

(e.g. vol. I p. 149). But he is proved wrong by his own discussion of the widely debated epigram 9.67, where Martial himself desires *fellatio* (cf. 2.31, 4.17, 4.50). H.'s questionable definition of 'oral sex' has obviously misled him into believing that a *fellatrix* and a *cunnilingus* provide 'the same service' (vol. II pp. 74f.; cf. A. E. Housman, *JPh* 30 [1907], pp. 247f. = *Classical Papers* [Cambridge, 1972], ii.725). An interpretation of 9.67 focusing on the rôles of the sexes has now been advanced by Obermayer (op. cit., pp. 223f.).

Although one may not always agree with H.'s interpretations, one outstanding merit is that he has more to offer than a simple accumulation of material. H.'s commentary represents not only a valuable source of information, it is also in its own right an invaluable contribution to the interpretation of the epigrams.

University of Munich

SVEN LORENZ

AVITUS

A. ARWEILER: *Die Imitation antiker und spätantiker Literatur in der Dichtung 'De spiritalis historiae gestis' des Alcimus Avitus. Mit einem Kommentar zu Avit. carm. 4,429–540 und 5,526–703*. Pp. xi + 384. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1999. Cased, DM 248. ISBN: 3-11-016248-2.

Arweiler studies Avitus of Vienne's (c. 490–518) use of ancient and late antique literature in his *De spiritalis historiae gestis*. Since he is concerned more with imitation than with Avitus, the historical background (pp. 1–6) is out of date and derivative. A. missed I. N. Wood, *Avitus of Vienne: Religion and Culture in the Auvergne and the Rhône Valley, 470–530* (D. Phil., Oxford, 1979) and a new commentary on *SHG* 1 by L. Morisi, *Alcimi Aviti De mundi initio* (Bologna, 1996); also perforce N. Hecquet-Noti, *Avit de Vienne, Histoire spirituelle. Tome 1: Chants I–III, Sources chrétiennes 444* (Paris, 1999). While M. Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity* (Liverpool, 1985) emphasized paraphrastic technique in biblical epic, A.'s work rightly reminds us that Christian poets such as Avitus did not employ just the Bible and a rhetorical manual. Although he avoids classical learning in his correspondence (unlike his relative Sidonius), Avitus, long known as an amplifier of biblical material with free excursus (e.g. the Nile, *SHG* 1.262–89, the Phoenix, *SHG* 1.239–44, an anatomy of the human body, *SHG* 1.75–113), was clearly learned in Latin poetry, both Christian and pagan. A. deserves credit for being the first to demonstrate in detail just how he composed from his poetic sources. But classical allusions are not all. Avitus used biblical exegesis. D. J. Niles (*Doctrine and Exegesis in Biblical Latin Poetry* [Liverpool, 1993], pp. 118–27) noted both general (pp. 118–27) and more specific (pp. 57–73) exegetical points. A. begins with material on the spiritual, moral, and historical senses of scripture, but the treatment is patchy. For instance, when discussing *SHG* 1.160 ff., Adam's sleep and Christ's death, he cites Jer. *In Is.* 13.48, but misses Aug. *CD* 22.17, and more importantly Avitus' own *Hom.* 2. Here considerably more work needed to be done. Hariulf (*Chronicon Centulense* 3. 3, *PL* 174.1257A) mentioned *Quaestiones* on the Pentateuch by Avitus. If these are not chimerical, they raise important questions about the relationship of his poetry and his own exegesis. A. (p. 24) points to glossematic material; the lost *Quaestiones* might explain it. A. has noticed Eucherius' influence (pp. 28, 29, 31), but (aside from

pp. 25 and 31) has missed the importance of Augustine's *De Genesi ad litteram*. (See now I. N. Wood, 'Avitus of Vienne: the Augustinian Poet', in R. W. Mathisen, D. R. Shanzer [edd.], *Culture and Society in Late Antique Gaul: Revisiting the Sources* [Aldershot, 2001].) His second chapter provides sample commentary on *SHG* 4.429–92 and 514–40 (onset and retreat of the Flood), and 5.526–703 (crossing of the Red Sea) (a text would have been helpful). This bristles with somewhat mechanical statistics on *iuncturae* as *spolia*, as well as on Avitus' lexical preferences. In Chapter III.1 A. reviews Avitus' use of pagan and Christian descriptions of floods and storms (pp. 221–49). Some were plundered (the Heptateuch poet, the *Carmen de Providentia Dei*, and Claudius Marius Victor), others not (Proba and Dracontius, pp. 229–301). Avitus also used Valerius Flaccus (p. 238), Seneca's *Quaestiones Naturales*, and many other texts. A. notably sharpens the picture provided by Peiper's (often over-optimistic in regard to Sidonius) *index fontium*. In Chapter III.2 (pagan and Christian 'Referenztexte' in *SHG* 5) A. expounds the mixture of pagan and Christian sources used to describe the flight of the Jews from Egypt (pp. 249–301). Here there are longueurs and improbabilities. Two instances of *vox* and the similarity of *nube columnam* and *nube columbam* seem forced evidence for Avitus' use of Juvenecus' treatment of Jesus' baptism to describe the column of light (pp. 254–5). 'Ausbeuten' (p. 280) and 'kontaminieren', without deliberate evocation of the source text (pp. 281, 287), characterize Avitus' composition. Since he both plunders *tesseræ* for his *opus sectile* without care for original context and uses choice finds with intent, instances of the former practice do not merit laborious description. They merely attest reading and belong among the *fontes* of an edition. The point of A.'s often over-detailed expositions of similarities is often unclear. (For instance, pp. 257–8, where Avitus uses *Aen.* 9.33 and the Heptateuch-poet 438 uses Claudian, *6 Cons. Hon.* 571 to describe the Jews' first sight of the Egyptian army, simply involve different sources.) Some examples may be miscategorized (e.g. p. 282 *SHG* 5.610 and *Aen.* 6.163, hardly a significant thematic imitation). Many are tenuous, dependent on one unexceptional word (p. 309). A. puzzlingly sometimes (p. 328) treats *Carm.* 6, the *De consolatoria castitatis laude*, as if it were part of the *SHG*. The last section (pp. 323–46 on Sidonius and Prudentius) is livelier and of greater interest (though the useful discussion of *SHG* 4.563–573 missed Anon. *Expos. in Apocal.*, *PL* 17.815 C, where Noah's carrion-eating raven is identified as the Jews). A. has many fine points to make in this book, but they are buried deep in material that many will find hard going. He has missed opportunities to confront the poetic with the prose Avitus (e.g. p. 50 misses *Contra Arrianos* 26, p. 10.27–36 and *SHG* 4.173–186). There is insufficient broad argumentation, generalization, and drawing of clearly defined conclusions. For specialists only.

Cornell University

D. R. SHANZER

CICERO THE PHILOSOPHER

J. LEONHARDT: *Ciceros Kritik der Philosophenschulen*. (Zetemata 103.) Pp. 229. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1999. Paper, DM 98. ISBN: 3-406-44729-5.

This book, a revision of the author's Munich *Habilitationschrift* of 1993–4, is about how we should read Cicero's philosophical treatises. As such, it is of interest to those

© Classical Association, 2001