

*Disiecta Membra: On the Arrangement of
Claudian's *Carmina minora**

GEORG LUCK

In our manuscripts and editions the order of Claudian's *Carmina minora* varies considerably, and the arrangement adopted by Th. Birt (*Monumenta Germaniae historica: Auctores antiquissimi*, vol. 10, 1892) and M. Platnauer (*Loeb Classical Library*, 2 vols., 1922, reprinted 1963) has no more authority, I think, than that of J. M. Gesner (1759). But since Birt, in his long *Praefatio*, claims to have discovered the arrangement closest to that of the archetype, we shall examine its merits first. It is based on the Mediceus, a fifteenth century codex which derives from an "antiquus codex" and is found, with minor variations, in the Ambrosianus, also fifteenth century, and about twenty other witnesses. Before reaching any conclusions we must survey the poems from the point of view of their content and their literary form. This paper will be partly a catalogue of the extant poems, but since they are hardly read nowadays except perhaps by a few specialists, such a survey is necessary. I realize how sketchy my contribution is, but a great deal of work is needed. For one thing, the text is corrupt in many places. Birt's text is far too conservative, his own conjectures are often rash and implausible.

The first group of poems in Birt's edition includes eight pieces, mainly of the descriptive genre. The very first piece repeats verbatim one of the four *Fescennina* which form a sort of varied prelude to the Epithalamium of Honorius and Maria. Was it lifted out of that context and placed here because it is the shortest of the four? But any of the others might have qualified as a "short poem." It is certainly an ingenious compliment to Stilicho, and his name is only mentioned here. Whoever put this piece at the head of the *Carmina minora* must have understood it as a tribute to Stilicho, perhaps the shortest in Claudian's oeuvre.

Number 2 is the description of a harbor. Why it should be the harbor

of Smyrna (according to the lemma in some manuscripts) or Saron (according to the lemma in the "vetus Cuiacii") is not clear. In some cases (see below, on No. 12) a lemma seems to have information which is not found in the poem itself; but this may be guesswork. These few lines could be a *topos* to be inserted into a longer poem where needed. There must be some connection between this and No. 5 (see below).

Number 3 is altogether different: four lines addressed to Aeternalis, the proconsul of Asia of A.D. 396 and apparently a patron of Claudian's, for the poet calls him *meus* . . . *Apollo* (v. 4; cf. Birt, *Praefatio*, p. XIV). The text of v. 3, as given in Birt and Platnauer, is unsatisfactory. The point of the poem is that Claudian can only speak in verse (cf. Ovid, *Tristia* 4, 10, 23-26), because he is inspired by his Apollo, Aeternalis, just as the oracle at Delphi, inspired by Apollo, is given in verse. Read: *carmina sunt, nam verba negant communia Musae* (non Heinsius ex codd.: *sed vulgo*). Claudian contrasts poetry (*carmina*) and prose (*verba communia*). The vulgate *sed* makes sense but lacks point, and *non*, found by Heinsius in some manuscripts, clashes with the beginning of the next lines: *carmina sola loquor*. The poem looks like the dedication of a collection of Claudian's poems to Aeternalis, but what texts would have been included? All the *Carmina minora*? Or just the ones dealing with ordinary subjects—subjects that someone else would write about in prose, such as No. 10, *De birro castoreo*? Number 4 is the description of a handsome bull: the lemma *Descriptio armenti* or *armentorum* is clearly misleading and probably read out of the last word of v. 1, *armentorum*.¹

Number 5 presents the same kind of problem as No. 2. In the "Excerpta Florentina" (15th cent.) it has the lemma *Est in conspectu longe locus*, probably a hint that these four lines are a variation on a Virgilian theme (*Aeneid* 1, 159-168), but Virgil wrote *est in secessu longo locus*. A scribe or editor perhaps recognized the parallel but quoted from memory. It is also possible that this piece originally was connected with No. 2, which begins with the words *Urbs in conspectu*. But the beginning of No. 2 is almost certainly corrupt, and probably should be restored as Pricaeus and Heinsius had suggested: *Urbis conspectum montana cacumina vallant | tranquillo praetenta mari*. Perhaps Nos. 2 and 5 are fragments torn from the same contest—a safe harbor and the city which it serves—or else they are variations on a passage in the *Aeneid*, to be inserted into a longer poem. Poets must have kept such patches for future use, just as Cicero had his collection of *praefationes*. Number 6 is similar: a variation on Virgilian themes (*Aeneid* 1, 148-150 and 7, 503-508). The lemma in some

¹ In v. 12 read *praestassent* (*praestarent* "vetus Cuiacii" : *portassent* vulgo).

manuscripts reads *rimanti telum ira facit*, an exact quotation of Virgil, *Aeneid* 7,508. Did the poet himself supply this piece of information? Or did a reader note the reminiscence in the margin (see above, No. 2)?

Number 7 is separated by Birt into two poems of four lines each. Both of them celebrate a marble sculpture: a chariot with four horses and the driver, all made from one block. This is the typical *ecphrasis* of a work of art, perhaps a well-known monument in Rome. Birt compares *Anth. Pal.* 9,759 (*Ἀδέσποτον*) and 760 (*Ἄλλο*), both consisting of one line only, both almost identical, with minor variations. Number 8, *De Polycaste et Perdicca*, is about the incestuous love of a mother for her son. There are different variations of this story in other sources,² but the lemma is questionable: nothing indicates that Claudian refers to the young hunter Perdiccas and his mother Polycaste (or Polycarpe). The text is corrupt: in v. 1 read *flammatum* (Heinsius) for *flammarum*; in v. 2 read *sanguinis, heu, fetum . . . timens* for *sanguinis effetum . . . timet*; and in v. 6 read *consule iam Veneri* for *c.i. Venerem*.

Number 9, *De hystrice*, could be part of a series on animals (cf. Nos. 18; 27; 42; 49; *Appendix*, No. 9, etc.). Claudian was clearly fascinated by the strange variety in the animal world. Number 10, *De birro castoreo*, a satiric epigram in the style of Martial, describes a shabby old overcoat made of beaver's fur. The coat was never worth much (*sex solidi* was apparently very cheap for such a garment at this time), but now it is only a shadow of its former self: *nominis umbra manet veteris* (mock-heroic after Lucan 1,135, *stat magni nominis umbra*, of Pompeius Magnus).

Number 11, *In sepulchrum speciosae*, could be inspired by a funeral monument, perhaps a statue that Claudian saw somewhere along a highway. It could also have been intended as the epitaph itself; though the name of the woman is missing, it could have been inscribed somewhere else on the monument. But the epigram might be purely literary; cf. Iulianus Aegyptius, *Anth. Pal.* 7,599. Number 12, *De balneis Quintianis quae in via posita erant*. The name of Quintius is not mentioned in the poem; hence the lemma either preserves independent information or is based on guesswork (see above, on No. 2). Again, it is not impossible that Claudian was asked to compose an inscription for this bath-house along the highway; the name of the benefactor might have been found on another part of the building.

Number 13 attacks a critic who claimed that Claudian's verse did not scan properly: "*claudicat hic versus; haec,*" *inquit*, "*syllaba nutat.*" Hence, he concluded, *totum carmen non stat*. These must be technical terms used by ancient metricians, and from that point of view the poem is quite important. Claudian replies that the critic is unable to read verse; he is

² Cf. Fr. Vollmer, *RE* 5 (1905), 1644.

therefore *podager*. This does not mean, of course, that the critic actually suffers from gout; it means that something is wrong with his "feet," i.e., the meter of Claudian's verses as he reads them. He actually "butchers" them, Claudian says (at the end of v. 2 read *lacerans* for *laceras*, following the edition of P. Burman the Younger, 1760). Number 14 is a brief poetic thank-you note for some honey which Maximus had sent him. Numbers 15 and 16 are two Latin versions of the anonymous epigram *Anth. Pal.* 5,50, which is attributed by some critics to Claudian himself. These are literary exercises.

Number 17 celebrates the statues of the two brothers who carried their parents to safety from a burning house. Claudian apparently saw these statues in or near Catina (Catania) on Sicily, and he praises the work of art no less than the act of *pietas* which it commemorates. During an eruption of Mt. Aetna, a miracle happened: the masses of hot lava stopped at this very monument, as if in awe of such devotion. The story is told elsewhere in different versions, e.g., in Ps.-Aristotle, *De mundo* 400 a 34-b 6: here the lava stream separates to spare the two living brothers and their burden. Henceforth the place was called *εὐσεβῶν χῶπος*, *piorum locus*. The text is greatly in need of restoration: read, e.g., in v. 35 *patri* for *pater* (with A), and in v. 42 *dicabit* for *dicavit* (with R and Heinsius).

Number 18, on a team of Gallic mules and their trainer, describes some kind of a circus act. Claudian is astonished at the skill and obedience of the animals. He notes that the trainer gives his commands in his native tongue, a Celto-Roman dialect (*barbarici . . . soni*, v. 8 = *Gallica verba*, v. 20). This could have been written anywhere, not necessarily on a trip through Gaul.

Number 19 is a short epistle in verse to Gennadius, the prefect of Egypt in 396 who seems to have lived in Ravenna after his retirement. Gennadius had asked for some of Claudian's poems, and is now told that none are left at home:

*Nam mihi mox nidum pennis confisa relinquunt
et lare contempto non reditura volant.*

Claudian compares his poems to young birds who have learned to fly and are eager to leave their nest, i.e., to reach the person who has commissioned them or to whom they are dedicated. Claudian's poetry is, to a large extent, *poésie d'occasion*, written to celebrate a certain event or a person, composed for a special *καίρος*. Even if Claudian kept—as he must have—a copy of his "official" poems, this was hardly the kind of thing Gennadius wanted: he probably was hoping for a more personal kind of poem, and this is what he gets, though it is quite short. Birt concludes from this poem that Claudian did not make a collection of his own

works. This may be true, but the poem itself does not support it. Number 20 is a charming piece, often quoted, on an old man of Verona who—unlike Claudian—had never left his home.

Number 21 attacks two high officials of opposite tempers, Flavius Mallius Theodorus and Rufius Synesius Hadrianus: one is too lazy, the other hyper-active. Theodorus was consul in 399, but before that time, it would appear, had dedicated himself for years to philosophy and agriculture (Claudian 17,138; 174 ff.).³ Hadrianus held the office of *praefectus praetorio* of Italy in 401–405 and apparently used his power to enrich himself.⁴ Claudian managed, in one short epigram, to offend two influential men at the same time, but Mallius seems to have forgiven him, while Hadrian, furious, demanded an apology (No. 22, immediately following), which turned out more than ten times as long as the offending poem. One cannot help wondering what the occasion may have been. Perhaps both men were candidates for a political office, and Claudian made it clear that he thought them both unfit, for different reasons. Number 22 is the *deprecatio* for the preceding attack on Hadrianus, a piece so humble and abject in tone that—like so many ancient poems of flattery—it seems almost ironical. And yet, I suppose, that was the required attitude, and Claudian may have been forced to write it under pressure from Stilicho; at least that is what the title in M (the catalogue) suggests: *excusatio pro se ad Stilichonem*. Number 23 is also a *deprecatio*, also addressed to a political figure, the quaestor Alethius,⁵ but without political character. Claudian had been critical of Alethius' poetry; Alethius was hurt, and Claudian, appearing very remorseful and contrite, promises from now on to praise everything Alethius writes. The way in which Alethius is compared to Homer and Virgil (vv. 15 f.) would indicate that the whole poem is not meant seriously. There is a thread connecting poems 21–23: an attack on two political figures; the apology addressed to one of them; an apology addressed to a third politician, but the attack itself is missing. This short series, however, is separated from related poems (attacks on Claudian, or Claudian's attacks on others: Nos. 13; 50).

Number 24 is a brief (fragmentary?) description of a lobster, probably not a living one but a cooked specimen on the table. It may be compared with *Appendix*, No. 3 (see below), with which it is connected in the Vaticanus 2809 (12th cent.). Number 25 is a long Epithalamium for Palladius and Celerina, similar to the *Laus Serenae* (No. 30) and the Epithalamium

³ Cf. A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, I (Cambridge, 1971), 900 ff.; W. Ensslin, *RE* 5A (1934), 1897 ff.

⁴ *Prosopography* (above, n. 3), I, 406; O. Seeck, *RE* 7 (1912), 2178.

⁵ *Prosopography*, I, 39.

for Honorius (among the "official" poems). Both epithalamia have an elegiac *praefatio* followed by hexameters. One might ask, why this was not included among the "official" poems (see below, on No. 30). Perhaps because it is relatively short, although it is one of the longest texts in the *Carmina minora*. Could it be unfinished?

Four poems dealing with scientific lore follow. Number 26 praises the hot mineral springs of Aponos (Abano, near Padua). Obviously the poet had visited the place; perhaps he had even taken the waters there. He saw the many *graffiti* and other inscriptions of grateful patients, some in crude verse. This must be the meaning of v. 4, *cum tibi plebeius carmina dicitet honos*, not "seeing . . . that a people's love bids poets to honour thee in song," as Platnauer translates. Number 27, on the Phoenix, follows Herodotus 2,73, and is partly mythological, partly epideictic or allegorical: the fabulous bird stands for immortality. Number 28 celebrates the Nile, and seems to be incomplete (J. J. Scaliger, F. Buecheler). Though Claudian was born in Egypt he follows literary models, such as Herodotus 2,20 ff.; Seneca, *Nat. quaest.* 4,1 ff.; Lucan 10,194-331. Number 29, on the magnet, blends science and mythology.

Laus Serenae (No. 30) should be added to Claudian's "official" poems (as should No. 25), and one is surprised to find it here. Again, it may be unfinished. Serena is Theodosius' niece and adoptive daughter, and Stilicho's wife (ca. 384-408).⁶ In the charming passage vv. 132-139 there is a textual problem:

*Ambas (sc. sorores) ille quidem patrio complexus amore,
sed merito pietas in te proclivior ibat;
et quotiens, rerum moles ut publica cogit,
135 tristior aut ira tumidus flagrante redibat,
cum patrem nati fugerent atque ipsa timeret
commotum Flaccilla virum, tu sola frementem
frangere, tu blando poteras sermone mederi.
Alloquii haerere tuis, secreta fideli.⁷*

Theodosius loves both Serena and her sister Thermantia; but Serena is his favorite. Even when he is depressed or angry, even when his two sons, Arcadius and Honorius, and his wife Flaccilla are afraid to talk to him, he will listen to Serena. She alone can put him in good mood; and he tells her state secrets. That much is clear. But the transition from 138 to 139 is difficult, and it seems possible that one or two lines had fallen out, as Heinsius suggested. Or else v. 139 is the beginning of a period which Claudian left unfinished. Apparently there is something missing also at

⁶ *Prosopography* I, 824; O. Seeck, *RE* 2A (1923), 1672 f.

⁷ *fideli* codd. : *fateri* Birt.

the end of the poem, for the "Excerpta Gyraldina" note: *In exemplari antiquo scriptum est in fine "hic deest," quod est verisimile*. There are some unusual corruptions in the text, too: perhaps it was preserved in a not easily legible autograph. We have asked the question, why were Nos. 25 and 30 not included among Claudian's "official" poems? The answer may be: because both were unfinished. This, of course, would affect their chronology. The place of the *Epistula ad Serenam* (No. 31), immediately after the *Laus*, is logical (though they are separated from each other in some manuscripts, and some preserve the *Epistula* without the *Laus*). The *Epistula* is more personal. We hear that Claudian, though painfully aware of his poverty (45 f.), was encouraged by Serena to propose to a young woman in North Africa. The letter seems to have been written immediately before the poet's marriage, to which, because of the distance, he cannot invite Serena. Vollmer⁸ and Seeck⁹ think the poem was written during Claudian's honeymoon and that he died soon afterward.

Number 32, *De Salvatore*, is a poetic paraphrase of the beginning of the Gospel according to St. John. It is comparable to the *Laus Christi*, *Appendix*, No. 20. Numbers 33-39 are seven epigrams on a crystal enclosing a drop of water. To those may be added two Greek epigrams by Claudian on the same subject (*Anth. Pal.* 9,753 and 754). This crystal obviously fascinated him and gave him an ideal opportunity to show his talent of deriving ever new ideas from the same theme. Numbers 40 and 41, the letters to Olybrius and his younger brother Probinus, resemble each other: both urge a friend to write soon (cf. Ovid, *Tristia* 4,7 and 5,13). The two brothers are also connected in Claudian's *Panegyricus dictus Probino et Olybrio consulibus*. The two letters stand next to each other in all manuscripts. Number 42, *De apro et leone*, appears to be unfinished; one would expect to hear about the outcome of the fight. Numbers 43 and 44 are invectives against Curetius. In 43 Curetius is introduced as the whoring son of a fraudulent astrologer (whose name, Uranius, is as fanciful as is the family tree of the astrologer in Propertius 4,1), and in 44 his vices are explained in terms of his father's art, i.e., through an interpretation of his own horoscope. Number 45: On the shell in which Serena used to wash her face. We learn that she wrote poetry.

The following poems are all connected with Honorius and his favorite horse. Number 46 is ostensibly written to accompany a cloak and a bridle given to Honorius by Serena: the cloak was her own work. Number 48 celebrates a strap for the horse embroidered by Serena. And No. 47, addressed to the horse, makes clear what valuable gifts the bridle, the

⁸ *RE* 3 (1899), 2655 (s.v. *Claudianus*).

⁹ *Op. cit.* (above, n. 6), 1673.

collar, the strap, and the blanket woven of gold and purple are (the strap must be the same strap as the one in No. 48). In this series we are not told specifically about the collar and the blanket (the *chlamys* of No. 46 must be for the horseman rather than the horse), but we can assume that they too were the gifts of Serena. The order of these poems, the same in all manuscripts (though 48 is missing in some witnesses) is misleading and could not possibly, I believe, have been planned by the poet. The address to the horse (No. 47) anticipates the gift of the strap which is introduced more elaborately in the following poem (No. 48). There is another problem: it is by no means certain that 46 and 47 are separate poems; Mommsen, for instance, thought them to form one piece. In this case the most natural order would be: 48, 46, 47. The lemma of No. 48, *De zona equi regii missa Honorio Augusto a Serena*, is more specific than those of 46, *De chlamyde et frenis*, and 47, *De equo dono dato* (a bizarre way of saying *de donis equo datis*). But the lemmata vary in the manuscripts: some do introduce the name of Honorius *ad* 46. The problem is complicated by the fact that another poem belonging here appears detached from the series in most witnesses (it follows 48 in the Veronensis), and was put into the *Appendix* by Birt (No. 4, see below). We can see that this short series of poems which are obviously related presented difficulties to the ancient editors.

Number 49, *De torpedine* (the electric ray), could be associated with Nos. 9, 18, etc. (see above). Number 50, often discussed because of its references to Christianity, attacks a certain Iacobus, commander of the cavalry, who had criticized Claudian's poetry. Claudian hits back as hard as he can, and denounces Iacobus as a coward and drunkard (cf. the methods of denigration in Nos. 13, 43, and 44). Whether a poem of this kind was ever published, is doubtful. Such poems are written to let off steam and to be shown to a few intimate friends. Number 51 is on the planetarium of Archimedes. Number 52, *De lanario*, a miniature cento, is missing in four important manuscripts (omitted in Platnauer's edition). Perhaps it is a torso as well as a cento. Neither the title nor the text have been explained so far. Could it be an improvisation, or some kind of a riddle? Number 53 (52 in Platnauer), the *Gigantomachia*, is clearly unfinished.

Birt has not included the poems of the so-called *Appendix carminum minorum* in the scheme which he proposes. The very existence of this *Appendix*, as indicated above, makes the problem with which we are concerned, almost insoluble. The poems of the *Appendix* are similar in character to the *Carmina minora* discussed above, but they are missing in some of the main manuscripts; therefore, their authenticity has been doubted, and they have received even less attention than the *Carmina minora*. A few of the poems are in the Veronensis (9th cent.; R), some are in the

Vaticanus 2809 (12th cent.; V), but some are known only from early editions. Almost all of them, however, show Claudian's elegance in style and versification.

Appendix, No. 1, *In Sirenas*, stands in R after *Carmina minora* 49, *De torpedine*. A series of oxymora makes it a remarkable *tour de force*: the Sirens are *dulcia monstra*, | *blanda pericla maris, terror . . . gratus in undis* (vv. 3 f.), and the death they bring is sweet for their victims: *nec dolor ullus erat: mortem dabat ipsa voluptas* (9). Number 2, *Laus Herculis*, follows the *Gigantomachia* (*C.min.* 53) in R. With its 137 lines it is the longest poem of the *Appendix*. But it is incomplete: only three out of Heracles' twelve (or twenty) labours are told. Like the *Gigantomachia* it is the torso of a rather ambitious project. The style is reminiscent of Callimachus' hymns. Number 3, *De dulcio*, consists of just one line: *Nectareo muro dulces cinguntur harenae*. This must be a kind of dessert, described in mock-heroic style: a sweet powdery substance surrounded by ripe grapes. In V it comes after *C.min.* 24, *De lucusta*. Are these pieces from a catalogue-poem describing the menu of a memorable banquet, from the hors d'oeuvre to the sweet? Number 4, *De zona missa ab eadem* (sc. *Serena*) *Arcadio Augusto*: If *Serena*, as we have seen above, had embroidered a strap for *Honorius*' horse, it is quite probable that she also made one for his brother's horse. In V the poem comes after *C.min.* 48. It is also preserved in M (Ambrosianus M 9, 13th cent.). Why is it missing in other manuscripts? Perhaps because they have the character of anthologies and do not attempt to collect the whole work of the poet.

Number 5, *Epithalamium Laurentii*, is rejected in the strongest terms by Birt (*Praefatio*, p. CLXVI), along with Nos. 6–8. A *Laurentius* is attested as *comes rerum privatarum* in the Eastern part of the Empire on 24 April 396.¹⁰ Whether the poem is genuine or not, it seems a very fine work of art, not just a conventional wedding-poem. *Aldhelm* knew and admired it. The description of a late Roman orchestra, as it performed at the wedding (vv. 60–63), will be of interest, not only to musicologists:

60 *Tympana, chorda simul symphonia, tibia, buxus,
cymbala, bambylium*¹¹ *cornus, aes,*¹² *fistula, sistrum,
quaeque per aeratas inspirant carmina fauces,*¹³
*humida folligenis exclamant*¹⁴ *organa ventis.*¹⁵

¹⁰ O. Seeck, *RE* 12 (1925), 1015.

¹¹ *bambylium* is Buecheler's conjecture for *bambilium* VM. Birt proposed *bombylium*, and this may well be right; but other forms, such as *bamborium* (*Gramm. Lat.* Keil 4,532.2), are attested too. It must have been a wood instrument with a deep humming sound, similar to the bassoon.

¹² *aes* Birt : et VM.

¹³ *fauces* M. Haupt : *voces* VM.

¹⁴ *exclamant* VM, corr. G. Wernsdorf.

¹⁵ *ventis* L. Mueller : *vocis* V¹ M.

The number of different wind instruments is impressive. Another passage (vv. 68–78) deserves to be mentioned: When the young couple has finally entered the bridal chamber, it is the duty of the *pronuba* to take away the bride's jewelry, her pins, etc., as a measure of precaution; during the customary *luctamen Veneris* the girl might get carried away, play become earnest, and the man might get scratched or even seriously wounded.

Numbers 6, 7, and 8 are prayers for safe return from a trip abroad, one addressed to Bacchus, the other to Mars, the third (which is incomplete) to Juno. The lemmata (*De Liberalibus*; *Laus Martis*; *De Iunonalibus*) are entirely fanciful, and the whole evidence is presented in a misleading way by Birt. If the poems are given any title at all, it should be something like *De reditu ad Liberum*; *D. r. ad Martem*; *D. r. ad Iunonem*. The composition is the same in all three poems: first an ἀρεταλογία of the divinity, then the prayer (*da reditum nobis*, or *da nobis reditum*, for variety's sake, 7,11), and then, introduced by *sic*, the wish that something pleasing to the divinity may come true. Numbers 6 and 7 are preserved in V and three other sources; No. 8 is found in V only (perhaps it was incomplete in the common source of these witnesses).

Number 9, *De hippopotamo et crocodilo*, is similar to the animal poems among the *Carmina minora*. It is almost certainly incomplete, as the *Schedae Peirescianae* of Vaticanus 9135 note. Number 10, *De aquila quae in mensa de sardonyche lapide erat*, is on a precious table, and can be compared to the *ecphraseis* of works of art (e.g., *C. min.* 7). Number 11, *De Isidis navigio*, is a prayer to Isis not to leave the country. Claudian was familiar with the cult of Isis (cf. Claudian 8, 570 ff.). The author of the poem calls her *nostra dea* (3). Number 12, *De lavacro*, is on a luxurious bathing establishment on the Black Sea (the poem is incomplete). Someone called Florens is invited to use these baths on a holiday. An Alexander and his mother are mentioned: this could be Alexander Severus and his mother Iulia Mamaea, as Birt observes. If so, then the poem could hardly be by Claudian, although it is most accomplished (the pleasures of a scented shower are described very gracefully, 6 ff.). Number 13, *De Vinalibus*, is on the Roman wine festival, which was celebrated on 22 April and 19 August (cf. No. 15 below, on the *Floralia*). The poem is probably incomplete. Number 14, *De Cytherea*: There are several textual difficulties, and the piece ends rather abruptly, but it seems to describe an epiphany of Venus, who visits the poet early one morning. Number 15, *De cereo*, is on the candles that were lit on the eve of the *Floralia* (on 28 April) and carried in a procession.¹⁶ Numbers 16–19: Only the titles are preserved in the catalogue of M. The scribe

¹⁶ Cf. G. Wissowa, *RE* 6 (1909), 2752.

may have seen them in his *exemplar*, but he just copied the titles. They all dealt with animals (cf., e.g., *C.min.* 9). Number 20, *Laus Christi*, appears first in Camers' edition (Vienna, 1510) along with No. 21. Birt deals with this and the following poem No. 21, *Miracula Christi*, at length in his *Praefatio*, pp. CLXX ff. Number 20 is incomplete (Scaliger), probably No. 21 as well (Gesner). Finally, No. 22, an epigram from Claude Binet's codex Cuiacianus, first published in his edition of Petronius, is on a pederast who introduces a *puer delicatus* as his son. The text as printed by Birt is unsatisfactory: lines 9 f., separated from lines 1-8 by the editor, should be inserted between 4 and 5. Read *puer* for *pater* in v. 9 (with W. Meyer), and *hic* for *huic* in the same line (with Patisson).

Before drawing any conclusions from this survey we should look briefly at the textual tradition of Claudian, because it affects our problem in various ways. For unknown reasons, Claudian's unfinished epic *De raptu Proserpinae*, as well as his panegyric on Probinus and Olybrius, became detached from the rest of his opus. For several centuries these two works had their own textual history. What we have of Claudian's Latin poems seems to have been handed down in several lines: (1) *Claudianus maior* (or *magnus*), including his longer poems (without the Panegyricus on Probinus and Olybrius) and the *Carmina minora*, probably along with some of the poems in the *Appendix*. But the Veronensis 163 (R) represents a separate tradition of the *Carmina minora*.¹⁷ (2) *Claudianus minor* (or *parvus*), containing *De raptu Proserpinae*. (3) The Panegyricus on Probinus and Olybrius, separated from (1) probably because it did not concern Stilicho, but joined to *Claudianus maior* in the twelfth century, as it seems. The distinction between (1) and (2) is simply based on the size of the codices: a volume containing only *De raptu* was of course much smaller than the volume with the rest of the works. This distinction is current in incipits and explicits of the manuscripts from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; it is also found in Vincent of Beauvais (Birt, p. LXXVII, n. 4).

Within (1), as we have seen, the order of the *Carmina minora* varies greatly. The Veronensis 163 (R), an important eighth century witness (though *akephalos*, it probably never included the long "official" poems), has them in the following order: *C.min.* 29 (starting with v. 34); 9; 17; 18; 20; 22; 23; 50; 49; *App.* 1; *C.min.* 51; 19; 40; 41; 32; 27; Lactantius' *Phoenix* (same theme as the preceding piece); 3; 6; 10-16; 21; 31; 53; *App.* 2; *C.min.* 46-48; 45. This is about half the number of poems included in Birt's edition; this, and the fact that at least one piece by another author

¹⁷ Cf. M. Fuhrmann, *Der kleine Pauly*, I (1964), 1203 (s.v. *Claudianus*).

is included, would characterize R as an anthology rather than part of a complete edition. Though the arrangement is quite different, the series *C.min.* 9–23 and 45–51 are represented in both collections: R and V (Vaticanus 2809). This seems to indicate that the scribe of V made a selection from a larger corpus. He went through it more than once, adding poems that he had left out previously.¹⁸

According to Birt's survey (p. CXXXV), there seem to be at least five different types of arrangement of *Carmina minora* found in various manuscripts and groups of manuscripts. None of them can be considered authentic, but not for the reasons given by Birt (pp. LXXVI f.; CXXXIV ff.). He seems to think that poems of considerable length—such as the Epithalamium for Palladius (*C.min.* 25, 145 lines long), the *Laus Serenae* (*C.min.* 30, 236 lines, perhaps planned to be even longer), the torso of a *Gigantomachia* (*C.min.* 53, 128 lines)—could not have been placed next to epigrams of eight and ten lines. Birt claims that Latin poets tended to place poems of similar length next to each other; he compares the *Priapea*, on the one hand, Statius' *Silvae*, on the other (p. LXXVI). But there is no rule which can be applied to all poets: analogies are not always helpful. One might compare the *Corpus bucolicorum*, i.e., a collection of bucolic and non-bucolic poems by Theocritus and other poets. Some manuscripts include more poems than others, and the order of poems varies. Many seem to have the character of anthologies, but we know (from Artemidorus, *Anth. Pal.* 9,205) that in the late Hellenistic period an effort was made to collect all the bucolic texts. The desire for completeness may have led ancient editors to include more and more poems that were not bucolic, and not by Theocritus.

Catullus' *liber* is not a good analogy either. It includes relatively short poems at the beginning and end, and a number of long ones in the middle. Birt (p. LXXVI) is forced by his theory to assume that Catullus' book was shortened and rearranged by an editor (*Neque Catullus suam syllogentalem qualem habemus promulgavit, sed inferior aetas et decurtavit et ordinavit*). But Wendell Clausen¹⁹ has shown convincingly, I think, that what we have is not one *liber* but three *libelli*, and that an "editor, more concerned to preserve than to present," (p. 40) placed some unfinished or otherwise unsatisfactory poems at the end of the first *libellus* (cc. 1–60). Not much is to be gained from the textual tradition of Ausonius. Birt believes (p. CXXXVI and n. 2) that the order found in the Vossianus Latinus 111

¹⁸ The scribes of the cod. Palatinus of the *Greek Anthology* seem to have followed the same procedure, especially in Book Seven.

¹⁹ *Classical Philology* 71 (1976), 37–43.

(9th cent.) is due to an editor, not the poet himself. But the possibility of a double *recensio* in Ausonius remains. Finally, the codex Salmasianus (Birt, *loc. cit.*), probably compiled in the 6th century, is an anthology. Even though some of the Claudian manuscripts, as we have seen, are anthologies, the tradition as a whole reflects the wish of many readers to have a complete edition, including everything the great poet wrote, *even* fragments, improvisations, and pieces whose authenticity was not above dispute.

We have seen that the problem of order and arrangement in Claudian's *Carmina minora* is closely connected with the textual tradition of the poet's works. The fact that certain poems are missing in some of the main manuscripts has led modern editors to relegate them into an appendix. Under such circumstances no manuscript can be a reliable guide. None of the different arrangements seems to reveal a principle, even though related poems are sometimes grouped together. Incidentally, there seems to be some evidence that none of our editions of Claudian is complete: a fragment quoted by a grammarian (*G.L. Keil*, 5,589,3), *rus istud pretio constat vili*, cannot be found in any of the extant poems. The grammarian, however, may have made a mistake: he also quotes four short passages from Ausonius which do not occur anywhere in the direct tradition.

But there is another argument overlooked so far. We have seen how many poems among the *Carmina minora* and in the *Appendix* are unfinished, mere fragments or possibly first drafts: Nos. 2; 5; 6; 24 (?); 28 (?); 30 (?); 43 (?); 52; 53; *App.*, Nos. 2; 9; 13; 20; 21. There is a difference between these pieces and the finished poems (short or long) which appear in both collections, but no attempt was made in ancient times to sort them out. Some unfinished poems appear in the series *C.min.* 1-25, which, as Birt claims, occurs in all the main witnesses, and must therefore be, in his opinion, the order of the archetype.

In conclusion, it is better to resign oneself than to indulge in fruitless speculation. *Magna pars scientiae est quaedam nescire*, as Grotius said. What we seem to have in Claudian's *Carmina minora* are pieces of all kinds and sizes, genres and styles from the poet's workshop, some finished, some fragmentary. One admires the versatility, craftsmanship, and fine literary style of the poet. Even a torso, left by a great artist, can be impressive. After his death, everything must have seemed important to an admiring public, and within a short time, I suspect, not one but several editions were made. The published material was soon rearranged and excerpted for different purposes, perhaps for use in schools, for anthologies, etc. The preserved manuscripts reflect many centuries of this editorial process, fluctuating between two extremes: a *Gesamtausgabe*, on the one side; an

Anthology, on the other. Our conclusion may seem disappointing, but it helps us to understand what could have happened when a prolific author suddenly died. Many unfinished projects were found among his papers. What we have is valuable, I think, just because some of it represents "work in progress" at various stages.

ADDENDUM

When I wrote this article, during a sabbatical leave of absence, I had no access to Alan Cameron's book on Claudian (Oxford U.P., 1970), nor had I read Christian Gnilka's review in *Gnomon* 49 (1977), 34-51. I am glad to see now that Cameron's views concerning the publication of the *Carmina minora* are consistent with my own. Cameron is convinced that the *Carmina minora* were published soon after the poet's death, at the order of Stilicho (pp. 416 ff.). Following Platnauer (Loeb edition, vol. I, 1928, p. xviii, n. 2) he believes that some pieces are mere jottings from Claudian's notebooks, fragments to be worked into a longer poem some day; he sums up: "Brief epigrams, epithalamia, half-finished epics and panegyrics all jumbled together in no apparent order, with a number of hexameter poems of 50-100 lines." (p. 418).

There are many valuable comments on the *Carmina minora* in Cameron's book: compare especially pp. 406 ff. on Nos. 30 and 31. He must be right when he says that No. 52 was unfinished at Claudian's death. In his opinion, Nos. 4, 9 and 10 of the *Appendix* are probably genuine (pp. 203; 407 f.). I think he has misunderstood No. 18 of the *Carmina minora* (pp. 391 f., "it describes with some admiration and astonishment how the farmers of Gaul control their oxen"). Gnilka's comments on Nos. 23 (*Studien zur Literatur der Spätantike*, Bonn, 1975, pp. 70 ff.) and 32 (*Gnomon*, loc. cit., pp. 50 f.) deserve to be read carefully.

I am very grateful to Miroslav Marcovich for editorial suggestions.

The Johns Hopkins University