
Purga ergo et tu ingenium tuum, ut aliquando etiam de tuis fontibus bibas (S. 232, Z. 21).


«Ihr werdet beginnen, selbst Lehrer zu sein.»


Dies also einige Anmerkungen, die den inhaltlichen Zugang zum monumentalen ‘Bauwerk’ des Origenes erleichtern sollen. Kritische Zensuren sind kaum möglich, denn die Arbeit der Herausgeber ist bisher sozusagen fehlerfrei. Es ist zu hoffen, daß bald weitere Bände erscheinen, die der Bedeutung des großen Theologen und Philologen Origenes gerecht werden.

Küssnacht bei Zürich  Heinrich Marti


The Priapea – sometimes referred to as the Carmina Priapea or the Corpus Priapeorum to distinguish it from the Priapic poems of the Appendix Vergiliana – is a group of 80 anonymous poems from the first century C.E. composed to, from the perspective of, and in honor of the god Priapus. These poems, often obscene in content or theme, are artfully arranged and, according to the current communis opinio, intended to be read as a single, interrelated unit: a libellus of epigrams.

The Priapea is, as Callebat (C) elegantly notes, «sinon une grande oeuvre, du moins une oeuvre de grand talent» (XLVIII).

C’s new volume follows up on a series of recent editions and commentaries of the Priapea: most notably Clairmont’s (1983) collation of forty manuscripts of the poems, Parker (1988), Cano and Velázquez (2000), and Bianchini (2001). Alongside these we should add Goldberg’s (1992) commentary. C’s volume is a welcome addition to these previous efforts. It provides (i) a thorough introduction to the text and context of the Priapea (pp. IX–LXXXVII), which expands on Parker’s contributions and updates the scholarship on a number of questions, particularly dating the poems, authorship, and genre and gender. The introduction also includes a learned study of the poems’ prosody and metrics by Jean Soubiran (S), and is followed by (ii) a new critical text with (iii) facing French
The introduction divides into seven main sections: (1) Priapus, (2) Priapus in Greco-Latin Texts, (3) Carmina Priapea, (4) Prosody and Metrics, by S (5) Manuscript Tradition, (6) Editions and Commentaries, and (7) Sigla. The first two sections are brief, introducing Priapus as a god, his cult, and his depictions in Greek and Roman representations and literature, particularly the priapean meter and the epigrams in the Palatine Anthology. Here C follows Parker, who gave a thorough list of poems about and to Priapus, dividing them by theme and content. C usefully links the Priapea to the concept of simplicitas, arguing that in the midst of an Imperial push toward restoring the old moral order (simplicitas) against modern corruption (luxuria), the poets both lampooned ancient simplicitas and adopted a nova simplicitas, the freedom to say and write without any taboo in an attempt to create realism. C places the Priapea squarely in this tradition, where the ‘simplicity’ of Priapus – a raw wooden statue, who speaks «simplicius» (3.9) – is an ironic comment on the true nature of simplicitas, a reading which will recur throughout the introduction and commentary. In his overview of the Carmina Priapea, C addresses the structure of the eighty poems as a single interconnected collection. Following Kloss’s observations on the careful metrical arrangement of the poems, C notes the poems’ thematic coherence, particularly in their portrayal of Priapus as burlesque. C then offers a valuable critique of Richlin’s view of the Priapea as a text that devalorizes women and offers evidence about Roman homosexuality, seeing it rather as a text that both belongs to a domain in which sex is a punitive action and that comments sarcastically on that domain. After structure, C summarizes the evidence for authorship of the Priapea, offering nothing new but setting out the issues clearly and succinctly and coming down on the side of a single, but unknown author of the Flavian period, contemporary to Martial. The poems’ genre he sees as difficult to determine and possibly unique, settling on the term «ethnographie burlesque». In language and poetics, C discusses at length the obscenity in the Priapea, suggesting that it does not belong to the poems per se but to their speaker, i.e., Priapus, as a generic assertion of Imperial-era nova simplicitas. There follow three related sections: mastery of language, mastery of languages, and mastery of style, the first of which praises the Latinitas and easy expression of the poems, while the second notes the poet’s ability to move between linguistic spheres, using the vocabulary of comedy, the countryside, juridical speech, high poetry, etc. with equal ease. The third identifies two main stylistic techniques at play in the poems: ‘distancing’ and ‘destructuring’, where distancing is a sudden change in register or reversal of reader expectation especially at the end of the poem, and destructuring is an ironic destabilization and devalorization of the poems’ surface message achieved by undercutting the figure of Priapus or the message of any passage or poem as a whole. The fourth section, Prosody and Metrics, contributed by S, discusses under ‘prosody’ the quantitative value of the final ‘o’ – in what contexts and with what frequency it becomes short – and uses this to date
the *Priapea* to before Martial but after Ovid and Seneca, a date slightly earlier than that C suggests. Under ‘metrics’, S discusses the confluence of vowels (elision, aphaeresis, and hiatus), the order and placement of spondees and dactyls, the quantities of the base in the hendecasyllable, and substitutions in the stasimon; and he proposes a truly novel, but unconvincing solution to the corruption at 72.1–2: that we read the lines as trochaic septenarii. I take this up below under ‘Critical Text’. The fifth section, Manuscript Tradition, summarizes the state of the question by following the identification of capital MSS, the recognition of four basic families by Buchheit, Clairmont’s valuable list of MSS readings, Parker’s return to the four families, and Cano & Velázquez’s adoption of Parker’s methods. C himself follows Kloss, who identified a relationship between the four families and reduced them to two related groups. This leads to an explanation of C’s *Critical Analysis*. He built his text from 14 MSS consulted in person or via microfilm: the oft-cited *Laur* 33,31 A, *Voss. Lat.* O.81 V, *Laur. Plut.* 39,34 L, *Guelf.* 373/ *Helm.* 338 H, *Wrat. Rebd.* 60 W, plus nine more, of which two, signified by small letters, may be copies of incunabula. He also consulted *Corsinianus* directly, Calì’s collation of *Catinensis S. Nicolai* 30, *Cazzaniga’s collation of Ambrosianus*, Ellis for *Vat.* 2876, and he spot-checked Clairmont’s collation, giving him access to readings from another twenty-two MSS. In his examination of the codices, C describes the fourteen MSS to which he gave sigla, and in his philological study of variants analyzes them into four groups *AN* (related variously to *GVL*), *FH* (related to *P*, *z*, *L*), *Wv*, *XO* (related to *T*), that fall into major, diverging lines: *ANGVL* and *PFHzTXOWv*. C caps his discussion of the Manuscript Tradition with a Summary of Results in which he explains that the transmission of the *Priapea* makes a stemma impossible, but the family groups simplify the comparison of variants. This is basically correct: what C adds is not a more complete collation of the MSS but a more careful recension of the MSS already collated. A clearer picture of the family relations may be visible with a more complete look at the MSS readings, but the method of analysis by family groupings will necessarily remain the same with so confused a tradition. In the sixth section, Editions and Commentaries, C discusses the early and recent printing history of the *Priapea*, distinguishing critical editions from texts and translations. C’s Sigla follows the Teubner’s (Baehrens/Vollmer) lettering for those they have in common, but one might still wish for a comparatio siglorum since several of the sigla conflict with those already in use by Parker and Cano and Velázquez and completely ignore those employed by Clairmont.

(ii) Critical Text Although C’s changes to the text are mostly minor, with a few exceptions discussed below, this is the soundest text published so far. C explains in detail in the introduction his careful method for identifying MS families and the principal representatives from each, and he shows a full command of the scholarship on individual cruces, to which he applies an intimate knowledge of Latin usage and syntax. His choices and emendations C explains at length in

---

1 Bod. Lat. class. 4,5 F; *Guelf.* 371/ *Helm.* 336 T; *Perusinus* 740 P; *Got. Phil.* 116 G; *Vat. Chig.* H.V. 169 X; *Berol. Ham.* 676 N; *Vat. Ott. Lat.* 2029 O; *Vat. Lat.* 1608 v, *Vat. Lat.* 1628 z.
the commentary, including the advantages and drawbacks of alternate readings. C's apparatus gives the readings for all fourteen of his MSS in every instance, a policy which can give the apparatus a bloated look, only sporadically helped by the siglum \( \omega \), which indicates "consensus codicum praeter unum vel duo". One oddity: the apparatus includes the incipits and explicits of C's fourteen MSS, even though these are not original to the poems themselves, have no equivalent in C's text, and no note in the commentary. Some of them include potentially useful information, as dates for the MSS and Renaissance attributions of authorship, but then so do MSS not among these fourteen. And one wonders, if the incipits and explicits are worth citing, why not also the titles to individual poems included in so many MSS? After the eighty poems of the *Priapea*, C helpfully includes an appendix of Bücheler's text of the six priapic poems often known as 81–85 and the Hymn to Priapus: *vilicus aerari* (81), *quid hoc novi est* (82), *vere rosa* (83), *ego haec* (84), *bunc ego* (85), and *salve sancte pater*, although these have no apparatus. The appendix refers the reader to pages VII, XVIII–XIX, and LXII of the Introduction but should read 'IX, XX–XXI, and LXIV'.

Decisions on particular readings are generally well-argued and strongly supported, as the correction "ficta" for the MSS "ficta" at 42.2, for which C adduces arguments of sense, metrics, and paleography, while using the same to point out flaws in the established readings and emendations. At 67.2, C revives Pascal's "Cadmi" for the MSS "canii" and editors' "Cadmis", giving both metrical support (the natural quantity of the syllable 'Ca-' must be long to spell out 'pe-de-ca-re', and the word in which it is contained must syllabify as 'ca-', while 'Cadmi' usually syllabifies as 'Cad-') and interpretive support: both Cacus and Remus, the other figure in the line, are anti-heroes associated with the Aventine Hill. At another major crux, 46.6, C reads "manes binc licet ut libenter ires", which as a desperatecorrupt line, receives an appropriately lengthy note in the commentary, but strangely no mention at all in the apparatus, despite the fact that there is a variety of readings and that this particular reading occurs in Vat. Lat. 5269, used by Clairmont, Parker, and Cano & Velázquez. C's defense of the reading "quaedam iunior" at 12.1 is weak. He tells us in his commentary "la fréquence même des corrections envisagées, dont plusieurs vraisemblables, incite à revenir vers la leçon iunior, notamment écartée par un souci excessif de symétrie" (105). But this seems rather proof of the opposite: that there is something insupportably wrong with the reading. Unconvincing is C's interpretation that "quaedam iunior Hectoris parentis" is meant ironically (106) while the subsequently listed women, the Cumaen Sibyl and Hecale, are meant sincerely, and his translation, "Plus jeune que la mère d'Hector" does nothing to bring out irony. C presents six new conjectures: 16.7 *tala quaquaque*; 32.7 *usque para pupex* (following S); 37.12 *partem*; 63.1 *quod hic <sumal> pedem fixi*; 63.18 *novisque iunctis pruriosa discordit*; 72.1–2 "Diligens Priape facito tutelam pomari / et rubricato minare furibus mutuo*" (following S). Particularly welcome is C's proposal at 63.18 to read "novisque iunctis pruriosa discordit" for "non inuentis pruriosa pruriginosa discordet", which is neither metrical nor gives good sense. S's solution to the hopelessly corrupt couplet at 72.1–2 is ingenious: S supposes that the lines may in fact be trochaic septenarii, a prayer meter, and he achieves the transformation by reordering the words of both lines and adding "et" to the beginning of the pentameter. While this solution is intriguing, it is unconvincing given the absence of other examples in Priapic poetry and its incompatibility with Kloss's analysis of the book's metrical arrangement.

(iii) **French Translation** C offers a facing prose translation of the poems, with the usual advantages and disadvantages of that method, and he succeeds in providing a readable, fluid French that captures the tone and feeling of the *Priapea*. 
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A brief quotation will suffice to show: Priapeum 17: «Quid mecum tibi, circitor moleste? / Ad me quid prohibes venire furen? / Accedat sine: laxior redibit! » «Qu’as-tu à faire avec moi, gardien importun? Pourquoi empêches-tu le voleur de venir jusqu’à moi? Laisse, qu’il s’approche... Il s’en retournera plus ouvert! » C unfortunately offers no discussion of his goals or methods in translation beyond an interesting distinction between «vulgare ob-scène» and «vulgarité familière» (XLII) in which he briefly discusses the different registers in which a seemingly obscene word might be activated to different degrees depending on its context. This distinction of register, while indisputably right, leaves room for a reader to disagree over the particulars, as «vidéo» for «ecfutatus» (26.7), «inverdis» for «pediconum» (68.8). The occasional puns are handled by including in brackets the Latin (7.2 «pe-dico») or French (68.5-6 «glande» for «épilen»; «cul» for «cûlum»). One only laments that a similar solution couldn’t be found for the more delicate puns, as «magnus testibus» (15.7), which becomes merely «important témoins», or the interplay between «misultis-stis» 10.1 («on ne peut pas plus stupides») and «salsa» 12.7 («piquants»), which is at least mentioned in the commentary. There are also the occasional infelicities in C’s rendering of individual words, as «florilèges» for «libello» (2.2), which begs the question of the nature of the collection, and the treatment of «cinaedus» throughout (25.5 = «homo» and 45.4, 46.2 = «mignon», neither of which quite catches the word). Worth further consideration is C’s translation of 78.3-6 «...vivæ misellæ landicæ / vis posse iurat ambulare praec fossis» «...jure maintenant, la pauvrette, que la fosse de son clitoris fait qu’elle peut à peine se déplacer!» in which he takes «landicae» as specifying the location of «fossae» rather than as a genitive of cause of emotion with «misella». The only real concern is that the poems seem to have been translated in isolation from each other, with more care given to the tone and register of the words within an individual poem than to the links between poems and their association as a book, with the result that C effaces many of the binding words1 that link the poems and suggest their interplay. For example, «partio» (1.7) becomes «les parties» but «en partem bonam» (2.11) «avec bienveillance»; «carnes» (2.8) becomes «marauders» but «capseris» (30.3) «cuelleis»; «susitne» (61.14) becomes «porter» but «susitnem» (63.3) «endurions». This makes the translation less useful for reading between and among poems in an interpretive style.

(iv) Bibliography C divides his bibliography into sections by theme: (a) ‘History of the Text’, concerned mainly with the transmission of the manuscripts, but also with the origins of the poems; (b) ’Modern Editions’, which include any printing of the text, whether a critical recension or not; (c) ’Textual Critiques’, dealing mainly, as the subtitle indicates, with individual poems and passages; (d) ’Language, Metrics, and Poetics’ dealing with generic linguistic and metrical issues; and (e) ’General Studies and Commentaries’ including studies of the Priapea themselves and of related topics. C’s bibliography is well-made and a useful update to Parker, Goldberg, and Bianchini.

(v) Commentary C provides a strong linguistic commentary in which he explains and argues for his textual choices, gives the variant readings and conjectures for difficult passages, explains the arguments for and against each reading, and how he came to make his selection, which usually derives from Latin usage, metrical, and paleographical considerations. Issues of syntax come up only when pertinent to the selection of a reading. Discussions of the structure of a poem are to such good effect when they occur that one will wish that C had included some comments on the ‘structure’ for every poem. What C does not do is make protracted comments on metrics – perhaps in deference to his colleague S –, or offer literary interpretations, either of individual poems or of the collection as a whole.

1 The fullest treatment of the «Wortverbindungen» is Goldberg (1992) 32–33.
This is a notable absence in studies of the *Priapea*, and there is great room for more work of a literary bent. The absence of consideration of the binding words and of interpreting the poems in their context makes itself felt here, as well, even on the textual level.

For example, at 50.2, C reads «fucosissima» against the «ficosissima» of the majority of the MSS and O’Connor on the grounds that the «fucosissima apparaît la plus simple et la plus vraisemblable en contexte». And perhaps it does, but that context must include the possibility that «fucosissima» is a binding word with «ficosissimus» at 41.4 and, more strikingly, «fico» at 51.3. One might then wonder whether part of the speaker’s frustration at a girl who «nec dat mihi nec negat daturam» comes from the sign (ficosissima) that she normally so clearly «dat» to others.

The commentary improves on Bianchini’s in scope by adding much greater depth to the lexical portions, greater thoroughness to the discussion of sources and intertext, and more depth to discussion of poetic structure. That there is some overlap with Goldberg is to be expected, and one might still look to her commentary for a fuller list of parallel passages, but C’s selectivity in this regard is appreciated.

In sum, C’s edition is a much-needed addition to scholarship on the *Priapea*. It offers a solid text, detailed commentary, readable translation, and a thorough introduction to the main issues that surround the text, complete with valuable insights into the genre and literary context.

Tacoma

Tyler T. Travillian

---


Al *De Nabuthae historia*, breve trattato del vescovo di Milano, Ambrogio, la Curatrice dell’opera dedica questo ampio commento, preceduto da introduzione e traduzione con testo a fronte.

L’episodio veterotestamentario su cui l’opera di Ambrogio è incentrata narra di un re, Achab, che, accectato da folle cupidigia, fa uccidere un uomo povero, Naboth, al solo scopo di impossessarsi della sua vigna (I Reg. 21): il contrasto tra i due personaggi si carica di un valore assoluto e diviene allegoria della contrapposizione tra ricchezza e povertà. Ambrogio prende spunto dalla storia biblica per condannare non tanto la ricchezza in sé, quanto il suo cattivo uso, fonte di inaccettabili ingiustizie e disparità sociali. E, allo stesso tempo prospetta una soluzione nel recupero di due altissimi valori, giustizia e carità, che, attraverso una più equa distribuzione dei beni, promuovano l’uguaglianza sociale.

Gettando un ponte tra passato e presente, la Palumbo opportunamente dimostra (40) come l’intrinseca correlazione tra carità e giustizia, postulata da Ambrogio, trovi significativi riscontri, ad esempio, nell’Enciclica *Caritas in veritate* di papa Benedetto XVI: «la giustizia è inseparabile dalla carità… La giustizia è la prima via della carità… Da una parte la carità esige la giustizia: il riconoscimento e il rispetto dei legittimi diritti degli individui e dei popoli… Dall’altra, la carità supera la giustizia e la completa nella logica del dono e del perdono». 
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