

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF MAXIMIANUS<sup>1</sup>

JARRETT T. WELSH  
University of Toronto  
jarrett.welsh@utoronto.ca

---

SUMMARY

This article presents notes on fourteen passages in the elegiac verses of Maximianus. Its purpose is to suggest some conjectures that may improve the text or, less definitively, that may lead to renewed scrutiny of it.

RESUMEN

En este artículo se presentan notas a catorce pasajes de las elegías de Maximiano. Su objetivo es sugerir algunas conjeturas que puedan mejorar el texto o que al menos provoquen nuevas reflexiones sobre él.

KEYWORDS

Maximianus, textual criticism

PALABRAS CLAVE

Maximiano, crítica textual

---

Fecha de recepción: 29/04/2011

Fecha de aceptación y versión final: 07/10/2011

---

The present paper examines fourteen passages in the elegiac poem of 'Maximianus' where some lingering difficulties may be felt in the established text. In these notes I begin from the text of W. C. Schneider, *Die elegischen Verse von Maximian*, Stuttgart 2003, which is more conservative than that of E. Baehrens, *Poetae Latini Minores* V, Leipzig 1883. In certain respects the text of C. Sandquist Öberg, *Versus Maximiani*, Stockholm 1999, whose edition is of considerable value for its fuller reporting of the readings of *recentiores*, is more sound than both, but as her text incorporates many variants or conjectures I have preferred to begin, for the sake of brevity and clarity, from Schneider's conservative text. (In practice the number of differences between the two recent editors' texts in the passages discussed in this paper is small, and I have signalled any differences in Sandquist Öberg's text.) In the apparatus below each passage I report, necessarily briefly and selectively, given the tradition and its contamination, the testimony of the *antiquiores*

<sup>1</sup> I am very grateful to the journal's editors for guidance and to its anonymous readers for very acute criticism of a longer version of this paper.

with selected readings from the *recentiores*<sup>2</sup>. I occasionally report the later manuscripts with their individual sigla, but in the interests of clarity and in view of the contaminated tradition I have often preferred to use the siglum  $\delta$  to note simply that the reading is found in one or more of the *recentiores*.

17–8

nec minor his aderat sublimis gratia formae,  
quae, uel si desint cetera multa, placet.

18 multa] muta Barth placet edd.,  $\delta$  : placent cett.

Maximianus claims to have been both talented (*his*, referring to the skills listed in verses 9–14) and quite handsome in his youth. *multa* can be interpreted either adverbially with *placet* (“which is very pleasing,” for which cf. *sumere multa*, 42), or adjectivally with *cetera*, as with the punctuation given above. On the first interpretation, *multa* seems somewhat weak after *sublimis gratia*; the second interpretation (“even if many other qualities are lacking”) is not entirely appropriate, since the point ought rather to be that a winsome appearance is pleasing even if no other distinctions are to hand<sup>3</sup>. Although *multa* admits of possible interpretations, then, there would seem to be some cause at least to test that reading against further proposals. Somewhat better sense could be had from either (1) a specific adjective or substantive to qualify *cetera*, or (2) an adjective modifying *quae* (*forma*) that will serve as subject of *placet*<sup>4</sup>. I would propose to try:

quae, uel si desint cetera *culta*, placet.

This proposal is partly prompted by, but perhaps also corroborated by, an Ovidian parallel: cf. *Medic. 7 culta placent. auro sublimia tecta linuntur*. If that connection is rightly felt, then the Ovidian verse may also have prompted the comparison of *uirtus* and gold that follows (19).

The same ambiguity that was noted above in *multa* would be possible with *culta*, which could be understood with *quae...placet* (“beauty which—if it is tended to—is pleasing, even if everything else is lacking”); the context, however, seems better served if *cetera culta* are taken together (“beauty, which is pleasing even if other cultivations are lacking”). Editors of Maximi-

<sup>2</sup> See, most conveniently, Sandquist Öberg, *Versus Maximiani*, 88–91, and 153–83 for full reporting of over fifty manuscripts.

<sup>3</sup> In his apparatus Baehrens pondered *cetera cuncta, placet*, which points toward the same interpretation. *cetera* alone, however, would convey the same point, rendering *cuncta* (and likewise *cetera multa*) superfluous.

<sup>4</sup> For the latter, cf. Barth’s *muta*, which is syntactically plausible but quite irrelevant to the context.

anus have long restored *placet*, which is demanded by the context, for the better-attested *placent*. If that reading is not merely an idle error, it could well have been prompted by reminiscence of the Ovidian passage.

21–2

si libuit celeres arcu temptare sagittas,  
occubuit telis praeda petita meis

21 temptare] intemptare V: tendere C: tractare R

*Temptare* can only mean that the Maximianus wanted to “test” the arrows already described as swift. The sense is not impossible by itself, but it is awkward when compared to *circumdare* and *uersare* in the subsequent couplets. The passage seems to require a verb signalling that Maximianus is ready to shoot his arrows (such as R’s *tractare*, perhaps a conjecture), just as *circumdare* signals that he is ready to release the hounds. Baehrens adopted *intemptare* from V (s. XIII), but when V stands alone its readings do not inspire much confidence<sup>5</sup>. One may therefore prefer one of the isolated readings to *temptare*, inasmuch as they make good sense, but none is certainly right.

Here again it may be worthwhile to consider another proposal, since a conjecture that explains both *temptare* and the variant readings may have a claim to priority. I would propose to try *librare* (for the verb used of the action of shooting weapons, cf. *ThLL* 7, 2, 1352, 11). The verb gives good sense with *sagittas*; more significantly, it is likely to have been misinterpreted by an early reader as meaning “to test, examine” (see *ThLL* 7, 2, 1350, 78). *temptare* would thus have originated as a misguided explanatory note, which then ousted the less familiar sense of *librare*; the variant readings *intemptare*, *tendere*, and *tractare* could then be seen as attempts to improve the sense of *temptare*.

63

ibam per mediam uenali corpore Romam

63 uenali] iuuenili δ

According to commentators *uenali* would mean that Maximianus walked through Rome as though he were up for sale, like a slave, at auction, but no one could afford his price<sup>6</sup>. Or it would signal that “Antonius” is another of

<sup>5</sup> For V’s isolated readings in only the first twenty verses, note 1 *cessas finem*] *finem cessas* V; 14 *grata*] *magna*; 16 *quanta*] *parua*; 18 *multa*] *membra*.

<sup>6</sup> R. Webster, *The Elegies of Maximianus*, Princeton 1900, 68–9; T. Agozzino, *Masimiano. Elegie*, Bologna 1970, 131; F. Spaltenstein, *Commentaire des Élégies de Maximien*, Rome 1983, 103. J. L. Butrica, (“Maximian”, *CR* 55, 2005, 562–4, at 564) noted that such a text

the poet's names, if one accepts Ellis' claim, which he supports by reference to *AP* 11, 181, taking *uenalis* ~ ὤνιος<sup>7</sup>. Or, as Schetter argued, *uenali* is to be taken, as *uendibilis* sometimes is, to mean *gratiosus* or *acceptus*..<sup>8</sup>. With such a diversity of interpretations, some more plausible than others, it is worth asking again whether *uenali* is correct.

At verses 59–60, Maximianus is an object of universal desire; in the next couplet, we are told that he refused to endure the *coniugii uincula grata*. But his resistance to the idea of marriage was neither total nor constant: at 63–72 he practically courts attention, strutting through Rome to be seen by potential brides. Only from 73 (*sed tantum sponsus*) does his hesitation emerge in full bloom, even though it was signalled in advance at 61–2.

Maximianus' desire and desirability in verses 63–72 offer important guidance. The tone suggested by those qualities leads to a piece of (admittedly) bold language; I would propose to try *geniali* in 63, which would have Maximianus strut through Rome with what one might first describe as a "marriageable body." For the usage, cf. *Ov. Ars* 1, 125, *ducuntur raptae, genialis praeda, puellae*. But the word also carries a tinge of the meanings "handsome" or "beautiful"; cf. *Alc. Avit. carm.* 1, 156, of Eve, *erigitur pulchro genialis forma decore*. One might therefore suspect that 'handsome' would be the dominant meaning (and Schetter indeed suggested something similar for *uenali*), with a hint of the implication of 'marriage.' The corruption would have been straightforward, for *geniali corpore* perhaps could not help but become *ueniali corpore*, and thence to *uenali*, whether by mere error or because it was recognized that *ueniali*, "that can be forgiven," was completely inappropriate to the context.

## 117–8

me uero heu tantis defunctum partibus olim  
Tartareas uiuum constat inire uias

117 heu] in Cδ defunctum] perfuntum F : perfuntum Cδ  
partibus CFδ : in partibus cett.

Schneider omits, I think rightly, the *in* that sometimes intrudes at two points in the tradition of verse 117. Its varied placement suggests that *in* is perhaps not authentic; instead, an explanatory note entered above the line will have been mistakenly inserted as a correction. Omitting *in* removes one difficulty from this verse, but *tantis defunctum partibus* is still unhappy. *defunctum* crudely overstates the paradox that is expressed in the

could scarcely avoid accusing Maximianus of prostitution.

<sup>7</sup> R. Ellis, "On the Elegies of Maximianus", *AJP* 5, 1884, 1–15, at 1.

<sup>8</sup> W. Schetter, *Studien zur Überlieferung und Kritik des Elegikers Maximian*, Wiesbaden 1970, 144 n. 24. This interpretation comes closest to the desired sense.

pentameter, and also overstates the condition of Maximianus' senses, which are merely declining or diminished, and not yet completely lost (119–20). I would propose to try instead:

me uero heu tantis *defectum* partibus olim

*Partibus* will refer to the list of declining senses begun at verse 119. The corruption of *defectum* (“weakened”) to *defunctum* was all the easier in the present context, and, once that corruption occurred, *in* was inserted to clarify the meaning of a text that could now be misread as “performed so many roles” (as, indeed, Ellis<sup>9</sup> understood the poet’s point to have been).

239–40

cumque magis semper iaceam uiuamque iacendo,  
quis sub uitali me putet esse loco?

240 sub uitali] funus tali *Baehrens* me putet (-at δ) *BoCδ*  
: computet *AFδ* : non putet *Wernsdorf* (*sic et Sandquist Öberg*)

This couplet is notoriously uncertain. Much has been written in defence of *sub*, but doubts about that preposition may reasonably still be entertained, not least because the phrase *sub uitali...loco* has been taken to imply both “I am alive” and “I am dead”<sup>10</sup>. Only *Baehrens* has rejected, in my view rightly, the preposition, but his conjecture is not convincing.

Comparing the syntax of verses 149–50 *caligine caeca | septum tartareo quis neget esse loco*, and noting again that the manuscripts are here divided between *me putet* and *computet*, I would suggest the following correction of the pentameter:

quis *me* uitali computet esse loco?

Since he spends more and more of his life lying down, he asks, who would consider him to be among the living? *me*, if omitted and added back by a corrector, could have ousted *com-* in some of the manuscripts, with the ensuing gap plugged by the only sensible preposition that scanned. This conjecture would also go a long way towards corroborating the readings *iaceam* and *uiuam* (239)<sup>11</sup>. For *computare* used in the sense of *putare*, cf. esp. *ThLL* 3, 2181, 9–15.

<sup>9</sup> R. Ellis, “On the Elegies of Maximianus II”, *AJP* 5, 1884, 145–63, at 148.

<sup>10</sup> Contrast Sandquist Öberg, *Versus Maximiani*, 143, with Spaltenstein, *Commentaire*, 156.

<sup>11</sup> The manuscripts are variously divided in their readings *iaceas*, *iaceat*, or *iaceant* (and the equivalent forms of *uiuere*); Sandquist Öberg, *Versus Maximiani*, 161–2, who prints the third-person forms, exhibits her typical diligence in recording variants.

295–6 (= 2, 3–4)

post multos quibus indiuisi uiximus annos  
respuit amplexus, heu, pauefacta meos.

296 pauefacta *ABoF8* : stupefacta *cett.* : labefacta *Baehrens*

Early in the reminiscences of Lycoris, Maximianus laments the change in the woman's feelings towards him. They were formerly inseparable (*mens eadem* 294, with *indiuisi* 295), but now she despises even the sight of him. *pauefacta* and *stupefacta* both imply a degree of fear that is not corroborated in the subsequent verses; Lycoris is certainly not scared of the old man she describes as *imbellis* and *decrepitus*. Baehrens, rightly recognizing that nothing from the manuscripts could be acceptable in this context, proposed *labefacta*. The sense is very neat after the emphasis on unanimity in 294–5, but it sits poorly both with what follows and, more significantly, with *respuit* in the same verse. *labefacta*, for all its palaeographical simplicity, therefore seems just to miss the mark. I would propose to try *tumefacta* in the sense of “haughty,” for which cf. Prop. 4, 1, 63 (and contrast 3, 6, 3), Sil. 2, 28, 7, 14, 8, 232, and, further, R. J. Tarrant, *Seneca. Agamemnon*, Cambridge 1976, 352 *ad Ag.* 958.

303–4 (= 2, 11–12)

haec me praeteriens cum dudum forte uideret,  
expuit obductis uestibus ora tegens.

303 dudum] ductum *Baehrens*

*Dudum* is possible but far from ideal; Baehrens' *ductum* offers little improvement. I suspect that the clue to restoring Maximianus' text is to be had at [Ov.] *Hal.* 34–7:

atque ubi praedam  
pendentem saetis audius rapit, hic quoque fallit,  
elato calamo cum demum emersus in auras  
bracchia dissoluit populatumque expuit hamum.

The discussion of this passage offered by J. A. Richmond, *The Halieutica Ascribed to Ovid*, London 1962, 43–4, is essential; noting the peculiarity of the phrase, he identifies a parallel at Suet. *Cal.* 6, 2, relevant both for *Hal.* and for Maximianus, in which *demum* occurs “in the unemphatic introductory clause.” The connection between Maximianus' Lycoris and the octopus of *Hal.* seems significant. When, at last, Lycoris happens to observe Maximianus' angling for her attention, she spits in disgust, echoing *expuit* at *Hal.* 37; *cum demum*, in the same metrical position, would suit Maximianus' couplet nicely.

355–6 (= 2, 63–4)

nec me adeo primis spoliauit floribus aetas:  
en facio uersus et mea dicta cano.

356 mea dicta] mea facta  $\delta$ : media dicta *A*: mea fata *Baehrens*

Maximianus claims not to have lost all his charms in his old age, for he still writes poetry. Both *dicta* and *fata* have found supporters (the latter is printed also by Sandquist Öberg), while *facta* is generally rejected. There are arguments in favour of each of these readings, and they are not necessarily wrong. Nevertheless, given the variants I would suggest, as no more than a possibility for consideration, that *mea ficta* may have been the original reading. The verb  *fingere*  is one of Maximianus' favourite words for the act of composing poetry; cf. 11–2, 129, and 537 (= 5, 17).

467–74 (= 4, 7–14)

uirgo fuit, species dederat cui candida nomen  
Candida; diuersis nam bene compta comis.  
huic ego per totum uidi pendentia corpus  
cymbala multiplices edere pulsa sonos; 470  
nunc niueis digitis, nunc pulsat pectine chordas  
arguto quicquam murmure dulce loqui.  
sic me diuersis tractum de partibus una  
carpebat uariis pulchra puella modis.

468 nam *AF*: sat  $\delta$ : stat *cett.* compta comis] composita modis  
*A* (modis *in ras.*) lacunam post 470 statuit *Baehrens* 471  
pulsat  $\delta$ : pulsabat (*om.* nunc)  $\delta$ : pulsant *F* $\delta$ : pulsans *cett.*

Two significant problems in the engaging introduction of Candida remain to be solved. The first is *nam* (468), which is logically difficult in the text given above; the second is the logical and grammatical difficulty lurking in *pulsat* (471), for which Baehrens preferred the better-attested *pulsans*.

(1) Schneider, *Maximian*, 220, provides a sensible discussion of the problems inherent in *nam*, which is difficult with *modis* (preferred by Sandquist Öberg) but produces a kind of sense with *comis*. Taking *diuersis comis* to mean that Candida had dark hair (comparing *diuersus* at *Ov. Am.* 1, 5, 10, used of a contrast of colours), Schneider understands *nam* as providing further justification for her name: Candida's dark hair sets off her fair complexion. The argument is logical, but the Latin does not completely support it. Baehrens' *facies* would make that point clearer, but *species* suggests that Candida's entire appearance, not just her complexion, was the cause of her name.

For that reason, it is worth reconsidering the variant readings *stat* and *sat*, and the isolated reading *composita* in A. Their testimony suggests the possibility that a correction in the margin was restored at various incorrect places in the verse. Allowing that *diuersis* is not demonstrably wrong, I would suggest the following possibility:

Candida; *dispositis* nam bene compta comis.

The pentameter would have been indebted to Ov. *Pont.* 3, 3, 16 *nec bene dispositas comptus ut ante comas*. On this conjecture, Candida's entire appearance, supported by rather than contrasted with her hair, gave rise to her name; the clause would now explain and corroborate her name, providing a much better justification for *nam*.

(2) In verses 469–70, which appear by all accounts to be sound, Maximianus describes how he saw cymbals, hanging all over Candida's body, making manifold sounds when struck. The couplet that immediately follows is awkward on the established text, since the present-tense verb *pulsat* is difficult between *uidi* (469) and *carpebat* (474). Baehrens printed *pulsans*, but that reading nevertheless produces a harsh transition and can only be acceptable if it depends on something lost in the concomitant lacuna.

The transmitted text echoes quite closely Verg. *Aen.* 6, 647 *iamque eadem digitis, iam pectine pulsat eburno*. It is possible that Maximianus replicated this verse quite closely, but it is also possible that the transmitted text has been unduly influenced by the Vergilian verse. There is, then, some room to question both *pulsat* and the repetition of *nunc*. While the word *pecten* can refer, as it does in the Vergilian verse, to the plectrum used to play a lyre, it can also be used metonymically for the instrument itself; the problems of the couplet fall away if we follow that interpretation of *pectine* while reading:

nunc niueis digitis *pulsato* pectine chordas  
arguto quicquam murmure dulce loqui.

"...then<sup>12</sup> (I saw) the strings, when the lyre had been struck with snow-white fingers, speak something sweet with a shrill murmur." *chordas* is now the subject of the infinitive, like *cymbala...edere*, but Candida's agency is not completely absent from the scene that catches Maximianus' eye; *niueis digitis* is nevertheless slightly difficult to integrate. More significantly, the instrument, and not Candida, now speaks *arguto...murmure*, which may now be set alongside, and as a compression of, *Ciris* 178 *non arguta sonant*

<sup>12</sup> For isolated *nunc* in this sense, cf. the comparable scene at 529–32 (= 5, 9–12).

*tenui psalteria chorda*<sup>13</sup>. Memory of the Vergilian text would have prompted *pulsato* to become *pulsat*, and *nunc* was then interpolated, modelled on the same verse, to save metre and sense. The hodgepodge quality of the scene emerging from this conjecture is what Maximianus meant when he said that he was *diuersis tractum de partibus* (473).

487–90 (= 4, 27–30)

certe difficile est abscondere pectoris aestus,  
panditur et clauso saepius ore furor.  
nam subito inficiens uultum pallorque ruborque  
interdum clausae uocis habebat opus.

490 interdum] internum A clausae] certae *uulgo*

The repetition of *clauso...clausae* in successive pentameters has occasionally come under suspicion, and has either been admitted—whether as the mark of a negligent or a skilled author—or has been altered to eliminate the repetition, which is attributed to a wayward glance that has introduced the same word from the preceding couplet. It would seem impossible to reach a definitive solution both for that reason and because *uocis habebat opus* will admit of two interpretations: either “serve the function of a (failed) voice” (cf. Ov. *Met.* 6, 609 *pro uoce manus fuit*) or “serve as, stand in for, a (fully functioning) voice.” The former interpretation is suggested by the transmitted *clausae*; the latter can be equipped with what might be judged better parallels: Maximianus 411 (= 3, 46) *sed stupor et macies uocis habebat opus*; Ov. *Pont.* 3, 1, 158 *interdum lacrimae pondera uocis habent*. The old vulgate reading *certae* aimed to restore this second interpretation (“stand in for a strong voice”). While acknowledging that a number of solutions are possible here (not least of which is retaining *clausae*), I would suggest that, if the second interpretation of *uocis habebat opus* be preferred, it would be somewhat more natural to read *clarae*, which is also more likely to have facilitated the accidental change to *clausae*.

515–6 (= 4, 55–6)

hoc etiam meminisse licet, quod serior aetas  
intulit, et gemitus, quos mihi laeta dedit.

516 laeta] lenta *uel* sera δ : lingua *Baehrens* : lena *Wernsdorf*

<sup>13</sup> Contrast Maxim. 530 (= 5, 10) *nescio quid Graeco murmure dulce canens*. It is much better that *arguto...murmure* should describe the sound of the instrument than the sound of Candida's voice. On the parallel from the *Ciris* and its singularity, see R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil*, Cambridge 1978, 175.

Pomponius Gauricus set these verses and their successors (515–20) as the conclusion to the ‘fourth’ elegy rather than as an introduction to the ‘fifth.’ Although that division is artificial, it has nevertheless sometimes been noted that these verses cohere more naturally with what follows than with what precedes them<sup>14</sup>. That view must, I think, be right; *serior aetas* better suits Maximianus’ encounter with the *Graia puella* than the episode involving Candida;<sup>15</sup> he declares here his intention to recall a painful story from later in his life.

That aspect of these verses may shed some light on a lingering textual issue. If it is sound, the adjective *laeta* must be taken together with *aetas*<sup>16</sup>. The result, however, is not sound: happiness is not a noteworthy quality of Maximianus’ old age in general, of his posting to the east, or of his encounter with the *Graia puella*<sup>17</sup>. The conjectures of Wernsdorf (whose *lena* looks ahead to the subsequent episode) and of Baehrens (whose *lingua* looks back at Candida) suggest an alternative approach, which is to introduce a new subject for *dedit*; their particular solutions, however, are untenable, since no *lena* is involved in what follows, while these six verses cannot reasonably promise to tell the story of Candida that has already been told. The singular cause of Maximianus’ sorrows in the episode of the *Graia puella* is his penis. Although the conjecture is bold from the point of view of palaeography, I would suggest the possibility of reading:

intulit, et gemitus, quos mihi *uena* dedit.

Cf. 555–6 (= 5, 35–6) *derigui, quantusque fuit calor ille recessit, | et nata est uenae causa pudenda meae.*

551–2 (= 5, 31–2)

terrebar teneros astringere fortiter artus:  
uisa per amplexus ossa sonare meos.

551 terrebar *ABoδ* : terrebam *Fδ* : horrebam *uel* urebar *δ* :  
pellebar *Baehrens* : torrebam *Ellis*

In verses 547–50, Maximianus is inflamed by the sight of the body of the *puella*; in 552, her bones creak from the force of his embraces, which she will lament in verses 553–6. Amid such a scene, *terrebar* (or *horrebam*, preferred by Sandquist Öberg) seems difficult to justify; Webster, *Elegies*,

<sup>14</sup> Note Wernsdorf’s *lena* and the views recorded by Schneider, *Maximian*, 222.

<sup>15</sup> *serior* here will, I suspect, have prompted Baehrens’ *serus* at 504.

<sup>16</sup> Neither *lenta* and *sera* can be seriously considered; the one is an attempt to make sense of the reading *leta*, while the other has simply invaded from the preceding verse.

<sup>17</sup> Schneider, *Maximian*, 222, instead sees irony in *laeta*.

108, attempted to defend it with the argument “the MSS point to this reading with a good deal of certainty... The meaning must be—not “afraid to”—but “frenzied to”, as the next line shows”<sup>18</sup>. Rather better sense would be supplied by Baehrens’ *pellebar*, by the *urebar* found in several late manuscripts (the sense is reasonable but the word itself is doubtless conjectural and difficult after *urebant*, 547), and by Ellis’ *torrebar*, which variously indicate Maximianus’ desire to embrace the girl. At the same time, it would be possible to introduce *astringere* logically and grammatically in other ways.

Considerable respect has been expressed for the form *terrebar*, but the distribution of readings signalled above makes it at least as plausible that *-r* is an attempt to make sense of something like *terrebam*. Furthermore, it is worth asking whether *terre-* is itself merely a mistaken anticipation of *teneros*. If so, something so far removed as Baehrens’ *pellebar* may well be possible. Schneider, *Maximian*, 224, has claimed that the infinitive *astringere* here follows *terrebar*, which is treated as “verb des Beginnens.” That argument seems doubtful, but a similar verb would obviously be appropriate here: Maximianus described the appealing appearance of the *puella* in the preceding verses and here was undertaking to embrace her. I would suggest, merely as a possibility, trying:

*pergebam teneros astringere fortiter artus.*

577–8 (= 5, 57–8)

contractare manu coepit flagrantia membra  
meque etiam digitis sollicitare suis.

577 flagrantia] languentia Mo : uirilia A : flaccientia Baehrens  
: frigentia uulgo

Maximianus’ erectile dysfunction prompts a valiant effort on the part of the *Graia puella*, and *flagrantia*, too, has prompted some hearty attempts to defend it<sup>19</sup>. In such a context, however, *flagrantia* seems to give the exact opposite sense of what is wanted. Baehrens’ *flaccientia* and the old vulgate *frigentia* both merit consideration, but the good classical phrase *languentia membra* would be neater, not least since Maximianus describes himself as listless (*mihi torpenti*) in verse 579. The reading in **Mo** is doubtless conjectural (cf. its isolated readings at 5.6 *patriis*] *propriis*; 5.17 *loqui*] *loquens*; 5.58 *etiam*] *solet*), but in this case its scribe may well have been correct.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Spaltenstein, *Commentaire*, 256; Schneider, *Maximian*, 224.

<sup>19</sup> See Schneider, *Maximian*, 225, for a brief survey.

593–4 (= 5,73–4)

cogimur heu segnes crimen uitiumque fateri,  
ne meus extinctus forte putetur amor.

593 heu segnes δ : huque senes A : heuque (heus G) senes BoFδ  
: heu senes δ

Both *heuque senes* and *heu segnes* seem merely to be attempts to rescue a metrically deficient earlier reading *heu senes*.<sup>20</sup> If both *heu* and *senes* are authentic, a syllable has dropped out between them. On the other hand, the deficient metre could as easily signal that either *heu* or *senes* is an interpolation; and while *heu* is excellent, *senes* does not seem so sacrosanct. With the caveat that interpolation is here not certain but merely a possibility, I would suggest reading:

cogimur heu *nostrum* crimen uitiumque fateri

*Senes* would have been entered as an explanatory note above *nostrum* before ousting it, thereby introducing the metrical deficiency. Maximianus would say that he is forced to reveal the shared (*nostrum*) problem of old age, lest his individual (*meus*) love be wrongly impugned.

<sup>20</sup> Baehrens' *ecce senes* has a fifteenth-century predecessor in **Pn**.