

## DID DAMASUS WRITE THE *CARMEN CONTRA PAGANOS*? THE EVIDENCE OF *ET*

In Alan Cameron's long-awaited and epoch-making study *The Last Pagans of Rome*, a typically erudite and stimulating chapter is devoted to the anonymous poem generally known today as *Carmen contra paganos* (*CCP*), written in the late fourth or (some have argued) early fifth century.<sup>1</sup> This poem (of 122 lines)—of which the text is still in many places uncertain, in spite of a wealth of critical attention from the time when it was brought fully to light by Delisle in 1867<sup>2</sup> to the present day<sup>3</sup>—is a blistering invective against worshippers of the traditional gods and their practices, and against one person in particular, whose identity has been much debated.<sup>4</sup> Cameron has brought forward a battery of strong arguments, many of them new, against the claims of Virius Nicomachus Flavianus,<sup>5</sup> for a long time the front runner, whose name used to be given confidently in the poem's title, and, like Ellis and Cracco Ruggini, has strongly championed the claims of Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, the grandee who was consul designate for the year 385 but did not live to take up the office.<sup>6</sup>

It is not proposed here to discuss the target's identity, but to examine Cameron's contention that the writer of *CCP* may be confidently identified: it was Pope Damasus.<sup>7</sup> As has long been clear,<sup>8</sup> this attribution was known in the Middle Ages, in an eleventh- and twelfth-century library catalogue of the abbey of Lobbes, which includes an item *Damasi episcopi versus de Praetextato praefecto urbis*, now part of number 238.<sup>9</sup> This ascription, though accepted by Courtney,<sup>10</sup> has been received by scholars with

<sup>1</sup> A. Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford, 2011), 273–319.

<sup>2</sup> L. Delisle, 'Note sur le manuscrit de Prudence n° 8084 du fonds latin de la Bibliothèque impériale', *Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes* 28 (1867), 297–303.

<sup>3</sup> The most convenient modern edition is in D.R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *Anthologia Latina* 1.1 (Stuttgart, 1982), 17–23, from which quotations will be taken.

<sup>4</sup> For a detailed bibliography, see the footnotes in L. Cracco Ruggini, 'En marge d'une "mésalliance": Prêtextat, Damase et le Carmen contra paganos', *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* 142 (1998), 493–516; L. Cracco Ruggini, 'Il paganesimo Romano tra religione e politica (384–94 d. C.): per una reinterpretazione del *Carmen contra paganos*', *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Memorie Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 8.23 (Rome, 1979), 1–141; and Cameron (n. 1), 273–85.

<sup>5</sup> On Flavianus, A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale and J. Morris (edd.), *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (= *PLRE*) (Cambridge, 1971), 1.347–9.

<sup>6</sup> On Praetextatus, *PLRE* 1.722–4.

<sup>7</sup> On Damasus, see 'Damasus I', in  *OCD*<sup>4</sup> (Oxford, 2012); Ch. Pietri, 'Damasus' in A. di Berardino (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Early Church* (trans. W.H.C. Frend) (Cambridge, 1992), 218–19; J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome* (London, 1975), 81–90.

<sup>8</sup> F. Dolbeau, 'Un nouveau catalogue des manuscrits de Lobbes aux XI–XII siècles', *RecAug* 13 (1978), 3–36.

<sup>9</sup> Dolbeau showed that *CCP* is imitated in the work of Héger of Lobbes, in 'Damase, le Carmen contra paganos et Héger de Lobbes', *REAug* 27 (1981), 38–43.

<sup>10</sup> E. Courtney, 'Supplementary notes on the Latin Anthology', *C&M* 40 (1989), 197–211, at 203.

less than full agreement.<sup>11</sup> Some cite a strong difference in style between *CCP*—sometimes denounced by modern writers as ‘doggerel’—and the extant verses of Damasus, praised as elegant by Jerome.<sup>12</sup> Cameron takes the identification seriously, however, seeing more in the catalogue entry than ‘medieval guesswork’ or an example of the common tendency to attribute anonymous poems to major authors, such as Cyprian, Paulinus of Nola and Tertullian.<sup>13</sup> To confirm the attribution to Damasus he undertakes a detailed philological study of the poem, in which he points to many shared characteristics of metrical practice, style and intertextuality.<sup>14</sup> Included in this is the phenomenon of ‘formulae’,<sup>15</sup> that is, more or less fixed expressions used by both Damasus and *CCP* for recurring themes of importance; various features of metre and prosody, both regular and irregular (regular ones may be used to detect a link if their frequency in the two authors is proportionately identical or similar);<sup>16</sup> some verbal parallels which arguably achieve more than the usual type of conclusion that one author knew or imitated another, or that both have the same source; and other surprises such as evidence in both poems that the pope read Petronius.<sup>17</sup> The present article, which uses philological argumentation to approach ‘the philological issue’ (Cameron [n. 1], 311), will concentrate on what is for Cameron the ‘final detail that clinches the matter’ ([n. 1], 314). This is founded on what he calls the ‘truly remarkable idiosyncrasy of Damasus: complete avoidance of copulative *et* (*et*= and)’.<sup>18</sup> He goes on to argue that the same idiosyncrasy is present in *CCP*.

This claim about Damasus’ very marked preference was first made by Maximilian Ihm, editor of the Teubner Damasus and writer of two relevant articles.<sup>19</sup> In 23.1 Ihm (25.1 in the later text of Ferrua),<sup>20</sup> *aspice et hic tumulus retinet caelestia membra*,<sup>21</sup> the meaning of *et* must, as Ihm’s index confirms, be *etiam*. The first two words of the

<sup>11</sup> Notably Cracco Ruggini, ‘En marge’ (n. 4), and D. Shanzer, ‘The anonymous *Carmen contra paganos* and the date and identity of the centonist Proba’, *REAug* 32 (1986), 232–48.

<sup>12</sup> Jerome, *De uiris illustribus* ciii, *Damasus, Romanae urbis episcopus, elegans in uersibus componendis ingenium habuit*. The ‘many short works in the epic metre’ also mentioned by Jerome there have not survived. In this article Damasus is throughout the writer of the ‘epigrammata’—that is, the epitaphs and elogia of martyrs and others.

<sup>13</sup> On such pseudepigrapha, see R. Herzog, *Die Biblepik der lateinischen Spätantike 1: Formgeschichte einer erbaulichen Gattung* (Munich, 1975), xxv–xxxii.

<sup>14</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 311–14.

<sup>15</sup> The notion of formulae perhaps suits Damasus rather better than *CCP*, where it is arguably more a matter of repeating or recycling the occasional phrase or constructing a similar line. In one case (Cameron [n. 1], 311 and n. 186), the scribe could well have been responsible (*Iatrator Anubis*, 100).

<sup>16</sup> The verses of Damasus number a little over 320 (some lines are not quite complete, hence the imprecision) or, for the present purpose, allowing for lines reused, just over 300; in *CCP* there are 122 lines in most editions. The ratio of their lengths is thus very close to 5:2.

<sup>17</sup> Courtney (n. 10) wonders if any other pope ever read Petronius.

<sup>18</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 314.

<sup>19</sup> M. Ihm, *Damasi Epigrammata (Accedunt pseudo-Damasiana aliaque ad Damasiana inlustranda idonea)* (Leipzig, 1895); M. Ihm, ‘Die Epigramme des Damasus’, *RhM* 50 (1895), 191–204; M. Ihm, ‘Zu lateinischen Dichtern: das *Carmen Flavianum* (Cod. Paris. 8084)’, *RhM* 52 (1897), 208–2.

<sup>20</sup> A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, with an appendix, *Tituli Damaso falso tributi vel ad damasianos spectantes* (Vatican City, 1942). Ferrua was principally an archaeologist, and, as he says, not a philologist, but his carefully prepared text is essential.

<sup>21</sup> *aspice et* is found in Verg. *G.* 2.114, but this passage is not included among the Virgilian models referenced by Damasus’ editors (*Aen.* 2.604, 6.855, 10.481: *aspice* alone in all cases). The reading *aspice ut* has been suggested to me (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.855–6 and *Ecl.* 5.6–7, where a verb in the indicative mood follows), but perhaps this would be too much of a flourish to be typical of Damasus’ opening lines.

line are De Rossi's emendation of the text in manuscript T, a medieval *sylloge* which uniquely preserves the opening line.<sup>22</sup> This has been accepted without reservation, for it is difficult to conceive an alternative; the fact that Damasus avoids hiatus seems to rule out simple *aspice*.<sup>23</sup> To explain *et* Ferrua speculated that it might have referred to the *spelunca magna*, the cave in which the various tombs inscribed with his verses were discovered. But another possible example of *et*—this is clearly copulative—is revealed by consultation of Ferrua's index; at 59.1 (= Ihm 61.1), both editors print the line as *corpore mente animo pariterque et nomine Felix*, implicitly preferring the text of two particular manuscripts (C and Th) to those of various other testimonies which give metrically acceptable wording without *et*.<sup>24</sup>

Two other apparent exceptions to Ihm's thesis should be mentioned. The reader will also find *et*, clearly copulative, three times in one inscription (Ferrua 50.7 and 8/9; Ihm 11.7 and 8/9), but the situation is not straightforward. Ferrua seems to agree with Ihm that lines 8 and 9 are an addition to Damasus' original poem by another writer; as for line 7, where Ihm insisted that the *et* apparent in the damaged line 7 (the left side of the manuscript is torn) must be part of a verb, Ferrua shows some sympathy with Ihm's *ornauet* [*sic*],<sup>25</sup> by at least referring the reader to 42.3 (Ihm 42.3 also), where the phrase *ornauit tumulum* is paralleled. Other suggested supplements are recorded by Ihm, including *composuit*, but Ihm had no time or space for De Rossi's suggested supplement *<te colit>* before *et*, dismissing it as 'improbable'.<sup>26</sup> (Although a verb in the present or future tense, ending in *-et*, cannot be ruled out, none seems to have been suggested.) There is another appearance of *et*, twice, in Ferrua's 33,<sup>1</sup> at lines 2 and 6; but although he includes this among the genuine poems, Ferrua admits to finding no ground for ascribing it to Damasus.<sup>27</sup> Ihm had followed the edition of Merenda,<sup>28</sup> where the criteria of authenticity are not linguistic, and placed the poem among the *falso tribut*, at 102.

Ferrua, then, seems to have been content to follow Ihm, or at least not challenge him, in the matter of copulative *et*. Yet, when carefully setting out his criteria for distinguishing between authentic and inauthentic epitaphs of Damasus, he dismissed the contention of Ihm that Damasus avoided copulative *et* as 'inane' (that is, fruitless for this purpose), and averred that he could see no reason for Ihm's conclusion.<sup>29</sup> This implies that he would not reject a poem, as Ihm was resolved to do, on this criterion alone.

The absence, or perhaps one should rather say rarity, of copulative *et* in over 300 lines of Damasus is indeed striking, and evidently a distinctive preference. He chooses

<sup>22</sup> G.B. De Rossi, *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1857–1888). Damasus' verses exist in the manuscripts of various *syllogae*, collections of inscriptions probably recorded by pilgrims, as well as on the tombs themselves, where they were inscribed by the calligrapher Filocalus, and their fragments. For the rest of this poem we have both kinds of testimony.

<sup>23</sup> There is hiatus in 79.5 Ihm, but that epigram was judged inauthentic by him; Ferrua rejected it altogether. It is highly unlikely, but perhaps not inconceivable, that *aspicis* was a medieval emendation of original *aspice*.

<sup>24</sup> Ferrua (n. 20), 215.

<sup>25</sup> Ihm in fact derived this from Terribilinius, who is acknowledged in the edition of A. Merenda, *S. Damasi Papae opuscula et gesta cum notis M. M. Sarazani iterum collecta ...* (Rome, 1754) (this edition is also that used in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*).

<sup>26</sup> Ihm, 'Die Epigramme' (n. 19), 196. In his edition he is certain (*pro certo habeo*) that *et* is part of a verb.

<sup>27</sup> Ferrua (n. 20), 168 does, however, rather confusingly, suggest circumstances in which Damasus might have written it.

<sup>28</sup> See note 25.

<sup>29</sup> Ferrua (n. 20), 53 ('cuius rei rationem non reperio').

to write, at the end of a hexameter line, *faleras telaque cruenta* (Ferrua 8.7, Ihm also) and *sinus regnaque piorum* (Ferrua 20.5, Ihm 26.5), and *domos regnaque piorum* (Ferrua 25.5, Ihm 23.5) rather than use an *et* which would give sound metre, as well as *domum regnaque piorum* (Ferrua 43.5, Ihm 43.5; also Ferrua 39.8 [Ihm 47.3]), where the syllable before *et regna*, had *et* been used, would have to be elided. It is not likely (and quite unprovable) that the phrase *regnaque piorum* in the last-mentioned case acquired the respect of a formulaic description of 'heaven', and that this influenced other usages. Damasus was in general a careful metrician, and knew his Virgil.<sup>30</sup> This aversion to copulative *et* is in no way due to the nature of epigraphic writing in general (as can be seen from the rich range of extant epitaphs from countless hands), nor to any feature of Damasus' subject-matter, or his approach to it, or the way in which he constructs his edifying short narratives of martyrs and others. Sometimes he employs asyndeton, but uses it no more than some other writers of Late Antiquity do (and much less than many); and although he makes frequent use of *-que*, it is not prominent.<sup>31</sup>

What about the author of *CCP*? Of the two examples of *et* that Cameron finds, neither, he claims, is copulative. They are in lines 15 and 59, and require careful investigation. The text of Shackleton Bailey will be used (14–16):<sup>32</sup>

pellitur arma Iouis fugiens regnator Olympi:  
et quisquam supplex ueneratur templa tyranni,  
cum patrem uideat nato cogente fugatum?

The ruler of Olympus, fleeing the weapons of Jupiter, is driven out; and does any suppliant reverse the tyrant's temples, when he sees the father routed by his son's compulsion?

This is the second of three derisive vignettes of the traditional gods in the core of the opening paragraph, each of which contains a scathing comment or sarcastic question attached. Here the point is that in view of Saturn's yielding to compulsion and his son's violent usurpation no suppliant respects the temples of Jupiter, which are deservedly defunct.<sup>33</sup> *Et*, with *quisquam*, is best taken as part of a phrase which certainly derives from Verg. *Aen.* 1.48, *et quisquam numen Iunonis adorat?*<sup>34</sup> Shackleton Bailey helpfully makes an exact reference to the lines in *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* in which

<sup>30</sup> Ihm, 'Die Epigramme' (n. 19), 194; 'Damasi Epigrammata' (n. 19), 2, where suggested allusions to other authors are summarized; and J. Fontaine, 'Damase Poète théodosien: L'imaginaire poétique des *Epigrammata*', in D. Mazzoleni (ed.), *Saecularia Damasiana. Atti del convegno internazionale per il XVI centenario della morte di Papa Damaso I* (Vatican City, 1986), 115–45, at 130–7. In Late Latin writers a short *a* is sometimes lengthened before a word beginning with *qu-*; this has nothing to do with 'grammarians' wives' (Ferrua [n. 20], 104), a comment evidently based on an obscure statement by L. Mueller, *De re metrica poetarum Latinorum* (Leipzig, 1894), 382–3 and 443, that Venantius and others were *metricorum praestigiis decepti*. Grammarians explain poetic usage, and rarely influence it, deliberately or otherwise.

<sup>31</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 315 gives figures for the use of *-que* in various other poems.

<sup>32</sup> Shackleton Bailey (n. 3).

<sup>33</sup> In line 14 the writer borrows the phrase *arma Iouis fugiens* from Verg. *Aen.* 8.320, and in line 15 *ueneratur* shows the influence of Virgil's *adorat* (*Aen.* 1.48), on which see next note.

<sup>34</sup> Like Virgil's Juno, the derisive author of *CCP* is commenting on the actual situation; he shows no awareness of the variant *adoret* attested by Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.10, and by Servius in three places (*G.* 4.502, *Aen.* 2.79, 12.11). Croke and Harries, in their valuable study of this and other polemical literature of the time (B. Croke and J. Harries [edd.], *Religious Conflict in Fourth-Century Rome: A Documentary Study* [Sydney, 1982], 80–3), translate the above text; Cameron treats the verb as present subjunctive ('would venerate'). The difference in meaning is minimal.

the Virgilian passage is classified.<sup>35</sup> This is not the category of *et* = *etiam*, but the larger one for *et* as *coniunctio copulativa*; and within this, it falls into the category in which [*et*] ‘ducit enuntiatum interrogativum: a. cum affectu (plerumque indignatione) elatum’.<sup>36</sup> If it is not obviously copulative in a simple sense of joining A and B, it is certainly not equivalent to the stronger word *etiam* (*TLL* uses the adverb ‘additive’ of this usage), as the practice of translators confirms: in their translation of *CCP* Croke and Harries have simple ‘and’, Cameron has no word, and neither does Bartalucci.<sup>37</sup> Translators of the Virgil passage agree: of ten translations I have consulted all but one offer no word equivalent to *et*. As for translators of Ovid, who uses the phrase twice, clearly influenced by the Virgil passage both times (*Am.* 3.3.33; 3.8.1, where it is the first word of a poem, making *et* = *etiam* even less likely), there is no attempt to render *et* in particular. Before Virgil the copulative force of *et* when joined to *quisquam* may have been felt more strongly—translators of Cicero (at *Clu.* 30 and *Leg. Man.* 42) divide.

The second example in *CCP* of supposedly non-copulative *et* is in the following context, where the writer asks why the initiate should change his garments and demean himself (57–9):

quis tibi, taurobolus, uestem mutare suasit,  
inflatus diues subito mendicus ut esses,  
obsitus et pannis ... ?

Who persuaded you, initiate of the taurobolium, to change your clothing, so that you, conceited rich man, should suddenly be a beggar and covered with rags ... ?

Here Cameron appeals to the note in Bartalucci’s commentary, where, although he has translated the words *mendicus ... et pannis* as ‘accattone e ricoperto di stacci’, Bartalucci surprisingly declares, ‘Quanto ad *et*, si può considerarsi equivalente di *etiam*’ and accordingly refers broadly to the second main category (*pars altera*) of *TLL* (5.2.906,74 ff. [*sic*]). Alternatively, Bartalucci suggests that this is a ‘pleonastic’ use of *et*; but the comment of Einar Löfstedt to which he refers relates to its use in certain correlative expressions, and has nothing to do with the case.<sup>38</sup> Surely, though, the usage in the present passage is purely copulative, simply connecting *mendicus* (whether this is seen as noun or adjective makes no difference) and, with postponement of *et* as often, the phrase *obsitus ... pannis*. There would be little point in saying ‘a beggar and, moreover, one covered in rags’. Of course, in English, where the adjective ‘beggarly’ may be thought largely metaphorical, one might well wish to translate as ‘a beggar covered in rags’ as Croke/Harries and Cameron himself do, but that does not affect the grammatical analysis and interpretation.

There is, then, no reason to see *et* (= *etiam*) anywhere in the text of *CCP*; it is a red herring. As for copulative *et*, we may count two in the passages just analysed. If it is objected that *et* in *et quisquam* is not obviously copulative in the usual sense, it is clearly not equivalent to *etiam*, and there is no reason to believe that the writer of *CCP* would

<sup>35</sup> *TLL* 5.2.890,79. No mention is made of the *CCP* passage (not all direct quotations of a word or phrase are given in the *TLL*).

<sup>36</sup> R.G. Austin speaks of this passage’s ‘querulous and angry tone’, and comments on the *et* in Verg. *Aen.* 4.215 with the single word ‘indignantis’.

<sup>37</sup> Croke and Harries (n. 34), 80–3; A. Bartalucci, ‘*Contro I Pagani*’ *Carmen cod. Paris. lat. 8084* (Pisa, 1998).

<sup>38</sup> E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Darmstadt, 1962 [repr.]), 43. An example is *tot de diis spolia, quot de gentibus et tropaea* (Min. Fel. Oct. 25.6).

have thought it was. As for Damasus, supposing that he did not spurn *et* completely (a faint possibility canvassed above), he used *et* once as equivalent to *etiam*, and perhaps once or twice in ways that are not equivalent to *etiam*, but rather copulative. There is no shared predilection or practice here. And whatever the exact numbers, one must also dismiss, in the interests of mathematical accuracy, the claim of Cameron, who presents the total numbers of these and other words in Damasus and *CCP*, that the proportions are ‘startlingly similar’.<sup>39</sup> Arguments from proportionality in stylistic matters—but it is nowhere proved that proportions are consistent in different works of an author—might have some force if exact, but have none in this case.

The economy with *et* is indeed striking and unusual. Many Latin authors, both of the classical and of the late antique periods, often have twenty or more cases of the word *et* in 122 lines, and none, in my extensive sampling, has so few as two. And in passages where *et* is relatively rare, the effect is evidently sought after without any particular purpose. The writer may perhaps have been quite unaware. This is overwhelmingly likely, for example, in Juvenecus, the Christian poet who wrote some fifty years before Damasus, who has at least one passage of equal length to *CCP* in which *et* appears only three times (2.713–829), and several where it makes just five appearances.<sup>40</sup>

Although Cameron’s argument depends on the absence, and not the rarity, of copulative *et*, in the interests of completeness one should examine a number of other passages in *CCP* which might have been taken into account in the search for *et*, but where it may have been corrupted or edited out. Thanks to the ‘apparato critico completo’ helpfully provided by Bartalucci (68–83) in addition to the apparatus beneath his text of *CCP*, and the shrewd and helpful apparatus of Shackleton Bailey, it is possible to adduce a number of other passages in *CCP* where the presence of *et* is not unlikely, or at least deserves consideration. It will certainly not be argued that all the emendations to be mentioned should be accepted, but there is a possibility that the number of its uses of *et* may not be quite so low as two. The passages are presented in the text of Shackleton Bailey, with enough lines quoted to give necessary context. In some cases the punctuation is changed, or must remain uncertain because of deeper textual uncertainty. The words principally concerned are in bold.

(a) 9–12:

Iuppiter hic uester, Ledae superatus amore,  
fingeret ut cycnum, uoluit canescere pluma.<sup>41</sup>  
perditus ad Danaen **fluere**t subito aureus imber,  
per freta Parthenopes taurus **mugire**t adulter.

This Jupiter of yours, overcome by love for Leda, so that he could be a swan chose to become white with feathers. Desperate for Danae, he [would] suddenly flow as a golden shower, with adulterous love he [would] bellow as a bull through the waters of Parthenope.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Putting the figures for Damasus first in each case, the figures given by Cameron are for *ac* 1: 1 or 2? (better, ‘2 or 3?’; for surely [line] 39 must be added to 72 and 116 [see below]); for *atque* 2: 0; for *-que* 45: 26. Cf. note 16.

<sup>40</sup> But it is not a common feature in late antique writers: Prudentius and Paulinus of Nola, among others, have averages as high as classical writers.

<sup>41</sup> The full stop here, used by Shackleton Bailey, Cameron and (in his text) Bartalucci, may not be needed. My solution is translated below.

<sup>42</sup> It must be stated immediately that the uses of the Latin imperfect subjunctive do not include anything equivalent to the English ‘would’ which is used of repeated actions in the past (as in ‘a frog he would a-woooing go’); hence the warning square brackets.

Our single manuscript, P, has *fluere*t and *mugire*t, with t superscript in the latter case; but as is clear from the list of such superscripts given by Bartalucci ([n. 37], 30), this does not signify anything more than a *lapsus calami*, quickly revised. What Bartalucci calls ‘l’aporia dei due congiuntivi’ (in lines 11 and 12) has attracted various unconvincing solutions. Cameron translates the two lines as if they were simply past indicatives.<sup>43</sup> Bartalucci, in his commentary, suggests (though his text in fact adopts the solution first made by Mähly, see below) that they might exemplify the imperfect subjunctives that express indignation or are, in the words of LHS 2.338, ‘unwilligen (‘polemischen’) Fragen’ (‘was he to ...’, which would be an abrupt change in expression). Shackleton Bailey suspected that a line was missing after line 10, as Cameron notes, and Baehrens one after line 13,<sup>44</sup> but it is not obvious how a few extra words in these positions might help. Not surprisingly perhaps, nobody seems to have suggested that the imperfect subjunctives might indicate final clauses, following on from *fingeret ut*; this would make the lines 11 and 12 impossibly compressed. (It may, of course, be the case that it was the proximity of *fingeret* that misled a scribe).

The problem is removed by emending the subjunctives to infinitives (*fluere*, *mugire*) each followed by an *et*, a suggestion put forward by Mähly<sup>45</sup> and resurrected by Shackleton Bailey. This helps to provide a close connection with the first of the three descriptions of Jupiter’s fabled loves (lines 9 and 10), where, overcome by love for Leda, in order to imitate a swan, he was willing to sprout white feathers. Here there is a clear statement of motive, strategy and implication(s) of the strategy; the proposed infinitives, based on *uoluit*, provide this very neatly in lines 11 and 12. This remedy was applied also by Baehrens,<sup>46</sup> but he was content to read *fluere subito* (for the prosody, compare *fluere Berecynthia* in 73 and *facere parua* in 82) and *mugireque*, a reading less close to what is transmitted.<sup>47</sup> If objection is raised to the postponement of *et* in line 12 to so late a position, there is a parallel in ps.-Tert. *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* 5.229, *humanis sese uestiuit et artubus ille*. Perhaps the original read *per*

<sup>43</sup> According to Cameron ([n. 1], 275, and cf. 315 n. 209), the writer of *CCP* has ‘an unaccountable predilection for imperfect subjunctives’, but this is questionable. If the use of imperfect subjunctives on average once in five or six lines is a predilection—and many passages of other authors that I have sampled have far fewer examples of it, and none has more or even as many—then the author of *CCP* may be said to have a predilection; but it is not an obviously unaccountable one, and the author is not given to eccentric usage (as Cameron has it). The imperfect subjunctive is used after *cum* (in its commonest sense of ‘when’, ‘since’) at least six times, and with *quod* (‘because’) once; after a relative pronoun, in what is often called a ‘generic’ usage, four times, or five times if one adds in *donaret* at 79, before which *quibus* is probably to be understood; after *ut* (in a clause of purpose) twice, or thrice if one adds in *fecit ... curaret* (line 85), where there is what some would call the omission of *ut* (this construction is common in Latin). In line 33 we seem to have an example of the kind of question mentioned below (in the words of LHS 2.338, ‘unwilligen’ [‘polemischen Fragen’]). These are all regular usages. The text and the sense of line 31 are uncertain, as they are in line 49 (discussed below). Apart from the two lines under discussion here, that leaves the three examples in lines 40–43, certainly to be explained all in the same way—perhaps as a kind of ‘attraction’ after *uellet*.

<sup>44</sup> E. Baehrens, ‘Zur lateinischen Anthologie’, *RhM* 32 (1877), 211–25, at 222; and *Poetae Latini Minores* (= *PLM*) (Leipzig, 1881), 3.286–92, at 288.

<sup>45</sup> J. Mähly, ‘Nachtrag zu vorstehender Recension’, *Zeitschrift für Österreichischen Gymnasien* 22 (1871), 584–90, at 585.

<sup>46</sup> Baehrens, ‘Zur lateinischen Anthologie’ (n. 44), 215, and *PLM* 3.286–92, at 288.

<sup>47</sup> If parallels are needed to this placing of *-que*, there is *reddereque* in Tib. 1.3.34 and others (M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse* [Cambridge, 1951], 93). In line 83 the manuscript gives *mittereque*, and no one has suggested *mittere et*.

*freta Parthenopes mugire et taurus adulter*, a neater line, so that *taurus* and *mugire et* should be transposed.

I therefore suggest:

Iuppiter hic uester, Ledaē superatus amore,  
fingeret ut cycnum, uoluit canescere pluma,  
perditus ad Danaen fluere et subito aureus imber,  
per freta Parthenopes mugire et taurus adulter.

This Jupiter of yours, overcome by love for Leda, so that he could be a swan chose to become white with feathers. Desperate for Danae,<sup>48</sup> he chose to suddenly flow to her as a golden shower, and with adulterous love to bellow as a bull through the waters of Parthenope.<sup>49</sup>

(b) 116–18:

ipsa mola et manibus coniunx altaria supplex  
dum cumulat donis uotaque in limine templi  
soluere dis deabusque parat superisque minatur ...

Your suppliant wife with her hands heaps up the altars with grain and gifts and prepares to fulfil her vows to the gods and goddesses on the threshold of the temple, and threatens the divine deities ...

P's *molat* cannot stand. Though the form *molare*, as opposed to *molere*, is occasionally found (Itala *Matth.* 24.41 *molantes*, changed in Vulgate to the regular *molentes*), and by verbal nouns (*molatio*, *molator*) in glosses, the verb is otherwise exclusively third conjugation. In any case, a ritual sense for the verb is unattested. Early emendations were *mola* (alone) by Morel;<sup>50</sup> *mola ac* by Ellis;<sup>51</sup> and *mola et* by Dobbstein,<sup>52</sup> who is followed by Shackleton Bailey and Bartalucci among others. Cameron, who discusses this passage briefly ([n. 1], 315 n. 203), finds Dobbstein's emendation 'tempting' but not certain given the divided ancient testimony to Verg. *Aen.* 4.517 *mola manibusque piis altaria iuxta* (*molam* is also attested), which obviously underlies the passage but surely supports *et* as much, or as little, as it does *ac*. But 'in the light of the poet's avoidance of *et*' he accepts *ac*, with some obvious circularity. A further problem, but one not relevant to the present question, is created by the remarkable hyperbaton of *mola* and *donis*, made harsher by the intervening *manibus*: Croke/Harries and Cameron have 'with grain and gifts', Bartalucci '[mentre con le mani] copre supplice di farro salato e di doni gli altare'.

The presence of *et* is less likely in the following passage, but it should be included in the interest of completeness; and it shows, as does passage (d), that a prolific textual critic saw nothing wrong in conjecturing *et*.

<sup>48</sup> Cameron translates *perditus* as 'in his infamy', and no doubt that was in the poet's mind; but the translation of Croke and Harries, with its hint of Latin love-elegy to match *adulter*, seems more apt.

<sup>49</sup> The writer probably meant the *Parthenium mare*, part of the eastern Mediterranean, referred to by Ammianus (14.8.10, 22.15.2 and 22.16.9) and Macrobius, *Sat.* 7.12.35. The nymph Parthenope, and the city of Naples named after her, had no part in the Europa myth; she originally lived in the land of Sidon (Ov. *Met.* 2.840).

<sup>50</sup> C. Morel, 'Le poème Latin du ms. 8084 de la Bibliothèque impériale', *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature* 4 (1869), 300–4, at 302.

<sup>51</sup> R. Ellis, 'On a recently discovered Latin poem of the fourth century', *Journal of Philology* 1 (1868), 66–80, at 79. No reason is given by Ellis for choosing *ac* rather than the equally frequent *et*.

<sup>52</sup> G. Dobbstein, 'De carmine Christiano codicis Par. 8084' (Diss., University of Louvain, 1879), 11 and 46.



(c) 23–4:

conuenit his ducibus, proceres, sperare salutem?  
**sacratīs** uestras liceat componere lites?

Is it appropriate, senators, to look for salvation to these leaders? Would it be right for these sacred ones to settle your quarrels?

At line 24 Baehrens suggested *sacratī, et*; as he explains in his edition,<sup>53</sup> this would make a clear reference to *proceres* (reflected in Croke and Harries, ‘sacred leaders’). Though the enjambement and the elision are certainly not impossible, the emendation robs the lines of a certain balance, even elegance; and the fact that *sacratīs* does not refer to the same beings as *ducibus* (these are the quarrelsome gods of lines 19–22) but to the ‘consecrated ones’ (the adjective is always used ironically, according to Cameron [(n. 1), 305]) is clear enough without emendation.

(d) 46–50:

sacratus uester urbi quid praestitit, oro,  
 qui †hierium† docuit sub terra quaerere solem,  
 cum sibi forte pirum fossor de rure dolasset,  
 †**diceretque**† esse deum comitem Bacchique magistrum,<sup>54</sup>  
 Sarapidis cultor, Etruscis semper amicus.

How did your consecrated man benefit the city, I ask, he who taught Hierius to seek the sun beneath the earth, when a country digger had by chance hewed for himself a pear-tree, and [would] say that it was a companion of the gods and master of Bacchus, worshipper of Sarapis, ever a friend of Etruscans?<sup>55</sup>

The text and punctuation are problematic. *diceretque* does not scan, for a double trochee is inadmissible in hexameters, even for the poet of *CCP* (whose metrical failings are largely ones of prosody, and are not errors of metre as such). Ellis suggested *diceret* with no copulative,<sup>56</sup> which leaves it uncertain how line 49 should be taken and indeed what its subject is. Shackleton Bailey suggested *dixit et* or *dixitque*; this would link line 49 closely with 47, with *dixit* then a second verb in the perfect tense in the relative clause introduced by *qui*. This would be easier if lines 48 and 49 were transposed. It is possible that line 50 belongs with the sentence that follows, in which case the question mark should be moved. There is now, in the reconstructed sentence, a marked contrast between the words *urbi* and *rure*: the sophisticated man of the city has descended to boorish simplicity.<sup>57</sup> Between the suggestions *dixit et* and *dixitque* it is impossible to adjudicate with confidence, though the fact that lines beginning with a double dactyl are more than twice as frequent in the poem as lines beginning with spondee and dactyl supports the former.

With these emendations, the translation of lines 46–9 would run: ‘How did your consecrated man benefit the city, I ask, (he) who taught Hierius (how?) to seek the sun

<sup>53</sup> Baehrens, ‘Zur lateinischen Anthologie’ (n. 44), 215, and *PLM* 3.286.

<sup>54</sup> Better sense would be given by *ministrum* (Haupt).

<sup>55</sup> On ‘[would]’, see n. 42. Line 50 may belong to the sentence that follows.

<sup>56</sup> Ellis (n. 51), 74.

<sup>57</sup> Priapus, made by the country labourer from a pear-tree, is intended, as Shackleton Bailey notes. (Such a lowly object joins the pantheon.) There are helpful parallels in Bartalucci.

beneath the earth, and who said that it was a companion of the gods and master of Bacchus, when a country digger had by chance hewed for himself a pear-tree?’

The above examples may furnish some additions to the number of instances of copulative *et* in *CCP*, but of course do not affect the fact that it is not avoided by *CCP* and thus cannot be a distinctive feature shared with Damasus, the point on which Cameron’s hypothesis rests. It has not been the purpose of this article to examine all the arguments that he puts forward and ‘the sheer number and variety of similarities between Damasus and *CCP* (verbal, metrical, prosodical, stylistic)’;<sup>58</sup> though making occasional comment on the criterion of proportionality and the notion of ‘formulae’, it has concentrated its focus on the issue highlighted by him as crucial, and as providing ‘all the confirmation that could be required’, namely the treatment of the word *et*. But, for their intrinsic interest, I end with a few comments on Cameron’s categories of close verbal parallels between the two texts, and similarities in the texts they know, where, naturally enough, some are more noteworthy and potentially significant than others.<sup>59</sup> My brief comments will concern first some observations on their uses of Virgil, and then his arguments from texts of which both seem to be aware.

(e)

Verg. *Aen.* 11.50 *cumulatque altaria donis*

Damasus 32.3 (Ihm: 33.3 Ferrua) *haec Damasus cumulat supplex altaria donis*

*CCP* 116/7 *coniunx altaria supplex | dum cumulat donis*

Cameron rightly observes that the word *supplex* is not present in the underlying Virgilian passage, but was added to this particular mix by both Damasus and *CCP*, and evidently shared by them alone.<sup>60</sup> Damasus uses the word of himself no fewer than five times;<sup>61</sup> as Ferrua points out, it indicates the pope’s role in the commemoration of martyrs and others, and is a kind of dignified and respectful self-fashioning. He is a humble suppliant praying for the deceased. But in *CCP* the word is used very differently, being used twice of the writer’s pagan adversaries. In line 15 (quoted above) it denotes a typical pagan disappointed with traditional cult, and in line 116 (quoted above, as [d]) it describes the grandee’s wife who, while her husband in the temples worships all the monsters of pagan devotion, attends the altars and seeks to move hell with magic charms, and in so doing sends the wretched man down to Tartarus. Is it likely that Pope Damasus could have recycled his saintly self-description in this way to denote the *supplex* of a religion he certainly thought superstitious?

<sup>58</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 315.

<sup>59</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 313–14.

<sup>60</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 313. This is also noted, from Ihm’s index, by Shanzer (n. 11), 246. In this article Shanzer analyses the similarities of *CCP* and Damasus, but her arguments that *CCP*, which she dates to 384, must have been written before Proba’s cento and that the centonist was not Faltonia Betitia Proba but Anicia Faltonia Proba (her granddaughter) have been found unconvincing: see R.P.H. Green, ‘Proba’s cento: its date, purpose and reception’, *CQ* 45 (1995), 551–63 and R.P.H. Green, ‘Which Proba wrote the cento?’ *CQ* 58 (2008), 264–76. The latter article also comments on the article of T.D. Barnes, ‘An urban prefect and his wife’, *CQ* 56 (2006), 249–56, which champions Shanzer’s identification of the centonist. See also Cameron (n. 1), 327–37. My attention has been drawn to a new piece of evidence on this matter, which is presented with brief comment in the Appendix below.

<sup>61</sup> Also at 44.3, 46.10, 47.5, 61.7, besides the above passage. The same observation is made by Shanzer (n. 11).

(f)

Verg. *Aen.* 7.337–8 *tibi nomina mille, | mille nocendi artes*Damasus 27.2 (Ihm: 21.2 Ferrua) *carnificumque uias pariter tunc mille nocendi CCP* 51–3:

fundere qui incautis studuit contacta uenena,  
 mille nocendi uias,<sup>62</sup> totidem cum quaereret artes;  
 perdere quos uoluit, percussit, luridus anguis.<sup>63</sup>

... who was eager to pour for unwary persons the poisons he had devised, a thousand ways of doing harm, since he sought as many contrivances. Those whom he wished to destroy, he struck down, the ghastly snake.

Cameron notes that the original Virgilian *artes* is found in all the passages that allude to the Virgil passage save these two (with a trivial exception).<sup>64</sup> This observation is not quite accurate, for in *CCP artes* follows the quotation proper after a few words. The way in which it is introduced seems to lack point: the intervening words *totidem cum quaereret* seem to be padding,<sup>65</sup> and translators see *artes* as a synonym of *uias*. An intertextual explanation may help to lessen the charge. I suggest that the writer of *CCP* recalled the gruesomely effective phrase of Damasus ‘the torturers’ thousand-fold ways of doing harm’, but also wished to recall Virgil’s picture of Allecto, wreathed in snakes and infected by their poison, which is particularly relevant since in the next line he calls the grandee (or the Devil) *luridus anguis*.<sup>66</sup> The allusion is a double one: it reinforces the Damasian line, and to some degree ‘corrects’ it by emphasizing the relevance of the original. If the term ‘window allusion’ is considered meaningful,<sup>67</sup> it is as if on opening the Damasian window one sees (and recalls) Virgil. Virgilian associations, as many a line shows, were important to the *CCP*. According to Shanzer, Damasus ‘caps’ *CCP*.<sup>68</sup> This procedure, however described, makes it likely that the writer of *CCP* is not actually Damasus but a poet aware of and influenced by him.

No less striking to Cameron are similarities in the texts they know,<sup>69</sup> and he finds such evidence in their use of Proba and Petronius. Knowledge of the former is evident in three passages of Damasus, and in two passages of *CCP*; his point is not that they both quote the same phrase (only one is used by both, *pia foedera* from the first line of Proba’s cento), or that they both know such a recent work,<sup>70</sup> but that both recall phrases from a short passage (lines 1–28). But how striking is this fact? That is the only part of Proba of which they could show knowledge, for all the remaining lines

<sup>62</sup> Although *nocendi* has often been suspected because of the unusual type of elision, no remedy has been found, and probably none is necessary.

<sup>63</sup> The punctuation here, as elsewhere, is Shackleton Bailey’s, and reflects doubts about the interpretation of this line.

<sup>64</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 313 and n. 193, using P. and J. Courcelle, *Lecteurs paiens et lecteurs chrétiens de l’Énéide* (Paris, 1984), 539–48. Cf. Shanzer (n. 11), 246.

<sup>65</sup> The use of the last two words, with *artes*, that is later made by Claudian (*c.m.* 30.233) does not help.

<sup>66</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 298–9.

<sup>67</sup> See among others R.F. Thomas, *Reading Vergil and his Texts: Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor, 1999), 114–41, especially 130–2; G. Kelly, *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian* (Cambridge, 2008), 21.

<sup>68</sup> Shanzer (n. 11), 246.

<sup>69</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 313, Shanzer (n. 11), 246.

<sup>70</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 314. Cameron’s rehabilitation of the earlier date is convincing ([n. 1], 327–37).

of the preface (the prefatory material continues to line 55) and the cento are composed of Virgilian material; quotations of Proba would be quotations of Virgil, or indistinguishable from them. Nor are these lines of the preface without importance; they virulently and vividly denounce the traditional symbols of classical inspiration and pour scorn on pagan deities (lines 13–22), a fact which may be lost from sight owing to equally vigorous emulation by later poets who are better known today.

Petronius, a very different author from Proba, is on the available evidence little known in the fourth and fifth centuries; there is also evidence from the sixth and seventh.<sup>71</sup> There are two passages in question, the first quoted by Damasus, the second by *CCP*. In Damasus Cameron notes the similarity of Petronius 128.1, *nocte soporifera ueluti cum somnia ludunt* and Damasus 21.9, *nocte soporifera turbant insomnia mentem*. *soporifer* is found with *nox* in other authors (Stat. *Theb.* 10.326, in the dative case, and Sil. *Pun.* 7.287, in the genitive case), and it might be argued that the phrase *nocte soporifera*, so conveniently metrical, was an obvious *iunctura* for any poet who needed a phrase for night-time. Damasus could have devised this particular combination without the help of Petronius, and been blissfully unaware of him, or he could have found it elsewhere, in a minor poet now unknown. In the other words of the lines set out above there is minimal similarity; it might be unsafe to build much on the similarity of the common words *somnia* and *insomnia*. So this pope (I cannot comment on others) need not have read Petronius at all, and, given the weakness of this link, the similarity between him and *CCP* falls. It is intriguing that at line 71 *CCP* has the words *nympharum Bacchique comes*, verbally identical to words at the beginning of Petronius 133.3.1, but wherever he found them and however he interpreted them—this is an intriguing question which cannot be pursued here—it is not, on the above argument, incontrovertible evidence of a predilection shared with Damasus.

The question of Damasus' authorship has also been taken up by Franca Ela Consolino in her contribution to the collection of essays entitled *The Strange Death of Pagan Rome* that discuss and analyse the various chapters of Cameron's book.<sup>72</sup> Quickly reviewing Cameron's manifold arguments, Consolino is unconvinced by many things, declaring, with good reason, that here 'statistics are almost no use at all', and that 'analogies in proportions' in metrical matters 'cannot make the point, because they can also be found in poets who have nothing in common' (105). But she is impressed by his argument about the complete avoidance of the copulative *et*. This, she avers, 'is the step nearer to the certainty that can be attained', words that relate to one of Cameron's more restrained remarks.<sup>73</sup> Cameron's 'clinging' argument is, according to Consolino, 'beyond any doubt' the strongest argument in favour of Damasus' authorship,<sup>74</sup> but evidence of remarkable value, she continues, 'is also offered by the heavy elision before' [*sic*; but the word 'after' is used, more correctly, on page 106] 'the relative pronoun and the

<sup>71</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 314 and n. 199. The words used by Prudentius at *C. Symm.* 2.179 (cf. K. Müller [ed.], *Petronius Satyricon Reliquiae* [Munich and Leipzig, 2003], xxxii) may have become a commonplace, while at Jerome, *Ep.* 130.19 the attribution of a line to Petronius is likely to be a mistake (Müller [this note], 183). Müller also records eight fragments from Fulgentius and one from Isidore.

<sup>72</sup> F.E. Consolino, 'Macrobius' *Saturnalia* and the *Carmen Contra Paganos*', in R. Lizzi Testa (ed.), *The Strange Death of Pagan Rome* (Turnhout, 2013), 85–107, at 94–107.

<sup>73</sup> Cameron (n. 1), 315–16: 'It is never possible to ascribe an anonymous work to a known writer with absolute certainty.'

<sup>74</sup> The long quotation from Cameron (n. 1) on pages 106 and 107 has no closing quotation marks; it in fact ends at the paragraph break on page 107. Perhaps unintentionally, it scoops up the unhelpful details about other copulative words already mentioned in this article (n. 39).

knowledge of Petronius'. She does not go so far as Cameron does when he says that the number of cases of such elisions in Damasus (12) and *CCP* (4) are 'almost exactly in the same proportion' (313), but she does not note that they are found in many poets of Late Antiquity, and indeed in some from the classical period.<sup>75</sup> The argument based on knowledge of Petronius is, as we have just seen, not strong enough to sustain the point.

Cameron argued that 'the shared avoidance of *et* provides all the confirmation that could be required' for upholding the medieval ascription and concluding that '*CCP* and the epigrams of Damasus were written by one and the same author, namely Damasus' ([n. 1], 316). This particular claim has a lot of weight to carry, and is not equal to it. To recapitulate the argument of this paper, the *et* which is undeniably present in line 59 of *CCP* is surely, *pace* Bartalucci and Cameron, copulative *et*. There could be debate about the classification of the other clear *et* in the phrase *et quisquam* (*CCP* 15), which in some ways falls outside the simple distinction of '*et* = and' and '*et* = *etiam*' borrowed from *TLL* (or, perhaps, overlaps with both). Of course, one might well wonder why a writer should draw a distinction between uses of *et*, and avoid one category but not the other. There may also, as I have suggested, be passages in *CCP* where examples of copulative *et* have been corrupted, or removed by editors; but for present purposes a single one is enough to refute the hypothesis. As for Damasus, it may well be that Ihm's claim that he totally avoided the word *et* was too sweeping; we have seen that there may well be one or two examples in epitaphs that were genuinely written by him. The later editor Ferrua was obviously not impressed by this criterion. Why Damasus should do this—he was certainly not constrained in any way by metre, by any epigraphic convention or by limitations imposed by his chosen style—need not be considered here. The gulf that many have perceived between the sensitive and elegant epitaphs of Damasus and the gravely flawed rhetorical ambitions of the anonymous author's spectacular satire in *CCP* has certainly not been bridged.<sup>76</sup>

University of Glasgow

ROGER GREEN  
Roger.Green@glasgow.ac.uk

## APPENDIX

A new piece of evidence relating to the questions of the date and the identity of the centonist has been brought to light by C.M. Lucarini in his survey of manuscripts containing Proba's cento.<sup>77</sup> The MS Rome, Casanatensis 386 includes 'something' that Inghirami di Prato, who prepared it, in 1432, had read in a very old (*antiquissimo*) book about Proba the centonist containing the 'holy poems of Proba, Prudentius and Sedulius'. According to it, the centonist (a) was *illustris* and the happy mother of three consuls, whom she saw holding the consulate; (b) was more famous, and happier, for her *sanctimonia*, and as such highly praised by Jerome and Augustine, who knew her; (c) died at the beginning of the fifth century (*ineunte saeculo quinto*), more or

<sup>75</sup> See E. Norden (ed.), *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI* (Darmstadt, 1957<sup>4</sup>), Anhang XI 2 (a), 456–8.

<sup>76</sup> I wish to thank Dr Luke Houghton, *CQ*'s anonymous referee and the editors Bruce Gibson and Costas Panayotakis for their help.

<sup>77</sup> C.M. Lucarini, 'La tradizione manoscritta del centone di Proba', *Hermes* 142 (2014), 349–70.

less at the age of 80 (*annum agens octuagesimum plus minus*); (d) wrote knowledgeably in Greek, and wrote other Latin poems, which were not extant; (e) was buried in Rome close to the bones of her husband, for whom she wrote the cento. Of these details (a) and (b) point to Anicia, (c) to Betitia. Nothing seems to be known of its origin or authority.