The volume has been carefully proofread and I have not found grave errors or misprints (some minor points are listed below).

XLIII n. 8: C. mentions a tradition ‘visigotico-insulare’ for De finalibus and ‘continentale’ for the Commentarium de ratione metrorum. These notions recur in the commentary (159) but are not developed and remain unclear to the reader.

XLIV (the stemma): the family labelled ψ in the stemma is referred to as υ later in the introduction (XLVIII second line of the second paragraph).

LIX n. 50: on the loss of perception of vowel quantity as an African vice a reference to Adams 2007 (esp. 260–5) would have been desirable.

LXXVII: I am not sure whether a syntactic divergence such as that between a structure with a concessive + main clause (quamquam … tamen) and that with two coordinates (quidem … tamen) can be taken as evidence for arguing about relations between different treatises.

7 line 6 (text) and 66 (translation): the phrase quorum altera would be better translated in the context as una delle quali (one of which) rather than delle quali la seconda (the second of which), since in the context the ‘liquid’ (i.e. final -s) is the first consonant, not the second.

100 note on antenouissimus – non potest: apart from Sacerdos, one could also mention the distinction between synaliphe and ecthlimps found in Consentius (28–9 N.), the former apparently involving loss of the first vowel, the latter loss of the second vowel.

In conclusion, C.’s book is a very useful contribution to the study of late antique grammatical texts and an excellent example of editorial work, conducted with expertise and rigour: her volume will remain for long the standard reference work for these texts.

Oxford

Giuseppe Pezzini


With Boethius and Cassiodorus, Ennodius is one of the authors who provide first-hand information about the Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy. Annotated editions of this churchman’s Life of Epifanius and Panegyric of Theodoric are essential to the historical literature of Late Antiquity, while canonists and ideologues of Papal power have treasured his Libellus pro Synodo for over a millennium. In contrast, Ennodius’ correspondence has generally been less than appreciatively received save by practitioners of the ars dictaminis. Compared to his explicitly topical compositions, Ennodius' letters have been little read and less understood in recent centuries because of their consummate literarity and unwavering allusiveness. His devotion to the art of rhetoric and the delectation of his readers wove a shimmering web of words that enveloped even the most mundane concerns and situations while hiving off bulky matters of substance into now-lost
attachments. Editors have dealt with the letters only as part of Ennodius’ variegated corpus, which has been edited only five times since printing was invented but never translated in full into any modern language.

The slapdash editio princeps of 1569 was produced by the Protestant humanist Grynaeus, who followed the roughly chronological mix of genres found in a ninth-century manuscript now in Brussels (Bruxellensis 9845–48) while introducing new errors. It was replaced by the more careful productions of the Jesuits Schott (1610) and Sirmond (1611). Both of these scholars divided Ennodius’ works into genres and the letters into multiple books: Schott opted for twelve, Sirmond nine. Sirmond’s Latinity, historical knowledge, and editorial judgement were deemed so magisterial that his edition with its nine books of letters was reprinted for more than 250 years until Hartel’s (CSEL 6, 1882) and Vogel’s (MGH AA 7, 1885) texts appeared.

Gioanni thus renders a great service to scholars of Late Antique and Early Medieval philology, history, and religion with this edition and translation of the letters. Based on a 2004 Lyon thesis, it materially advances the study of the constitution and reception of text of the works, providing a comprehensive treatment of the manuscript evidence in the light of recent scholarship. It introduces several new witnesses unknown to the nineteenth-century editors which demonstrate that Ennodius was more popular in the Middle Ages than scholars have supposed (CXXXIX–CLXXXI).

As the inaugural volume of the Budé Ennodius, Volume 1 (2006) is equipped with a wide-ranging discussion of the author, his Latinity, and the reception of the letters, as well as an account of the manuscript transmission and previous editions. Gioanni presents aspiring readers with a four-part 175-page Introduction (VII–CLXXXI). Since a full analysis of Gioanni’s very detailed preface would be lengthy indeed, a commented overview of the topics covered must suffice.

Section I, ‘Ennode par lui-même’ (VIII–XXXIV), cautiously reconsiders what can be known about Ennodius’ family and personal life. Rather than take a definite stand on the question of which of Felix Ennodius’ sons, Firminus (known from Sidonius) or Camillus (Sirmond’s choice), fathered Ennodius, Gioanni quotes Bureau regarding the difficulty of identifying either man (XIII). Yet his family tree shows Camillus as Ennodius’ father (XVII). Although Gioanni readily concedes that Ennodius married, he sidesteps the ‘hypothesis’ that identifies Speciosa as his wife to dwell on the influence of Augustine’s Confessions (XXIII). His handling of Ennodius’ career is discreet as well. Gioanni rightly views his elevation to the see of Pavia as a disappointment, but considers Pavia important only because of the prestige of its bishops Epifanius and Maximus (XXIX), not its function as a Residenzstadt. Gioanni reads his subject’s personality from his background and profession: ‘an urban cleric’ who loved ‘society with all its intrigues’ and notably mistrusted the countryside while showing ‘a pronounced taste for the city’ (XXXI). He deems Ennodius’ preference for civilised Christianity merely an expression of the Late Antique pagan-rural/Christian-urban dichotomy. I believe it also bears witness to Ennodius’ highly un-Romantic Ro-
manitas, and that the epistolary convention of ill-health does not preclude Ennodius being a genuine valetudinarian.

Each of the next three parts has three subdivisions. Section II, 'Fonctions des Épitres' (XXXIV–XCV) states three reasons why Ennodius wrote his letters: to transmit ancient culture (XXXIV–LXVII), to maintain epistolary communication (LXVII–LXXXII), and to manifest his commitment as a clergyman to serving the bishops of Milan and Rome (LXXII–XCV). Citing Ennodius’ predecessors in the genre (Sidonius Apollinaris, Ruricius of Limoges, and Avitus of Vienne, inspired by Symmachus, Ausonius, and Pliny), Gioanni notes the utility of letters as models for teaching, then discusses the theory and practice of exchanging letters; Ennodius’ own compositional peculiarities (e.g. interchangeable te and vos: XLII–XLV); the letters’ structure and typology; the Christianisation of Classical culture by integrating patristic content, notably from Ambrose and Pomerius (whom Gioanni calls a master not of Greek and Latin, but of pagan and Christian literature); the repurposing of secular culture’s mythological and rhetorical equipment; and reading, teaching, and Latinity (LII–LXVII). The treatment of ‘sociabilité épistolaire’ considers correspondents, social continuity and mobility, the quasi-religious status of amicitia and concordia, and the question of how to define nobilitas in a Christian context. Gioanni characterises Ennodius’ work for his episcopal superiors as diplomatic intermediation, soldiering in the Church’s war against heresy and schism, and staunchly upholding Roman cultural and political values.

Aware of the difficulties later readers like Arnulf of Lisieux had with Ennodius’ writing, Gioanni analyses stylistic ideals, compositional practice, and aims in Section III, ‘La préciosité du latin d’Ennode’ (XCVI–CXXXIII). His paradoxical style exalts the virtues of simplicity while cultivating lexical abundance, labyrinthine structural variety (CV: typical clausulae), and a profusion of images. With sympathetic subtlety Gioanni shows that Ennodius reworks Ciceronian and particularly Vergilian models, dynamically blending them with Scriptural and patristic material to create something new. He views this ‘extreme préciosité’ of language positively: it expresses both social crisis and political power. In conclusion, he affirms that Ennodius is worth reading not merely as a witness of his time, ‘an epistolographer between two worlds’ (CXXXII), but also in his own right as a literary artist, a consummately diplomatic verbal Daedalus.

The most significant part of the introduction is Section IV, ‘La transmission de la Correspondance’ (CXXXIX–CLXXXI), which brings the history of the text of Ennodius up to date at last. Gioanni acknowledges Rohr’s work in discovering two manuscripts unknown to Vogel, then delves into the Foucaultian ‘archéologie’ of the collection (CXXXIV–CLIV) to reach several conclusions based on the irregularities and lacunae which hint at the text’s beginnings. First, Ennodius was unlikely to have assembled and disseminated the corpus himself, whereas Paul the Deacon had a leading role in the ninth-century reception and transmission of the text, exemplified by the two oldest manuscripts B and V (the latter copied from the same now-lost Carolingian manuscript as the False Decretals). As well, he asserts the order of the earliest manuscripts is less chronological than hitherto thought. Estimating that 94% of the texts contain no explicit chronological mar-
kers though a fair number of allusions aid chronology, he observes other group-
ing principles—for example recurrences of distinctive words and phrases (includ-
ing titles) in multiple letters, geographical clusters of addressees, and similar
themes—resulting in a corpus made up of many small sets of texts. He believes a
medieval edition comparable to that of Avitus of Vienne’s letters can tell us much
about Ennodian reception, though it would admittedly raise further questions.

Detailed remarks on the transmission and reception of the first two books of
letters follow (CLIV–CLXXVIII). Gioanni has expanded the Carolingian testi-
monia to include manuscripts of Ennodius’ works and excerpts in collections
made for other purposes such as the False Decretals (Pseudo-Isidore) created at
Corbie. Among them and justifying this edition are the ninth-or tenth-century
liturgical florilegium in Paris (BN Lat. 2833a, Gioanni’s own discovery; F in the
stemma) and a collection of Ennodius’ letters with extracts of Symmachus’ (Lon-
don, BL Royal MS 8 E IV, never before collated; A in the stemma). Ennodius’
appearance in such compilations reflects how widely he was prized as a model of
letter-writing.

After 1160, when Arnulf of Lisieux censured his style in a letter to the Papal
legate Henry of Pisa (who for his part would have appreciated Ennodius’ views
on Rome’s primacy), Ennodius’ stock began to decline. His popularity in the
later Middle Ages and the Renaissance (when late antique Latinity was abhorred)
can be measured less in the few complete manuscripts of his works and more by
his appearance in approximately thirty collections of excerpts, among them three
hitherto unknown French florilegia derived from the later twelfth-century Flori-
legium Angelicum. Gioanni’s comments on the work of previous editors are
prefaced by a stemma (CLXXIV) of the manuscripts used in this edition, pro-
ceeding from the sixth-century ‘archetypes of each work collected into sub-
groups’ that were copied into the archetype of the full corpus (ω) around 800.
Two copies of this archetype were made, one (β) leading only to the Brussels
manuscript (B), the other (α) the source of the earliest florilegium (F), Vat. Lat.
3823 (V), from which all later manuscripts derive, and the False Decretals (Pi).
Since the B text is more valuable, its readings and corrections are systematically
cited in the apparatus, whereas those of V and its descendants appear only when
they are ‘exceptionally interesting’; special attention is also paid to the new re-
readings of F. The very numerous medieval corrections preclude an exhaustive appa-

ratus.

The final section of the introduction proper (CLXXVIII–CLXXXI) summa-
rises the known manuscripts of Ennodius’ letters with reference to Fini’s 2000
monograph. Excluding the excerpted texts found in copies of the Collectio Avel-
lana and the False Decretals, Gioanni lists twenty containing all or a significant
part of the corpus and thirty-seven collections of excerpts, the latter divided
almost equally between the Florilegium Anglicum and various other compila-
tions. An appendix containing the text and translation of Ennodius’ epitaph, a
select bibliography, and the conspectus siglorum fill out the front matter
(CLXXXII–CXCVIII).

This wealth of information in the introduction points to a fundamental prob-
lem with Vol. 1. Gioanni’s extended comments are too extensive and detailed
(despite the statement on CLXXXI that the book represents the ‘version abrégée’ of his thesis) to introduce the text, which should be the principal attraction. On the other hand, they are not developed generously enough to constitute an independent monograph.

Not until nearly 200 pages into the volume do we have the summaries, text, apparatus, and translation of Sirmond’s Books I and II (facing pages 6–41 and 50–83), followed by the ‘Notes complémentaires’ (85–196). Gioanni presents a conservative text that respects the manuscript tradition; reacting to Vogel’s edition and its ‘too often emended’ textual difficulties, he limits interventions to specific problems and minimises conjectures (CLXXVII). Yet some editorial choices are puzzling. After saying that the eighth-century archetype (grandparent of B, F, and V) was compiled from a set of sixth-century sub-groups (of which I am not persuaded), Gioanni could have edited these letters as 1 to 54 rather than retaining the Sirmondian scheme. At 1.5 (14), why is Grynaeus’ Ennodius Fausto printed without comment when 1.17 (33) has the manuscripts’ Fausto Ennodius (no mention of Grynaeus)? The emendation destricta for the manuscripts’ stricta at 1.18.4 (35) is otiose: post-Augustan authors use the latter with the apposite meaning (Tac. Ann. 4.36; Val. Max. 2.9.6, 8.2.2; CJ 1.53.6). Lastly, the apparatus at 2.13.7 (66) notes that a ten-line poem (Carm. 2.2/ Vogel Op. 50) is appended to this item’s end in the newly discovered letter-collection A and prints all of it, but fails to address the fact that Opusc. 2 (Vogel Op. 49) separates the letter and the poem in the full manuscripts.

As far as I can determine, Gioanni has fashioned an accurate and often elegant translation that advances the work of Stanislas Léglise, an enthusiastic defender of Papal authority (CLXXVI, CLXXVIII) whose ambition to translate the entire corpus into French resulted in a single volume containing the letters (Oeuvres complètes de saint Ennodius 1, 1906, not 1910 as at VII n. 3). Anyone who has tried to translate Ennodius knows that unpacking his Latinity into another language almost always requires more words than the original; Gioanni need not apologise by bracketing bits of French in <...>, as at VII n. 1910, as at 2.6.1–2 (17) and 2.12.3 (64).

Mislaid Vogel paragraph numbers (CLXXVIII) occasionally mar both French and Latin texts, as on 11 (1.3.9 in the French should begin at ‘Gardez-vous’, not ‘Une chose’), 14–15 (1.5.3 should begin at Nam Avieni mei, not Stirpis suae gestatura), and 18 (1.6.3 should begin at ‘Vous croîtrez, provinces’). Minor lapses of capitalisation (13) and punctuation (19, 82) do not impair understanding.

The elucidation contained in Vol. 1’s notes is predominantly philological and often enlightening, for instance the medical insights into 1.12.4 (125). Sometimes, though, the content is needlessly repetitive, as in the comments on 2.27 (192–3): note 1 lacks brevity and simple citations of Plautus (a standard Classical author) would have sufficed for note 4. Engagement with potentially topical references is sparse; the commentary on 2.14 to the African bishops is a welcome exception (177–8), while the notes on 2.19 to Constantius (183–6) emphasise Gallic patristic references rather than Ennodius’ differences with Augustinian teaching.

Gioanni’s Volume 2 (2010) holds Books 3 and 4 of the Sirmondian division. What does its introduction add to the discourse on Ennodius? After acknowledging some new publications on Ennodius, Gioanni considers the historical
context of the Laurentian Schism (VII–XIV), the ‘contractualisation’ of exchanges in Theoderic’s Italy (XIV–XVII), and Ennodius’ epistolary concerns regarding ethics and society (XVII–XXII). He also supplies a timeline that coordinates notable political occurrences in East and West with ecclesiastical events and Ennodius’ own chronology (XXVI–XXIX), and a short supplementary bibliography (XXXI–XXXIV).

Text and translation occupy facing pages 8–32 and 41–67; the notes are on 69–147. I note two typographical oddities: the item titles in Vol. 2 are slightly smaller than in Vol. 1, and the title of 3.34, *Ennodius Senario* (32), is not in small caps. Though editorial choices remain safely conservative on the whole, they again raise some questions. At 3.3.1 (12), Gioanni writes *graves* rather than the manuscripts’ unanimous *grandes* because of *graves hiatus patitur* at 1.1.4, arguing that both show a strong Symmachan influence. Here the phrase is developed differently (*biatus paterer litterarum*), however, with *grandes* attesting to Ennodius’ love of variation. At 3.10.3, he replaces *quae* with *qua*; it may be better Latin but is no clearer than the manuscript lection. In contrast, his adoption of Vogel’s conjectures *indici* for the manuscripts’ *indicis* at 3.20.1 (23) and *uidimus quem didicit* at 4.2.2 (42) make good sense.

Freed from having to justify its subject, this instalment is a more concentrated product than its predecessor, with greater emphasis on historical elements. The philological expertise of the notes continues, complemented by more references to recent scholarship at the same time as they avoid bold conclusions. The commentary usefully combines wide research and a tight focus on the firmly provable. For example, basic information for the letters to Senarius (3.11–3.34; 4.27, 4.33), a relative and functionary at Ravenna who received one item (1.23) in Volume 1, is recapitulated and enriched with new material including an interpretation from Schröder’s 2007 ‘Bildung und Briefe’ (79, note 2 on 3.11.1) and thoughts on the meaning of *latentis interna consilii* (144–5, note 7 on 4.3.3.2). The notes to 4.1 to Pope Symmachus (104–106) are similarly informative, though the correct title of Sotinel’s book (XXXIV and 106) is ‘Identité civique et christianisme: Aquilée du IIe au VIe siècle’, published 2005 (not 2006).

The new strengths and continuing weaknesses of this edition are patent in Gioanni’s remarks about 3.15 to Euprepia (84–88). They blend observations on Ennodius’ relationship with his sister, the grammatical constructions and semantic implications of his words to her, the political and military situation (but not the date), and the issues related to her son Lupicinus, for whom *Dictio* 8 (Vogel *Op. 69*) was also composed. They are needlessly verbose for the Budé format – note 5 quotes the letter’s first two paragraphs in full to illustrate its sententiae on motherhood when the same text is already on 19–20, note 10 reproduces eight lines of Vergil’s *Georgics* (3.241–48) when a bare citation would suffice – and at the same time rigidly genre-bound.

If Gioanni’s only purpose in this commented text and translation is to explain Ennodius’ letters as literary creations in the epistolary genre, his analysis of the correspondence’s philological and rhetorical elements has accomplished it nicely. Yet aspects of both volumes suggest that he cherishes the more comprehensive goal of illuminating the writer and his works. Realising this aim may require a
different framework: to capture the fullness of Ennodius’ language and experience entails going outside the box of genre.

Vancouver

Stefanie A. H. Kennell


2 Siehe die Überschriften von Tl. 1 und 6 in Kap. 1, Tl. 1 in Kap. 3, Kap. 2 und 5 sowie Tl. 3 und 5 im Anhang von Stangl. Dasselbe gilt passim für den Text, so z. B. – trotz zahlreicher korrekter relativierender Formulierungen – auf fast jeder Seite der Einleitung.