

Benjamin Goldlust: Corippe, *Johannide*, livre 4. Introduction, édition critique, traduction et commentaire. Paris: Institut d'Études augustiniennes 2017 (Collection des Études augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 202). 271 p., 1 map. € 36.00. ISBN: 978-2-85121-286-3.

Corippus's¹ eight-book epic *Iohannis* narrates and celebrates the North African campaigns of the Byzantine general John Troglita in the late 540s. Its fourth book falls into two parts. The first half contains the conclusion of a nightlong recounting of past events (clearly modeled on *Aeneid* 2–3) by the tribune Liberatus. The second begins with dawn, morning prayers, and the arrival of a Byzantine envoy to report the enemy chief Antalas's rejection of John's peace terms. With combat now imminent, John delivers a speech of exhortation to his troops, and the book closes with the Roman order of battle, including brief portraits of the divisional commanders.

Benjamin Goldlust has already done a service to Corippian scholarship as editor of an important 2015 conference volume.² His commentary on Book 4 joins previous treatments of Books 1,³ 2,⁴ 3,⁵ and 8,⁶ as well as Giulia Caramico's as-yet-unpublished commentary⁷ on Book 5 (which Goldlust saw in near-final form). Goldlust takes into account Caramico and Riedl-

1 I employ the traditional spelling since it is used in the book under review. But I accept Peter Riedlberger's argument that we should in fact refer to the poet as Gorippus. See most recently his article: Again on the name 'Gorippus' – State of the Question – New Evidence – Rebuttal of Counterarguments – The Case of the Suda. In: B. Goldlust (ed.): Corippe. Un poète latin entre deux mondes. Lyon 2015 (Collection Études et Recherches sur l'Occident romain 50), pp. 243–270.

2 See previous note.

3 M. A. Vinchesi (ed.): Flavii Cresconii Corippi Iohannidos liber primus. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento. Naples 1983 (Studi e testi di Koinonia 9).

4 V. Zarini: Berbères ou barbares? Recherches sur le livre second de la *Johannide* de Corippe. Nancy 1997 (Études anciennes 16).

5 C. O. Tommasi Moreschini (ed.): Flavii Cresconii Corippi Iohannidos Liber III. Florence 2001 (Biblioteca Nazionale. Serie dei classici greci e latini. Testi con commento filologico n. s. 8).

6 P. Riedlberger: Philologischer, historischer und liturgischer Kommentar zum 8. Buch der Iohannis des Goripp. Nebst kritischer Edition und Übersetzung. Groningen 2010.

7 Goldlust's bibliography (p. 251) cites this as already in print as of 2017, but a communication from the author (6 April 2022) confirms that it has not yet appeared.

berger's demonstration that Book 4 ends at line 596.⁸ The remaining lines hitherto assigned to it belong to the opening of Book 5 and are accordingly left to Caramico.

Goldlust's introduction (pp. 9–65) covers briefly what is known of the author's biography ("Corippe, la *Johannide* et l'époque de sa composition", pp. 9–12) before turning to the role of Book 4 in the poem ("Place du livre 4 dans la *Johannide*", pp. 12–16), its relationship to Books 3 and 5 ("Principes de composition du livre 4", pp. 16–22), and its internal structure and plan ("Plan du livre 4", pp. 23–26). The book can be seen as transitional (between night and day, between past and present, between narrative and action). It also has an obvious delaying function, like the early books of Lucan and Statius, ratcheting up the tension before battle is finally joined. Goldlust, however, sees it above all as "une préparation logique et psychologique" (p. 34) for the events of Book 5, in which John will come fully into his own.

There follows a brief survey ("Typologie littéraire", pp. 26–34) of Corippus's use of epic conventions (narration, ecphrasis, catalogues, similes, speeches). A section on political and religious ideology ("Idéologie politique et religieuse", pp. 34–39) notes the poem's ubiquitous contrast between the native Mauri (savage, animalistic, malignant, deceptive, and pagan) and the Romans (valorous, humble, pious, and Christian). Goldlust also looks at the book's value as a historical source ("Intérêt historique", pp. 39–45), particularly in relation to Procopius. The main focus here is on Liberatus's narrative; Goldlust here sees Corippus reshaping (though not fundamentally falsifying) historical events to create a constellation of lesser figures against which his primary hero, John, can shine still more brightly.

Goldlust then turns to language, meter, and poetic technique ("Langue, métrique et style", pp. 45–61). The treatment of language is relatively superficial (e.g. p. 47: "L'adjectif est très largement utilisé par Corippe dans notre livre"), with late and poetic usages mingled indiscriminately in an unhelpful way. The discussion of metrical patterns largely follows a recent study by Jean-Louis Charlet.⁹ Goldlust's own interest clearly centers on

8 G. Caramico/P. Riedlberger: New Evidence on the Beginning of *Iohannis*, Book V. In: MD 63, 2009, pp. 203–208.

9 J.-L. Charlet: L'hexamètre de Corippe dans la *Johannide* et dans le *Panégyrique de Justin II*. In: B. Goldlust (ed.): Corippe (note 1), pp. 337–346.

Corippus's use of earlier poets. Of this he takes an expansive view: Corippus borrows not only from Vergil, Lucan, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Claudian, and Dracontius, but also from Valerius Flaccus, Statius, Silius Italicus, Juvenecus, Prudentius, Paulinus of Nola, Sedulius, Cyprianus Gallus, Paulinus of Périgueux ... "On est [...] frappé," Goldlust concludes, "de la richesse de la 'bibliothèque' dont pouvait disposer ce poète *quondam per rura locutus*" (p. 58). The explanation, I think, is that many of the borrowings Goldlust discerns are imaginary – but more on this below.

The introduction closes with textual matters: information on the unique manuscript (*T* = *Milano, Biblioteca Trivulziana 686*) and its orthography ("Le *Trivultianus* 686, son orthographe et l'édition du livre 4", pp. 61–64) and a list of divergences, about thirty-five in all, from the most recent complete edition of the poem¹⁰ ("Variantes du texte de la présente édition par rapport au texte de l'édition Diggle–Goodyear", pp. 64–65). No editor of Corippus can disdain conjecture, and the *Iohannis* has generated some bold ones. (As Goldlust delicately puts it "il n'a pas manqué d'audace à certains éditeurs corippéens", p. 45.) Goldlust himself is fairly conservative, at least by comparison. His preferred conjecture is "économique" (e.g. on 345) or "minimaliste" (e.g. on 471). More daring sallies are put down to "hyper-interventionnisme" (p. 45; cf. on 422) and we are regularly told that a given conjecture "ne s'impose pas" (e.g. on 283–284). In several places he discards a widely accepted correction to return to the manuscript reading. At 40 he prints *T*'s implausible *moribus* against Mazzucchelli's *montibus*, without comment on the unusual *de* construction that results. At 280 he retains *T*'s *tanta* where all previous editors have corrected to *sancte*. His own contributions are few. At 326 he prints *Tesiphonem* (after *T*'s *Tesiphone*) rather than *Tisiph-*, perhaps rightly. At 374 he suggests reading *dum* in place of *cum*, but does not explain why the latter is unacceptable.

Goldlust describes his apparatus as "positif" (p. 69). He not only gives us the reading of *T* and records conjectures, but also tells us which editors printed which variant, so that one is regularly faced with entries like "**284** nostrisque *T* *Mazzucchelli Bekker Patsch* : nostrosque *Petschenig Diggle-Goodyear*" (p. 87). This is tedious even for substantive differences, and maddening for trivial orthographica: we do not need to be reminded over and

10 Flavii Cresconii Corippi Iohannidos seu de bellis Libycis libri VIII. Ediderunt J. Diggle et F. R. D. Goodyear. Cambridge 1970.

over that Josef Partsch and Michael Petschenig wrote *urguere* while Immanuel Bekker and Diggle/Goodyear preferred *urgere*. (Also tiresome, in an apparatus filled with conjectures, is the constant repetition of “*coni.*”) On the bright side, Goldlust has himself examined the manuscript and is occasionally able to correct earlier editors’ misreadings. At 76 he reports that *T* has the correct *pia*, not *piam* as Partsch and Diggle/Goodyear had claimed; at 294 he reports *letique* rather than *letin-* or *letim-*. (In both cases earlier collators misread a dot-stroke over the *i* as a nasal bar.)

The commentary proper takes up about half the volume (“*Commentaire*”, pp. 107–247). Comments are keyed only to line number; no lemma is provided. This is particularly irritating for discussions of echoes and allusions, where one has to flip back to the text to see what Corippus wrote. (On the plus side, Goldlust often gives brief context for the *similia* he cites). All comments on a given line or lines are presented as a single continuous paragraph, which makes it harder to consult the commentary on particular points. Like his author, Goldlust can be repetitive and prone to auto-imitation. The note on 195 takes forty-three words to say “cf. on v. 40” (which itself repeats a portion of the introduction), while that on 200 takes three lines to say “cf. on v. 42.” At 569 we get fifty-two words where a simple “cf. on v. 220” would have done.

Commentators on the *Iohannis* have a complex brief. They must be fluent in the history and prosopography of early Byzantine North Africa, including Berber names and toponyms. They require a familiarity with the Latin poetic tradition (especially Vergil and Lucan), and the ability and judgment to distinguish between the errors of a highly corrupt manuscript and the regular usage of a less-than-stellar author. Finally they need to master the surprisingly substantial Corippian bibliography. Here Goldlust is clearly at home. In some cases, perhaps, overly so: I see little point in directing readers to an unpublished 2005 *mémoire de maîtrise* (on 138), or in a note that invites us only to consult the notes of Mazzucchelli’s 1820 “editio princeps”¹¹ (on 94–95).

One central area where there are some shortcomings is in the treatment of poetic echoes. Modern databases make it easier to trace similarities of

11 Flavii Cresconii Corippi Iohannidos seu de bellis Libycis libri VII editi ex codice Mediolanensi musei Triultii opera et studio P. Mazzucchelli. Milan 1820.

phrasing than it has ever been.¹² But such ease has concomitant drawbacks. It can be tempting to go too far, to see an ‘echo’ or an ‘allusion’ or a ‘*Kontrastimitation*’ where there is only coincidence or a shared reliance on poetic *Gemeingut*. Corippus’s borrowings from Vergil and Lucan are rarely subtle. It would be surprising if his *arte allusiva* were more sophisticated in the case of poets like Silius or Valerius Flaccus. The very availability of these writers in sixth-century North Africa cannot simply be assumed, and the bar for identifying echoes should be high. Many apparent similarities are better regarded as proxies for the poetic tradition as a whole, including lost works. Here Goldlust often seems to me overconfident about fairly tenuous similarities. Some examples:

- 39 *sonat ungula cornu*: As Goldlust sees, the model is plainly Verg. georg. 3.88 *grauiter sonat ungula cornu*, so there is no point to citing Sil. 16.318, which lacks *sonat*. (Enn. ann. 439 Vahlen = 431 Skutsch, while a potential model for Iust. 3.293, has only the word *ungula* in common with our passage.)
- 41 *ardua castra gerit*: the resemblance to Lucan. 1.397 (*castra [...] curuam super ardua ripam*) and Sil. 3.556 (*castraque praeruptis suspendunt ardua saxis*) seems fairly superficial. Corippus needs no prompting to employ *arduus* (26 times Ioh., six times Iust.) and in this epic of warfare *castra* are of course mentioned constantly (78 times).
- 110–111 *durae contempsit uulnera mortis | pro patria contentus amor*: the vague resemblance to Prud. c. Symm. 2.707 (*pro patria et pulchram per uulnera quaerere laudem*) cannot possibly sustain the intertextual gazebo that Goldlust builds upon it.
- 258 *lumina subtremulis spargebat lampadis undis*: “la fin du vers peut provenir de Paul. Petr., *Vita Mart.* 1,168 (*spargebat lampade terras*).” I think the similarity is mere chance: both *spargere* and *lampas* are very common in these formulaic sunrise descriptions. Paulinus’s phrase blends Verg. Aen. 4.584 *spargebat lumine terras* (noted by Goldlust) with Verg. Aen. 4.6 *lustrabat lampade terras*.
- 342 *uirtutem indomitam*: Hardly a ‘reprise’ of *Ciris* 118, *indomitas uirtute retundere mentes*, where *uirtute* is to be construed with *retundere* (omitted in Goldlust’s quotation!). A closer parallel would be Sen. Herc. f. 39, *indomita uirtus colitur*, but the phrase is one any two poets might have coined independently.

12 Notably the invaluable *Musisque Deoque* (<http://mizar.unive.it/mqdq/public/>), on which I have gratefully drawn throughout.

- 387 *et ferus accipiter mitem sub nube columbam*: Goldlust sees this verse as “riche de toute une tradition poétique” that embraces Vergil, Ovid, Claudian, and Juvenecus (he has overlooked Sil. 5.282). But Corippus could have constructed the line just out of Claud. *carm. min.* 27.81 *non ferus accipiter* and Verg. *Aen.* 11.721–722 *accipiter [...] | consequitur pennis sublimem in nube columbam* (and I wonder if he really needed Claudian).
- 413 *et uirtute potens*: Goldlust sees a possible reminiscence of Verg. *Aen.* 12.827 *sit Romana potens Itala uirtute propago*. But *et uirtute potens* (also Coripp. *Ioh.* 7.27) is found elsewhere at line opening in late antique verse: Prud. *c.* *Symm.* 2.1131; Paul. *Nol. carm.* 20.271; Mar. *Victor aleth.* 1.40; *CLE* 465.17 (and for *uirtute potens* in this *sedes* also *Orient. carm. app.* 3.65; *Ven. Fort. carm.* 2.12.5; 9.1.100; *Anth. Lat.* 255.3 Riese). This looks like poetic *koiné*.
- 492 *ferrato*: “on trouve déjà cet adjectif en 1,427 [*ferratas ... turmas*], où il est sans doute repris de Claud., *6 Cons. Hon.* 571 (*ferrati uenere uiri*).” Goldlust’s “sans doute” is often a danger signal, and here too he is over-hasty. *Ferratus* of armored units is found as early as Hor. *carm.* 4.14.29–30 (*agmina | ferrata*), and is common coin in later poetry (*TLL* 6.1.572.72–81). If Corippus drew on Claudian’s line it was more likely for 8.131 *ferrati micuere uiri*.
- 502 *per extensos [...] campos*: “provient sans doute de Sil. 15,766–767” where *per extentos [...] campos* straddles two lines. It is instructive to compare Goldlust’s assurance (“sans doute” once more!) with the neutral formulation of Riedlberger (on 8.379): “Die Junktur erscheint zuvor nur bei Sil.”
- 523 *componens ordine turmas*: the similarity to Stat. *silv.* 4.2.39 *famulasque ex ordine turmas* (of household serving-maids) seems to me fortuitous. Corippus has *ordine* in penultimate position 21 times in the *Iobannis* and forms of *turma* in final position 31 times. That both should once appear in the same line seems unremarkable.
- 566 “La séquence *cuncta regens* pourrait être un lointain souvenir de Claud. *laus Ser.* 66 (*haec generat qui cuncta regant*).” Why not of Ov. *fast.* 4.859 or half a dozen other passages?
- 583–589: The catalogue of Roman commanders concludes with Troglita’s able aide Ricinarius, including an extended list of his virtues in asyndeton. Goldlust sees an imitation of Paul. *Petric. Mart.* 3.413–419, citing the appearance of *mitis* and *corde humilis* in both passages. But whole-line asyndeton is a common device in late antique verse (see below on 223–224). Corippus’s ultimate model is surely Ennius’s depiction (with similar asyndeton) of Servilius Geminus’s unnamed confidant at *Enn. ann.* 234–251 Vahlen = 268–286 Skutsch. This was a famous passage, as its extended

quotation by Gellius shows, and Corippus might have known it whether or not he knew the whole poem.

Attentive as he is, Goldlust misses some noteworthy similarities or certain borrowings (including from Vergil and Lucan):

- 4–5 *tot clades memorare ducum casusque meorum | atque meos*: cf. Verg. Aen. 1.753–755 (Dido to Aeneas) *dic* [...] | [...] *casusque tuorum | erroresque tuos*. (The poet has Aeneas’s narrative in mind in this passage, as Goldlust notes.)
- 24–25 *gelidis ut maestus ab undis | Phoebus*: it seems worth comparing Manil. 2.941 *niridis gelidis et Phoebus ab undis*. (As at 258 the similarity may be generic rather than specific.)
- 210 *infelix uirtute mea*: cf. Sil. 6.404 (Marcia) *infelix nimia magni uirtute mariti*.
- 252 *dolor atque pudor fera corda fatigat*: Liberatus’s auditors react to his narrative and are stirred to action (cf. 251 *animis in proelia surgunt*). Surely this is modeled on Verg. Aen. 10.397–398 *Arcadas [...] mixtus dolor et pudor armat in hostes?*
- 413 *suffere labores*: Goldlust notes Lucretian parallels for the clausula, but not its Ennian pedigree (Enn. ann. 425 Vahlen = 401 Skutsch).
- 439 *ergo agite*: “L’attaque du vers [...] rappelle celle de Verg. Aen. 7,130 (*quare agite*).” Vergil in fact has *quare agite* in three other passages (georg. 2.35; Aen. 1.627; 8.273), but he also has the actual phrase Corippus employs, *ergo agite*, at Aen. 3.114 and 5.58.
- 458–459 *sonuere uerendi | arma uiri*: “peut rappeler Verg., Aen. 4,149 (*tela sonant umeris*).” I think Corippus is rather recalling Verg. Aen. 9.731–732 *et arma | horrendum sonuere*. The whole description of John, with its imagery of flashing, lightning, etc., looks back to Vergil’s picture of Turnus there.
- 484–485 *felix, si fata dedissent | longaevos in luce dies*: Goldlust canvasses Vergilian models, but Corippus is imitating Lucan. 1.114–115 (apostrophe of the dead Julia): *quod si tibi fata dedissent | maiores in luce moras* [...]
- 514 *fortis Achilles*: a Dracontian clausula (Drac. Romul. 9.9; 125; 211), though prefigured at Ov. epist. 3.137.
- 517–518 *iam senior grandisque annis, cui cruda senectus | et uirtus iuuenilis erat*: Goldlust cites Silius for *cruda senectus*, but he has missed the echo of Verg. Aen. 6.304 (Charon) *iam senior, sed cruda deo uiridisque senectus*.

Together with Vergil and Lucan, Corippus’s other major model is himself. Goldlust generally notes recycled phrasing, but some examples can be

added (26 parenthetical *heu miseri* = Coripp. Ioh. 5.173; 248 *Libycasque ruinas* = Coripp. Ioh. 3.107). Some such observations seem of dubious utility, e.g. 73 “pour une autre occurrence dans notre livre du verbe *deserere* à l’attaque du vers, voir le v. 185”; 87 “le substantif *rapina* figure à deux autres reprises, dans notre livre, en fin de vers, aux v. 102 et 243.” Anyone in need of this information can find it in a concordance or database.

Along with (reported) action and speeches, Book 4 includes some memorable similes: John’s troops clustering around him are like bees around their king (297–303), while the Moorish assembly is compared to an infernal council (322–328). John himself is likened to a bull planning its charge (569–576), and, rather more imaginatively, an organist (576–582). Goldlust does well with these comparisons; on the musician simile he has consulted with a subject expert (as he does for military tactics at 555). His coverage of topoi and conventional motifs can sometimes be supplemented:

24–25: For the formulaic description of sunrise Goldlust refers us to two Homeric passages (one of which in fact describes sunset); it would have been helpful to cite the classic treatment of Henry Bardon.¹³

25–26 *signa tyranni* | [...] *nostris occurrere signis*: for such “battle polyptoton” (“chest to chest,” “shield to shield,” etc.) see the treatment by Jeffrey Wills.¹⁴ (Goldlust is certainly right to see Lucan. 1.6–7 as the model here.)

84 *aduentu stupuere ducis*: not discussed by Goldlust; for this motif see the commentaries of Anthony John Woodman¹⁵ on Vell. 2.75.1 and Stephen Phelps Oakley¹⁶ on Liv. 10.11.5.

179 “Stotzas mourant est déposé à l’ombre d’un arbre, comme déjà Sarpédon chez Homère (Il. 5,693).” Also relevant, perhaps, is the wounded Mezentius at Verg. Aen. 10.835 *arboris adclinis trunco*. (Goldlust notes a borrowing from Camilla’s death scene in the same line.)

13 H. Bardon: L’aurore et le crépuscule (thèmes et clichés). In: REL 24, 1946, pp. 82–115.

14 J. Wills: Repetition in Latin Poetry. Figures of Allusion. Oxford 1996, pp. 194–202.

15 A. J. Woodman (ed.): Velleius Paterculus. The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative (2.41–93). Cambridge 1983 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 25), p. 183.

16 S. P. Oakley: A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X. Vol. 4: Book X. Oxford 2005, p. 159.

191–192 *aluens amnis erat mediis praeruptus in aruis*: “Topothésia épique” says Goldlust, rightly. But the structure of the line (with the form of *esse* at the *caesura*) is also traditional, e.g. Verg. Aen. 1.12 *urbs antiqua fuit*; 441 *lucus in urbe fuit*.

213 *uideo iam Tartara*: not discussed by Goldlust. For deathbed visions of this sort cf. Eur. Alc. 252–255 ὄρω δίκωπον ὄρω σκάφος ἐν | λίμνῃ [...] Χάρων | μ’ ἦδη καλεῖ; [Sen.] Herc. O. 1432–1447 (especially 1435 *te, pater, iam uideo*); Eug. Tolet. carm. 14.53 *iudicis [...] iam tristis cerno tribunal*. The use of *iam* here is akin to (or a subcategory of) ‘prophetic *iam*,’ e.g. Petron. 121 vers. 111; Sil. 1.129; Drac. Romul. 8.128 *iam pugnans Danaï, iam cernimus Hecctora tractum*.

264–265 *gaudentque tuentes | prospera discussis ludentia flamina uelis*: descriptions of fluttering flags (especially the famous dragon banners) are a motif of the late antique jeweled style: cf. Amm. 16.10.7; Claud. Rufin. 2.364–365; Claud. 3 cons. Hon. 138–141; Sidon. carm. 5.402–407; Drac. frg. 2.

276–277 *iam nullus arator | arua colit*: not discussed by Goldlust, but a familiar *topos*: cf. e.g. Catull. 64.38 *rura colit nemo*; Lucan. 1.28–29 *multos [...] inarata per annos | Hesperia*; Ps. Quint. decl. 12.13 *nullus inuersis aratro glebis campus nitet*.

320–321: The association of black skin with evil is also discussed by Franz Joseph Dölger.¹⁷

395–398: Goldlust cites Virgilian storm similes; he might have noted that the comparison of a crowd or assembly to a sea stirred by the wind is conventional (first in Hom. Il. 2.144–149; 394–397). Corippus will deploy the motif again at 8.203–205.

517–518: The officer described here (not John Troglita but another of the innumerable Johns) is not, *pace* Goldlust, a *puer senex* but the opposite: an older man who retains the vigor of youth.

Goldlust notes points of language and style but tends to outsource more extended discussion, most often to Michael Petschenig’s index,¹⁸ Ernst

17 F. J. Dölger: Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit und der Schwarze. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Taufgelöbniß. Münster 1918 (Liturgiegeschichtliche Forschungen 2), pp. 57–64.

18 Flavii Cresconii Corippii Africani grammatici quae supersunt. Recensuit M. Petschenig. Berlin 1886 (Berliner Studien für classische Philologie und Archaeologie 4,2).

Appel's "Beiträge",¹⁹ M. Darquennes's 1942 Louvain thesis²⁰ (how many libraries will have this, I wonder?), and the 1966 Columbia dissertation by George Shea.²¹ Some points where his notes can be supplemented:

- 43: Goldlust implies that treatment of *dies* as masculine and feminine in different passages is a Corippian peculiarity. Not so: see the classic treatment of Eduard Fraenkel²²; also Roland Gregory Austin²³ on Verg. Aen. 6.429.
- 69: For *sentire* + infinitive Goldlust cites Tert. anim. 38.2; he might have mentioned Jan Hendrik Waszink's²⁴ note ad loc.
- 126 *fac nos uelle fugam*: a formulation more at home in elegy or declamation than epic. Cf. however Verg. Aen. 4.540 *fac uelle*; Ov. met. 2.290 *exitium fac me meruisse*.
- 220: For *populus* = *exercitus* see also the discussion by Josef Svennung.²⁵
- 223–224 *perfidus, infelix, atrox, insulsus, adulter, | praedo, homicida, rapax* [...]: for whole-line asyndeton of this sort see the discussion of Michael Roberts.²⁶ For its use, as here, in a *schetiasmos* cf. e.g. Anth. Lat. 83.124 Riese (Dido to Aeneas) *improbe, dure, nocens, crudelis, perfide, fallax*; Sedul. carm. pasch. 5.59–60 (Judas) *tune cruenta, ferox, audax, insane, rebellis, | perfide, crudelis, fallax, uenalis, inique*.

- 19 E. Appel: Exegetisch-kritische Beiträge zu Corippus mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des vulgären Elementes seiner Sprache. München 1904.
- 20 M. Darquennes: Flavius Cresconius Corippus. Stylistische Studie. Lic. Louvain 1942.
- 21 G. W. Shea: The 'Iohannis' of Flavius Cresconius Corippus. Prolegomena and Translation. Diss. Columbia University. New York 1966.
- 22 E. Fraenkel: Das Geschlecht von *dies*. In: Glotta 8, 1917, pp. 24–68 = E. Fraenkel: Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, vol 1: Zur Sprache. Zur griechischen Literatur. Rome 1964 (Storia e letteratura 95), pp. 27–72.
- 23 P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus. With a Commentary by R. G. Austin. Oxford 1977, p. 156.
- 24 Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani *De Anima*. Ed. with Introduction and Commentary by J. H. Waszink. Amsterdam 1947. Reprint Leiden/Boston 2010 (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 100).
- 25 J. Svennung: Orosiana. Syntaktische, semasiologische und kritische Studien zu Orosius. Uppsala 1922 (Uppsala Universitets årsskrift 5), p. 125.
- 26 M. Roberts: The Jeweled Style. Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity. Ithaca/London 1989, pp. 59–61.

244–245 *succurre gementi*: | *namque potes*: Goldlust notes that “l’appel à Jean évoque une prière,” but not that *namque potes* contributes to the effect: cf. Verg. Aen. 6.366; Val. Fl. 1.11 (with Andrew Zissos’s²⁷ note ad loc.); 2.490.

365 “*germanus* est préféré [sc. to *frater*] dans les passages caractérisés par une grande affectivité.” For similar claims see James Reeson²⁸ on Ov. epist. 11.89, who discerns this emotional use above all in apostrophe (as here). But *frater* can have plenty of “affectivité” in the right context, as Catull. 101 shows. Corippus’s usage may simply reflect metrical convenience or a striving for epic (especially Vergilian) *color*.

392 *rursus redeant*: “caractéristique du goût de Corippe pour le pléonasme.” In fact such redundancy is frequent in expressions of returning, in Greek as well as Latin: see George Kortekaas²⁹ on Hist. Apoll. 15.

494: *aureus* may have a poetic coloring (partly a function of semantics: poets often have occasion to describe golden things), but a word found over seventy times in Livy can hardly be called “très rare en prose.”

Goldlust does not make exaggerated claims for his author’s literary ability, but tries to give him his due, albeit in somewhat monotonous terms. This or that is “très expressive” (p. 83; pp. 311–312) or shows “beaucoup d’expressivité” (p. 170), even “expressivité particulière” (p. 99). Another favorite is “donner un relief particulier”: “l’enjambement et l’hyperbate donnent à l’attaque du vers [...] un relief particulier” (p. 29; sim. p. 10); “l’anastrophe [...] donne un relief particulier au récit” (p. 74); “cet intertexte donne un relief tout particulier à ce vers” (p. 194). There are fanciful interpretation of elisions at 231 (*infanda et*) and 244 (*mersa est*). The final note, on 596, offers a tantalizing taste of narratological analysis, not much in evidence elsewhere.

I close with some miscellaneous observations and corrections:

39: For “à propos de *crebro sonat*” read “à propos de *sonat ungula cornu*.”

27 Valerius Flaccus’ *Argonautica*, Book 1. Ed. with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary by A. Zissos. Oxford 2008.

28 J. Reeson: Ovid *Heroides* 11, 13 and 14. A Commentary. Leiden/Boston/Köln 2001 (Mnemosyne-Supplements 221), pp. 85–87.

29 G. A. A. Kortekaas: Commentary on the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*. Leiden/Boston 2007 (Mnemosyne-Supplements 284), p. 208.

- 46 *tectis uenientes pellimus hostes*: Goldlust notes the echo of Verg. Aen. 12.595 (Amata) *tectis uenientes prospicit hostes*, but it does not seem to have occurred to him that it might be relevant to establishing the case of *tectis* here.
- 68 *nutantes animos*: Goldlust cites Ov. met. 10.375 *animus* [...] *nutat* and Claud. Gild. 281 *animus nutauerit*, but there are also parallels in prose, e.g. Ambr. epist. 2.7.33 *nutantis animi*; Aug. serm. 54.1.1 *animus nutans*. This suggests, not that Corippus was reading the Fathers, but that the phrase is less striking than it might seem.
- 237 *placidus cana granitate*: Goldlust describes *granitate* as a “personnification.” I think we have to distinguish between instances like Verg. Aen. 1.292 (*cana Fides et Vesta*) and cases like this or Catull. 108.1 (*tua cana senectus*) where *cana* is better viewed as a transferred epithet.
- 239 *genitor* [...] *senilis*: Goldlust puzzlingly describes *genitor* as “synonyme poétique de *senex*,” but the parallels he cites all refer to God as *genitor omnipotens* or the like. I think his *senex* must be a slip for *pater*.
- 263 *iussa spectare magistrī*: Goldlust calls this a case of lengthening in arsis, noting only in passing the really relevant point, that “cet allongement se fait devant un groupe biconsonantique.” In fact lengthening of a final short vowel before *s* + consonant in the following word is frequent in Corippus: see Riedlberger³⁰ on 8.46.
- 278 *montibus*: Goldlust accepts Petschenig’s emendation of the transmitted *noctibus* as appropriate in context and “une moindre modification [...] que les autres corrections proposées.” The same confusion is found at Sen. Phaedr. 444 (*noctibus* E, *montibus* A).
- 303 *praecepta capessunt*: Goldlust casually notes that this clausula “a été imitée par Aldhelm, *Carm. eccles.* 4,1,6.” Important if true – but is it true? Andy Orchard lists possible echoes of Corippus in Aldhelm, including this one. He finds the resemblances “tantalizingly bland,” yet inclines to think that “Aldhelm did indeed know the poetry of Corippus.”³¹ It may be worth noting the appearance of the same clausula in the poetry of two fifteenth-century Italian humanists: Tommaso Seneca, *Historia Bononiensis* 1.316;
- 30 Riedlberger: Kommentar (note 6), S. 142–143.
- 31 A. Orchard: *The Poetic Art of Aldhelm*. Cambridge 1994 (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 8), pp. 188–191. M. Lapidge: *The Anglo-Saxon Library*. Oxford 2006, pp. 116–119 adds nothing to Orchard on the *Iohannis* but gives good reasons for thinking that the *In laudem Iustini*, at least, made its way to England, where it was quoted by Asser.

Giovanni Pontano, *Urania* 1.923.³² It is difficult to imagine that either of these poets had read Aldhelm. Did they read Corippus? Just conceivably. But it seems at least as likely that one or both generated the clausula independently, and that Aldhelm did as well.

308–309 *uolucres* [...] *cursus* | *corripuit*: Goldlust sees a play on the poet’s name; this seems to me unlikely (even more so, of course, if the name was Gorippus). The verb is found 31 times in Vergil, including four times in this form and metrical position. The use here (like 1.508 *corripit*) is not in any way marked, nor is this a natural place for a *sphragis*. Goldlust’s assertion that the verb “a une coloration spécifiquement chrétienne” is arguably true for the sense ‘rebuke,’ but that is hardly relevant to our passage.

468–471 *Sonipes* [...] *gaudet et in latos laetatur currere campos*: T’s *luctatu* is corrected to *luctatur* by most editors, but Goldlust – for once rejecting minimalism – prefers Mazzucchelli’s *laetatur*: “l’effort ardent déployé par le cheval lors de sa course n’entrerait-il pas en contradiction avec la joie qu’il manifeste [...] au début du vers?” No: the horse which had previously resisted the bridle (469 *oppugnat frenis*) is now eager to gallop and strains against the reins.

483: A reference seems to have dropped out after “voir,” I think to Ernst Robert Curtius’s “Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter”.³³

Trivial misprints: p. 183, line 2, for “Mac Cormick” read “McCormick” (also in the bibliography, p. 259); p. 227, line 7, for “p. 40” read “p. 140”; p. 261, line 11, for “in Early” read “in an Early”; p. 262, line 3, for “Romisches” read “Römisches.”

Corippus has been luckier in his commentators than he perhaps deserves: Tommasi Moreschini and Riedlberger, in particular, have set the bar high. Goldlust does not quite rise to their level, but students of Corippus will still find this commentary of value.

32 T. Seneca: *Historia Bononiensis. Qualiter Galeatius Marescottus eques extraxit Hannibalem Bentevolum de carceribus et reliqua per utrunque gesta. Carmen epicum*. Ed. J. Fógel. Leipzig 1932 (*Bibliotheca scriptorum medii recentisque aevorum*: Saec. XV 5), p. 8; G. Pontano: *Urania*. Ed. B. Soldati. Florence 1902, p. 29.

33 E. R. Curtius: *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern 1948. Goldlust normally cites the French version: *La littérature européenne et le Moyen Âge latin*. Translated by J. Bréjoux. Paris 1987.

Gregory Hays, University of Virginia, Charlottesville
Associate Professor of Classics
corippus@gmail.com

www.plekos.de

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Gregory Hays: Rezension zu: Benjamin Goldlust: Corippe, *Johannide*, livre 4. Introduction, édition critique, traduction et commentaire. Paris: Institut d'Études augustiniennes 2017 (Collection des Études augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 202). In: Plekos 24, 2022, S. 179–192 (URL: <https://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2022/r-goldlust.pdf>).
