*Graeca and Other Emendations in Aulus Gellius, Donatus’ Commentum Terenti, and Passio Perpetuae.*

1. 'ὄναιό σου or 'ὄναιο σύ? A sarcastic Greek polite formula in Gellius, *NA* 14.6.

In a passage of *Noctes Atticae* 14.6.5, Gellius narrates how an unnamed fellow scholar on one occasion tenders him his book of antiquarian curiosities, but Gellius, after briefly perusing it, returns the rival volume with these words:

Quem cum statim properans redderem, 'ὄναιό σου,' inquam' doctissime uirorum, ταύτης τῆς πολυμαθίας et librum hunc opulentissimum recipe nil prosus ad nostras paupertinas litteras congruentem.’

‘and hastening shortly after to return the book I told him ‘most learned of men, may you reap rich harvest from this erudition of yours, and take back this very opulent book which is absolutely incomparable with our poor learning.’

The general content is clear, and the passage if often discussed as an important commentary of Gellius’ understanding of his activity and his work. I wish to correct the Greek on one small point, namely 'ὄναιό σου, which in my view ought to be altered to 'ὄναιο σὺ. I am not the first to propose this alteration, since Madvig wrote, in *Adversaria critica ad scriptores Latinos, II,* p. 605 (Hauniae 1873) very jejunely wrote ‘scribendum, ut sententia sit, ὄναιό συ’, which I wish to modify slightly by printing a stressed form σύ. Polite formulas, employed in their normal or sarcastic sense, as in this case, have a certain formularity. In the commonly accepted text, σου is either a possessive going with ταύτης τῆς πολυμαθίας (but the separation across several words is against it), or it is coordinated in asyndeton with the ensuing genitive, ‘may you have joy of yourself, of your learning’. The latter is the way in which I imagine most editors have construed the passage, but it is an odd phrase, and I think it does not hold in the face of the Greek parallels for this polite phrase, which is found in a number of cases with the subject pronoun to mark opposition between two chosen paths, or different choices: may *you* enjoy this, *I* will carry on in the way I know.

The most telling parallel comes from Lucian, *Symposium* 23, where two philosophers argue about the best sort of wisdom in life, with one accusing the other, as in Gellius, of pursuing a futile sort of learning: Ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν ὄναιο αὐτῶν. ἐγὼ δὲ ὡς ἂν μόνον τὸ καλὸν ἀγαθὸν ἡγούμενος εἶναι οἴσω ῥᾳδίως τὴν ἀτιμίαν, ‘but may you have enjoyment of all these; I will suffer lightly the loss of a good name while I continue to believe that only the beautiful is a good’. Similar turns, but not in sarcastic contexts, are also found in Eur. *Orestes* 1676-77 εὐγενὴς δ’ ἀπ’ εὐγενοῦς γήμας ὄναιο καὶ σὺ χὠ διδοὺς ἐγώ (‘being noble yourself, may you have benefit from a noble wife, and may I also, in giving her to you’), and, from a later period, Procop. Gaz. *Epistulae* 114 Loenertz ἀλλ᾿ ὄναιο καὶ σὺ σαυτοῦ καὶ τῆς σῆς προνοίας ἡ πόλις. ἐμοὶ δὲ βαρὺ πατρίδος ὑπερορᾶν (‘but may you have enjoyment from yourself and the city from your intelligence; for me it would be grave to neglect my fatherland’). The parallels from Lucian and Procopius appear especially closer in construction, with a contrastive personal pronoun and the genitive of the thing which denotes the source of the envisaged benefit or enjoyment. The passage in Procopius also suggests that interpreting σου in Gellius as ‘may you have enjoyment from yourself’ in asyndeton is grammatically inadequate (a stressed or emphatic form such as σαυτοῦ would be preferable). The most famous passage in which the well-wishing formula occurs, again with contrasting use of a subject pronoun, is Hom. *Il.* 24. 554-6, where the suppliant Priamus entreats Achilles to return Hector’s body, ‘so that I see him with my eyes... and may you, Achilles, enjoy’ the great gifts Priam has brought him (ἀλλὰ τάχιστα / λῦσον ἵν᾽ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδω: σὺ δὲ δέξαι ἄποινα / πολλά, τά τοι φέρομεν: σὺ δὲ τῶνδ᾽ ἀπόναιο).

1. *Passio Perpetuae* 5

*post paucos dies recipimur in carcerem; et expaui, quia numquam experta eram tales tenebras. o diem asperum: aestus ualidus turbarum beneficio, concussurae militum.*

The style of this famous passage from Perpetua’s own narrative of her experience of emprisonment is certainly noteworthy, though perhaps somewhat curt and abrupt, especially the final nominal phrases: “few days later we were admitted to a gaol; and I was frightened, because I had never experienced such darkness. O day of woe: unbearable heat because of the great crowd, beatings by the soldiers”. Available annotated editions of this famous text (Heffernan, Bastiaensen) give no parallel for the nominal ‘impressionistic’ sequence of narrative strokes: ‘O miserable day: a stifling heat on account of the crowds, beatings from the soldiers.’ Perpetua’s narrative is unique in many senses, but the apparent unconcern for this feature of her style is striking. I wonder if the transmitted text should not conceal a corruption: in particular I wonder if *o diem* should not be replaced by *odorem,* to create a continuous sequence of accusatives governed by *experta*. Accusatives after the exclamatory *o diem* are read in some MSS; in fact 2, 4 and 5 in Van Beek’s apparatus have *aestus ualidos*, and the same reading is implicit in the two exclamatives of the Greek version, ὦ δεινὴν ἡμέραν καῦμά τε σφοδρόν, cumulative evidence which suggests that the accusative was in the archetype: if the emendation is accepted, it has to be a very early corruption, shared by all extant witnesses. *Odor asper* is a common enough phrase, and goes naturally with the heat and the confusion of the gaol: cf. Cassiod. *Exp. Psalm.* 143.263 *Sic merito asperis odoribus comparata sunt, quae simplicium corda fetido sermone decipiunt*; Plin. *NH* 27.63 *Crocodileon chamaeleonis herbae nigrae figuram habet, radice longa, aequaliter crassa, odoris asperi*.

1. *Notes on Donatus’ In Terentii Eunuchum.*

*Comm. Eun.* 310 congerebam clancvlvm ἠθικῶς *et* ἱλαρῶς *nimis*. Bureau et al., authors of a very recent annotated translation of Wessner’s text full of excellent suggestions and providing an important new tool for modern study of Donatus, published online at <http://hyperdonat.tge-adonis.fr/editions/html/corpus.html>, translate ‘c'est à la fois conforme au caractère du personnage (ἠθικῶς) et dit de façon plaisante (ἱλαρῶς)’: while there can be no doubt about the frequently repeated ἠθικῶϲ, ἱλαρῶϲ, restored by Rabbow, is unparalleled in Donatus and rather uninformative (everyhing is comical in a comedy, one way or another). The string of nonsensical Greek letters preserved in some of the MSS, as reported by Wessner in the apparatus (for example hεικωϲαναργωϲμιααιϲ in B, the important *Vaticanus Reginensis Latinus* 1595), suggests however a different solution, namely: ἠθικῶϲ *et* ἐναργῶϲ *nimis*, ‘very much in character, and vividly’. ἐνάργεια is of course a common term in ancient criticism, referring to the ability to place a concept before the very eyes of the readers, whatever the means to do so. In Donatus ἐνάργεια is sometimes achieved through the use of a vivid present tense, but he has ἐνάργεια also of the linguistic characterization of long-winded old men’s speech. In general, ἐνάργεια is often associated with *ecphrasis* and the translation of an idea into a dramatic scene, and its use seems apt enough here, where the servant pledges himself to gratitude in response to the boy’s sneaking into his cell with victuals stolen from his father’s kitchen. For a parallel from a passage of literary Greek criticism cf. Dem. *De elocutione* 4.216 (with several examples of vividness in narrative), in which the author praises Ctesias’s narrative of how the death of Cyrus was reported to his mother: 4.216 μάλα ἠθικῶς καὶ ἐναργῶς τόν τε ἄγγελον ἐμφήνας ἀκουσίως ἀγγελοῦντα τὴν συμφοράν, καὶ τὴν μητέρα εἰς ἀγωνίαν ἐμβαλὼν καὶ τὸν ἀκούοντα. (‘Ctesias... indicates very naturally and vividly the messenger's reluctance to announce the calamity, while he himself causes the reader to join in the mother's grief’ transl. Rhys Roberts).

*Comm. Eun.* 282 age modo nvnc tibi patent hae fores ex eo, quantum licere oportuit, ostendit, quam misere nihil illic liceat Parmenoni] Bureau et al. translate the passage with ‘en disant cela, il montre, autant qu'il peut se l'autoriser, combien il est triste que Parménon ne puisse rien faire là-bas.’, from which Donatus, if I understand this and the attached footnote, would apparently describe the author’s viewpoint (*il est triste*) and his dramaturgical necessity. Donatus’ note, in my view, dwells on what is particularly exacerbating for Parmeno: the extent of what is permitted (to the soldier and his attendants, namely free access to the courtesan’s house) drives home to Parmeno how little is permitted to him there, a consideration that makes him miserable, *misere*. But *oportuit* has no place in this phrase, and I suggest it is a corruption for the palaeographically similar *apparuit*, ‘the realization of what is evidently allowed to the rival, shows Parmeno how painfully out of luck they are’, or something to this effect.

*Comm. Eun.* 795 omnino meretrix non putat idoneum, cui reddenda sit ratio cuique se purget: adeo apud illam amicitiae eius pertaesum est; nam erant qui dicerent, si uellet militi reconciliari] In the last clause, *erant qui dicerent* should be changed to *erat quid diceret* ‘she knew what to say, if she really had wished to make peace with the soldier’, presumably a hint at Thais’ ability with *blandimenta* and all sorts of terms of endearment. The corruption is an instance of haplography *quid diceret> qui diceret*. Bureau et al. suggest a more complicated solution *errant qui dicant,* a bit far fetched in my view, and not compatible with the various MS readings.

*Comm. Eun.* 796 huc redde idioma est pro contumelia reposcentis. sic et in Hecyra «*renumeret d. h. e.* Bureau et al. translate c'est un idiotisme (idioma) qui marque le reproche d'un débiteur, a translation which seems to construe *idioma est pro* together with the meaning ‘(phrase, *idioma*)expressing (the admonition administered to someone insolvent)’. In my view, however, Donatus’ usage suggests that *idioma* means here ‘expression appropriate/characteristic of/ for someone in a particular state or situation’, here someone asking something back in an insulting manner. Donatus wishes to emphasize the manner and tone of the expression, and in particular the non immediately clear use of *huc*. Idioma also takes the genitive of the linguistic behaviour identified by a specific feature: it is *huc* that is offensive, instead of *mihi*. Cf, *Comm. Hec.* 502 'huc' ἰδιωτισμός irascentis et exigentis debitum. I propose therefore to alter the Latin to *per contumeliam reposcentis*, to be translated as ‘*huc redde* is a phrase capturing well the tone of someone who asks something back in an offensive/aggressive manner’.

*Comm. Eun.* 780 qvi malvm alii malum κατὰ παρένθεσιν suauiter infertur. ... et non interponitur malum nisi conuersis oculis ad eum, qui id quod reprehendimus dixerit. Bureau et al. interpret *suauiter* as a commentary on the aptness of the parenthetical expression *malum*, something like ‘appropriately’ (‘malum (fléau !) est agréablement mis entre parenthèses (κατὰ παρένθεσιν)’), but the following remark about the fierce expression of the speaker suggests that the text should be altered to *saeuiter*, or at least *insuauiter*. It is, as usual, an indication about the tone of the utterance, and about the badly suppressed impatience of Gnatho while dealing with his increasingly indecisive patron Thraso*.*