The point about *kalâm* influence is particularly important because it underscores the fact that 'philosophers (*falâsifa*)' in Islam were not pursuing an isolated intellectual program, but rather engaged directly with the contemporary theological disputes of the 'theologians (*mutakallimûn*)'. One outcome of W.'s book should be that historians of Arabic philosophy will realize the need to learn more about *kalâm* as well as more about late-antique philosophy. Indeed, W.'s approach epitomizes what I see as the three most fruitful avenues for the study of the first few centuries of Arabic philosophy: taking late-antique thought (especially the commentators) into account, being attentive to details of the Arabic translations of philosophical works rather than imagining Avicenna and others as engaging directly with Greek sources, and recognizing the interplay of philosophical and *kalâm* arguments. W.'s outstanding book should serve as a model for future research on Avicenna, and on the formative period of Arabic philosophy in general.

King's College London PETER ADAMSON

EUSEBIUS' LIBRARY

A. J. CARRIKER: *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 67.) Pp. xvi + 358. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003. Cased, €97/US$121. ISBN: 90-04-13132-9.

Andrew Carriker's scholarly tome stands in welcome contrast to an ostensibly similar book whose title it echoes.[1] Robert Ogilvie's study of *The Library of Lactantius* (Oxford, 1978) was a slender volume of careless and too often borrowed learning. Ogilvie constructed his picture of what Lactantius had read almost exclusively from the *index auctorum* of Samuel Brandt's edition of Lactantius in the Vienna corpus (*CSEL* 27 [1893], 241–69), and he failed to take proper account of Antonie Wlosok's fundamental study *Laktanz und die philosophische Gnosis* (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1962, no. 2), which he cited only at second hand (p. 79 n. 2, cf. E. Heck, *Gnomon* 52 [1980], 572–4). Ogilvie belonged to a generation where the degree of Doctor of Philosophy was not obligatory for university teachers, and he consciously cultivated the image of a gentleman-scholar, whereas C. informs his readers in his very first sentence that his book 'is a revision of the dissertation by the same name that [he] completed at Columbia University'. It is indeed a professional piece of work whose author is fully cognizant of the relevant modern scholarship.

C. first sets out what is known of the library at Caesarea from the early third century, when Origen settled in the city to the decline of Caesarea between the Muslim conquest and the arrival of the Crusaders in 1101 (pp. 1–36). He concludes quite reasonably that 'it seems unlikely that the library at Caesarea survived the vicissitudes of the seventh century' (p. 29). He next offers a brief chronology of Eusebius' life and

[1] J. Bryce, *The Library of Lactantius* (New York and London, 1990), which reproduces unchanged the text and notes of a Harvard Ph.D. dissertation of 1973 with an updated bibliography, has a very different focus: not what Lactantius had read, but how his thought was influenced by Cicero, Lucretius and Virgil. Bryce's treatment of Lactantius' debt to these three authors is superior to Ogilvie's.

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.356 Published online by Cambridge University Press

writings, and surveys his use of sources in a second chapter which contains a particularly useful discussion of how Eusebius uses the phrase λόγος (κατ)ἔχει and some other closely similar expressions (pp. 37–74, esp. pp. 63–8). A series of six chapters (3–8) then sets out the evidence for Eusebius' knowledge of various categories of texts which may on the basis of his knowledge be presumed to have been in the library of Caesarea: philosophical works, works of poetry and oratory, historical works, Jewish literature, Christian literature and documents, and contemporary documents (pp. 75–298). The book ends with a useful summary list of the contents of Eusebius' library (pp. 299–315) which makes clear what types of literature were familiar to him and of what types he shows no clear knowledge. The list registers as certainly known to Eusebius more than 150 Christian works, more than fifty different works of philosophy, nearly forty items of Jewish literature (including thirty works of Philo), and a dozen historical works of Greek authors who either wrote about the Jews or were used by Eusebius as sources in his *Chronicle*. On the other hand, the standard classics of Greek literature are almost entirely absent: the list contains no Greek orators, though C. argues that Eusebius may have been familiar with some rhetorical handbooks (p. 138); the Attic tragedians are entirely absent; the only Greek poets to appear are Homer and Hesiod; and while the historians Herodotus, Thucydides, and Cassius Dio do appear, each of them has a question mark beside his name. They appear because C. argues that, despite the lack of explicit references or identifiable quotations, the possibility that Eusebius could have read them 'deserves/is worth consideration' (pp. 151–4)—a weak claim which hardly justifies their inclusion in a list of texts that Eusebius had actually read.

C. has performed an immensely useful service in providing the large-scale systematic investigation of the library at Caesarea which Karl Mras called for in the preface to his edition of the *Praeparatio Evangelica* fifty years ago. He has assembled the relevant evidence carefully, conscientiously, and accurately, so that his book will provide a secure and detailed basis for further investigations. However, his critical skills in evaluating evidence do not match his assiduity in collecting it. Let me illustrate the poor judgement which constantly disfigures the book with a series of examples, the first of which has no direct bearing on C.'s main subject.

All readers of Gibbon recall with pleasure his character sketch of the younger Gordian, who was briefly emperor in Africa in the year 238 and whose 'twenty-two acknowledged concubines, and a library of 62,000 volumes, attested the variety of his inclinations' (*Decline and Fall* Chapter 7 [1.191 Bury = 1.195 Womersley]). C. discusses the alleged library (though not the concubines): 'SHA, *Gord.* 18.2–3, reports that Gordian II inherited 62,000 *libri* from his tutor, the son of Serenus Sammonicus, but the unreliability of the *Historia Augusta* casts doubt upon this number' (p. 34). Only upon the number of volumes? C. does not appear to realize that the author of the *Historia Augusta* has invented the story wholesale—the otherwise unattested son of Serenus Sammonicus no less than his library (and the concubines).

The *Contra Hieroclem* differs from the rest of the Eusebian corpus in a variety of ways: for example, it is the only work attributed to Eusebius of Caesarea that shows the slightest influence of the Second Sophistic Movement, and it refers to Hierocles' official position in a way that is difficult, perhaps impossible, to reconcile with its traditional ascription (for a brief statement of these two fundamental points, whose force C. seems not fully to appreciate, see *JRA* 9 [1996], 550; *Phoenix* 55 [2001], 151–2). Accordingly, Thomas Hägg, *SO* 67 (1992), 138–50, argued that the author of the *Contra Hieroclem* was a sophist named Eusebius who resided in north-western Asia Minor and perhaps heard Hierocles recite his anti-Christian polemic in Nicomedia in

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.356 Published online by Cambridge University Press

303. C. rejects Hägg's conclusion on the grounds that 'since Hägg himself admits that "the above considerations are of course not enough to *prove* the inauthenticity" of the *Contra Hieroclem*, it seems prudent to retain the work in Eusebius' corpus' (p. 38 n. 7). That is a silly argument. Hägg went on to observe that his hypothesis solves 'the contradictions concerning the date as well as the paradox of "Eusebius the sophist" ', and he urged Eusebian scholars, especially 'experts on his style', to examine the question of authorship in more detail. C. has conspicuously not done so, even though the *Contra Hieroclem* provides the only evidence that Eusebius of Caesarea was familiar with the *Corpus Hermeticum* (p. 88), or that the library of Caesarea 'included a copy of Moeragenes' biography of Apollonius of Tyana as well as copies of Apollonius' *Vita Apollonii Tyanensis* and Hierocles' *Φιλαληθὴς λόγος*' (p. 98).

C. opines that 'Eusebius certainly read Homer and Hesiod in his youth, but whether he returned to these poets after his early schooling is doubtful' (p. 131). On one level, this verdict shows commendable caution. On another level, however, C.'s argument is unsatisfactory. From works other than the *Contra Hieroclem*, he registers ten Homeric phrases used by Eusebius as well as two lines quoted entire, and he treats them all as quoted from memory (pp. 132–3). That all these are quoted from memory need not be doubted, but does it follow that Eusebius had read Homer as a boy? Many modern English-speakers reproduce phrases or even whole lines of Shakespeare without having read or seen performances of the plays from which they are taken. C. simply assumes that Eusebius must have read Homer. But a Christian education of someone who was born *c*. 260 and brought up in a Christian household need not have included Homer at all.

More important both for Eusebius himself and the intellectual history of the fourth century is Plotinus. In a notable paper which analysed the diffusion of the writings of Plotinus in the century following his death in 270, John Rist observed that Eusebius refers to Plotinus 'on the immortality of the soul' as a work in two books (*PE* 15.22.1, 10.9), from which he deduced that 'Eusebius knows of an edition of Plotinus divided differently from that of Porphyry' and hence that there is no certain evidence that Eusebius knew any more Plotinus than the two treatises from which he quotes, namely, *Enneads* 4.7 and 5.1 in Porphyry's edition ('Basil's 'Neoplatonism', *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic*, ed. P. J. Fedwick [Toronto, 1981], pp. 137–220, at p. 163). C. rejects Rist's conclusions with appeal to P. Krause, *RHR* 113–14 (1936), 207–18, and asserts that 'the weight of the evidence suggests that Eusebius drew all of his quotations of Plotinus from Porphyry's edition, the *Enneads*' (p. 110), but he does not attempt to answer Rist's argument.

In short, C. has produced a useful collection of material rather than a definitive treatment of his stated subject.

University of Toronto T. D. BARNES

NONNUS' GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

C. De Stefani (ed.): *Nonno di Panopoli:* Parafrasi del Vangelo di S. Giovanni. *Canto I.* Pp. 263. Bologna: Pàtron Editore, 2002. Paper, €16. ISBN: 88-555-2634-0.

Four other volumes of the rapidly growing Italian edition of this twenty-one book text are now in print: Book 18, ed. Livrea (1989); Book 20, Accorinti (1996); Book 2, Livrea (2000); Book 5, Agosti (2003)—and more are promised (Livrea [2000],

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.356 Published online by Cambridge University Press