CARLO M. LUCARINI, *Paulinus pellaeus, Carmina (Accedunt duo carmina ex cod. Vat. Vrb. 533),* Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum teubneriana, München – Leipzig: W. de Gruyter, 2006, xxix + 38 pp., ISBN-13: 978-3-598-71323-1

Carlo Lucarini has edited and brought together in a single volume four pieces of early Christian poetry all formerly associated with Paulinus of Nola. Two actually belong to Paulinus of Pella, grandson of the Nolan's master and friend Ausonius: the *Eucharisticon*[1], a poem of 616 hexameters written close to the time of the poet's death in the mid-fifth century and a very brief hexametric prayer of thanksgiving dating to the more prosperous and settled times of his young adulthood. Hartel had published the latter as *C.* 3 in his edition of Paulinus of Nola and included the other two pieces, both in elegiac distichs, in his appendix of spurious works[2]. All four reflect the theological and literary culture and the politico-economic circumstances of Christian Roman society at the time of the Germanic invasions. They should be read and studied together.

I. THE *EUCHARISTICON*
Paulinus of Pella's *Eucharisticon,* though a compelling work, makes great demands on the reader's patience[3]. In many ways

[1] Against the more recent editors, Lucarini argues for the neuter form of the title for which there is a single parallel in Stat., *Silu.* 4.2. The neuter seems also to have been the form transmitted by the lost manuscript used by the first editor; *v.* below.

[2] W. von Hartel, *Sancti Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani Carmina,* CSEL, vol. 30, Wien, *etc.* 1893. I have not been able to consult A. Ruggiero, *Paolino di Nola, I Carmi,* Roma 1990, or the subsequent reprint with Latin text (Napoli 1996).

[3] Unless otherwise indicated, I cite the text of Paulinus according to W. Brandes, *Paulini pellaei Eucharisticos* in *Poetae christiani minores,* part 1: *Paulini petricordiae carmina, etc.,* CSEL, vol. 16, Wien, *etc.* 1888. I shall cite also C. Moussy, *Paulin de Pella, Poème d'action de grâces et*

recalling the *Confessions* of Augustine, the *Eucharisticon* is an autobiographical poem, punctuated by frequent outbursts of praise and thanks to God for the guidance that has led the author from the restlessness of secular ambition to repose in ascetic renunciation[4]. It was the 17th-c. philologist and historian Jacques Sirmond who first recognized that the author must have been the grandson of the poet, praetorian prefect, and consul Ausonius[5]. Born in 376, Paulinus was in his eighties when he composed the *Eucharisticon,* in which he describes first the comfort and happiness of his youth, then the steps by which he was gradually stripped of all the advantages of family, wealth, and security. He tells of his early studies of Greek and Latin literature, his youthful enthusiasms for riding and hunting, his first sexual experiences with the maidservants of his father's house, his marriage to a young heiress, and his establishment of a thriving household of his own. Soon after he reached the age of thirty, he experienced his first deep sadness with the death of his father. This coincided with the movement of the Alans and Vandals across the Rhine in early 407 and the consequent disruption of his whole social milieu. Our poet's life story now intersects with larger events of this unsettled time: the Gothic domination under Athaulf and his puppet emperor Attalus, the burning of Bordeaux by the Goths in 414, the siege of Bazas

---

prière, SC, vol. 209, Paris 1974; J. Vogt, "Der Lebensbericht des Paulinus von Pella," = pp. 527-72 of W. Eck, H. Galsterer, and H. Wolff, *Studien zur antiken Sozialgeschichte: Festschrift Friedrich Vittinghoff,* Köln-Wien 1980; A. Marcone, *Paolino di Pella, Discorso di Ringraziamento Eucharisticos,* Fiesole 1995. My translations follow H.G. Evelyn White, *Ausonius with an English Translation in two volumes with the* Eucharisticus *of Paulinus Pellaeus,* vol. 2, LCL, London- New York 1921.

[4] *V.* Moussy, *Paulin de Pella*, 19-22.

[5] In the manuscript *(P)* that underlies the *editio princeps* (*v.* below), the author had been identified as Paulinus. Consequently, the work was long attributed to Paulinus of Nola. Sirmond advanced the correct identification in his edition of Sidonius Apollinaris, *ad ep.* 8.11; *v.* Brandes, *Paulini pellaei Eucharisticos*, 265-6. Scholars have disputed the question whether Paulinus was the son of the poet's son, Hesperius, or his son-in-law, Thalassius; *v.* Brandes, *Paulini pellaei Eucharisticos*, 266-74. The latter position is that now generally accepted; *cf.* Moussy, *Paulin de Pella*, 10-13 and Lucarini (pp. ix-x).

during which Paulinus was more in fear of assassination by a
band of young men within the walls than of capture by the
Germanic forces without. In mid-life, after years of adherence
to some unnamed heresy, he returned to catholic Christianity.
After losing his wife, his sons, and his property, he retreated to
Marseilles, where he lived among like-minded ascetics, perhaps
including Salvian and Prosper[6]. Here, reduced to surviving on
the gifts of friends, he received an unexpected boon, proceeds
from the sale of a piece of abandoned property, which would
permit him to live his last years in financial independence. He
composed the poem in two stages, lines 22-563 in 455, prior
to, and lines 1-21 and 564-end in 459, after the sale of his
property[7].

Though he has a good, even exciting, tale to tell, the poet's
style is exasperating. He frequently imposes on the reader
sentences of bewildering complexity, which extend to half a
page or more. A typical example, that narrating the trip from
Pella to Carthage following shortly on his birth, occupies twelve
hexameters (22-33). A main clause of two lines is followed
by coördinated purpose or result clauses of five and three lines
apiece, these by a temporal clause of two more. Seven participial
constructions are scattered throughout.

His prosody is so free as frequently to cause confusions over
case forms: on the one hand correption of the -a of first declension
ablatives (*Uasatis, patria maiorum et ipsă meorum,* 332)[8], of
the -us of fourth declension genitives (*atque ita suscepti statŭs
actibus inpiger instans,* 194)[9], on the other, odd lengthenings
of short terminations, not just at caesura, but anywhere it
suits his convenience: *Sed redeo ad seriem decursāque illius*

---

[6] For the invasion of 406-07, the burning of Bordeaux, and the siege of
Bazas, *v.* Moussy, *Paulin de Pella*, 28 and his remarks *ad* 235, 311, 332,
334, 346, 379; for Attalus, *v. ad* 293-4 and 295; for the poet's possible as-
sociation with Salvian and Prosper, *v.* p. 23 and *ad* 521.

[7] *V. ibid.,* p. 17.

[8] *V.* also 197 (*conpertă . . . ratione*), 529-30 (*sine terra / dignă
coli*).

[9] *V.* also the correption in *domŭs* at 166, 189, 479, 552 and *conspectŭs*
at 612.

aeui / tempora (113f.)[10]. Indeed he lengthens (*rite recurrente stātuto tempore pascha,* 475) and correpts (*nam quosdam scimus summa humănitate Gothorum,* 289) even in the middle of a word[11]. He allows hiatus just about anywhere, even after short syllables: *namque | et incautus quidquid culpabile gessi* (106)[12]. In a particularly rough line explaining how he exchanged sloth for energetic exertion, Paulinus lengthens a neuter plural termination and leaves it standing in hiatus at the bucolic diaeresis: *gaudia contentus, malesuadā | otia curis* (190). In the preface to his work the poet humbly confesses his lack of eloquence: *nec eloquii tanta fiducia, ut facile audeam cuiusquam opera scriptoris aemulari* (*pf.* 1). As Brandes scathingly remarks, this is no mere posing: *nec habemus, quod reprehendamus nimiam uel adeo fictam eius modestiam, quippe qui neque sententias ita formauerit, ut infinitas prope continuationes atque grauissima quae dicuntur anacolutha uitaret, et metricae artis ita expertem se praestiterit, ut nullam paginam foedis maculis non conspergeret* (p. 277).

Readers and editors will wonder where Paulinus drew the line between the acceptable and unacceptable. This quandary presents itself in a particularly acute way in seven lines that have come down to us in a form either too short (53, 335, 399, 542, 593) or too long (61, 346). Would our poet have regarded as adequate a five-foot line such as *quidquid iam potui meminisse necesse est* (53)?

Given Paulinus' labored style and irregular meter, it is particularly vexing that his work reached the age of printing in just two manuscripts. One of these, traditionally known as *P,* provided the text for the *editio princeps* published by Marguerin de la Bigne in vol. 8 of the *Bibliotheca sanctorum patrum* (Paris 1579). Unfortunately, Bignius tells us nothing

---

[10] For lengthening to produce the first *longum* of a foot, *v.* 220 (*acceptāque fruenti*), 539 (*utrāque*); for lengthening to produce the second *longum* of a spondee, *v.* 468 (*penitendā*), 572 (*cunctāque*).

[11] For lengthening of a short syllable within a word, *v.* also 270 (*euīdenter*), 314 (*inrōgauere*), 449 (*dāre*); for correption of a long syllable within a word, *v.* also 114 (*litterăturae*), 203 (*desĭderanti*).

[12] *V.* also 115 (*me mihi | ipse*), 292 (*maioris noua | est*), 348 (*urbe | ab obsessa*).

about the manuscript or the collection it belonged to, and no subsequent editor has been able to identify his source, which may have been destroyed in the process of transcription and printing[13]. The other manuscript remained unknown and unused. Bignius' edition was very corrupt, and, in the absence of additional primary sources, a succession of ingenious and learned scholars did their best to restore the text to legibility solely through conjectural emendation. Kaspar von Barth (1587-1658), Étienne François Corpet (1804-67), Friedrich Haase (1808-67), and Ludwig Leipziger all made substantial contributions[14].

Wilhelm Brandes' edition of 1888 marked a new departure. He was able to exploit the second manuscript, the ninth-century *Bernensis 317* (*B*) first identified by Karl von Halm[15]. As Brandes demonstrated, *B* and *P* descend from the same source, but neither could be a copy of the other[16]. He recognized four hands, *B¹-B⁴,* two medieval and two modern. Only the first two, the copyist and a corrector of the ninth century, convey the medieval tradition; the third hand of the sixteenth or seventeenth century and the fourth of the eighteenth or even nineteenth century offer marginal notes and conjectures[17]. This

[13] *V.* Brandes, *Paulini pellaei Eucharisticos*, 281 and Lucarini, p. xvi. On de la Bigne and his editorial enterprise, *v.* G.M. Vian, *Bibliotheca divina: Filologia e storia dei testi cristiani,* Roma 2001, 215-6. Vian, however, dates the publication of this series to 1575.

[14] Barth proposed emendations to the *Eucharisticon* in his *Animaduersionum libri LX* (Frankfurt 1624) and in unpublished commentary posthumously added to a collection of late-antique Latin poetry edited by Christian Daum (*v.* n. 23 below). For Corpet, *v.* Ausonius, *Oeuvres complètes,* 2 voll., Paris 1843. Leipziger was a student of Haase, whose work he incorporated with his own in *Paulini carmen eucharisticum prolegomenis et adnotationibus illustratum.* (diss. Bratislava 1858).

[15] Brandes, *Paulini pellaei Eucharisticos*, 281. For a summary description of this codex, *v.* B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen),* vol. 1: *Aachen – Lambach*, Wiesbaden 1998, #573. Lucarini (n. 15) mis-states the catalogue number as "DCIV."

[16] Brandes, *Paulini pellaei Eucharisticos*, 283-5. Lucarini (pp. xvii-xix) seconds this conclusion.

[17] Lucarini accepts Brandes' palaeographical analysis (pp. xiv-xv). Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts,* believed that the text was written by two alternating hands

new source permitted Brandes to judge the accuracy of many a conjecture and to restore the original reading in numerous passages. Its single most important contribution was a corrupt, but comprehensible, report of the second half of line 468, omitted in *P*. In addition, the second hand of *B* had corrected the hypermetric line 528.

Yet even this new source shed no light on numerous perplexed passages. *B* reiterated the other five incomplete and the two other overly long hexameters of *P*. After a painstaking study of the metrical usage of the verse as transmitted in the manuscripts, Brandes concluded that while rough hiatus and capricious lengthening and correption were so widespread that they should be recognized as characteristic of Paulinus' style, it would not be plausible to attribute to him the construction of lines too short or too long. Thus, while resorting to conjectural emendation to reduce these seven lines to acceptable length, he shunned emendations proposed to smooth verses that were rough, but not actually impossible, by classical canons[18]. After an equally careful review of the poet's word choice, syntax, and accidence, he decided that conjecture was demanded in some forty other places to restore a text that had to be regarded as, not merely inelegant or difficult, but actually incomprehensible. Fourteen were his own emendations, the others the suggestions of earlier scholars, especially Barth[19]. Thus, his philological erudition, embodied in extensive indices, allowed Brandes to strike a judicious balance between, on the one hand, respect for the tradition and, on the other, attention to the rudimentary requirements of verse construction and the minimal demands of plain sense. His edition established all but the details of the

---

and corrected by two medieval correctors, one of the ninth and another of the tenth century.

[18] *V.* pp. 277-8, especially his warning, *Caue tamen cum Barthio pleraque omnia id genus uitia uocabulis immutandis uel transponendis expellas.*

[19] Brandes inserted his own emendations into the text at *pf.* sec. 5 and lines 58, 62, 67, 270, 275, 283, 330, 371, 415, 468, 541, 566, 608. He suggested further corrections in his *apparatus* at 4, 38, 105, 299-300, 318, 329, 357, 390, 497, 536, 558. At 139, he mistakenly claimed as his own conjecture a reading that is actually transmitted by *B*.

text. Complemented with a wide-ranging *apparatus fontium,* it remains fundamental for the philological and literary study of the *Eucharisticon.*

The publication of Brandes' edition led to further study of Paulinus' metrics, style, and syntax, which C. Moussy was able to exploit in his bilingual edition for the Sources chrétiennes[20]. Given the roughness and obscurity of the text, it is remarkable that Moussy decided to change Brandes' readings in only thirteen places. In most of these, he reverted to a reading attested by the medieval tradition[21]. In line with his more conservative approach, Moussy seldom listed in the *apparatus* suggestions not adopted in the text. His cogent explanations of phraseology that will strike a classicist as improbable or downright impossible are, in effect, cautions against too facile indulgence in emendation. Indeed, in his circumspect treatment of earlier textual criticism, Moussy proceeded further with an essential element of Brandes' method[22].

It is Lucarini's primary merit to have clarified the contributions of earlier editors and the affiliations of their editions. A careful study of Christian Daum's introduction and notes to the edition of 1680-81 allows him to show that the edition belongs neither to Daum, nor to Barth, though accompanied by their annotations[23].

[20] Moussy refers repeatedly to Ch. Müller, *Obseruationes grammaticae in Paulini pellaei carmen Eucharisticum,* Berlin 1933. *V.* also Ch. Caeymaex, "La métrique de l'*Eucharisticos* de Paulin de Pella," *MB* 1, 1897, 308-17 and "Le style de l'*Eucharisticos* de Paulin de Pella," *MB* 2, 1898, 161-7.

[21] Moussy changed Brandes' readings at *pf.* 5 and vv. *36, 53, 316, *406, *415, 431, *451, *478, *493, 558, *599, *608. In the asterisked lines he restored the reading of *BP,* in 431, the reading of *B.* Vogt ("*Der Lebensbericht des Paulinus von Pella,*" 529) reproduces the text of Moussy, while Marcone (*Paolino di Pella, Discorso di Ringraziamento Eucharisticos*, 27) follows Moussy except at 415 and 431, where he prefers emendations printed by Brandes.

[22] This is the edition for anyone approaching Paulinus for the first time. Moussy's introduction and explanatory notes provide an excellent sketch of the socio-political, theological, and literary context in which Paulinus lived and facilitate an understanding of his accomplishment as author.

[23] The edition appears in a collection of early Christian verse published

It is to be attributed to an unknown but learned amanuensis, who provided Barth with a handwritten copy of de la Bigne's edition, in which he had silently corrected many erroneous readings. In the introduction and the *apparatus,* Lucarini uses the annotation "*ed. Barthii*" to refer to this corrected copy of de la Bigne's text made for Barth's use and the unknown's emendations, mistakenly attributed to Daum by earlier editors[24]. He supplies a plausible explanation for Daum's mistaken reference to a nonexistent edition of the *Eucharisticon* in a later printing of de la Bigne's *Bibliotheca sanctorum patrum* at Cologne in 1618[25]. He shows that the edition published in volume 6 of the *Collectio pisaurensis* of Latin poetry (1766) depends, not as previously assumed, on the *editio princeps,* but on the anonymous *editio Barthii* published by Daum[26]. He vindicates for Corpet a handful of emendations most of which had been wrongly attributed to Haase and Leipziger[27]. His care to highlight the many conjectures of early scholars that were later confirmed by the *Bernensis* may be regarded as an act of philological *pietas.* Lucarini evinces a particular admiration for Barth; he follows Moussy in noting Barth's eight conjectures verified by *B,* and, like Brandes, he reports in the *apparatus* another twenty-one suggestions of that accomplished scholar[28].

---

in two volumes, the first of which bears the date 1681, the second 1680: *Benedicti Paulini Petrocorii de vita b. Martini libri sex . . . Paulini, Ausonii nepotis, Eucharisticum . . . . Cura et studio Christiani Daumii* (Leipzig); *v.* Lucarini, p. xvi and n. 24 and pp. xix-xx.

[24] *V.* Lucarini's *ap. crit.* to vv. 139, 148, 245, 536, 579, 583-4, 612. In all these places the unknown restores the truth where the text of either *P* or *PB* is corrupt. In the former case, his conjectures were confirmed by the *Bernensis.* Brandes notes only the correction at 536, which he attributes to Daum. Moussy attributes all of the unknown's conjectures to Daum.

[25] Lucarini, p. xxi.

[26] *Collectio pisaurensis omnium poematum, carminum, fragmentorum latinorum,* vol. 6 (Pesaro 1766). This was an attempt to publish all Latin poetry from the beginning to the sixth century A.D.

[27] For Corpet's edition, *v.* n. 14 above. Lucarini points out that Corpet's emendations have been wrongly attributed by Brandes and/or Moussy to Haase (355, 575, 593), Leipziger (162, 523), and Brandes (270).

[28] For conjectures verified by the *Bernensis, v.* the *ap. crit.* to *pf.* sec.

Lucarini's text—its setup, its critical annotations, its other interpretative apparatus, and its choices—marks no real advance and, in some ways, fails to build upon the improvements made by Brandes and Moussy. Before reviewing his choices of readings, I address several basic issues that concern, not only the *Eucharisticon,* but all the works published in this volume. Under the heading "set-up" I shall consider the *Conspectus siglorum* and the disposition of the text, under "critical annotations" the observations Lucarini records in his *apparatus* and his abbreviated phraseology, and under "other interpretative apparatus" Lucarini's attempts to help the reader understand the text.

II. Problems Common to Lucarini's Editions of
  All Four Poems
A. Set-up
1. *Conspectus siglorum*
Lucarini nowhere explains his usages regarding the identification of hands. While in the introduction to the *Eucharisticon* he concurs with Brandes' discrimination of the four hands in the *Bernensis*[29], it would have been helpful to provide an explanation of the notations B^1-B^4. While Brandes

---

3 and lines 14, 210, 297, 486 (two emendations), 487, and 528. Moussy mentions all but the first; Brandes none. For conjectures that both Lucarini and Brandes report but Lucarini does not print, *v. ad* 36, 44 (*spaciosa* is a misprint for *spat-*), 47, 53 (Lucarini apparently corrects Brandes' and Moussy's statement of the conjecture), 71, 149 (two conjectures), 150, 151, 242, 271, 305 (two conjectures), 334 (Lucarini apparently corrects Brandes' statement of the conjecture), 357, 451, 478 (accepted by Brandes), 480, 526, 542, 593. Moussy mentions only two of these (*ad* 36, 53). At line 20, Lucarini records another of Barth's conjectures noted by neither Brandes nor Moussy. Lucarini follows Brandes and Moussy in adopting conjectures of Barth not verified by the *Bernensis* at vv. 100, 174, and 346. At v. 493, he and Brandes agree with Barth against Moussy and the codd. In *pf.* sec. 1 (*profectu*) and v. 16, Lucarini accepts emendations of Barth rightly rejected by both Brandes and Moussy. At 130, 142, 197, and 488, all three editors follow an emendation of Barth that was suggested also by the third hand of the *Bernensis,* whom Brandes had dated to a time perhaps prior, perhaps contemporaneous, with Barth; *v.* above.
  [29] *V.* pp. xiv-xv.

used B^1 to refer to the first hand, it seems that Lucarini reserves this notation for the work of the first hand as corrector[30]. But, in the notes to the *Ignoti peccatoris precatio,* Lucarini does not make the same sort of distinction between U and U^1; instead, at line 49, to record a correction of the first hand he uses the formula *ab ipsa libr. manu corr.* As he never collects and systematizes his usage, he falls into inconsistency.

Nor does he provide a full listing of the abbreviations used in the notes. While most of his Latin usages become clear with repetition, I am still wondering what *interr. interp. Corpet* (*ad Euch.* 67) could possibly mean[31]. In notes to the *Paulini oratio* we encounter both *dispic.* (8) and *disp.* (9). Is there a difference? *Corr.* usually means *correxit* but sometimes *correctum* (*-a?*) *est (Ig. Pecc. or.* 49). Occasionally, the reader will encounter an abbreviated or short title for an ancient work or a modern secondary source, for which no complete title appears in either the relevant *Conspectus* or the bibliography[32]. A reader has the right to expect that a *Conspectus* will equip him for immediate comprehension of the notes.

Certainly, Lucarini should have provided in each *Conspectus* or bibliography full references to the work of earlier scholars that will be cited in the *apparatus.* In the notes to the brief *Paulini oratio,* we encounter the names of Vinetus, Heinsius, Graevius, and Green all without explanation. Which Heinsius, Daniel or Nicolaas[33]? Similarly in the *Conspectus* to the *Ignoti peccatoris precatio,* there is no explanation of the references

---

[30] Instead of *P,* the traditional designation of the lost manuscript behind de la Bigne's edition, Lucarini prefers *M* (= Marguerin?). This sort of change only complicates the task of textual criticism. Lucarini himself seems to become confused *ad* 47, where he cites *P,* rather than *M.* What could be the meaning of "Pmg." *ad* 27?

[31] Elsewhere, as the reader must gather for himself, *interp.* stands for *interpunxit; v. Paulini oratio, ad* 1.

[32] At *Euch.* 552, there is a reference to *carm. adv. Marc.* Even if the reader recognizes the work, he is left without any indication of the edition cited. *V.* also *ib., 616* where Lucarini cites *LHS* (no indication of volume) and J. Svennung, *Unters. zu Pall.*

[33] Elias Vinetus (1509-87), Daniel Heinsius (1580-1655), Nicolaas Heinsius (1620-81), Joannes Georgius Graevius (1632-1703); R.P.H. Green, *Decimi Magni Ausonii Opera* (Oxford and New York 1999).

to Pontanus and Tommasi that will appear in the notes[34]. His negligence in these cases contrasts with the care with which he set out the textual history of the *Eucharisticon*.

2. Disposition of the Text

Lucarini prints all four works each as a single block of text. Though the *Paulini oratio* and the *Ignoti conquestio* are both brief poems, the others are long and cover many diverse topics. The reader of the *Eucharisticon,* exhausted by Paulinus' endless and convoluted sentences, would be especially grateful for sign posts of ends and new beginnings. Brandes had provided some, and Moussy had helpfully elaborated his division[35]. At a minimum, paragraph divisions are necessary at vv. 22 and 564 to reflect the two stages of composition. In the *Ignoti peccatoris precatio,* Lucarini simply follows the bad example of Hartel, who had provided no subdivisions. In both the longer poems, the reader's patience is unnecessarily burdened by a lack of articulation.

This burden is aggravated by the physical characteristics of the volume. In the text itself, a somewhat small type size (ten point?) is printed on a bright white page with a very narrow interlinear space. I found the experience of reading physically, as well as mentally, challenging.

B. Critical Annotations

The critical notes to all the works are overburdened with unhelpful information. In those to the *Eucharisticon,* we find impossible readings such as *adverds* (*P)* for *adversis* (2) and orthographical variants such as *ausi* (*B*) for *hausi* (9). As there are only two sources of medieval tradition, we cannot speak of isolated errors, but how do these minutia illustrate or supplement the text[36]? Furthermore, I would eject all reports of correction

[34] *V. ad* 21 and 187. Is the former reference to Iohannes Isacius Pontanus (1571-1639)?

[35] I count ten paragraph changes in Brandes' text, nineteen in Moussy's.

[36] Discussion of the implications of various sorts of palaeographical and orthographical errors would have been welcome in the introduction. At the end of the *Conspectus siglorum* for the *Eucharisticon,* Lucarini of-

by the original copyist or the corrector of the *Bernensis,* where these coincide with the reading of *P.* As Brandes and Lucarini agree that the corrector was a contemporary of the first hand and revised the text according to the exemplar used by the first hand, a note distinguishing the reading of *B* from that of *B²* (e.g. pf. sec. 5 uelit] uellit *B, corr. B²*) is not only useless but potentially misleading. A reader who has not studied the introduction could imagine that *B²* refers to a corrector possessed of an additional medieval source or to a scholar who, like *B³* and *B⁴,* emended on the basis of his own knowledge. Of the seventy-two notes on the first 100 lines of the *Eucharisticon,* thirty-six, or fully half, to me seem useless.

Some forms of notation are confusing. Lucarini uses the name "Brandes" to refer to Brandes' conjectures without distinguishing between those his predecessor had printed and those he had suggested in his *apparatus*[37]. In the *Ignoti peccatoris precatio,* the notation "de Hartel" covers the same two situations.[38] Sometimes *"Brandes dub."* refers to a suggestion that Brandes had himself cautiously advanced with a qualifying *fort.;* at other places where Brandes had been equally circumspect, Lucarini omits the *"dub."*[39].

C. Other Interpretative Apparatus

Lucarini's other interpretative apparatus consists of his introduction, some scattered notes in the *apparatus criticus,* and an index of proper nouns that covers all four poems. The first is almost entirely dedicated to an exposition of the

---

fers only the most schematic contrast of the orthography characteristic of *B* and *P:* in the former, the prevalence of compound words with non-assimilated prefixes, in the latter, the prevalence of assimilation.

[37] *Cf.* Lucarini's note on *pf.* sec. 5, where Brandes prints his own conjecture *inculcanda,* with his notes on ll. 4, 105, 357, and 390, where Brandes suggests emendations in his *apparatus.*

[38] *Cf.* Lucarini's note on 109, where Hartel prints his own conjecture *sensus,* with his notes on 76 and 168, where Hartel suggests emendations in his *apparatus.*

[39] *Cf.* Lucarini's presentation of Brandes conjectures for ll. 38 and 58 with his presentation of Brandes' conjectures for lines 105, 357, 390, and 558. At 318, Lucarini replaces his usual abbreviation with *dubit.*

medieval tradition and the history of the printed editions of the *Eucharisticon.* On p. xxiv, he offers a stemma of the manuscripts and the editions that well summarizes the results of previous scholarship and his own discoveries. One could have wished for a much fuller presentation of material regarding the other three poems previously published by Hartel. In the introduction to a critical edition, a reader expects to find all the information necessary to a proper understanding of the text; it is not sufficient to refer him to another source. Nonetheless, for what he covers, Lucarini's exposition is clear and lively; indeed he displays a mastery of Latin prose composition that few modern critics will be able to match[40].

The interpretative notes scattered throughout the *apparatus* are of very various value. Some refer to the *TLL* or to other sources for parallels for Paulinus' usage or to support a conjecture[41]. At times he paraphrases the meaning of a difficult passage[42]. The *Index nominum,* though not useless, extends to less than two full pages.

Two large needs are entirely overlooked: illustration of Paulinus' poetical language, his metric, his syntax, and diction, and an accounting of his borrowings from, and references to, classical literature, the Scriptures, and earlier Christian poetry and prose. Lucarini would have performed a considerable service by excerpting and correcting the abundant material provided in Brandes' indices. The reader who may be wondering if he is reading a complete or incomplete line, or who may be stumped by a particularly obscure phrase will need much more help than what he can find in Lucarini's very few notes.

---

[40] I noticed the following typographical errors in the introductory material: n. 14, *satagerunt;* n. 24, *Bendicti;* n. 26, Ouvres; n. 29, Sosial-geschichte; n. 34, *quem;* n. 38, *notitia;* p. xxv, l. 7, *Quod carmina* (*om.* ad); p. xxviii, Caeymeaux.

[41] *V. ad* 203, 266, 507 for illustrations of usage reflected in the medieval tradition; for references meant to support conjectures, *v. ad* 480 (where I find the reference to Tacitus, *Ann.* 16.26.5 entirely baffling) and 522.

[42] At line 71, he corrects previous erroneous interpretations (Is he referring to those of Evelyn White and Moussy?) of lines 68-71. I could not understand the point of his note at 280.

The failure to provide an *apparatus fontium* is far more serious. At the least, Lucarini ought to have weighed the quotations and allusions suggested by Brandes, Moussy *et al.,* and presented to the consideration of the reader those he deemed probable or possible. Instead, he sends the reader to Brandes' catalogue, which he supplements with reference to a brief article printed in the 1970's[43]. As any serious evaluation of readings must take into account the poet's use of earlier tradition, the *apparatus fontium* is almost as essential as the *apparatus criticus.*

III. Lucarini's Choice of Readings

A. In the *Eucharisticon*

Lucarini's Paulinus is, by and large, that of Brandes. He too leaves the rough hiatus, correption, and metrical lengthening we have described, but normally draws the line at attributing to the poet verses either too long or too short. There may be one exception. Though Brandes and Moussy regarded verse 593 (*te praefando loqui, te meminisse silendo*) as half a foot short, Lucarini provides no indication *in linea* of incompleteness[44]. Consequently, his note, containing the remedies proposed by Barth, Corpet, and Brandes, ought to mean that the line may be read as it stands, though other scholars have considered it problematic. Or is the lack of some indication of incompleteness just the editor's oversight or a printing error?

In a handful of places, though, Lucarini seems to wish to smooth out some irregularity. In *pf.* sec. 1, Paulinus humbly disclaims the virtues of the great men who have written autobiographies: *a quorum me praestantissimis meritis tam longe profecto quam ipsa temporis antiquitate discretum non utique ratio aequa consilii ad contexendum eiusdem prope materiae opusculum prouocauit* ("Since I am of course as far removed from these in their outstanding worth as in point of time, it is certainly no similar reason and design which has induced me to

---

[43] *V.* n. 39, pp. xxiii-xxiv.
[44] *V.* Brandes, *Paulini pellaei Eucharisticos*, 278 and Moussy *ad* 590-3.

put together a little work almost identical in subject"). Accepting Barth's emendation of *profecto* to *profectu,* Lucarini creates a parallelism between *profectu* and *ipsa temporis antiquitate* which would both modify *discretum* ("removed from these in their outstanding worth as much in point of achievement as in that of time"). An alternative, he suggests might be to keep *profecto* and add *ab* before *ipsa temporis antiquitate.* Then one would have a parallelism of *a quorum . . . meritis* and *ab ipsa temporis antiquitate.* But this is already the sense of the transmitted text. Furthermore, *profecto* will soon appear in *pf.* sec. 3, and Paulinus has a most notable penchant for repeating favorite words. Why impose a neat parallelism on such a slovenly author[45]? Though apparently willing to attribute an impossible hexameter to Paulinus, Lucarini here and there imposes a more logical or classical form of expression. In this, his method represents a retrogression: from Brandes' careful evaluation of the medieval tradition to the literary and imaginative approach of Barth who, in emending Paulinus, relied principally on his sense of style and knowledge of verse construction.

Of course, any editor of Paulinus must have frequent recourse to emendation. On my count, Lucarini correctly follows Brandes in receiving twenty-eight conjectures into the text[46],

[45] Many of Lucarini's departures from the manuscript readings are similarly neat but unnecessary. A few more examples: Barth's suppression of the repetitive *me* in *pf.* sec. 2; Lucarini's classicizing conjecture *inconcinna* for *inconsulta* at 86; Brandes' (but Brandes had expressed a prudent reservation!) *quam* for *quem* at 329, where Lucarini does not even note that he is rejecting the reading of *BP;* Lucarini's *prohibendo* for *prodendo* at 452, where he rightly disregards Moussy's attempt to interpret *prodendo* as a verbal adjective derived from *prodeo* (Why not understand it as a gerund = "Revealing this in my case, you proved, . . . "?); and Lucarini's *noctis* for *multis* at 511, where the change provides much clearer sense but deprives Paulinus of the feeble, but probably desired, antithesis *multis / una* in the second hemieps.

[46] I indicate in parentheses the author or source of the emendation to which I am referring: 27 (*B³,* Barth; *v.* n. 28 above), 58 (Brandes), 62 (Brandes), 67 (Brandes), 100 (Barth), 117 (*ed. Barthii*), 130 (*B³,* Barth), 197 (*B³,* Barth), 270 (*Coll. pisaur.; v.* n. 26 above), 275 (Brandes), 283 (Brandes), 330 (Brandes), 346 (Barth), 362 (Daum), 371 (Brandes), 415 (Brandes), 432 (Haase), 458 (Haase), 468 (Brandes), 474 (Tillemont), 480

wrongly[47] in receiving two. In a half dozen more places he admits a conjecture not received by or unknown to Brandes that to me seems necessary or very likely[48]. In contrast, he restores the reading of the manuscripts in just six places, where Brandes had admitted conjecture. In all but one of these, he follows Moussy's defense of the medieval tradition. Thus, he takes into his edition half of Moussy's improvements on Brandes[49].

Yet, overall, Lucarini's text does not represent an advance over that of Brandes. I count a total of forty-five differences involving words rather than punctuation[50]; in the majority of these, I consider that Lucarini has degraded, rather than improved, the text. I have already referred to his penchant for imposing a neater structure or more elegant word choice on

(Leipziger), 488 (*B³,* Barth), 511 (Haase), 523 (Corpet), 536 (*ed. Barthii*), 541 (Brandes), 566 (Brandes), 575 (Corpet).

[47] In his remarks on 493 (primo *Barth* : -a *BP*) and 608 (discrimine *Brandes* : -a *BP*) Moussy provides convincing defense of the manuscript readings. In the incomplete v. 53, I prefer Moussy's supplement *dudum* to *posthac,* which Brandes suggested in his *apparatus,* and Lucarini adopts.

[48] *V.* 316 (Barth), 399 (Lucarini), 522 (Lucarini), 558 (Brandes), 569 (Moussy). Lucarini agrees with Moussy in adopting Barth's *nos* (316 non *BP*) and Brandes' *notis* (558 natis *BP*), which Brandes himself had relegated to a note. Moussy's *iuvenescere* (569) is an orthographical correction. *Nimium,* Lucarini's supplement to the incomplete v. 399 is simpler and more elegant than Brandes' suggestion *ingens* endorsed, though not received into the text, by Moussy. At 522, Lucarini's *parui* (-ua *BP*) may be just another improvement on an inelegant turn of phrase, but, while I could find many parallels for *parui . . . census,* I have not been able to locate one for *parua . . . substantia.* Whether right or wrong, Lucarini's conjecture evinces a remarkable sensitivity to Latin usage.

[49] Lucarini adopts the emendation proposed by Moussy at 569 (*v.* previous n.) and follows him in restoring a manuscript reading at 36 (Barth), 406 (Haase), 431 (gratulanda *B* : gratanda *ed. Barthii*), 451 (Barth), 478 (Barth); the name in parentheses is that of the scholar whose emendation is rejected. *B* and *P* concur in all of these, except 431. Line 270 (Corpet) is the one place where Lucarini restores a manuscript reading rejected by Brandes and not endorsed by Moussy. Here the reading of *BP* (honoris) creates a genitive without a head, and Lucarini posits a lacuna directly following.

[50] I may have missed some of these changes, which Lucarini does not collect for the reader.

Paulinus. In a couple of places, Lucarini's alterations of the text change major events of the story. Paulinus relates that the Goths under Athaulf burned the city of Bordeaux and stripped the inhabitants, including him and his mother, of their possessions. Nonetheless, they permitted Paulinus and his family to escape with their lives and respected the honor of the young women: *cunctarumque tamen comitum simul et famularum, / . . . inlaeso penitus nullo adtemptante pudore* (321-23). For 323, Lucarini substitutes *inlaeso penitus nulla evadente pudore, i.e.* all the girls were raped[51]. When Paulinus and his family were trapped in the besieged city of Bazas, it was a rabble of free young men and unrestrained slaves within, rather than the barbarians outside, the walls, who presented the graver danger: *et grauior multo circumfusa hostilitate / factio seruilis paucorum mixta furori / insano iuuenum <. . .> licet ingenuorum* (333-35)[52]. Lucarini reëstablishes social distinctions among free and slave by changing the last two words of line 334 to *instincta furore;* the freemen do not mix with the slaves but urge them on to criminality. Would it not better serve Paulinus' rhetorical point, the disgraceful association of free and slave in social strife, to depict the two participating on equal terms in the same acts of violence[53]?

Many other departures from the text as established by Brandes, though not so intrusive, yet go well beyond minor adjustment.

---

[51] Perhaps Lucarini regarded the change as necessitated by the *tamen* in l. 324 (*me grauiore tamen releuato suspicione*). Paulinus would be contrasting the rape of the servant girls with the safety of his own daughter, then fortunately absent. But the adversative may rather contrast his fears for himself, his mother, and his entourage with his even more acute concern for his daughter. Alternatively, *tamen* may here lack adversative force; *v.* Marcone, *Paolino di Pella, Discorso di Ringraziamento Eucharisticos, ad* 350 and *cf.* Paulinus, *Vita Ambrosii,* 3.9 with Bastiaensen's note *ad loc.;* C. Mohrmann, A.A.R. Bastiaensen, L. Canali, and C. Carena, *Vita di Cipriano, Vita di Ambrogio, Vita di Agostino,* 2nd ed. (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla 1981) = Vite dei santi, vol. 3.

[52] V. 335 is lacking a foot; Brandes had suggested the supplement *nequam,* which is accepted by Moussy.

[53] In Roman historiography, slaves are frequently associated with the lower ranks of freemen in revolutionary challenges to the entrenched social order; *cf.* Sallust, *Cat.* 30.1-2, 56.5.

In a description of the voyage in which, in earliest infancy, he was carried from Pella to Carthage, Paulinus enumerates some of the great natural barriers he had to cross: *ninguida perque iuga et sectas torrentibus Alpes / Oceanumque fretum Tyrrheni et gurgitis undas* (29-30). Lucarini substitutes *Aegaeumque* for *Oceanumque* and explains, *"a Demetriade, opinor, conscendit."* Yet our poet has but scant regard for geographical precision. Note the order: Alps, Ocean, Tyrrhenian Sea. Furthermore, Cicero had used the phrase *Oceani freta* to refer to the straits of Gibraltar, "where the greedy wave parts Europe and Libya.[54]" At once inordinately bold and ineffectual, such changes make this edition into something of an oddity[55].

[54] *V. Tusc. disp.* 1.45; M. Pohlenz, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia,* vol. 44: *Tusculanae disputationes,* Stuttgart 1918. Cicero refers to explorers, *ii, qui Oceani freta illa viderunt, "Europam Libyamque rapax ubi dividit unda."* The quotation is drawn from Ennius (*Ann.* 546W.); *v.* E.H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin,* 4 voll., vol. 1: *Ennius and Caecilius,* LCL, Cambridge, Mass. - London 1935. The translation is Warmington's.

[55] Other departures from the text of Brandes that to me seem similarly reckless: 236 priuata cum sorte patris de funere functi *BP* : privata tum sorte pater de funere functust *Luc.* (This makes the verse a finite clause parallel to *successit* in line 233, to which it is logically subordinate as the part to the whole.); 507 participando *BP* : participantum *Luc.* (I find eighteen further examples of gerunds or gerundives in the same metrical position; for close parallels, *cf.* 447, 563.), 523 nouis subitura *BP* : novi subituri *Luc.* (This deprives *fructibus* of an epithet and destroys the chiasm of the pairs of nouns and epithets: *spes magna nouis . . . fructibus.* Paulinus frequently pairs an epithet at the central caesura with a noun in the fifth foot; *cf.* 474, 477, 504, 543.); 526 aliunde *BP* : cultumque *Luc.* (This eliminates a harsh hiatus very much in Paulinus' manner; *cf.* 294. Nor is there any difficulty in meaning: trade in wine, always the most profitable commodity, brings in the wealth through which this city pays for its imports.); 536 studui *BP* : statui *Luc.* (Lucarini's text provides a clearer sense, but Paulinus may mean that he intended to concentrate all his efforts on that one source of income; *cf.* the placement of *studui* in 469, *studuisse* in 290, and *studui* in 369.). Lucarini makes more modest, but unhelpful, changes at vv. 17, (*Ad loc.,* he refers to his note in *Eos,* vol. 92, 2005, which provides only a parallel for the nexus *pangere + uersus.* But *pangere* here probably means "to celebrate"; *cf.* Prud. *C.* 9.3, 7, 84 and, especially, *Pe.* 4.148, where the infinitive occupies the same place as in *Euch.* 17), 61, 166, 461, 463. At 93, Lucarini prints *et potiore* for *hoc*

In addition, Lucarini suggests in his *apparatus* another fifteen emendations that he does not put into the text. Some are neat[56], some bad[57], none necessary. Nonetheless, his suggestion of *intente* for *attente* in v. 597 (*saepius attente nunc multo inpensius oro*) is shrewd and worth consideration. In sum, the abundance of unnecessary, often banalizing, conjecture reminds one of the excesses of early scholars who relied too much on wits and memory. While the meager recension may encourage and, in some cases, necessitate a freer approach, Lucarini overindulges.

B. In the Other Poems

Of the three other poems, only the first belongs to our author. Just nineteen hexameters, it was passed down in two ninth-century manuscripts of Ausonius, Leiden, Universiteitsbib. *Voss. lat.* 111 (*V*) and Paris, B.N. *lat.* 7558 (*N*), under the title *Paulini oratio.* As these contain also the exchange of letters between Ausonius and his friend and pupil Paulinus, the misattribution to the Nolan persisted through the nineteenth century. Pierre Courcelle, who recognized the many affinities of diction and theme with the *Eucharisticon,* first attributed these verses to Ausonius' nephew, and that attribution is now generally accepted[58].

---

potiore of *BP,* but as there is no note *ad loc.,* this may be just a typographical error. At 598, he adopts a bad conjecture of Leipziger's.

[56] *V. ad pf.* 1 (ipsa *BP* : ab i. *Luc.*); 304 (optata *BP* : obl- *Luc.*); 372 (ipse *BP* : atque *Luc.*).

[57] 22 (in *BP* : et *Luc.*), 51 (sensus *BP* : -u *Luc.*), 255 (laeva *P* : lena *B* : laeta *Luc.*), 333 (multo *BP* : -a *Luc.*); 336 (caedem *BP* : caedem est *Luc.*); 344 (me intra *P, B^{pc}* : me etiam i. *Luc.*); 536 (sperare paratas *BP* : praestare p. *Luc.*); 542 (caelebs *BP* : c. celere *Luc.* This is one of the defective lines. Lucarini's conjecture at least suggests a plausible *ratio corruptelae,* but the resultant *celere facile,* two identically formed adverbs in juxtaposition, would create a jingle for which I find no parallel in Paulinus.); 552 (renouatas *BP* : releuatas *Luc.*); 599 (plura *BP* : peccata *Luc.* Moussy has shown that the passage is probably not defective.); 609 (varii *BP* : -a *Luc.* Again Lucarini neglects a device of word order; *cf. nostrum . . . finem* in 611 and my remarks on 523 in n. 55 above.).

[58] *V.* "Un nouveau poème de Paulin de Pella", *VigChr* 1, 1947, 101-13. I shall cite the *Paulini oratio* according to the edition of Moussy.

The other two are transmitted without title in a fifteenth-century codex containing the poems of Paulinus of Nola, B.A.V. *Urb.* 533, from which they were edited first by A. Cardinal Mai[59] and then by Hartel, who relegated them to his appendix, where the poem of 240 lines figures as *C.* 3, and that of twenty-eight as *C.* 4[60]. Lucarini has entitled the former *Ignoti peccatoris precatio,* the latter *Ignoti conquestio de domesticis calamitatibus*[61]. As I have previously remarked on problems bearing on the presentation of the manuscript evidence, the disposition of the text[62], the substance and the terminology of the critical notes, and the lack of illustrative indices, I shall now focus on Lucarini's constitution of the text.

1. *Paulini oratio*

The poet, a *paterfamilias,* surrounded by his wife and children, directs a prosperous estate staffed with homeborn slaves and smart retainers (15-7); he prays that God maintain his position against the malice of enemies (5-6) and grant him the virtue to resist the temptations that could undermine his family and fortune (8-12). The piece reflects the domestic felicity of

[59] A. Mai, *SS. Episcoporum Nicetae et Paulini scripta ex Vaticanis codicibus edita,* Roma 1827. Mai believed both poems to be the work of Paulinus of Nola. He subsequently republished these verses in *Classicorum auctorum e vaticanis codicibus editorum tomus V*, Roma 1833; *v.* M.G. Bianco, *La vita alla luce della sapienza: Il carme anonimo* Sancte Deus lucis lumen concordia rerum, Università degli Studi di Macerata Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, vol. 54, Roma 1990, nn. 308-9, pp. 75-6.

[60] Hartel (pp. xxviii–xxix) had identified this codex with the *siglum T,* which Lucarini unhelpfully changes to *U*. For a description of the contents and decoration of this codex, one of those belonging to the library of Duke Frederick II, *v.* Bianco, *La vita alla luce della sapienza*, 73-4.

[61] Unless otherwise indicated, I cite the longer poem according to the edition of M.G. Bianco, *La vita alla luce della sapienza*, the shorter according to that of Hartel, *Sancti Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani Carmina.*

[62] In my copy, the page containing the *Conspectus siglorum* for the "Appendix" has been bound between the first and second pages of the *Ignoti peccatoris precatio.* I suppose this printing error is due to the K.G. Saur company.

Paulinus' young adulthood; it must predate the death of his father and the invasion of 407[63]. Passages of the *Eucharisticon,* where the poet expresses his preference for a poverty sustained by God to the worldly prosperity that he had loved and lost, read like a recantation of this prayer[64].

The *Paulini oratio* presents few textual problems. Lucarini takes over from Hartel one inessential 16th-c. emendation[65]. In the passage where the poet prays that salacious speech never undermine his chastity, Lucarini introduces a conjecture and a novel interpretation; the poet would be speaking about the tongue of the devil rather than his own[66]. This is ingenious but unnecessary and interrupts the otherwise coherent focus on the virtues and vices of the speaker.

2.   *Ignoti peccatoris precatio*

This poem, like the *Eucharisticon,* constitutes one long act of praise in which the speaker expresses in first person his gratitude for the unmerited grace of God. Yet, unlike Paulinus, the speaker tells us nothing about his personal circumstances and presents God's gracious intervention solely in terms of redemption from sin. The poem, structured around a trinitarian confession, falls into eight principal sections followed by a final seal and prayer. The first three are addressed to God: 1-18, the poet must praise God, but can he say anything worthy of the Transcendent?; 19-48, all creation, animate and inanimate, praises God; 49-90, a

---

[63] For a discussion of the time frame within which the poem was written, *v.* Moussy, *Paulin de Pella*, 213-4.

[64] *V.* ll. 431-50. After 448, Lucarini indicates a lacuna but provides no explanatory note. I see no need to assume the loss of a line.

[65] Vinetus' change of *epulis (VN)* to *epulisque* in 15 (*Adsit laeta domus epulisque adludat inemptis / uerna satur*). Moussy had also adopted this reading, but without proper attribution.

[66] In line 11 (*Mens contenta suo nec turpi dedita lucro / uincat corporeas casto bene conscia lecto / inlecebras, turpesque iocos obscenaque dicta / oderit illa nocens et multum grata malignis / auribus effuso semper rea lingua ueneno,* 8-12), Lucarini substitutes *fuderit* for *oderit*. The traditional text amounts to "let me lie on a chaste bed, and let my tongue detest salacious speech," while Lucarini's would imply "let me lie on a chaste bed though the devil's tongue spew salacious suggestion." He refers to *Paulinus, C.* 16.52, "*ubi* 'malus ille' *est diabolus.*"

sinner must confess his faults before praising God. The next two are more specifically directed to the Father: 91-120, the Father forgives sin both at and after Baptism; 121-70, the poet prays to the Father for the virtues that will ensure a virtuous life. The next two concern the work and the nature of the Son: 171-96, the Incarnation and Redemption save men from the death merited by their sin; 197-226, Christ is true God and true man. The eighth (227-36), proclaims the procession of the Holy Spirit. In the last few lines (237-40), the poet prays for perseverance in his trinitarian faith. M.G. Bianco situates the author of this poem along with Paulinus of Pella in fifth-century Aquitaine[67].

The poem reaches us in a very corrupt form. Numerous passages of the transmitted text make little or no sense; several lines (47, 61, and 73) are incomplete, and one pentameter is missing (212). Yet as the quality of verse composition and the clarity of expression are generally much higher than in the *Eucharisticon,* the discrimination between the genuine and the corrupt is not so challenging[68]. By my count, Hartel had printed twenty-four conjectures, seventeen of Mai's and seven of his own[69]. Here again, Lucarini offers much clarification of the history of the text. He vindicates for Mai a half dozen emendations left without attribution by Hartel and even assigns to Hartel a change for which that editor had not claimed credit[70].

[67] *V. La vita alla luce della sapienza*, 18-35. Bianco's articulation of the themes (13-4) is more detailed than mine; nevertheless, she indicates a transition at most of the points I have specified.

[68] Nonetheless, there are a couple of metrical difficulties that Lucarini might have clarified: 147 (*conscientia:* pronounced as a quadrisyllable); 165 (*tua:* pronounced as a monosyllable); *v.* Bianco, *La vita alla luce della sapienza*, *ad locc.*

[69] I discount mere orthographical corrections. For Mai's emendations received by Hartel, *v. ad* 15, 34, 55, 61 (two), 67, 73, 78, 105, 125, 156, 174, 188, 189, 209, 217, 233. For Hartel's, *v. ad* 13, 61, 109, 119, 164, 188, and 211.

[70] For the attributions to Mai, *v. ad* 67, 125, 189, 209, 217, 233. At 211, while Hartel reports from *T* the reading *in,* this is actually his emendation; the codex reads *e.* Bianco, *La vita alla luce della sapienza*, is much less precise in the attribution of emendations.

Lucarini accepts these twenty-four conjectures, the great majority of which are necessary and palmary[71]. At 105, where the author expresses a fear of ceding to temptation, I would not have followed Hartel in receiving Mai's change of *fida* (*T*) to *firma: pars si qua meis membris male firma vacillet.* Here the author may be alluding to Mt 14.30 where Peter, because of his insufficient faith, begins to sink into the waters of the Lake of Galilee. The same allusion may be behind lines 137-8.: *Instrue sollicitum, nutantes dirige gressus, / credenti plenam plenior adde fidem*[72]. As Lucarini has not noted or collected them, it is unclear to what extent he has considered scriptural allusions in the constitution of his text.

In addition to providing a title, Lucarini makes twenty-one verbal changes from the text printed by Hartel. In two places, he follows Bianco in correcting what seem to have been typographical errors[73]. Through inadvertence he introduces an error of his own; at 133 (*in quis vita brevis, post mortem poena perennis),* the word *vita* is erroneously repeated in the fifth foot.

Of the remaining eighteen, a couple of his changes restore good sense to a meaningless, if metrically and syntactically passable, passage. For example, at 199 (*unus homo, virtus similis, substantia par est*), his change of *homo* to *honor* restores consistency to what should be an expression of the co-equality of the Son with the Father. Concurrently, the emendation frees the text of what would have been an odd case of metrical lengthening[74]. At 166-70, combining several changes

---

[71] Bianco makes a strong case for retaining the transmitted reading at 13 (illi *T* : -e *Hartel*) and 55 (crimine *T* : -a *Mai*). I am less convinced by her defense of the tradition at 164 (nostra *T* : -ae *Hartel*). Her text of verse 34 is quite intelligible, while that as emended by Mai and further emended by Lucarini (*v.* n. 77 below) to me seems unintelligible. She and Lucarini disagree on the reading of the pronoun in the fifth foot (quive *teste Bianco* : que *teste Luc.*).

[72] Bianco retains *fida,* for which she adduces many good arguments *ad loc.;* she does not, however, refer to the gospel pericope.

[73] *V. ad* 5 (corporis *Hartel* : -eis *T*) and 185 (iusto *Hartel* : -a *T*).

[74] Lucarini, however, inserts an inept comma after the first foot of 197 (*Ex te qui genitus sine tempore et ordine, per te / sic totum accepit,*

in punctuation with the adoption of an emendation tentatively advanced by Hartel (the finite *expediam* for the participle *expediens*), Lucarini restores crisp clarity to a passage that Hartel had recognized as problematic[75]. Five other changes look very possible[76]. In this poem, where the meter and the language are those of formal artistic usage, Lucarini's boldness and fine sense of Latinity can operate within more defined bounds and achieve more plausible results than in the slipshod verse of the *Eucharisticon*.

In the other places, Lucarini's departures from the text of Hartel do not to me seem improvements. Most of these are

---

quod tibi nil minuit). That punctuation suggests that *qui*, which actually refers to the Son, should be construed with the antecedent *te*, referring to the Father.

[75] Hartel had printed 166-70: *totum posse tuum; uix mihi uelle subest, / ac si multiplices in cassum porrigo curas, / paucis rem uerbis plenius expediens. / sunt qui saepe sibi dictis contraria poscunt; / utile quod scis, deus, hoc tribue.* Lucarini, taking 166 as the end of the period beginning in 163, in 167-70 prints *Ac si multiplices in cassum porrigo curas, / paucis rem verbis plenius expediam: / sunt qui saepe sibi dictis contraria poscunt: / utile quod nobis scis, Deus, hoc tribue.*

[76] In 21 (*lata mari, terris gravia, splendentia caelo*), Lucarini's *uda* replaces the odd *lata* of *T;* this is perhaps as good as Pontanus's (*cf.* n. 34 above) *lota*. In 76, Lucarini receives Hartel's suggestion *immistus* (*qui mare qui caelum terrasque et quicquid in his est / omnibus immistis extra vel intra regis,* 75f.). This agrees with other expressions of divine immanence (*e.g. totum qui penetrat orbem,* 61) and eliminates the very unlikely concatenation *in his . . . / omnibus immistis* transmitted in *T.* At the head of 107 (*ceu patulum populans intret ovile lupus / et leo secretis rapidus prorumpat ab antris,* 106-7) Lucarini replaces *et* (*T*) with *aut;* the image of the ravening lion is thus contrasted with, as well as joined to, that of the wolf. In 179 (*cur dubitem totum quod sit tua cura per orbem, / ne quisquam pereat qui tibi crediderit,* 179-80), Lucarini's substitution of *cum* for *quod* (*T*) and his repunctuation (*cur dubitem, totum cum sit tua cura per orbem,*) restore classical syntax and a tighter period quite in keeping with the poet's elegant style. In 183 (*de nihilo sumptum nihilum finxisse putatur*), his addition of the preposition *in* before *nihilum* very much clarifies the sense of purpose ("for no purpose at all") that would remain implicit and vague without it: If God formed man from nothing for no purpose at all, his act would seem to be mere play rather than creation.

Lucarini's own conjectures; the best are neat but unnecessary[77]. The worst is the substitution of *te* for *tu* in 109, a change that renders absurd a passage already obscured by bad punctuation inherited from Hartel. The poet, with reference to Mt 7.8 and Lk 11.10, presents himself obstinately pounding at God's door, until it is opened, and he receives the answer to his petition. Lucarini prints *Sed te, sancte Deus, sensus si verba loquuntur / et non mens aliud, lingua aliud loquitur, / sollicitus, cupidus, devotus pectore et ore / pulso; patere iube . . . .* (109-12). This produces a transitive active clause in which *te* becomes the direct object of *pulso,* "But I knock on you, holy God . . . ; bid the door be opened." Certainly, the *tu,* like *sancte Deus,* must be vocative; both prepare for the imperative *patere iube* to which they must be joined, rather than separated. The intervening material constitutes the conditions that must be fulfilled if God

---

[77] The following seem to me neat, though not likely: 23 inserta *T* : ex- *Luc.* (where the poet may be thinking of places shaded by trees rather than of lofty projections standing out among or above the trees); 26 vivida *T* : uvi- *Luc.* (Lucarini's alternative is more literal, less picturesque.); 34 cuncto *T* : -i *Luc.* (In the pentameter, an epithet at the end of the first hemieps not infrequently modifies a noun at the head of the second; *cf.* 102, 228, 240.); 47 constant *suppl. Luc.* (This supplement seems to me inferior in sense to Hartel's *scimus.* It is also palaeographically less plausible.); 62 accessu *T* : -us *Ruggiero* (This correction does not change the sense. Like Bianco, I take the original form as dative.); 86 plus *T* : post *Luc.;* 131 totum *T* : totum hoc *Luc.* (The emendation = "all this present world" is a bit more precise than the transmitted reading, whose sense is, nonetheless, clear.); 187 credere causam *T* : cedere causam *Hartel* : cernere causam *Bianco* : cedere mortem *Luc. et Tommasi* (The transmitted text is senseless. Hartel's conjecture is the easiest palaeographically and accords best with the context, where Christ's voluntary submission is contrasted to Adam's willful disobedience, the original cause of death). In a couple of places his proposed changes are not at all attractive: 24 *omnibus apta satis T* : *sentibus aspra satis Luc.* (This makes much worse sense, whether we are to understand *satis* as the ablative of the perfect participle of *sero* or the adverb, "sufficiently."); 125 servandis . . . fastos *T* : servandi . . . fastus *Hartel, Bianco* : seruandi . . . fasti *Luc.* (The noun should probably be the fourth declension *fastus* used by Orientius in 2.123, the model for this line, cited *ad loc.* by Bianco; *v.* R. Ellis, *Orientii carmina* in *Poetae christiani minores, etc.* None of the editors supplies an attribution for the emendation of *fastos* to -us.).

is to receive the suppliant: *Sed tu, sancte Deus—sensus si verba loquuntur / et non mens aliud, lingua aliud loquitur, / sollicitus, cupidus, devotus pectore et ore / pulso—patere iube* (But you, holy God, if my words have meaning, and my mind and heart speak as one, if in my urgent need, devoted in heart and mouth I knock, bid the door be opened, *etc.*)[78]. Again, one wonders if Lucarini has pondered the biblical allusion to which he does not refer[79].

3. *Ignoti conquestio de domesticis calamitatibus*

The speaker of this poem prays for the restoration of his ruined family to a modicum of prosperity. Six years have passed since his brother was taken captive in some foreign land (5-8). In the interim, the family's wealth has been stolen (17-18), and the speaker, his sister, who is a consecrated virgin, and his brother's wife and children have been reduced to beggary (20-1). If Christ will return the captive to his family and the family to their home with a small sufficiency, all will praise Christ (25-8). While the speaker suffers the same reversal of fortune as the author of the *Eucharisticon* (*nobilitas periit miseris, successit egestas,* 21), his prayer takes a trajectory opposite to the latter's ascetic resignation. Of course, the picture of his sister-in-law begging to support four children (9-12) suggests that their circumstances were far worse than those to which Paulinus and his family were reduced.

This short poem presents few issues. Hartel had taken over several obvious and necessary emendations first suggested by Mai; these Lucarini retains[80]. In addition, at line 23 where Hartel had printed the inaccurate *sed miserere, potens rector, miserere precantum,* Lucarini restores the reading of the manuscript, *miserere, precamur.* I cannot agree with his indication of a lacuna of at least a couplet between vv. 14 and 15[81]. Here, as

[78] In line 109, Lucarini rightly accepts Hartel's conjecture of *sensus* for the transmitted *sensu.*

[79] Bianco (*ad* 112) cites the relevant scriptural passages.

[80] *V. ad* 10, 26-7.

[81] Lucarini does not find satisfying the transition from *est mihi quae primis Christo sacrata sub annis / excubat egregia simplicitate soror.* (13-4) and *haec sub sorte pari luctum sine fine retentans / privata*

too often, Lucarini wishes to introduce a radical change into a passage he finds less than completely clear.

In general, Lucarini's work evinces much philological skill, even brilliance. In several places in the *Eucharisticon,* he has introduced readings that make better sense than or seem stylistically superior to either the manuscript tradition or previous emendation. His conjectural emendations to the *Ignoti peccatoris precatio* are more significant; he restores meaning to several passages and produces a more plausible text in a number of others that were certainly problematic. He has put most of his effort, in fact more than many editors have, into discerning sense from nonsense and likely, from unlikely, diction.

Yet, throughout the volume, one misses both rigor in the details and breadth of vision. While some of his more important contributions concern the history of the printed editions, Lucarini's own is often difficult to use due to its incomplete *conspectus siglorum,* his overburdened *apparatus,* and his inconsistent forms of notation. His manner of emending the transmitted text seems more belle lettristique than scientific. For pointers to the larger literary and theological context the reader must look elsewhere, as Lucarini provides no notes or appendices on metrical, grammatical, or syntactical usages and no *apparatus fontium.* Rather than re-editing these four poems, he might have published his textual and text historical contributions as a series of philological papers.

John F. Petruccione
The Catholic University of America
Petruccione@cua.edu

---

est oculis iam prope flendo suis (15-6). I do not understand why the state of the sister could not be said to be as wretched as that of the wife (*sorte pari*). Both women weep themselves blind, one for the loss of her brother, the other for the loss of her husband.