clear introductory guide to this varied historical literature far outweigh such reservations. Indeed, a second volume to cover A.D. 470–630 would be welcome!

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

ENNODIUS

S. A. H. KENNELL: *Magnus Felix Ennodius: A Gentleman of the Church*. Pp. 256. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2001. Cased, £31. ISBN: 0-472-10917-0.

That Ennodius has been sadly neglected by all, but perhaps most by English-speakers, is less a matter of difficult Latin or Sirmond's division of the work according to genre than of a genuinely diverse corpus that lends itself to firewalls, e.g. between items of obvious historical importance (*Panegyricus*, *Vita Epiphani*, *Libellus pro synodo*), the frivolous (much of the verse), the secular, the theological, and the personal. Ennodius' surviving works date from his diaconate (A.D. 502–13), so would-be biographers have likewise been discouraged by paucity of evidence for his episcopate (A.D. 513–21). K. steers around other bibliography on Ennodius (largely the historical studies, e.g. p. 124) and instead offers five diverse chapters on her 'gentleman of the church'. She approaches Ennodius 'through what he writes about rather than through the people to whom he writes' (p. 32).

'Looking for Ennodius' provides a historical outline and an excursus about editions (pp. 13–16). Epiphanius' Christian career before his diaconate is used to reconstruct Ennodius' putative progress through the lower orders, although K. admits that 'for Ennodius' particular situation we have no specific information' (p. 11), and that the mission is impossible (p. 13). (For comparison, H. G. J. Beck, *The Pastoral Care of Souls in South Eastern France During the Sixth Century* [Rome, 1950], pp. 44–91 gives a Gallic cursus: *ostiarius*, *lector*, exorcist, acolyte, subdeacon, deacon, and priest.) One notes, however, that Ennodius' transition to the diaconate is actually treated as somewhat of a shotgun conversion [#438.25; Vogel, p. vii]). He can be placed in Northern Italy in *c*. 489/90, but the period before is obscure. K. assumes (p. 16) that the collection has 'a completely ecclesiastical context', because the datable material in it was written after E. became a deacon and has an apparently ecclesiastical transmission. She accordingly concludes that the church tolerated Ennodius' more pungent secular writings. But Ennodius' opus was preserved in a chronologically ordered *Nachlaß*, so more private writings may have ended up there too without the author's consent (*pace* K., p. 22). The 'Eucharisticon' (#438) is read as an autobiographical letter (pp. 23–9). K. weighs its *quae mecum matrimonii habuit parilitatem* (codd.) (#438.27) and B's *quae mecum matrimonii habuit parilitate subiugari*, and decides (wrongly) in favour of the former. She uses this reading to suggest, partly following Ferrai (*Archivio Storico Lombardo* 20 [1893], 248–57), that Ennodius actually married. B's, however, is the *lectio difficilior*, and the other reading derives from it. More importantly, she fails to invoke the end of the phrase, 'et fieret praeclari dux femina tituli': 'My helper gained more than I asked with the result that she who planned to go beneath the yoke with me in the pairing of marriage, shared the beauty of the religious life with me, and a woman became a leader (allusion to Vergil, *Aen*. 1.364 'dux femina facti') of a renowned title'. The rest of the passage implies that the woman conquered the will of the flesh and kept her *pudicitia*. But the putative situation still requires comment: was Ennodius' fiancée's mother a widow? (No father

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.391 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is mentioned.) How did he work his way into the family? Ferrai (p. 956) cites Ennodius' #103, assuming an authorial voice, and claims (p. 957) that E. had children per his epitaph, v. 3. 'clarus prole quidem'. K. (even on p. 220) does not really face up to the problems raised by these texts.

'The Divinity of Letters' affirms the ubiquity of E.'s interest in adorned discourse. We are taken through letters of recommendation for Parthenius that document the value of higher education, *dictiones* for him and Aratus, metaphorical language, epitaphs, violations of the *lex epistularis*, subjects and limited topicality of declamations, and the poor bureaucratic style of Ravennan conveyances (an irrelevant comparison). 'Living in a Material World' illuminates those things of Ennodius' world that he described: nature, seasons, ecclesiastical and secular buildings, slaves, *missoria*, animals, greedy men, named epigrammatic butts, bishops of Milan, and ill-health.

'Family's Boons, Kinship's Bonds' lumps together some prosopography of E.'s family, and an autobiographical and topical interpretation of some of the *dictiones*. A 'Just So' story is intended to explain how the Ennodii came to Gaul (pp. 130–1): Ennodius' name is Greek, derived from Enodia, an equitating goddess worshipped in Thessaly (Usener and Robert) and Colophon (Pausianias). Ennodius liked horses (118). Ennodius' ancestor therefore must have been interested in rhetoric and came from Asia Minor in the second century to a Gaul 'replete with rhetors'.

The discussions of 'Cynegia' (pp. 67, 125, 134–5, 142) are confusing. A Cynegia commemorated in #219 to Euprepia in 506 is identified with a Roman Cynegia of #361 and #362.2 who appeared to Ennodius in a dream in 509 and reproached him for not inscribing her sepulchre in verse. Because there is no 'externally corroborated Gallic Cynegia who died in 506', K. claims the epitaph of #219 was written before Cynegia died. Most unlikely, given direct allusions to her *anima* and *spiritus*, to *busta*, *ultima fila sororum*, and *exitium*, not to mention the tense of *vicerunt*. There were most probably two (the one of #219 does not have to be in Gaul, nor does the one of #177.2), one who died in 506 and one who died in 509 and was buried in Rome (identified as Faustus Niger's wife). The logic at 142 of 'since other metrical options exist . . .' escapes the reader. At pp. 147–8 K. follows Vogel (p. vii) in deducing that Speciosa was Ennodius' ex-wife from a misinterpretation of #48.6. The passage does not refer to 'a relationship . . . that E. no longer considered valid' (namely, his alleged marriage). He merely alludes to a *familiaritas*, and because it relates to Speciosa *and* her sisters (*germanae*), it is unlikely to be a marriage.

An attempt to link the *controversiae* to contemporary and personal issues founders on a lack of corroborative linguistic evidence: for example, that #363, on the ransoming of a profligate son, has a connection to Lk. 15.31. *Interpretatio Christiana* requires threshold words, and K. argues, in effect, that absence signifies presence (p. 161; with the thin end of wedge on p. 76). Contrast his clear allusion in #438.15. Why not explore the Christian reverberations of #220.1, on Thetis, the tragedy of a divinity whose offspring must die? At least the word 'natura' is used there. That #221 has more to do with the family than with the state and that the family in the declamation is the elective family of the church remains unproven (p. 162). Nothing demands an ecclesiastical interpretation. If one is looking for legates and contemporary resonances, 506 was a time of considerable tension and shuttle diplomacy between Italy and Francia.

At some point, a discussion of E.'s geographical origins—Gaul (see R. Mathisen, *Francia* 7 [1979], 621 with n. 96) or Italy?—would have been welcome, for there is interesting ambiguation on this point in his works. Although E. clearly had many close Gallic relatives and #5 says his stock is Gallic, he carefully avoids saying that he

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.391 Published online by Cambridge University Press

himself was born there, and one could conclude that he was not born in Gaul and certainly not at Arles (#313 merely calls Arles a *dulcis sedes*). In some works he identifies himself with things Italian (#455.4 and #423.45 *vetus adcola* of the Po). This is unlikely to be simply a matter of current location. He could have been born somewhere in Italy, though not in a place that could qualify as 'Liguria' (#311.1).

'Speaking Out for the Faith' outlines writings written in a clerical capacity, e.g. the *praeceptio de cellulanis*, #56 on free will, #461 to Caesarius of Arles, *dictiones* for Epiphanius and Maximus, the *Libellus pro synodo* (whose tone she finds incompatible with the style of modern bureaucrats, p. 192). The postscript traces Ennodius' episcopal life and *fortuna* down to the time of Sirmond.

Some literary and linguistic points:

#109.2's 'vitia nostra regionum mutatione non fugimus' imitates Horace, *Ep*. 1.2.27 (p. 134 n. 33); Brutus' pejorative animal connotations do not first start in late antiquity (p. 84); an *asellio* is a donkey-driver, not a donkey (p. 116); K. surprisingly identifies the subject of #180 ('crure quod ambo') as a 'bisexual adulterer' rather than a hermaphrodite. What about 'clune quod ambo', by the way? (p. 121).

In #467 (p. 161) the speaker starting at *nescimus* is clearly someone who was attacked by the defendant, is female ('pro sexus verecundia'), and has a child ('parvulum nostrum'). The piece is probably fragmentary, not just 'much briefer'. More probably the handsome son was wrongly disinherited, killed his father, and tried unsuccessfully to kill his mother, who avoided his dagger but was blinded ('oculos non habemus'). He then attacked her reputation, perhaps by suggesting that she and a lover (rather than he himself) murdered the father. Her small child was somehow dragged into the deception. She is the first-person speaker.

#464.2 'Praelati ceteris pondus obsequii' means 'the weight of a service that is more lofty than others' (p. 202). *Proferre* and *praeferre* have been confused.

Unsupported suggestions, many prosopographical and many highly questionable, are rife. For example: that Aurelianus of #270 is the same as the Gallic priest of #390 and #412, and the Gallic Bishop of #455 (p. 36). That Aetheria was married to Arcotamia's priest-monk son at Lérins (p. 37) (Is K. deriving this somehow from 'relictis dei cultoribus' at #412.2?). That the Vestalis in #223 represents a *Christian* virgin (pp. 76–7). This claim would need fleshing out, e.g. with Augustine's discussion about dishonored nuns from *Civ. Dei* 1 and secondary literature such as R. Lizzi, 'Vergini di Dio – vergini di Vesta: Il sesso negato e la sacralità', in S. Pricocco (ed.), *L'Eros difficile* (Rubbettino, 1998), pp. 89–132. That in #380 'the Roman schism inspired Ennodius' (p. 77). That #112 concerns Faustus (comparing #70) (p. 97). That #164 describes Ennodius' own house (pp. 105–7). That Gerontius (#112) was to be freed to join the Roman clergy with his money (p. 113). How is K. reading 'ut gestis ecclesiasticis ex omni obnoxietate solvatur'? That the rider in #126 is Theoderic (p. 115). That #336 is self-referential (p. 211). Why could it not be a draft? Or a text without a title? That Ennodius' orthography was 'receptive to current usage' (pp. 80 and 83). That #464 is not the basis of Symmachus, *Ep*. 13 (Thiel), but some intermediate work.

Despite some flippancies at her subject's expense, K. is sympathetic to him and rightly emphasizes that middle-brow sources matter (p. 2). But insufficient comparative material and context are adduced to explain Ennodius's unusual profile: e.g. hunting (p. 119), sexual epigrams (p. 121), taste for anatomical material in religious verse (#14.7 and #305). His interest in sexual misconduct (Aetheria the runaway wife, p. 36; Rusticus the fornicator, #461.7) and canonical problems (Laconius and the close-kin marriage of Ennodius' niece that Ennodius will pursue with Pope Symmachus, p. 197)

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.391 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in Gaul requires more elucidation. Despite translations in the text, all too frequently other relevant portions of a sentence escape translation and its meaning is left obscure. For example, #134.2 not clarified: 'distensa per tormenta ranulam longis hominibus coaequabo', p. 127; force of #39.6 misrepresented, p. 64, 'peaceable cohabitation of Homer and the Bible inside Ennodius' head': the letter says that secular rhetorical patterns should be rejected, things intent on matters that perish, like to the web of Penelope. An annotated translation should ideally have preceded this monograph. All too frequently, interpretative problems that require 'going under the hood' are skated over. Much of the matter is literary, and large tracts summarize content. This may be useful to the uninitiated, since there is nothing in English on Ennodius and little enough in other languages, but in the end what Ennodius can contribute to history matters the most. And there is simply too little serious attention to it here. Till a new translation appears K.'s book will be a useful, though flawed, *vade mecum* to the corpus.

Cornell University DANUTA SHANZER

A BYZANTINE CHRONICLE IN LATIN

B. CROKE: *Count Marcellinus and his Chronicle*. Pp. xvi + 300, maps. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-815001-6.

The Illyrian Marcellinus moved to Constantinople early in the sixth century as a veteran or refugee (pp. 68–9, 76–7). There he wrote his Latin chronicle for A.D. 379–534—having extended it from its original 518 terminus so as to end with Justinian's Vandal victory; later it was further extended by an unknown author to the 550s, but our text breaks off in 548. The only eastern continuator of Jerome and Eusebius, M. is distinctive in combining Latin language with eastern focus (see his preface) and reflects the interests of the Illyrian community in Constantinople (p. 72). He often preserves unique information (examples, p. 178), but there are also omissions, some surprising (e.g. civil disturbances under Anastasius, pp. 126–7), others arising from M.'s personal viewpoint (e.g. defeat of the 'pro-orthodox' Vitalian, pp. 132–3, cf. 135–6). In the extension to 534 some years are left blank.

C.'s book has two sections, 'The World of Marcellinus' and 'The Chronicle and its Transmission'. The first, in four chapters, relates the chronicle to contemporary history and the Constantinopolitan background, and identifies a personal voice in M.'s laconic notices and selection of material, e.g. pp. 51–2 interest in the 518 Scupi earthquake, cf. p. 92; pp. 65–9 links with the Illyrian army. This argument becomes persuasive following discussion (Chapter 3) of the military-based Illyrian community in contemporary Constantinople and its active pro-orthodox stance. C. links M. with this Latin-speaking group rather than the more obviously literary Italian or African communities represented respectively by Anicia Juliana and Priscian (pp. 88–93). Practically nothing is known for certain about M., the only testimony outside his own being Cassiodorus', who mentions (*Institutes* 1.17.1–2, 1.25.1) two lost works each in four books (1) on the qualities of times (on chronology?) and location of places, and (2) on Constantinople and Jerusalem, as well as M.'s position as *cancellarius* to Justinian (?A.D. 520–7): C. proposes that the chronicle was completed to 518 before M.

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.391 Published online by Cambridge University Press