

D' AURIA (I.) (ed., trans.) *Claudio Mario Vittorino: Alethia. Praecatio e primo libro. Introduzione, testo latino, traduzione e commento.* (Saggi 13.) Pp. 382. Naples: Clio Press, 2014. Paper, €30. ISBN: 978-88-88904-18-4.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X18000975

Sixty years have passed since the last commentary on the *Praecatio* and the first book of Claudius Marius Victorius' *Alethia* was written: in 1955 P.F. Hovingh published the text of the opening prayer and of Book 1.1–170 with an introduction, a translation into French and a commentary. With her publication of the *Praecatio* and the first book of *Alethia* (which is a paraphrase of Gen 1:1–3:24), D'A. provides a fresh commentary of the whole first book, along with an introduction, a translation into Italian and a Latin text (without a critical apparatus) that diverges from Hovingh's edition for the *Corpus Christianorum* (1960) only in two passages, discussed in the commentary (*Aleth.* 1.22; 1.357). Her translation, it should be noted, is not the first one in Italian, as S. Papini translated the *Alethia* for Città Nuova in 2006. D'A. refers to this translation, and sometimes she rightly specifies why her lexical choices are more appropriate for the meaning of Victorius' text. An index of passages cited and one of modern authors are provided at the back, together with a general bibliography.

In the introductory section, D'A. lucidly lays out essential points about Victorius and his oeuvre and acquaints the reader with the most significant scholarly debates on the *Alethia*, such as its incompleteness, its genre and the Latin version of the Bible used by Victorius.

One of the greatest strengths of D'A.'s commentary is the valuable insight she gives into theological issues, such as the unity of Trinity (pp. 110–16), semipelagianism and various questions concerning God's creation. D'A.'s notes are particularly successful when she explores both the semantic aspects of the text and philological questions. Great attention is devoted to intertextual references, but D'A. lacks a proper theoretical background (her bibliography on intertextuality is limited) and seldom goes beyond the limits of a sheer mentioning of parallels. Sometimes she does not recognise the influence of an author, whilst she quotes lexical echoes that are scarcely relevant: for instance, for the end of line 100, *lumine fulsit*, she only mentions Sil. 1.496, whereas Lucr. 5.708 is closer to Victorius' discussion on the moon. Similarly, the hypotext of Proba, *Praef.* 10 may be more meaningful for line 501 than Seneca, *Tro.* 747.

A further reservation: D'A. does not seem to be particularly interested in drawing from the text an overview of late-antique aesthetics, although the *Alethia* provides rich material for it. Assonance, homoeoteleuton and different patterns of repetitions that constitute the late Latin 'jeweled style' can be frequently found in Victorius' lines.

However, none of these weaknesses takes away from the fact that D'A.'s work is a well-elaborated and detailed study of the beginning of the *Alethia*, and both students and scholars will benefit from it.

*Università degli Studi di Milano*

ELENA CASTELNUOVO  
[elena.castelnuovo@unimi.it](mailto:elena.castelnuovo@unimi.it)