these deacons knew something of the *Georgics*), Drepanius has a wide range, both classical and contemporary. There is evidence of works of Ausonius, including perhaps some not present in V, and enough similarity with Claudian—two pairs of words, to put it a little brutally—to date it before 396/7. The direction of imitation looks like a fifty–fifty issue to me, but the point is not crucial to the author's picture of the convert's 'evolution'.

Finally, having discussed whether Drepanius' God was one or two (there is no evidence of the Holy Spirit in *De cereo paschali*), she asks whether the Pacati known to us from this period are three or one (two is also a possibility), reinstating a reasonable suggestion of Harnack. If Drepanius was in his mid-thirties when he stood up and praised Theodosius for having combined valour and maturity when he became emperor at exactly that age, he could have been not only the Pacatus who wrote against Porphyrius (this fragmentary work is dated, tenuously, to 410–20), but even the Pacatus who received material with which to write a life of Paulinus of Nola soon after the saint's death in 431. Such a work, about a fellow-pupil of Ausonius, and a man who in places begins to look like the *alter ego* of Drepanius, could have been a most interesting document.

University of Glasgow ROGER GREEN
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni305

MAXIMIAN

W. C. Schneider: *Die elegischen Verse von Maximian. Eine letzte Widerrede gegen die neue christliche Zeit. Mit den Gedichten der Appendix Maximiana und der Imitatio Maximiani*. Interpretation, Text und Übersetzung. (Palingenesia 79.) Pp. 255. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2003. Cased, €48. ISBN: 3-515-07926-2.

Schneider offers here a new interpretation of the poetry of Maximianus along with more general discussions of both Maximianus and the so-called *Appendix Maximiana*, followed by a new text and translation of both.

Part I, with its fourteen subsections devoted to such issues as content, genre, language and metre, date, and poetic imitations, is the heart of the book. In the less original parts, S. acquits himself well, with (for example) some thoughtful discussions in I.8 of the alleged imitations of or by other poets of late antiquity, though parallels for some of these phrases in Virgil, Horace, and Lucan are not discussed (and Boethius, another *senex maestus*, is not among the poets considered). On the other hand, the discussion of Maximianus' relationship to Augustan poetry (I.9) fails to identify a single concrete example of the kind of intertextual allusion that is crucial to the claims of Section I.14 and to the general thesis; moreover, it lacks any explicit comparison with earlier Latin love-poetry, which ought to be crucial to understanding the erotic contents. Space does not permit a complete review of S.'s argument that Maximianus wrote a kind of 'Widerrede' or 'Gegengesang' contesting certain aspects of contemporary Christianity and raising 'the question of Rome's identity, the question of Roman existence in the new world dominated by Christianity' (pp. 119–20), but I came away unconvinced. Certainly a hymn to the penis seems unlikely in a devout environment, but too many of S.'s suggestions strain belief. See, for example, I.12, which discusses the women involved in the poet's sexual encounters: if

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni306 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lycoris is meant to recall the origins of love-elegy, why is it the affair with Aquilina that follows the elegiac pattern? Why would anyone connect Candida with the *candida scrofa* of Juv. 12.72 and thus with Alba Longa? How can the *Graia puella*, who laments that the penis was her 'wealth' (608), be a symbol of the 'heroic' age of Greece—evoking the Trojan War, no less—rather than a simple whore? For me, Maximianus' use of *peccare* (457, 512) represents a test-case for the plausibility of the claim that we are witnessing a contestation of Roman identity against Christian values. This is a key technical term both in 'classical' Latin elegy and in Christianity, but in Maximianus it is only a euphemism for *futuere*; and S. has not a word to say about it.

There is no question, however, that S. has made a significant contribution through his demonstration (I.3; see also his article in *RFIC* 129 [2001], 445–64) that the division into six elegies, universal in modern editions, has no authorial foundation and simply duplicates Pomponius Gauricus' edition of 1501; Maximianus wrote a single elegy of 686 lines, which the MSS divided in various ways, often influenced by key-words 'indexed' in the margins and mistaken for poem-breaks (I have accordingly used the 'new' numbering in this review). Since I am thoroughly familiar with such phenomena from Propertius, I need no convincing, but for other readers S. might have strengthened his case with some comparanda. On the other hand, I doubt that *Nugae* could have been the title (pp. 44–5); surely the MSS that use this word have taken it from the disparaging reference in Alexander de Villa Dei to *nugae Maximiani*. Other MSS give titles that amount to 'On Old Age', a simple deduction from the opening lines; we will never know what Maximianus himself called the poem. As to the interpretive possibilities of a unitary reading, from the viewpoint of classical love poetry we might see the poet's *persona* as the familiar figure of 'the scorner scorned' (see e.g. Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1.25). Or perhaps the real theme is regret in old age over a life of sexuality first rejected, then misused outside its proper purpose, which—as the *Graia puella* reveals, too late, of course, for Maximianus—is procreation within marriage; on this reading, it is a thoroughly moral poem compatible with both pagan and Christian philosophies. Of course still other possibilities remain.

The poems of the *Appendix Maximiana* (Section II) really have nothing to do with Maximianus apart from association in a fifteenth-century MS and the fact that some at least are more or less contemporary. S. might have done better to omit them, since the presence of sixth-century erotic poems evoking pagan goddesses and ignoring Christianity can raise doubts about how 'polemical' Maximianus really was. Section III surveys Maximianus' *Nachleben* from late antiquity to the modern world, with detail decreasing as the years advance and the poetry's audience wanes.

In Section IV, S. offers his own texts and translations of all the poems discussed. The best thing to be said about the text of Maximianus is that, though it also indicates the traditional arrangement, the continuous numbering of the lines facilitates the task of reading them as a single work. The lack of an *apparatus criticus* is especially unfortunate in a tradition as 'open' as this one, where the reader needs to see the variants more easily than by consulting notes at the back. Concerning the punctuation, I will say only that I do not understand it. Typographical errors, rare elsewhere, are more common here, and *Laethea* (123), *occurit* (146), *veteres* (325), *capellis* (347), *floribuis* (356), *curaeque* (378), *plana* (450), *laetebar* (479), *putebar* (483), *dulci* (530), and *culpando* (595) all appear to be unintended. Decisions about whether any given problem is a typographical error or a poor editorial choice are complicated by such earlier oddities as 'die *gemini regni*' (51), *caelus* (125), and *planus pectus* (three

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni306 Published online by Cambridge University Press

times on 135, but cf. *pectus planum* on 229). The text can be described as conservative, and its difficulties are sometimes fudged in the translation; in 8, for example, S. prints *quodque omni peius funere, velle mori*, which lacks a verb, but translates *estque*, the reading of Baehrens that he rejects in the accompanying note, while in 63, like many editors, he wants Maximianus to describe himself as striding *uenali corpore* but must avoid the implication of prostitution with '*Wie* zum Ausbieten meines Leibes' (emphasis added).

The book has a full bibliography and a list of passages cited, but an index of words, subjects, and persons would have greatly enhanced its utility.

Memorial University of Newfoundland J. L. BUTRICA
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni306

VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS CONCLUDED

M. Reydellet (ed.): *Venance Fortunat:* Poèmes. *Tome III. Livres IX–XI. Appendice*—In laudem sanctae Mariae. (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé.) Pp. 215. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2004. Paper, €48. ISBN: 2-251-01434-9.

Nearly 1500 years after he wrote them, Fortunatus' words remain substantially unread. And yet—as the publication of the volume under review proves—interest in the establishment of the text that transmits them has never been higher. The completion of the Budé trilogy of Fortunatus' poetry brings to a conclusion Marc Reydellet's impressive editorial accomplishment. His edition joins that of Stefano Di Brazzano, published in 2001, and Friedrich Leo's majestic *MGH* edition, published over a century and a third ago. Clearly derivative in many respects of R., DiBrazzano cannot be said to compete either with him or Leo for pride of editorial place. Readers of Fortunatus, however, will not be able to do without R.

The volume under review prints the poems of Books 9–11, the appendix, and the *In laudem sanctae Mariae*, the assigning of which to the *corpus* of Fortunatus remains controverted (and, as with all Budé texts, also includes facing-page translations into French). The high level of R.'s accomplishment, both editorially and in terms of his translations, is in evidence on every page. He has thought through metrical, thematic, and textual issues, and if readers will not always agree with his editorial decisions or the interpretive gambits that support them, they will always be made to understand his moves—none of which is heavy-handed.

There is much ground covered in this volume, containing the final books of Fortunatus' collection. That the collection is somehow looser in these later books is beyond question: the careful symmetries and topical gatherings of the earlier books, ordered by the poet himself, are now abandoned. The ninth book, in fact, offers the most *variatio* of the eleven books, containing pieces to lay and religious leaders and to kings, but including poems about figures both living and dead; the tenth is the most disorderly, containing a prose treatment on the Lord's prayer, poems to royalty, saints, and churches, and at least one poem that seems unfinished. By distinction, the pieces of Book 11 are the most personal, bordering at times on the erotic, and, along with those found in the appendix, seemingly the most intricately lyrical of the collection.

R. has digested the large body of prior editorial work on Fortunatus' text, dating

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni306 Published online by Cambridge University Press