neve haec monstra tibi faciant, Alcmena, pavorem;
sic mater potes esse dei. iam tolle serenum
laeta animum, tantoque libens haec aspice vultu
ut deceat genuisse Iovem.

“And do not let these monstrous creatures [the two snakes that are attacking baby Hercules] cause you fear, Alcmena; in this way you can be the mother of a god. Now joyfully lift up your heart in peace, and look upon them gladly with such(?) a countenance that it becomes Jupiter to have be-gotten him [Hercules]”.

Birt takes vultu in the sense of despectu, “contempt”. That tanto vultu can have this or any other relevant sense I do not believe; tanto must be corrupt. The sense which we expect in view of line 48 (pavorem) is securo, “free from fear”; if Riese’s discarded tuto can have this sense, it is the easiest change; otherwise either Baehrens’s lento or (I suggest) placido (> tacito > tanto) could be considered. But irrespective of what we read in 50 the ut clause in 51 is unsatisfactory: how could the honour which fatherhood con-fers on Jupiter be either the consequence or the purpose of Alcmena looking upon the snakes without fear? I suggest that deceat should be doceas, “in or-der that you may prove that Jupiter is the father”; doceas derives support from fidem at 15 (fecisti de patre fidem) and probabit at 41 (patremque proba-bit... patrem). I take the ut clause as final, not however expressing the
conscious purpose in Alcmena’s mind but a “rhetorical pseudo-final” clause expressing the “voluntas fati” (Hofmann-Szantyr 642).

2.79-80  
*heu quanta virorum*  
*funera! quam multos stravit cum dentibus apros!*

“Alas how numerous the deaths of men! How many boars did he [the Nemean lion] lay low with his teeth!”

Hall records seven ways of rewriting the latter exclamation, most of them violent and most involving the change of *apros* to *agros*; but Birt is justified in objecting to *agros* on the ground that no one has ever heard of lions devastating fields and crops. A note in the edition of Lemaire (Paris 1824) takes *cum dentibus* as equivalent to the expression of a second object of *stravit*: “laid low boars together with their tusks”; but this distinction between boars and their tusks seems improbable. Surely *dentibus* are the lion’s teeth; in which case *cum* has the instrumental sense which is common in late Latin, and the sense of *stravit cum dentibus* is repeated in 83, *morsu fudit*; cf. also 91 in *nova sanguineos armanentem vulnera rictus*.

14 (Anth. 746).3-6  
te, mea bella Cythere,  
aspicio venientem et tu mea limina grato introitu dignata rosas et lenis amomi  
delicias miras tecum allicis.

“I see you coming, my beautiful Cythere, and you, deeming my threshold worthy of your welcome entry, bring(?) with you roses and the wonderful delights of mild perfume.”

*Secum allicere* is not a convincing phrase. Should *allicis* be *advehis*?*

Aberdeen, Scotland  
W. S. WATT

* I am very grateful to Professor J. Delz for commenting on an earlier version of these notes.