

REVIEW ARTICLE / DISCUSSION

LATIN LITERATURE BETWEEN DIOCLETIAN AND AMBROSE

T. D. BARNES

A CENTURY HAS PASSED SINCE Martin von Schanz published the first volume of his "history of Roman literature as far as the legislative work of the emperor Justinian" (*Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian*). This first volume, published in 1890, dealt with Republican literature; a second two years later covered early imperial literature from Octavian's final victory in 30 B.C. to the death of Trajan, while the third volume, published in 1896, went from the accession of Hadrian in 117 to Constantine's conquest of the East in 324. The fourth volume proved to be a much more difficult enterprise: the first part, on Latin literature of the fourth century, appeared in 1904, but the second was not yet finished when Schanz died in 1914 and it was prepared for its eventual publication in 1920 by Carl Hosius and Gustave Krüger. Schanz's history was both an academic and a commercial success. It immediately established itself as the authoritative handbook of Latin literature, rapidly eclipsing its predecessor and only serious rival, W. S. Teuffel's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, which had been translated both into French and twice into English (in 1873 and again in 1891/2 from the fifth edition). Teubner of Leipzig brought out no fewer than five editions of Teuffel's work in the twenty years before Schanz's appeared (in 1870, 1872, 1875, 1882, and 1890, the last two revised after Teuffel's death by A. Schwabe), but only one further edition thereafter, the sixth, revised by Wilhelm Kroll and Franz Skutsch (three volumes: 1910–1916). The third volume of this last edition, though published in 1913, was not completely superseded by its competitor and still retains scholarly value, not least because it goes far beyond the sixth century, its last paragraph being a notice of Paulus Diaconus, an older contemporary of Charlemagne.¹

Handbuch der Lateinischen Literatur der Antike, ed. R. Herzog and P. L. Schmidt, 5: *Restauration und Erneuerung 284–374 n. Chr.*, ed. R. Herzog. Munich: Beck. 1989. Pp. xxix, 559. The French version, *Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine 5: Restauration et renouveau (284–374)* (Paris: Éditions Brepols) was announced for publication in 1990, but has not yet appeared (September 1991).

¹While *PLRE* 1 (1971) cites M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* 4.1² (Munich 1914) more than a dozen times, it also refers to W. S. Teuffel, W. Kroll, and F. Skutsch, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 3⁶ (Leipzig 1913) in at least four entries, viz. Donatianus 6 (268), Donatus 4 (268–269), Papyriensis (667), and Tiberianus 1 (911).

Revisions were made to Schanz's history of Latin literature over several decades in order to keep pace with the development of classical scholarship. The process of revision was so long associated with the name of Carl Hosius that the work came to be known familiarly as "Schanz-Hosius." But the degree of revision was uneven: the first two volumes were thoroughly revised three times, their fourth editions being published in 1927 and 1935 respectively, while the third volume got as far as a third edition in 1922, and a second edition of the first part of the fourth appeared in 1914. But there has been no updating at all for more than fifty years, though the latest versions of each volume have remained in print, and successive generations of scholars have purchased and gratefully used them. The time has thus long been ripe for a replacement. Serious planning for one began about 1980, and the first volume of the total of eight projected came out in 1989. It is a superb achievement of cooperative scholarship of high technical calibre.

The new "handbook of Latin literature" illustrates how greatly the world of classical scholarship has changed in a century. A hundred years ago Schanz could set out to write a history of Latin literature in German as sole author. The "new Schanz-Hosius" was from the start a cooperative and international enterprise, whose contributors and editors include non-German scholars; indeed, many paragraphs of the fifth volume were originally written in French and the editor of the sixth volume will be the French Latinist Jacques Fontaine.² Moreover, it is intended that each volume be published almost simultaneously in French in Paris by a Belgian publishing house. Other differences are equally significant. The new work goes well beyond Justinian to terminate at the death of Bede in 735, and the first volume to be completed and published is not one devoted to the earliest Latin literature or even to one of the periods that has traditionally been most studied in Departments of Classics. It is the first of the four volumes devoted to Latin literature of the Later Roman Empire and beyond. It would not be fanciful to interpret this as revealing something significant about contemporary Latin studies, at least in Europe.

The scope of the fifth volume of the *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* is defined both chronologically and thematically as "Restoration and Renewal: Latin Literature from A.D. 284 to 374." The starting point is clear and justifiable, since the proclamation of Diocletian as emperor on 20 November 284 marked a real break in the history and culture of the Roman world. But why 374? The justification stated in the introduction speaks of a

²At least one mistake has crept in during the translation of an entry originally written in French into German: discussing the *Sermo de centesima, sexagesima, tricesima* transmitted under the name of Cyprian (575.1), the first sentence on page 418 states that J. Daniélou and two other scholars "setzen den sermo ins 2. Jh., indem sie seine Abhängigkeit von Tertullian annehmen"—which is clearly the opposite of the sense intended in the second clause.

change of generations and of the spiritual climate (501: "durch einen Generationswechsel, durch einen Wechsel des geistigen Klimas"). As marks of the beginning of the "Age of Theodosius (374–430)" (the advertised subtitle of the sixth volume) are instanced the elections of Martin as Bishop of Tours in 372 and of Ambrose as Bishop of Milan (here dated to 373), Damasus' ending of the christological dispute in the West in 372—and two eastern phenomena, viz., the writings of Basil as bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia from 370 onwards and the fact that "um 370 nötigt das sprunghaft um sich greifende Mönchtum Kaiser Valens zu ersten Massnahmen"—whatever precisely that is supposed to mean.

Some latitude has naturally been allowed over which authors are included in the volume. There is an entry for Nemesianus (555), even though both his *Eclogues* and his *Cynegetica* were written before the accession of Diocletian (the latter work refers to the former and salutes the *divi fortissima Cari / pignora*, i.e., the brothers Carinus and Numerianus who ruled jointly in 283/4 after their father's death). Ausonius too is included (554), and indeed enjoys the largest spread (some forty pages in all), even though much of his oeuvre was written after 374. That is clearly correct, for authors should not be split between volumes, and, even if he lived on into the 390s, Ausonius was born ca 310 and belongs mentally to a pre-Theodosian generation.³ On the other side, at least two omissions deserve comment. Both Justin's abbreviation of Pompeius Trogus (637), and the anonymous treatise *De rebus bellicis* (604) have been deferred to the next volume. That is clearly a correct decision for Justin, despite the assumption of virtually all scholars until very recently that he worked in the second or third century.⁴ On the other hand, the case recently stated with verve and aplomb for dating the *De rebus bellicis* to the fifth rather than the fourth century is not likely ever to win wide acceptance.⁵

³Paradoxically, however, W. L. Liebermann adopts a consistently late chronology for the composition of Ausonius' poems: for example, he unhesitatingly deduces a date towards 390 for both the *Ordo urbium nobilium* and the *Commemoratio professorum Burdigalensium* on the strength of isolated references to historical events of the 380s (554.11, 12), although the contents of both sets of poems as a whole suggest rather that they are much earlier compositions which Ausonius revised superficially for some sort of collected edition of his works towards the very end of his long life.

⁴PIR² J 713. Hence omitted from PLRE 1 (1971), which begins at 260. For a date in the very late fourth century, see R. Syme, "The Date of Justin and the Discovery of Trogus," *Historia* 37 (1988) 358–371 = *Roman Papers* 6 (Oxford 1991) 358–371.

⁵H. Brandt, *Zeitkritik in der Spätantike. Untersuchungen zu den Reformvorschlägen des Anonymus De rebus bellicis* (Munich 1988, *Vestigia* 40) 135–162. Brandt inclines to put the composition of the work in the late 440s. In favour of a date in the late 360s, see G. Bonamente, "Considerazioni sul *De rebus bellicis*," *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Macerata* 14 (1981) 11–49; Alan Cameron, "The Date of the Anonymus *De rebus bellicis*," *Literature and Society in the Early Byzantine World*

The whole of the *Handbuch* is organised by paragraphs numbered from §100 to §999, many of which are divided into sub-paragraphs, so that each volume has up to one hundred consecutively numbered paragraphs. Thus the fifth volume runs from §500 entitled "Introduction to the Latin Literature of Late Antiquity," which is immediately followed by an introduction to the volume (§501), to §599 on Latin versions of the *Life of Antony*. The prefatory matter recommends that all references to the *Handbuch* be given to these paragraphs and hence have the form "HLL 5 (1989) §507.1"—a recommendation which will be scrupulously observed here, except for the otiose repetition of the title, volume number and date of publication, and the siglum §. One consequence of this principle of organisation is that, since an author receives at most one numbered paragraph in the main continuous series running from 500 to 599, all the writings of a single author must be discussed together, no matter how diverse they may really be. Hence Firmicus Maternus' work of Christian apologetic *De errore profanarum religionum* is registered and discussed with his *Mathesis* under the heading "Astrology" (515) and both the grammatical works and the theological treatises of Marius Victorinus are discussed under philosophy (564).

Within each paragraph, the new *Handbuch* attains a clarity of exposition far superior to that of the old Schanz-Hosius: it sets out the ancient evidence for the life, career, and writings of each author as numbered testimonia (T: 1, etc.), which are grouped according to their relevance, and it provides separate numbered bibliographies (Lit. 1, etc.) for different items, problems, or works in complex entries. Thus there are in all thirty-eight separate and detailed bibliographies for Ausonius (554), thirty-two for Hilary of Poitiers (582), seventeen for Lactantius (570), and thirteen for Aelius Donatus (527). Another welcome innovation is that "Rezeption" usually has a separate section at the end of the entry for each author.

The volume is divided into three parts. The first deals with technical writing under the headings of legal texts (502–510), medical writers (511–514), astrology (515), geographical and topographical "Gebrauchsliteratur" (516–520), and grammar and rhetoric (521–527), the second with the traditional genres of pagan Latin literature—oratory, which has by this period become coterminous with panegyric (528), historiography (529–541), poetry including Christian poetry and also, rather surprisingly, the amusing but entirely prosaic *Testamentum Porcelli* (542–562), philosophy (563–566), and epistolography (567, though the literary letters surviving from the period are in fact discussed elsewhere in the volume together with the rest of their authors' *oeuvre*). The third part is devoted to Christian literature under the headings of apology (568–571), exegesis (572–579), anti-heretical

(London 1985) no. IX (a "revised and fortified version" of his 1979 paper of the same title).

and dogmatic writings (580–589), pastoral writings (590–592), and hagiography (593–599).

There are fifteen contributors to the volume, whom it would be difficult (and perhaps pointless) to try to assess individually. It must be said, however, that P. L. Schmidt stands out from the rest of the contributors in the astonishing breadth, variety, and depth of scholarship that he displays. He has singlehandedly written all the entries, many of them complicated, for grammar, rhetoric, oratory, and epistolography (521–528, 567, and part of 564), all the entries for historical writing except one minor one (529–541, with the exception of 540.2), the entry for the *Testamentum Porcelli* (550.2), and a wonderfully clear account of the complex textual transmission of Ausonius and its problems (554).

Since a volume such as this, especially one of such high overall quality, can hardly be reviewed in the normal fashion, the discursive and often disconnected observations which follow concern writers and texts on which the present writer feels that he has something to say. The choice inevitably reflects his own interests and refers often, perhaps excessively, to his own publications, but he hopes that this concentration will be ascribed less to egocentricity than to a desire to provide practical help to those who may have occasion to consult the volume.

I

On the legal literature of the period 284–374 (502, 504–510), D. Liebs provides clear guidance by presenting a succinct digest of his earlier and fuller discussions in his books on Hermogenianus (published in 1964) and *Die Jurisprudenz im spätantiken Italien (260–640 n. Chr.)* (Berlin 1987). His treatment of imperial legal utterances (503) is less happy, since it omits some important documents. There is no mention of the edict issued by Galerius in 305/6 of which copies are known from Tlos in Lycia and Athens (*CIL* III 12134; *IG* II/III² 1121; cf. A. Steinwenter, “Eine vergessene Kaiserkonstitution,” *Studi in onore di Emilio Betti* 4 [Milan 1962] 135–144), or of the imperial edict curbing extortion by procurators and *Caesariani* found at Lyttos in Crete which should probably be attributed to Licinius (*ICret* 1.229–230 no. 189)—like the so-called *Edictum Constantini de accusationibus* (*FIRA*² 1.94).⁶ There is also no reference here to Constantine’s letter to the poet Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius, whose authenticity is denied elsewhere in the volume by K. Smolak (544, at p. 240,

⁶ *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass. 1981) 321, n. 68. In annotation on the inscription as editor of *Inscriptiones Creticae*, M. Guarducci noted its strong similarity in phrasing to the edict *De accusationibus*, of which a copy was found with it (no. 188): Liebs rightly accepts Licinius as the author of the latter (p. 58, n. 9, with recent bibliography).

n. 19). Moreover, the fact that the versatile P. L. Schmidt has added a brief paragraph on Constantine's *Speech to the Assembly of the Saints* prompts the question why the other letters, edicts, and legal pronouncements of the same emperor which are preserved with it by Eusebius in his *Life of Constantine* and which, like it, though preserved only in a contemporary Greek translation, were originally composed in Latin, are not also registered and discussed.⁷

There are in addition a number of minor inaccuracies and mistakes. For example, the praetorian prefect Philippus died in 351 (the date is to be deduced from Athanasius *Historia Arianorum* 7.6; Zosimus 2.46–47 and the scholiast on Julian *Orat.* 2, 97c),⁸ so that the letter of Constantius to Marinus praising Philippus as one still in office cannot be as late as 352; and Salutius Secundus was not praetorian prefect of the East in 362 but an old-style praetorian prefect who accompanied Julian even on campaign as a sort of deputy-emperor.⁹

Firmicus Maternus (515). The section on the *Mathesis* by W. Hübner appears to be excellent on the purely astrological aspects of the work, but it overlooks the discussion of both the date of the work (fixed to the spring of 337 by the fact that the preface styles the dedicatee Lollianus *consul designatus*) and the horoscope in *Math.* 2.29.10–20 in "Two Senators under Constantine," *JRS* 65 (1975) 40–49—an article also overlooked in the long discussion of Maternus' career by R. Turcan in the introduction to his edition of and commentary on the *De errore profanarum religionum* (Paris 1982, Budé), where it is cited only among the addenda (p. 354).

It is a matter of far less moment that A. Wlosok in her excellent discussion of Firmicus Maternus' polemic against paganism does not record the suggestion made in *AJAH* 3 (1978) 75, n. 100 that the *De errore profanarum religionum* was written in 343 precisely. With Turcan she prefers to

⁷For proof that the Greek version of the *Speech* is the translation of a Latin original, see D. N. Wigtill, "Towards a Date for the Greek Fourth Eclogue," *CJ* 76 (1981) 336–341. Without any reference to this important article, R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (Harmondsworth 1986) 627–635, has recently argued that the *Speech* was composed in Greek and delivered in Antioch on Good Friday 325, i.e., 16 April 325. On the original language of the *Speech*, he pronounces "this issue is soluble, and I will survey it elsewhere" (778, n. 9), but no discussion from his pen seems yet to have appeared in print. As for the place of delivery, it is physically impossible for Constantine to have been in Antioch as late as mid-April 325, even if he visited the city in the winter of 324/5; cf. *AJAH* 3 (1978) 54–56; *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, Mass. 1982) 76. On the other hand, the date of 16 April 325 may be correct—with delivery in Nicomedia, as argued in an unpublished doctoral thesis by D. Ison, *The Constantinian Oration to the Saints—Authorship and Background* (diss., University of London, London 1985) 207 ff.

⁸The last item of evidence is overlooked in the account of Philippus' career in *PLRE* 1 (1971) 696–697.

⁹*Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1984/1985* (Bonn 1987) 15.

see in *Persica vota conlapsa sunt* (29.3) an allusion to Shapur's unsuccessful siege of Nisibis in 346. But W. Portmann, "Die 59. Rede des Libanios und das Datum der Schlacht von Singara," *BZ* 82 (1989) 1–18, has now argued persuasively that the famous nocturnal battle near Singara should be dated to 344 (with J. B. Bury, O. Seeck, and E. Stein) rather than to 348 (as the majority of recent historians of the period have assumed, including the present writer). If that is correct, then Maternus might be referring to the battle of Singara and hence writing ca 345. But the argument for dating the *De errore* to 343 proceeds from the assumption that if Firmicus Maternus had known of a victory over the Persians for which Constantius claimed credit, then convention, loyalty, and prudence alike would have led him to allude explicitly to the emperor's role: since he refers explicitly to Constans' expedition to Britain in the winter of 342/3 but says nothing similar about Constantius, it ought to follow that he was writing before he learned of the victory which the eastern bishops used as an excuse for their hasty departure from the Council of Serdica late in 343 (Athanasius *Historia Arianorum* 16.2).

II

Origo Constantini Imperatoris (534). P. L. Schmidt rightly rejects the recent argument of I. König, *Origo Constantini* (Trier 1987) 19–28, that the *Origo* draws on Jerome's revision of Eusebius' *Chronicle* and must therefore have been written after 380. Schmidt explains the similarities of phrasing by the hypothesis that Jerome may have read the *Origo*: for a fuller statement of the case, see "Jerome and the *Origo Constantini Imperatoris*," *Phoenix* 43 (1989) 158–161, where it is also argued that the text as transmitted in the sole manuscript reproduces a redaction made not long after 420 by an editor who both abbreviated the original account of Constantine written ca 340 and interpolated it from Orosius.

"Die sogenannte Enmannsche Kaisergeschichte (=EKG)" (536). It is most welcome for this lost work to receive a separate entry of its own. Although twenty-five years ago it could be derided as "a ghost of which little has been heard in recent years" (Alan Cameron, *JRS* 55 [1965] 249), the Kaisergeschichte is a necessary postulate whose use by Aurelius Victor (537), Eutropius (538), Festus (539.1), the *Historia Augusta* (639), and the *Epitome de Caesaribus* (637) is now generally acknowledged. The list of authors who used the Kaisergeschichte here omits Jerome (647): for an attempt to prove that he used the lost Kaisergeschichte as well as the extant Eutropius, see *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1968/69* (Bonn 1970) 21.

Pseudo-history has a paragraph to itself, with separate entries for Julius Valerius (540.1), the so-called *Itinerarium Alexandri* which is transmitted

with Julius Valerius in Ambros. P 49 sup. (540.2), the Metz Alexander epitome (541.1), and *De morte Alexandri Magni liber* (541.2). The focus on Alexander has produced a one-sided verdict on the *Itinerarium Alexandri*, viz., that as a completely dilettante product of the fourth century, it is worthless for modern historians of the ancient world. That is correct only if the work is viewed solely as a source for Alexander and his period. In fact, the *Itinerarium Alexandri* is one of the very few contemporary writings still to survive from the 340s, and its preface puts Constantius' Persian war in a perspective rather different from that to be found either in ancient writers who expressed an opinion after 350 or in most modern analyses (see *JRS* 75 [1985] 135–136).¹⁰

Latin epigraphical poetry (543) has a ten-page entry by W. Schetter which steps outside the chronological scope of the volume to provide not only a detailed survey of epigraphical poetry between 284 and 374, but also an excellent brief introduction to the genre as a whole. (Metrical inscriptions known from medieval manuscript sources are included, but not the epigrams of Damasus, however preserved, which are deferred until the next volume [641].) Unfortunately, however, the entry has one feature which will inconvenience many readers. The majority of texts discussed are cited only by their number in F. Buecheler, *Carmina Latina epigraphica* (Leipzig 1895–97, with a supplement by E. Lommatsch, 1926). As a matter of editorial policy, Buecheler usually printed as text only the metrical portion of an inscription, so that the prose portion of an epitaph, which in many cases supplies the exact name of the deceased to which the verse portion merely alludes, is to be found in his annotation. That procedure makes it more difficult for the reader to visualise the text of the inscription as a whole. A handbook of Latin literature could surely have found space to provide cross-references to *CIL* and *ILS*, especially since Dessau's large and well-annotated selection contains many of the texts discussed here.

My specific observations on this paragraph are confined to the two consecutive sub-sections entitled "Ehren- und Dedikationstituli" and "Profane Bauinschriften" which together occupy just over a page (234–235). These include some important historical texts, such as the poem of four rough hexameters from the forum at Lambaesis celebrating Constantine's victory over Maxentius (*CLE* 278 = *CIL* VIII 18261) and two inscriptions honouring L. Aradius Valerius Proculus, consul in 340 (*CLE* 325, 892 = *ILS* 1241, 1242): together with a parallel dedication to Proculus in prose which also comes from his house in Rome (*ILS* 1240), the first of these two verse

¹⁰On the preface, and in favour of identifying the author as Julius Valerius himself, see J.-P. Callu, "La Préface à l'*Itinéraire d'Alexandre*," to appear in *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes. Mélanges offerts à J. Fontaine* (forthcoming).

inscriptions dates the establishment of the short-lived praetorian prefecture of Africa to Proculus' proconsulate in 332/3 (*New Empire* 133; cf. 171). There appears to be no mention here, however, of *CLE* 893 = *ILS* 735 = *CIL* V 7781 which, though not a piece of inspired poetry, appears to show that the emperor Constantius ordered or supervised building activity at Albingaunum during a visit to the town that is not explicitly recorded anywhere, i.e., presumably as he travelled from North Italy to Arles in the early autumn of 353.

On *CLE* 1916 = *ILS* 9351, see J. F. Matthews in *Aspects of the Notitia Dignitatum* (Oxford 1976, *BAR* Supp. 15) 174–177. On the inscription from the obelisk of Constantius (*CLE* 279 = *ILS* 736 = *CIL* VI 1163), see G. Fowden, "Nicagoras of Athens and the Lateran Obelisk," *JHS* 107 (1987) 51–57.

Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius (544). The account of the poet's life has unfortunately not emancipated itself from the effects of the misattribution of the horoscope in Firmicus Maternus *Math.* 2.29.10–20 to Porfyrius by *PLRE* 1 (1971) 649, 1004, 1006–08.¹¹ The entry fails to mention the salient fact (not recorded in *PLRE* either) that the horoscope belongs to a man born on 14 or 15 March 303 (*JRS* 65 [1975] 41; cf. O. Neugebauer, "The Horoscope of Ceionius Rufius Albinus," *AJP* 74 [1953] 318–320). K. Smolak also rejects as "fingierte Briefe" both the letter of Porfyrius to Constantine and the emperor's letter to the poet. That is misplaced scepticism. The two letters were not written, as is assumed here, as a pair comprising (i) Porfyrius' dedication to the emperor of the extant cycle of twenty poems which include celebration of his victory over Licinius in 324 and his *vicennalia* followed by (ii) the emperor's gracious acknowledgement of the presentation of these same poems. On internal criteria, the letters should be some years earlier than the cycle of twenty poems, and Constantine's letter appears to be earlier than that of Porfyrius. Both letters belong to the period before Porfyrius' exile: Constantine's was probably written in Rome very shortly after the battle of the Milvian Bridge on 28 October 312 to acknowledge Porfyrius' first presentation of poems to him—poems which have not survived—and Porfyrius' letter too may be as early as the winter of 312/3. The letters thus constitute central evidence for Constantine's concern to preserve and foster traditional literary culture immediately after his conversion to Christianity (*Constantine and Eusebius* 47–48, 309, nn. 40, 41).

The quotation of *AE* 1931.6 = *SEG* XI 810 (Sparta) in T: 4 omits the vital word ἀνθ(ύπατον). To the bibliography may be added W. Levitan,

¹¹The misattribution was also accepted by G. Polara in his edition: he prints Firmicus Maternus *Math.* 2.29.10–20 as "testimonia de Optatiano 3" (*Publili Optatiani Porfyrii Carmina* [Turin 1973] 1–3).

"Dancing at the End of the Rope: Optatian Porfyrus and the Field of Roman Verse," *TAPA* 115 (1985) 245–269.

The *Pervigilium Veneris* (551) is one of the most beautiful, most influential, most edited, most translated, and most controversial of Latin poems. The two recent critical editions of L. Catlow, *The Pervigilium Veneris* (Brussels 1980, *CollLatomus* 172) 43–49 and D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Anthologia Latina* 1.1 (Stuttgart 1982) 139–144 (*Carmina Codicis Salmasiani* 191), and the text offered by Alan Cameron, "The *Pervigilium Veneris*," *La poesia tardoantica: trà retorica, teologia e politica* (Messina 1984) 209–234, at 232–234 (cf. 210, n. 5: "the critical apparatus on which it rests must wait for my forthcoming edition") differ greatly from one another, while estimates of the date of the poem have ranged from the reign of Hadrian to the very end of the fifth century. Of late a date in the early fourth century has been gaining ground steadily, and Cameron has recently reiterated and partially expanded the arguments of E. Baehrens (*Unedirte lateinische Gedichte* [Leipzig 1877] 36–37; cf. *Poetae Latini minores* 4 [Leipzig 1882] 48) in favour of identifying the author as the poet Tiberianus, from whose pen four poems otherwise survive. In this Cameron was followed by D. R. Shanzer, *A Philosophical and Literary Commentary on Martianus Capella's De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii, Book 1* (Berkeley 1986) 46. K. Smolak here dates the poem to the first half of the fourth century but pronounces Cameron's arguments for identifying its author as Tiberianus to be insufficient.¹² But D. R. Shanzer now argues that lines 22–26 adapt phrases from Ausonius, *Cento Nuptialis* 3.11–12 and 16–17—with the corollary that the *Pervigilium Veneris* was written after 368 ("Once Again Tiberianus and the *Pervigilium Veneris*," *RFIC* 118 [1990] 306–318, at 307–308). Hence it is worth recalling the verdict with which Sir Cecil Clementi concluded his discussion of the date of the *Pervigilium Veneris* long ago: "I feel the fact that the poem is included in the *Anthologia Latina*, a selection from authors who wrote in the Carthaginian kingdom of the Vandals, and the further fact that it was imitated by Fulgentius, who lived in Africa under the Vandal kings, to be strong arguments for dating it not earlier than the first half of the fifth century" (*Pervigilium Veneris*³ [Oxford 1936] 90).

Tiberianus (552) is implicitly identified as C. Annius Tiberianus, praetorian prefect in Gaul at the end of the reign of Constantine. (To the testimonia cited, add the inscription from Antioch published by D. Feissel, *Travaux et mémoires* 9 [1985] 421, which shows that the date of *ILT* 814 is not 337, as assumed here and in *New Empire* 134–136, but 335 or 336.) Alan Cameron, *La poesia tardoantica* (1984) 224, has recently proposed to identify the poet as one of the two Tiberiani who were *praefecti urbis*

¹² Attribution to Tiberianus is rejected more forcefully by U. Zuccharelli, *Tiberiano* (Naples 1987) 105–106.

in 291/2 and 303/4 respectively on the grounds that in the poet "we have perhaps one of that generation of Roman senators who sat at the feet of Plotinus and Porphyry at the turn of the third and fourth centuries." That seems a little over-optimistic and a little too early. But the philosophical allusions in Tiberianus do permit some inferences about the date of his poems. Smolak detects "a certain popularisation of Neoplatonism in the late Constantinian period," while D. R. Shanzer has recently made the precise suggestion that Tiberianus' *Versus de deo* (esp. 27: *quo genitus factusve modo*) allude to the Arian controversy and hence were written after the Council of Nicaea, i.e., after 325 (*RFIC* 118 [1990] 314–317). However, it needs to be emphasised that the poet Tiberianus is not necessarily identical with any of the Tiberiani who are attested as holding high political office. *PLRE* 1 (1971) 911 rightly gave the poet a separate entry as Tiberianus 1, even though it stated that he was "possibly to be identified" with the praetorian prefect under Constantine.

Laudes Domini (560). R. Herzog argues that the naming of the emperor Constantine and his sons fixes the date of this Christian poem written in or near Autun to the years 317–326, i.e., before the death of the Caesar Crispus (which was an execution, not, as stated here, a murder). I cannot understand what he means by "ihre Nennung": the poem indeed names Constantine and alludes to his sons (143–148: *at nunc tu . . . victorem laetumque pares mihi Constantinum. / hoc melius fetu terris nil ante dedisti / nec dabis; exaequent utinam sua pignora patrem!*), but the sons are left anonymous. The probable date is shortly before or even during the war of 324—after which Constantine officially assumed the title of *victor* (*Constantine and Eusebius* 390, n. 12).

Faltonia Betitia Proba (562). R. Herzog here rejects the thesis of D. R. Shanzer, "The Anonymous 'Carmen contra Paganos' and the Date and Identity of the Centonist Proba," *REAug* 32 (1986) 232–246, that the *Cento Probae* copies the anonymous *Carmen contra paganos* and that the centonist is therefore Anicia Faltonia Proba, the wife of the great Sex. Petronius Probus, consul in 371, rather than Faltonia Betitia Proba, the wife of Clodius Celsinus Adelfius, who was *praefectus urbi* in 351. In support of the traditional identification of the centonist, see now J. F. Matthews, "The Poetess Proba and Fourth-Century Rome: Questions of Interpretation," *Institutions, société et vie politique au IV^{ème} siècle ap. J.C. (284–423). Autour de l'oeuvre d'A. Chastagnol* (Rome 1991) 275–302, who sets out and discusses in full the varied evidence which attributes the cento explicitly to Faltonia Betitia Proba.¹³ If the centonist is indeed Proba the wife of Adelfius, then (as Matthews observes) the obvious occasion for the compo-

¹³A much clearer exposition than that by C. Schenkl in the preface to his edition of the cento (*CSEL* 16 [1888] 513–520).

sition, or at least the presentation, of her lost epic on the war of 351–353 was Constantius' visit to Rome in 357. Proba's extant Virgilian cento could be much later: writing shortly after 394 Jerome derided the author as a *garula anus* (*Ep.* 53.7, quoting *Cento* 403, 624 = *Aen.* 1.664, 2.650).

Asclepius (565). See recently A. Wigtil, "Incorrect Apocalyptic: The Hermetic 'Asclepius' as an Improvement on the Greek Original," *ANRW* II 17.4 (1984) 2282–97; G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes. A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind* (Cambridge 1986), esp. 38–44 (with further bibliography). The latter argues that "despite its periphrastic manner, there is no good reason to suppose that the translator materially altered the Greek *Perfect Discourse*." G. Madec here espouses the alternative view that the *Asclepius* is a "free reworking" of the Greek original. (The bibliography appears to omit D. M. Parrot [ed.], *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2–5 and VI* [Leiden 1979, Nag Hammadi Studies 11] 400–451, who prints the Coptic and Latin texts of *Asclepius* 21–29 in parallel with separate translations into English. There is also an English translation of the Coptic version of *Asclepius* 21–29 in J. Robinson [ed.], *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*³ [San Francisco 1988] 332–338.)

III

The third section contains two of the longest entries, twenty-nine pages on Lactantius (570) and thirty-three on Hilary of Poitiers (582). The author of the former, A. Wlosok, has also contributed entries on Christian apologetic as a literary genre (568) and on Arnobius (569), as well as her earlier entry for Firmicus Maternus' *De errore profanarum religionum*: they all show her fine sensitivity as a Latinist who always produces work that is careful, accurate, and illuminating. The entry for Hilary is also a distinguished piece of scholarship from J. Doignon, who draws on a lifetime of scholarship centred on the author.

Lactantius (570). Wlosok's reconstruction of Lactantius' career, which is essentially the traditional one, keeps him in Bithynia, or at least Asia Minor, for the whole decade of the Diocletianic persecution (303–313), then has him summoned to Trier as tutor to Constantine's son Crispus ca 314/5. This is not the place to reiterate the full case for holding the significantly different view that Lactantius left Asia Minor for his native Africa in 305, went from Africa to Gaul ca 310, and then returned to Nicomedia in 313 (*Constantine and Eusebius* 13–14, 291–292). But two of the central premisses of that case may be set out. First, Lactantius was undoubtedly deprived of his official chair of rhetoric in Nicomedia under the terms of the first persecuting edict of 24 February 303, but automatically became entitled to recover it as a result of Licinius' restitution of rights and property to the Christians of Bithynia in June 313 (*Mort. pers.* 48.2–12—the document

too often misleadingly styled "the edict of Milan"). Second, the *De mortibus persecutorum* presents a very hostile picture of the emperor Maximian and repeats an official story about his death in 310 which appears to have been manufactured for propaganda purposes at the court of Constantine in 311 (*Mort. pers.* 8.1–6, 29.3–30.6). But Constantine's propaganda represented Maximian as a congenital criminal only during the war against his son Maxentius: immediately after the Battle of the Milvian Bridge a new official story was concocted which denied that Maximian was Maxentius' real father at all, thus preparing the way for the full rehabilitation of Maximian which came with his consecration as *divus* ca 318 (*JRS* 63 [1973] 41–43). If Lactantius had first arrived at the court of Constantine as late as 314, his Maximian would not be the depraved and avaricious tyrant whom the *De mortibus persecutorum* denounces with such vigour.

Wlosok also reiterates the case that she has developed elsewhere for dating Lactantius' poem *De ave phoenice* to the early years of the Diocletianic persecution: a date in the winter of 324/5 is now argued against her by R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (Harmondsworth 1986) 639–641, while J. Bryce, "Lactantius' *De ave phoenice* and the Religious Policies of Constantine the Great," *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989) 13–19, contends that the aged Lactantius composed it for the emperor's *vicennalia* in 326.

Besides the long entry for Hilary (582), the section on anti-heretical and dogmatic writings contains full and informative entries for five bishops who, like Hilary, were prominent in the ecclesiastical politics of the 350s, viz. Ossius of Corduba, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, Phoebadius of Agen, and Potamius of Lisbon (583–587). There are also a number of scrappy entries, of which some could perhaps have been omitted altogether—a dozen church councils from Elvira before 303 (though that is not the date stated here) to Valentia in 374 (581), an anonymous commentary on the Nicene creed apparently written in North Italy ca 370,¹⁴ and a completely unrelated exegesis of the apostles' creed (588), and a miscellaneous entry entitled "Kaiser und arianische Bischöfe" which discusses three letters of Constantius and the known writings of the bishops Auxentius of Milan, Ursacius and Valens, and Germinius of Sirmium (589). Church councils are included if documents from them happen to survive in Latin regardless of whether the documents were originally written in Latin or Greek. Thus the "dedication council" at Antioch in 341 is registered and Hilary, *De synodis* 29/30, is adduced for its creed (581.5). But the eastern bishops who met at Antioch in 341 clearly wrote their synodical letter to other eastern bishops in Greek, and Hilary's Latin is a translation of the Greek original quoted in Athanasius *De synodis* 23. On the other hand,

¹⁴For brief discussion, see C. Piétri, *Roma Christiana* (Rome 1976, BEFAR 224) 731; R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (Edinburgh 1988) 528.

neither Julius, who was bishop of Rome from 337 to 352, nor the Council of Rome in 341 over which he presided has an entry anywhere in the volume. Why? Apparently because the long letter which Julius wrote in Latin in the name of this council happens to survive only in a Greek translation (Athanasius *Apologia contra Arianos* 21–36). And the “Council of Sirmium (357)” (581.9) was not a formal council at all. Moreover, it is unclear why Liberius, who succeeded Julius, has been separated from his political allies and correspondents of the 350s to be classified as a pastoral writer (592).

The final section on hagiography (593–599) is briefer and more perfunctory than one would expect from the distinguished pen of J. Fontaine. Besides passions and *acta martyrum* which are generally recognised as authentic (cf. *New Empire* 176–180), it includes some whose claims to be contemporary documents of the Diocletianic persecution are dubious: for example, the passions of Maxima, Donatilla, and Secunda (596.4), of the martyrs of Abitina (596.6), and of Serenus and Quirinus (597.4, 5). On the other hand, it is right, proper, and salutary to put a sermon, a passion, and a letter which describe the repression of Donatists in 317 and the 340s on the same level as the passions of catholic martyrs (598.2–4: the three texts have recently been re-edited by J.-L. Maier, *Le dossier du donatisme* 1 [Berlin 1987, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 134] nos. 28, 37, 36).

The section and the volume conclude with Latin translations of the *Life of Antony* (599). I have argued that the Greek *Life of Antony* is neither the work of Athanasius nor an original composition, but an Alexandrian revision, admittedly in all probability by someone quite close to Athanasius, of a lost Coptic original written by a disciple of Antony which was independently translated into Syriac (*JTS* NS 37 [1986] 353–368). Whether that is correct or not,¹⁵ the Greek *Life of Antony* was an instant best-seller, being rendered into Latin ca 360 within five years or so of its hero's death by an anonymous and unpolished translator (599.2) and again a decade later by Evagrius of Antioch, who produced a version of real literary merit which at once began to circulate widely in Italy and the West (599.3). One of Jerome's earliest works, the *Vita Pauli*, was a conscious attempt to outdo the *Life of Antony* with an audacious work of sheer fiction; some years later, probably ca 390, after the *Vita Pauli* had been received with scepticism, he composed the more historical *Vita Hilarionis* patterned on the

¹⁵For a defence of Athanasian authorship of the Greek *Life*, see A. Louth, “St. Athanasius and the Greek *Life of Antony*,” *JTS* NS 39 (1988) 504–509; for a restatement of the traditional view that the Greek *Life* is primary, see L. Abramowski, “Vertritt die syrische Fassung die ursprüngliche Gestalt der *Vita Antonii*?,” *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont* (Geneva 1988, *Cahiers d'Orientalisme* 20) 47–56; R. Lorenz, “Die griechische *Vita Antonii* des Athanasius und ihre syrische Fassung,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 100 (1989) 77–84.

same literary exemplar (M. Fuhrmann, "Die Mönchsgeschichten des Hieronymus. Formexperimente in erzählender Literatur," *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'antiquité tardive en occident* [Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1977, Fondation Hardt: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 23] 41–89). It is highly appropriate that a survey of the "restoration and renewal" of Latin literature under Diocletian and his imperial successors should conclude with a text which so deeply influenced the development of Christian monasticism and fascinated pious imaginations throughout the Middle Ages and beyond.

The volume of the *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* devoted to Latin literature, edited by E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen (Cambridge 1982), contained nearly one thousand pages. Yet it polished off the "Later Principate" in little over a hundred sides, which covered Latin literature from Apuleius in the Antonine age (who was perversely placed last of all) to Martianus Capella and Sidonius Apollinaris in the middle of the fifth century. The coverage was deliberately selective, confined to what could be considered both "classical" and "literature" in a narrow sense of both words. The broader approach adopted in the new *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur* does more justice to the very varied culture of Late Antiquity.¹⁶

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5S 1A1

¹⁶J.-P. Callu, "Propos sur l'imaginaire latin au Bas Empire," *QUCC* 64 (1990) 77–99.

I am most grateful to Professor Callu, John Matthews, Danuta Shanzer, and Hagith Sivan for their generosity in allowing me to read and to make use of unpublished manuscripts, and also to Danuta Shanzer for her detailed comments on an earlier version of this review-article.