

The Poems of Dracontius in their Vandalic and Visigothic Contexts

Mark Lewis Tizzoni

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

The University of Leeds, Institute for Medieval Studies

September 2012

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

© 2012 The University of Leeds and Mark Lewis Tizzoni

The right of Mark Lewis Tizzoni to be identified as Author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Acknowledgements:

There are a great many people to whom I am indebted in the researching and writing of this thesis. Firstly I would like to thank my supervisors: Prof. Ian Wood for his invaluable advice throughout the course of this project and his help with all of the historical and Late Antique aspects of the study and Mr. Ian Moxon, who patiently helped me to work through Dracontius' Latin and prosody, kept me rooted in the Classics, and was always willing to lend an ear. Their encouragement, experience and advice have been not only a great help, but an inspiration. I would also like to thank my advising tutor, Dr. William Flynn for his help in the early stages of the thesis, especially for his advice on liturgy and Latin, and also for helping to secure me the Latin teaching job which allowed me to have a roof over my head.

I would also like to thank the various administrators who have made my studies possible, especially Alison Martin, for all of her friendly help and support, and Daniel Lockley, for helping me through the US Student Loan process. And also I must thank good old Uncle Sam, for those same Student Loans.

I would also like to thank my various friends and colleagues at Leeds and elsewhere who have given me guidance and support over the years. I must especially thank Nick Dupras for years of friendship and discussion. Special thanks also to Hrvoje Kekez, Ben Pohl and Lauren Moreau. I would also like to thank my students, especially those in the last year, who let me give them various pieces of Dracontius' and Eugenius' verse and reminded why I started doing this.

Lastly, I thank my family and my friends back home in Pennsylvania. Without their help, love and support (both emotional and financial) I could never have dreamed of doing this PhD. My parents have been an immense aid; the least of their efforts has meant that at no point during this thesis have I gone hungry. Above all I must thank my fiancée, Sarah Lynch, for years of advice, support, love, coffee and, above all, patience. Special thanks must also be to those who helped to start me on this path, but did not live to see me complete it: especially my grandparents, Lloyd and Frances Lewis and my cousin Colonel Ralph "Bud" Clark, who first got me interested in the Middle Ages as a young boy. It is to them that I dedicate this work.

Thesis Abstract:

The goal of this thesis is to examine the cultural transformation of the Roman world as witnessed in the poetry and poetic traditions of the Latin-speaking West. In essence this thesis asks one fundamental question: when did the Late Antique world finally transform into the medieval? In order to answer this question, it will focus its investigation on one particular representative case-study. This case-study is provided by the poetry of the Late Antique North African poet Dracontius. After their initial composition in the final decades of the fifth century, part of Dracontius' corpus, the *Satisfactio* and Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, were redacted by Eugenius II of Toledo in mid-seventh-century Visigothic Spain. These poems, then, allow us to examine both Dracontius' own context in the Vandal kingdom of North Africa as well as Eugenius' context in late-Visigothic Iberia. This examination into Dracontius' Vandalic and Visigothic contexts will centre around one particular, and frequently undervalued, source of evidence: the use of *loci similes*. The investigation, split into two parts, will use these *loci similes* to examine and analyse the poetic methods employed by these two authors and the cultural mindsets behind them. Although the fundamental argument will be based on the shared texts, consideration will be taken both of the other works of these two authors and the wider literary landscape. After completing this investigation, the thesis will seek to explain its findings through a cultural historical analysis of their wider cultural and geographical contexts. After contextualising these works, the thesis will then give its own explanation, based on this new poetic evidence, as to why, and how, the final transformation of the Roman world came about.

Table of Contents:

Introduction	1
1. Literature and the Transformation of the Roman World: the Status of the Question	5
2. Who's Who: What we know about Dracontius and Eugenius in Brief	10
3. The Art of Latin Poetry, and its Place in Late Antique Literature	16
4. The Method: Cultural Mindset through Poetic Composition	28
Part I: The Vandalic Context	32
1. Dracontius and the Classics	32
i. The Overall Picture of the Classical <i>Loci Similes</i>	33
ii. The Classical <i>Loci Similes</i> in Detail: Two Case-Studies	40
iii. Through the Lens of the Redaction	48
iv. Conclusion	61
2. Dracontius' <i>Opera</i> and the World of Late Antique Poetry	62
i. Introduction	62
ii. Dracontius' Late Antique Sources	68
iii. What the Sources Tell Us	99
iv. Conclusion	103
3. The Use of the Bible in Dracontius' <i>Opera</i>	106
i. Dracontius' Knowledge of the Bible	107
ii. Dracontius' Use of and Engagement with the Bible	117
a. Dracontius and his Exegesis	118
b. The Bible as Lexicon	121
c. The Bible as a Source of Ideas	127
d. The Bible as Source Material	130
iii. Dracontius' Views regarding the Bible	133
iv. Conclusion	137
4. Dracontius in Conclusion: Appropriation or Continuity?	139

Part II: The Visigothic Context	147
1. Introduction	148
i. The Manuscript Tradition	158
ii. Navigating the Problematic Waters	167
2. Eugenius and his Redaction: Dracontius in Spain	173
i. Introduction	173
ii. Why?: the Historical Prose Answer	175
iii. How?: What the Text Itself can Tell Us	186
a. The Orthographical Differences	192
b. The Other Set of Differences	196
c. The Matter of Metre and Rhyme	217
d. How?: In Conclusion	226
iv. How and Why: the Implications of the Redaction	228
3. Eugenius and his Original Poetry: Between Originality and Classical Tradition	233
i. Eugenius' Poetic Method: the Evidence of the <i>Loci Similes</i>	236
ii. Eugenius' <i>Ars Poetica</i> : the Nature of the Original Poems	245
4. Conclusion: Between Tradition and Originality in the Redaction and the Independent Works	258
Conclusion: Dracontius and the Transformation of the Roman World	261
1. Dracontius' Poetry in its Vandalic and Visigothic Contexts: the Conclusion of the Case-Study	261
2. The Triumph of the Monastic Ideal and the Transformation of the Roman World	266
Appendix	280
Bibliography	299

Introduction

The fifth century AD was a period of great struggle and great change. The period witnessed the sack of Rome by the Visigoths in 410 and by the Vandals in 455, the parcelling out of the Western Empire amongst the various successor states and the final deposition of the last Western Roman Emperor in 476. These disasters sent shock-waves throughout the Roman world: thence the origin of St Augustine's *City of God*. Yet, the fifth century was not entirely one of despair as it witnessed great cultural achievements. Over the years, the events of this century have been the centre of one of the greatest of historical debates. Some scholars have indeed seen these as a collapse, as the 'Fall of the Roman Empire'.¹ Others have seen this period as one of transformation rather than one of collapse, during which the institutions of the Roman Empire were preserved and adapted.² Much of this debate, historically, has been centred upon the traditional historical concerns of politics and economics. Yet, politics and the economy are not the sum of a civilization, and so the discussion shifted.

¹ The most famous advocate of the Fall of Rome is most probably Edward Gibbon with his *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Although Gibbon has long been out of favour with most academic discourse, his thesis still dominates the popular conception of the period. For the modern scholarly argument for the 'Fall', see for example Bryan Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome: and the End of Civilization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) and Peter Heather, *The Fall of the Roman Empire* (London: Macmillan, 2005).

² This position dates back much farther in the historiography than is often thought. An important nineteenth-century example is A. Frédéric Ozanam, *History of Civilization in the Fifth Century*, trans. by Ashley C. Glyn, 2 vols (London: W. H. Allen and Co., 1868). Among the most famous, and most read, proponents of this school is Henri Pirenne, with his *Mohammed and Charlemagne*, trans. by Bernard Miall (London: Allen and Unwin, 1939). While the Pirenne Thesis has since been largely disproved, the essential ideas behind it remain important. There are many others who have supported the transformation paradigm both before and after Pirenne. Much progress was made in this field especially in the last decades of the twentieth century, which saw, for example, the work of the *Transformation of the Roman World* series. For the modern scholarly argument the surveys of Peter Brown are an important starting place.

One avenue was archaeology and the study of the everyday lives of those who lived in the lands which had made up the Empire. As archaeology saw more advances, it was able to paint a fuller, and better, picture.³ Another avenue was ecclesiastical history.⁴ Yet another avenue was found in the study of culture, especially of the history of art and architecture.⁵ All of these have been valuable, and all of these have provided results. But there is yet another avenue of cultural study, reserved for the last solely because this thesis too takes it: literature.⁶

The study of Late Antique literature is, in actual fact, every bit as old as the study of the period's history. But here, instead of the 'Fall of Rome', scholars saw *décadence*.⁷ This idea of *décadence* was built around the literature of the late Roman and post-Roman world, spanning roughly from the third through to the fifth century. In the twentieth century, much of this discussion came to focus on the work of Saint Augustine.⁸ Yet, this very study of Saint Augustine which at first affirmed the idea of *décadence* also served to overturn it.⁹ Much as with the historical questions,

³ A recent survey of the period with an archaeological bent can be found in Guy Halsall, *Barbarian Migrations and the Roman West, 376-568* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

⁴ While it is a wider study, see, for example Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, ad 200-1000*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003).

⁵ The study of cultural history (especially as regards the study of art) follows essentially in the footsteps of Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. by S. G. C. Middlemore (New York: Harper and Row, 1958), the original of which was published first in 1860. For modern scholarship on art, see for example the relevant articles in *Late Antique and Medieval Art of the Mediterranean World*, ed. by Eva R. Hoffman (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007) especially Jás Elsner, 'The Changing Nature of Roman Art and the Art-Historical Problem of Style', pp. 11-18. A useful work in terms of visualisation is the heavily illustrated (if not art-history-centred) Peter Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity AD 150-750* (New York, London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1989).

⁶ There are also a number of studies on Late Antique literature: see the discussion below.

⁷ This is especially true of the French school, who originally coined the term. The great champion of this notion of *décadence*, Henri-Irénée Marrou, subsequently wrote against it.

⁸ Here Marrou was central with his *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris: E. De Boccard, 1938).

⁹ This is again Marrou, in both his *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique: Retractatio*, (Paris: E. De Boccard, 1949) to and his *Décadence romaine ou antiquité tardive? III^e-IV^e siècle* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1977).

where scholars had once seen only disunity and difference, they now saw transformation and continuity.

The present thesis, however, does not intend to look simply at literature, and certainly not at literature for literature's sake. Instead, it intends to investigate the transformation of the Roman world in terms of literary *culture*. This culture does not merely involve style and form, but something much deeper, something much more important. This culture involves the way in which the Late Antique mind, or at least the mind of the Late Antique poet, perceived of the world: the way in which the poet saw himself, his art, and, through this, the place the Late Antique poet held in the greater spectrum of ancient culture and history. In essence then, the present study intends to examine the *cultural mindset* of the Late Antique poet.

One of the most important aspects of antique culture was indeed the literature which it produced. The Greco-Roman world was a world of letters: Late Antiquity was no different. The literature of any given time or place can shed a great deal of light on the culture in which it was produced. Poetry was one of the keystones of Classical Latin culture and remained as such throughout the period of Late Antiquity. Poetry not only expressed the tastes, desires, and cultural mindsets of its authors and audiences but was also a conservative art which retained the forms and ideas of the past. Poetry, as the best mirror for 'secular' high culture, provides us with a remarkable opportunity to study the transformation of the Roman World. It was a powerful and popular element of Roman culture that continued to be practised, regularly, from the time of Ennius. In poetry the scholar finds something of a cultural chronicle: it does not record dates and events, but rather records thoughts, ideas, cultural values and *mores*. Is it not, in truth, these things, the ways in which people thought of and perceived their own world, that truly make up a civilisation?

In order to study these perceptions in close detail, the present thesis will examine one particular, representative, case. This case-study centres on two poems of the North African poet Dracontius. Written sometime near the close of the fifth century these poems, the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*, if they are now rather obscure, were important and influential poems in their own day. These poems, treated alongside Dracontius' other verse, provide an invaluable lens through which we can view not only the world of Late Antique North Africa, but that of the Late Antique West as a whole. The true value of this case-study, however, hinges upon the fact that, some one-hundred-and-fifty years after Dracontius composed these two works, they were redacted by Eugenius II, Archbishop of Toledo. Eugenius' redaction allows us greater insight not only into his own seventh-century Visigothic Spanish context, but also greater insight into Dracontius' own North African context. The comparison between the two different versions of these texts allows us a unique and rewarding opportunity to view the very same piece of Late Antique culture at two different times and places. The similarities and differences which this comparison brings to light allow us to view the transformation of Latin culture in microcosm. In order to be most effective, this case-study will view the texts both in a wider lens, and in close magnification: both techniques complement each other, and both yield important evidence. The study will be divided into two parts: the first will be concerned with Dracontius' original texts. The Dracontius part will in turn be divided into four chapters. The first will deal with Dracontius' use of the Classical inheritance. The second will investigate Dracontius' use of Late Antique sources, as well as his own place in the Late Antique tradition. The third chapter will focus on Dracontius' use of the Bible.¹⁰ The fourth will serve as a conclusion. The second part

¹⁰ The study of Dracontius' sources is necessarily a complex and involved effort. In truth, all

of the case-study is concerned with the redaction of Eugenius. This part will be divided into three chapters. The first chapter of the Eugenic part will discuss the manuscript issues of the redaction and lay the groundwork for the rest of the investigation. The second Eugenic chapter, the longest of the thesis, will address the redaction itself, looking not only at its context and methods, but the differences (and the similarities) found within it. The third and final chapter of this part will place the evidence of the redaction into the wider context of Eugenius' independent works. The final conclusion of the thesis will then seek to explain, in cultural-historical terms, the evidence and conclusions brought forth from this case-study. Before moving to a discussion of methodology, however, it is best to first give a little more background.

1. Literature and the Transformation of the Roman World: the Status of the Question

The scope of this thesis, while centred on one case-study, is nevertheless quite wide. As it will necessarily discuss both literary and cultural history, in the context both of Vandal North Africa and Visigothic Spain, as well as the greater western Mediterranean, the traditional doctoral *status quaestionis* would prove a rather unwieldy creature. Instead of this inventory of recent research, it is perhaps best to give a brief overview of key works in the various regions and disciplines with which this thesis is concerned.

of Dracontius' *loci similes* are fully interwoven not only with the text, but with each other. Biblical rests next to Classical, as does the Late Antique. Any separation of these sources is, in some way, artificial. That notwithstanding, there are many factors which argue for this very separation. Not least of these factors is the unwieldiness of a forty-thousand-word chapter. For the sake of ease, then, these divisions have been employed here.

The study of Vandal North Africa, *per se*, has typically been something of a reserve for political historians and archaeologists. The main work on Vandal North Africa for the last sixty years has been, and remains, Courtois.¹¹ In more recent years, however, Vandal North Africa has seen a strong upsurge in scholarly attention, and the field has been greatly expanded.¹² In general, the main push of the more recent studies has been to recast Vandal North Africa more as a prosperous and important centre, a hub of intellectual culture, education, and wealth, and has been, in many ways, to dispel the old notions of the violent and barbaric Vandals and instead to replace these with a more sophisticated, and indeed more Roman, image.

Visigothic history is a much more trodden, but also more varied, path. There are a number of surveys of Visigothic Iberia, and especially useful are those of Roger Collins and E. A. Thompson. In recent decades, however, scholars have done a great deal of work on Visigothic Iberia, and there has arisen a plethora of books, chapters and articles dealing with diverse and varied aspects of the Kingdom of Toledo's culture and history. Nevertheless, while many aspects of Visigothic history have been covered in English and French, and indeed German and Italian, many aspects of Visigothic studies remain the preserve of Spanish, and sometimes of

¹¹ Christian Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris: Arts et métiers graphiques, 1955) is the central work.

¹² The most recent monographs are Andy Merrills and Richard Miles, *The Vandals* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010) and Jonathan Conant, *Staying Roman: conquest and identity in Africa and the Mediterranean, 439-700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). There are also several important collections, most notably *Vandals, Romans and Berbers: new perspectives on late antique North Africa*, ed. by A. H. Merrills (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), *Das Reich der Vandalen und seine (Vor-)Geschichten*, ed. by Guido M. Berndt and Roland Steinacher, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters* 13 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2008), and Frank M. Clover, *The Late Roman West and the Vandals* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1993). There are a number of scholars working on various aspects of Vandal North Africa, such as Yves Modéran, Roland Steinacher, Guido Berndt, Ralf Bockmann, Philipp von Rummel and others.

Portuguese.¹³ The modern student of Visigothic Spain is perhaps best directed to the bibliographic work of Alberto Ferreiro.¹⁴ The recent work on Visigothic Iberian history has served both to flesh out the framework of the old scholarship and update our knowledge of that kingdom in light of the academic developments undergone in the study of Late Antiquity as a whole.

Also key to the present thesis is the study of Late Antique language and literature. There are a number of literary studies on Late Antique literature and poetry in general, or on some particular aspect or genre within it.¹⁵ The traditional studies are those of F. J. E. Raby and Ernst Curtius.¹⁶ Traditional studies have tended to view Late Antique literature as either being Medieval, or as a decrepit and debased form of the Classics. Modern scholars, however, have sought to give the literature of Late Antiquity its own rightful place. Perhaps the most accessible of these recent works would be the literary studies of Michael Roberts.¹⁷ The most notable works of the last few decades, however, are those of Pierre Courcelle and Jacques Fontaine, who have done a great deal to enhance our understanding of Late

¹³ While the Iberian scholarship is very good, the Peninsula nevertheless continues to struggle with its twentieth-century political inheritance. Those coming from the right have tended to see Visigothic Spain as a centralised realm, those from the left as a fragmented one. Nevertheless, much of the scholarship is indeed very good. Of note are Pablo C. Díaz and Meritxell Pérez Martínez, among others.

¹⁴ Covering up to 1988 is *The Visigoths in Gaul and Spain, AD 418-711: a bibliography* (Leiden: Brill, 1988) and from then up until 2003 is his *The Visigoths in Gaul and Iberia: a supplemental bibliography* (Leiden: Brill, 2006) For more recent scholarship there is also *The Visigoths: Studies in Culture and Society*, ed. by Alberto Ferreiro (Leiden: Brill, 1999).

¹⁵ Due to the nature of this thesis, the bibliography here will focus principally on poetry.

¹⁶ Raby's two main works are: *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957) and *A History of Christian Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953). Curtius' work has been translated into English: Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. by Willard R. Trask, Bollingen Series 36 (New York: Pantheon, 1953). Also worth noting is the work of Ozanam, cited above.

¹⁷ Roberts has produced several important monographs. For these, see the bibliography. Daniel Nodds' work is also of note here (again, see the bibliography).

Antique literature and poetry.¹⁸ In terms of language, a great deal of work has been done by Roger Wright in terms of dispelling the traditional notion of the two norms of the Latin language.¹⁹ This work, in turn, has given new weight and importance to Late Latin literature: no longer was it solely the preserve of an educated elite written in their own preserved dead language, but a living (if still educated) literature actively taking part in the wider culture of its day. In terms of Late Antique education, the principal study remains the work of Pierre Riché.²⁰

There has also been a good deal of literary scholarship focused on the two regions with which the present thesis is focused. North African literature has rightly been viewed as a spectrum, and the Vandal kingdom has formed one period of this. One of the most important works has been that of Henri-Irénée Marrou.²¹ Marrou's conclusion was, in essence, that although St Augustine was imbued with the Classics, his culture and way of thinking were effectively medieval: an important point to keep in mind for the present study. In more recent years, a great deal more work has been done on Vandal African literature, and its poetry has featured in the works of Roberts and Niles. More specific studies on North African poetry are to be found in the work of David F. Bright.²²

¹⁸ Pierre Courcelle's main monograph of concern here is his *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques*, 3rd edn (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1964). The works of Fontaine are numerous: especially important here are his *Naissance de la poésie dans l'occident chrétien: esquisse d'une histoire de la poésie latine chrétienne du IIIe au VIe siècle* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1981) and his *Études sur la poésie latine tardive d'Ausone à Prudence: recueil de travaux de Jacques Fontaine* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1980).

¹⁹ This argument is principally expressed in his *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France* (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1982).

²⁰ The English translation is: *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West: Sixth through Eighth Centuries*, trans. by John J. Contreni (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1976).

²¹ Especially *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*.

²² Most notably his *The Miniature Epic in Vandal Africa* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), which deals principally with the secular works of Dracontius.

The literature of Visigothic Spain has received even more attention.²³ Much of this attention, of course, has been focused on Isidore of Seville. The giant in this field has been, and remains, Jacques Fontaine.²⁴ Fontaine's important work describes the cultural change seen in Isidore's *opera*: for him, Isidore bears witness to the final transformation of Classical culture.²⁵ This, again, is an important point to bear in mind throughout the present thesis. Historically, Visigothic poetry has not received quite the level of attention its Vandalic counterpart has. Nevertheless, there has been a substantial amount of work done by a selection of scholars. The most prominent of these are Carmen Codoñer, who has been working the field for several decades, and more recently Paulo Farmhouse Alberto.

In all of these topics and disciplines there are, of course, many other scholars and contributions, not to mention various ideas and interpretations. These, however, will appear in the course of the argument. For now, the most important points to take away are those of Marrou and Fontaine: what are in essence two different viewpoints on the central question of this thesis. This question, perhaps better stated, is this: in the course of the transformations of Late Antiquity, when did Latin culture, or rather, the Latin mindset, as witnessed in the poetic arts, cease to be Classical and start to be something else? This is the question which runs throughout the case-study of this

²³ A valuable overview, with a bibliographic emphasis, is presented by *La Hispania visigótica y mozárabe: dos épocas en su literatura*, ed. by Carmen Codoñer (Salamanca: University of Salamanca Press, 2010).

²⁴ Fontaine's principal works here are *Isidore de Séville: Genèse et originalité de la culture hispanique au temps des Wisigoths* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000) and *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique*, 2nd edn, 3 vols (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1983). Other scholars, however, have also made important contributions to the field, such as Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz. A good starting point for his research is his *De Isidoro al siglo XI: ocho studios sobre la vida literaria peninsular* (Barcelona: Ediciones El Albir, 1976).

²⁵ Fontaine focuses especially on the transition from classical to medieval and the ambiguity therein. This, of course, is a very basic summation, and Fontaine's work is of exceptional importance for the study of Visigothic intellectual culture.

thesis, and which we must return to in the conclusion. For the present, however, we must look at a little background.

2. Who's Who: What we know about Dracontius and Eugenius in Brief²⁶

Blossius Aemilius Dracontius was from the upper strata of Vandal North African society, distinguished 'both in poetry and in politics'.²⁷ We know little of his life, but a picture can be constructed from what biographical information exists in his writing. The subscript of Dracontius' *Romulea* 5 describes him as '*vir clarissimus et togatus fori proconsulis almae Karthaginis*': 'most illustrious man and Roman citizen of the forum of the proconsul of propitious Carthage'.²⁸ *Vir clarissimus*, of course, was an official Roman title of nobility, signifying senatorial rank, used during the later imperial period. The title of *vir clarissimus* denoted, in the Dominate, the basic rank of senator, with the *illustres* and the *spectabiles* being higher ranks of the senatorial order.²⁹ The title *senator* (the equivalent of *vir clarissimus*), along with those of the

²⁶ This is intended as only a brief background introduction. Most monographs dealing with Dracontius provide a biography. See, among others, Bright, *Miniature Epic*, pp. 14-18; Domenico Romano, *Studi Draconziani* (Palermo: U. Manfredi Editore, 1959), pp. 9-23; J. M. Díaz de Bustamente, *Draconcio y sus Carmina Profana: Estudio biográfico, introducción y edición crítica*, Monografías de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 44 (Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 1978), pp. 33-65; and Claude Moussy, 'Introduction', in *Dracontius: Œuvres*, 4 vols (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002), I, 7-136 (pp. 7-31). See also Serafín Bodelón García, 'Draconcio y el reino vándalo,' *EPOS: Revista de filología*, 17 (2001), 29-53. For Eugenius, see below.

²⁷ Frank M. Clover, 'Carthage and the Vandals', in *Excavations at Carthage 1978, Conducted by the University of Michigan VII*, ed. by J. H. Humphrey (Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum, 1982), pp. 1-22 (p. 12).

²⁸ Dracontius, *Romulea* 5. This passage can tell us more than simply the status of Dracontius, especially the latter part regarding the proconsul. Clover expands on it in his 'Carthage and the Vandals' (p. 12). Dracontius was certainly of Roman heritage, but he was possibly of Vandal heritage as well: this has been a matter of debate in the scholarship., Bright, *Miniature Epic*, pp. 14-15 building on Dirk Kuijper, 'Varia Dracontiana' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1958), pp. 7-10 has argued for Dracontius' descent from a Roman father and a Vandal mother. Other scholars have dismissed this, namely Romano, pp. 11-12 and, Díaz de Bustamente, pp. 38-41. The present author is inclined to follow Romano and Díaz de Bustamente.

²⁹ cf. Averil Cameron, *The Later Roman Empire* (London: Fontana Press, 1993), pp. 103-05.

illustres and *spectabiles*, is mentioned in a law of 25 February 484 promulgated by the Vandal king Huneric.³⁰ Dracontius delivered poems at public events; *Romulea 5*, for example, was delivered at the ‘Baths of Gargilian’, as the subscript attests. Dracontius also served as an *advocatus* to Pacideius, a proconsul of Carthage.³¹ Dracontius was, indeed, a court poet. He worked in the latter part of the fifth century under the Vandal kings Huneric, Gunthamund and Thrasamund.

Like other Romans of his day, however, Dracontius suffered the wrath of his barbarian sovereign, and he was imprisoned by King Gunthamund. He was imprisoned on account of a poem, almost without doubt a panegyric, which he wrote addressed to an *ignotum dominum*, and which does not survive.³² The identity of this *ignotum dominum* has been the subject of a not inconsiderable amount of ink over the past one hundred years of scholarship. Most all of the scholarship ‘has accepted the argument that the [Dracontius’] fateful *carmen ignotum* was composed in honour of a foreign ruler and was intended in some way to express the writer’s dissatisfaction with the Vandal regime in Africa’.³³ The most likely candidates put forth in these arguments are the emperors Anastasius and Zeno, and the kings

³⁰ This law is found in Victor of Vita, *Historia Persecutionis*, 3.3-14; the ranks are found at 3.10. This is especially interesting, as these two latter titles originally depended upon service to the emperor, and were not heritable.

³¹ Clover, ‘The Symbiosis of Romans and Vandals’, p. 62. What exactly the role of *advocatus* was is difficult to tell, although it doubtless indicated some form of legal professional.

³² Dracontius, *Satisfactio*, 94. The parallel with Ovid is strong, on was not lost on Dracontius.

³³ A. H. Merrills, ‘The Perils of Panegyric: The Lost Poem of Dracontius and its Consequences’, in *Vandals, Romans and Berbers: New Perspectives on Late Antique North Africa*, ed. by A. H. Merrills (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 145-62 (p. 146). Merrills includes a full and accurate review of the scholarship on the subject, with full references (see note eight, p. 146). Merrills’ article is the most recent and most direct work on this subject: the present discussion, therefore, will principally refer to this article for the sake of convenience. The *carmen ignotum* of which Merrills speaks is the lost poem/panegyric of Dracontius here discussed.

Odoacar and Theodoric the Ostrogoth.³⁴ These would indeed seem to fit the description given by Dracontius of ‘ignotum mihi dominum’.³⁵ This, however, would have been a most serious crime.³⁶ ‘Upon closer investigation’, Merrills writes, ‘it is difficult to associate Dracontius’ lost work with any one of these figures, and still more of a challenge to reconcile the production of such a panegyric to a foreign ruler within the standard patterns of late antique poetic patronage’.³⁷ Indeed, Merrills points out, if Dracontius had in fact composed a panegyric in praise of a current ruler in Italy or Constantinople, ‘his sentence seems to have been remarkably light’.³⁸ This, as Merrills rightly concludes, suggests that Dracontius’ crime was indeed not of political treason. Yet, Dracontius was still imprisoned for this panegyric in praise of an *ignotum dominum*, and this demands some form of explanation. No writer of panegyric ‘sought to celebrate a ruler from whom he could not benefit immediately, and none directed his work to a figure indifferent to his praise’.³⁹ Following this argument, and Dracontius’ known social standing, Merrills tentatively assigns the identity of this *ignotum dominum* to king Huneric, reading *ignotum* in the sense of Lucan’s *Bellum Civile*, 4.378-81 as ‘long-forgotten’.⁴⁰ This identification of the *ignotum dominum* with Huneric explains both Dracontius’

³⁴ Merrills, ‘The Perils of Panegyric’, p. 147, summing up the arguments referenced in note eight on p. 146.

³⁵ *Satisfactio*, 94.

³⁶ While its nature is different, a parallel does exist which should be noted here. Avitus of Vienne’s *Epistula* 46, addressed to Clovis and congratulating him on his baptism stands as an example of a letter of praise written to a foreign ruler. However, the case of Avitus’ letter is a curious one, and it was almost certainly addressed not to a ‘foreign ruler’ but to the ruler of a kingdom to which his own was allied. For dating the letter I have followed Danuta Shanzer and Ian Wood, trans, *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose*, Translated Texts for Historians, 38 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2002), p. 362-68, and Ian Wood. ‘The Construction of Frankish Catholicism, 507-8’, Paper presented at the *International Medieval Congress*, Leeds, 13 July 2009.

³⁷ Merrills, ‘The Perils of Panegyric’, p. 147.

³⁸ Merrills, ‘The Perils of Panegyric’, p. 148.

³⁹ Merrills, ‘The Perils of Panegyric’, p. 151.

⁴⁰ Merrills, ‘The Perils of Panegyric’, p. 151, 156.

punishment and its lack of severity. Huneric, after all, had, in an attempt to secure the succession for his own son, killed almost all of Gunthamund's family.

Gunthamund's reaction to the poet who praised his enemy makes a good deal of sense. Indeed, 'as a victim of political circumstance, therefore, rather than of his own treacherous behaviour, the relative leniency of Dracontius' punishment, and his refusal to accept a heavy burden of criminal guilt, both seem comprehensible'.⁴¹ The identification of the recipient of Dracontius' panegyric as Huneric, therefore, seems to be the most accurate.⁴²

However one attributes the panegyric, its result remains the same:

Gunthamund imprisoned Dracontius. While Dracontius' political career may have suffered heavily as a result of this, his poetic career did not, and the pieces for which Dracontius is most known were composed while he remained imprisoned. These pieces, written with the intention of securing his release, are the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*, with which this thesis is primarily concerned. The *Satisfactio* is essentially an apology to Gunthamund, detailing the merits of clemency, and giving examples of past mercies: both from God and his Saints, and the Roman emperors. The *De Laudibus Dei*, a further exposition on the theme of God's mercy, stands as Dracontius' *magnum opus*. It consists of three books totalling about 2300 lines of dactylic hexameter. Book I includes a paraphrase of the beginning of the Book of Genesis, and represents Dracontius' foray into biblical epic. The *Satisfactio* is the older of the two works, and was most probably written before 491, with the *De Laudibus Dei* having been written sometime later in the reign of Gunthamund.⁴³

⁴¹ Merrills, 'The Perils of Panegyric', p. 155.

⁴² While there is still speculation on this point, I myself follow Merrills' argument for the identification with Huneric.

⁴³ Roberts, *Biblical Epic*, p. 105.

Neither of these poems was able to secure from Gunthamund Dracontius' release from prison. His release was secured, however, with the accession of Thrasamund to the Vandal throne. These two works represent the portion of Dracontius' *opera* concerned with Christian theme and subject. His other four works, the *Romulea*, the *Orestis Tragoedia*, the *De mensibus* and the *De origine rosarum*, are, on the surface at least, pagan in character.

Eugenius II of Toledo was a poet in his own right, and wrote a number of works in addition to his edition of Dracontius. A number of his poems and letters are preserved. Excluding his redaction of Dracontius, Eugenius' poems are generally short, being mostly *epigrammata* with a selection of slightly longer pieces, and he did not dabble in epic. As with Dracontius, we know little of his life. Aside from what can be gleaned from his own works, we have some information from Ildefonsus of Toledo's *De viris illustribus* and in the correspondence between Braulio and the Visigothic king Chindaswinth which relates to him.⁴⁴ He flourished in the central years of the seventh century. Unlike Dracontius, Eugenius did not pursue a career in secular politics, but rather spent most of his life as a cleric. Born into an aristocratic family, he started as a priest in Toledo, and spent the first part of his life there. After his initial time in Toledo, he removed to the monastery of Braulio in Zaragoza, desiring to spend his life as a monk and having been appointed

⁴⁴ A very brief biography of Eugenius is given in Carmen Codoñer, 'The Poetry of Eugenius of Toledo', in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, Third Volume 1981*, ed. by Francis Cairns (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1981), pp. 323-42 (p. 323). The following biography is founded largely on Codoñer's. The few brief mentions of Eugenius II to be found in E. A. Thompson, *The Goths in Spain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), pp. 195, 199 agree with Codoñer's account. Most recently, a brief but accurate and worthwhile biography (in Spanish, complete with discussion of life and literary contribution as well as a recent bibliography) is to be found at Salvador Iranzo Abellán, 'Eugenio II de Toledo', in *La Hispania visigótica y mozárabe: dos épocas en su literatura*, María Adelaida Andrés Sanz et al., ed. by Carmen Codoñer (Salamanca: Universidad Salamanca/Universidad de Extremadura, 2010), pp. 110-118. See also the bibliography therein.

archdeacon there by the abbot. In 646 King Chindaswinth summoned Eugenius back to Toledo and appointed him as bishop of that important see. ‘Despite Braulio’s efforts to dissuade the king from his purpose’ Eugenius ‘eventually went’.⁴⁵ Eugenius sat as bishop for eleven years, a term that spanned the end of Chindaswinth’s reign and the beginning of Reccaswinth’s, and died in 657.⁴⁶ He was known especially for his artistic and scholarly efforts.

While this biography is short, it can tell us a few important things. Eugenius was a highly educated man of letters. This is clear. The monastery at Zaragoza was a place of great learning, and during his time there Eugenius was most certainly exposed to a great deal of Classical literature. Essentially, we should expect Eugenius to be on equal footing with Dracontius in terms of learning.⁴⁷ Eugenius participated in the latter part of the ‘Isidoran Renaissance’, and stands rooted in the school of learning represented by that great scholar and bishop, Isidore of Seville. Indeed, ‘generally scholars associate him with the late classical tradition, represented by the poems of the *Anthologia Latina* (specially with the poets of the Vandal epoch)’.⁴⁸ Thus, Codoñer continues, ‘he is therefore seen as belonging to an

⁴⁵ Codoñer, p. 323. A study of this event can be found in Ruth Miguel Franco, ‘Braulio de Zaragoza, el rey Chindasvinto y Eugenio de Toledo: imagen y opinion en el *Epistularium* de Braulio de Zaragoza’, *Emerita, Revista de Lingüística y Filología Clásica*, 79.1 (2011), 155-76.

⁴⁶ King Chindaswinth’s reign was a peculiarly violent one. An overview of his reign can be found at Thompson, *The Goths in Spain*, pp. 190-99. For his reign in the context of the seventh century see Roger Collins, *Early Medieval Spain: Unity in Diversity, 400-1000*, 2nd edn (New York: St Martin’s Press, 1995), pp. 87-143.

⁴⁷ While learning might well have been different between these two periods, the evidence of the *loci similes* strongly asserts Eugenius’ close familiarity with Classical and Late Antique literature. Spain was also a known centre of education (see Riché, pp. 258 ff.) Certainly, the learning of Isidore, Braulio of Zaragoza, and Ildefonsus attest to this high level. Nevertheless, the educational system does appear to have come more under the aegis of the Church by Eugenius’ day.

⁴⁸ Codoñer, p. 324.

academic world, tied to a dead past'.⁴⁹ As Codoñer suggests, this is a rather overly grim view, and will be addressed here in due time.

In brief, then, these are the two main players of the present examination. Other authors will come into the investigation at various times in order to show wider trends and cultural links, but they will be discussed in turn. Now that our two poets have been discussed, however, it is best to look a little more into the background of their art.

3. The Art of Latin Poetry, and its Place in Late Antique Literature

Neither Dracontius nor Eugenius composed their poetry in a vacuum. No Late Antique poet, indeed no poet or author at all, did. Just as nature abhors a vacuum, so too does literature. They wrote within the context of a long-standing tradition.

Although speaking of his own oratorical genre, the fourth-century BC Greek writer, teacher and rhetorician Isocrates sums up this tradition in his *Panegyricus*:

If it were possible to present the same subject matter in one form and in no other, one might have reason to think it gratuitous to weary one's hearer by speaking again in the same manner as his predecessors; but since oratory is of such a nature that it is possible to discourse on the same subject matter in many different ways - to represent the great as lowly or invest the little with grandeur, to recount the things of old in a new manner or set forth events of recent date in an old fashion- it follows that one must not shun the subjects upon which others have spoken before, but must try to speak better than they. For the deeds of the past are, indeed, an inheritance common to us all; but the ability to make proper use of them at the appropriate time, to conceive the right sentiments about them in each instance, and to set them forth in finished phrase, is the peculiar gift of the wise.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Codoñer, p. 324.

⁵⁰ Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, trans. by George Norlin, in *Isocrates*, ed. and trans. by George Norlin, Loeb Classical Library, 3 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1928), I, 123-25 (7-9). Original follows: εἰ μὲν μηδαμῶς ἄλλως οἷόν τ' ἦν δηλοῦν τὰς αὐτὰς πράξεις ἀλλ' ἢ διὰ μιᾶς ἰδέας, εἶχεν ἂν τις ὑπολαβεῖν ὡς περιεργόν ἐστι τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐκείνοις λέγοντα πάλιν ἐνοχλεῖν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν: ἐπειδὴ δ' οἱ λόγοι τοιαύτην ἔχουσι τὴν φύσιν, ὥσθ' οἷόν τ' εἶναι περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν πολλαχῶς ἐξηγήσασθαι, καὶ τὰ τε μεγάλα ταπεινὰ ποιῆσαι καὶ τοῖς μικροῖς μέγεθος περιθεῖναι, καὶ τὰ τε παλαιὰ καινῶς διελθεῖν καὶ περὶ τῶν νεωστὶ γεγενημένων ἀρχαίως εἰπεῖν, οὐκέτι φευκτέον ταῦτ' ἐστὶ περὶ ὧν ἕτεροι πρότερον

While he may be discussing only oratorical theory, Isocrates' words apply equally to all of the disciplines of Classical writing, especially poetry.⁵¹ This tradition, which forms a constant throughout the Classical period, entailed placing one's original work into the often very strict framework of previous models.⁵² For the Hellenistic poets this was to fit their ideas into the structures of Homer, Hesiod, and the 'Homeric' Hymns. For the Roman poets, this meant placing their work into the framework of Greek poetry, stretching, via the Hellenistic poets, straight back to those poets' own models. They adopted Greek metrical forms and styles, along with imagery, themes and conventions. 'Their main intention', Williams writes, 'was to reproduce in Roman poetry the virtues of Hellenistic Greek poetry'.⁵³ In a statement that applies equally to their Roman counterparts, Williams describes the work of the Hellenistic poets thus: 'They have taken the old forms, but they hope to fill them with new creations'.⁵⁴ This is the heart of the work of the Classical poets. Indeed this was the work of the greatest of all the Latin poets, Vergil, and his *Eclogues* and *Georgics* reverberate with the Hellenistic poets, such as Theocritus, his *Aeneid* with the work of Homer. Nor does Vergil neglect his Roman antecedents. Indeed, for his

εἰρήκασιν, ἀλλ' ἄμεινον ἐκείνων εἰπεῖν πειρατέον. αἱ μὲν γὰρ πράξεις αἱ προγεγενημέναί κοιναὶ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν κατελείφθησαν, τὸ δ' ἐν καιρῷ ταύταις καταχρησασθαι καὶ τὰ προσήκοντα περὶ ἐκάστης ἐνθυμηθῆναι καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν εὖ διαθέσθαι τῶν εὖ φρονούντων ἰδιὸν ἔστιν. For Greek I have used the available translations, for Latin, all translations will be by the author, unless otherwise noted.

⁵¹ In this piece, I have followed the MHRA Style Guide in terms of capitalizing the word 'Classical', as it denotes a specific historical and literary period. However, whenever I have quoted a work, I have maintained the original form (including capitalisation and spelling), in deference to keeping whole the original, whether or not it conforms to the MHRA Style Guide.

⁵² A study of originality and tradition in Roman poetry up to 8 BC can be found in Gordon Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968). Also useful is Francis Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1972).

⁵³ Williams, p. 40. The influence of the Hellenistic school was especially pronounced with poets like Catullus and Tibullus.

⁵⁴ Williams, p. 37.

Aeneid, Vergil ‘owed’ to the early Latin epic poet Naevius ‘immense obligations’.⁵⁵

Likewise, Vergil used Cato’s *De re rustica* for his *Georgics*. Williams writes:

‘Virgil’s imagination was more powerful and original than that of any other Roman poet: he had the capacity to take an idea and make something entirely new out of it, combining it with elements from anywhere and everywhere’.⁵⁶ This, in part, is what makes Vergil so great.

For the Latin poets who came after Vergil, his work formed a new exemplum standing equal to Homer and the other authors of the past. Indeed, the work of Vergil came to surpass all others, including Homer, as the chief model for Latin poetry.

Along with the other poets of the Golden Age of Latin Literature, such as Catullus, Horace and Ovid, Vergil became the foundation of later Latin poetry. The traditional canon of Classical literature was added to in the century following the death of Augustus by poets such as Lucan and Juvenal. For the poets of later periods, the composition of poetry entailed the use of traditional Greek metres, inherited from the Golden Age poets, and the incorporation of quotations, references and themes from the great Roman poets.

While the Golden and Silver Age poets exerted a great influence over the later Latin poets, this is not to say that that literature remained unchanged or set in stone. Later Latin literature does have traits peculiar to it. Later Latin poetry is marked by a certain verbosity (*copia verborum*) and a more copious employment of rhetoric.⁵⁷ ‘The tendency to concentrate on individual episodes, often developed in

⁵⁵ J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature* (London: John Murray, 1909), p. 7.

⁵⁶ Williams, p. 95.

⁵⁷ Michael Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity* (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1985), pp. 64-65, 149. See also André Loyen, *Sidoine et l’esprit précieux en Gaule aux derniers jours de l’empire* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1943). It should also be noted that rhetoric was, of course, already a rather prodigious characteristic of Silver Age

the form of ethopoeia or ecphrasis, to the detriment of the composition as a whole', Roberts writes, 'is characteristic of late [Latin] poetry'.⁵⁸ This rhetorical flourish and *copia verborum* were not new concepts. Indeed, they had always been present in learned Latin, and certainly they can be seen in the works of Vergil and, as one would expect, even more especially in Cicero. However, in later Latin literature, under the influence of Seneca, Pliny, Apuleius and others, they became part of the prevailing tastes of the age.⁵⁹ Thus, in the composition of Latin poetry, this combination of tradition and originality could be undertaken not only in use of exempla or models of content, but also of style or manner, emphasizing one element over another to fit the changing tastes of the day. Different forms also came into greater popularity, most notably the panegyric, certainly an ancient one, which became more and more popular in the later Empire, and whose popularity continued to grow.⁶⁰ Yet, no matter how much tastes had changed, they still remained the same, in essence, from the late Republic into Late Antiquity: whatever differences in style might be employed, the desire was still for poetry written solidly in the same Classical tradition.

This very Classical approach to poetry was taken up wholeheartedly in the Late Antique period, and long outlived the political entity that was the Roman

Latin poetry. Important here also, although focused centrally on St Augustine, is the discussion in Marrou, pp. 47-104.

⁵⁸ Roberts, *Biblical Epic*, p. 65. NB: Roberts prefers to spell ekpfrasis in the Latin fashion with a 'c' as opposed to the 'k' which will be used in this paper, as 'k' better represents the Greek kappa, although I have retained his original spelling in the quotation.

⁵⁹ Roberts, *Biblical Epic*, p. 149. Pliny the Younger and Apuleius can be (and at various times have been) listed as late Latin authors themselves (We should note that they wrote in essentially different genres, but that the *traits* exhibited in their writing are what earn them this later attribution). Representing the old school of Classical scholarship, Mackail lists Apuleius and Fronto as 'post-classical' and sees in Apuleius the beginnings of 'Mediaeval' literature (*Latin Literature*, p. 205, 237-39).

⁶⁰ It should be noted that one of the younger Pliny's few surviving works is, in fact, a panegyric.

Empire in the West. Late Antique poets took as models almost all of the successful Latin poets of earlier periods, whether they were minor or major. While Vergil remained the foremost model in Late Antique poetry, a trend which was anything but new, other poets, who had not been as important before, became significant models.⁶¹ Additionally, Late Antique poets, much as the Golden Age poets before them, also took the work of contemporary or near-contemporary poets as models for their own poems. Thus, for example, in the *Satisfactio* of Dracontius, there are resonances not only with Classical authors, but also with Comedian, Claudius Marius Victorius, Prudentius and Ausonius. Late Antique Latin poetry, however, saw an injection of fresh and new ideas into the old framework. This new material came from Christianity. While poets continued to base their poems solidly in the pagan Classical tradition, using the established metres, and forms, and weaving Classical references into their works, they began to fit new subject matter into this old framework, and adapt the old forms to new topics.⁶² The Christian poets of Late Antiquity ‘stand firmly in the classical tradition of imitation and adaptation of earlier works of literature’.⁶³ While there are distinct changes, as White points out, there are in fact rather more distinct continuities.⁶⁴ The insertion of distinctly Christian themes and subjects, in fact, fits very neatly into the traditions of imitation and originality practised by the Classical poets. A parallel can be seen with Vergil’s *Aeneid*. Vergil took the genre and form of heroic epic inherited from Homer (represented by both

⁶¹ The prevalence of Vergil can be explained partly by the singular quality of his work, and partly by the fact that, due to this previous quality, his texts became standard required reading in the Classical and Late Antique schools, and any learned Latin speaker knew the works of Vergil from boyhood.

⁶² For a good discussion of Late Antique Christian poetry see Carolinne White, ‘Introduction’, in *Early Christian Latin Poets*, *The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 3-23.

⁶³ White, ‘Introduction’, p. 19.

⁶⁴ White, ‘Introduction’, p. 4, 6, 11.

the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*), and, selecting a minor character from the *Iliad*, created a very Roman piece, distinctly Roman both in subject and in theme. His approach to imitation and originality is identical to that of the Late Antique Christian poets, which, of course, really is the approach of Vergil. They sought to express Christian subjects and themes in the forms inherited from, principally among others, Vergil. Vergil was very influential for Late Antique poets, and ‘imitation of [him] may be one of the most striking characteristics of much of early Christian Latin poetry’.⁶⁵ A case in point of this trend of expressing Christian ideas in Classical fashion is the genre of biblical epic so popular in the fourth and fifth centuries. The Late Antique poets sought to make epics using Classical references, language, and the dactylic-hexameter metre appropriate to the genre, but focusing on explicitly Christian subjects and themes, such as the New Testament, and, later on, the Old Testament, especially the books of history. The authors of the biblical epics, Juvencus, Arator, ‘Cyprianus Gallus’, Claudius Marius Victorius and Avitus of Vienne being the most prominent and important, sought to create poems paraphrasing various sections of the Bible, written in the Classical tradition and embellished with Classical resonances and rhetoric, so as to make the scriptures more appealing to an erudite audience, whether pagan or Christian.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ White, ‘Introduction’, p. 19.

⁶⁶ Roberts, *Biblical Epic*, p. 107. For ‘Cyprianus Gallus’, his name and identity, see Roberts, *Biblical Epic*, p. 93. His identity is of no real concern for the purposes of the current argument. Pierre Riché, in his *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West: Sixth through Eighth Centuries*, trans. by John J. Contreni (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1976), p. 81, suggests that the poets of biblical epic wrote them in this fashion because they could do nothing else, they knew no other way to write. White believes that they may have written these biblical epics, especially the paraphrases of Genesis, as a means of rivalling ‘the accounts of Creation and the Golden Age in pagan literature, notably those of Lucretius in Book 5 of the *De Rerum Natura*, of Virgil in his fourth *Eclogue* and of Ovid in the first book of his *Metamorphoses*. While I would tend to favour some sort of motivation for their composition of these works in the style they chose, I believe the truth most probably lies in a combination of reasons. Regardless, their motivation need not concern us here yet.

Many Late Antique poets, while Christian, wrote works wholly concerned with pagan topics and themes. The largely North African *Anthologia Latina* contains many such poems, some likely authored by Dracontius himself.⁶⁷ In fact, Dracontius' *opera* demonstrate the wide-ranging compositions of the Late Antique poet rather well. His *Satisfactio* and *De Laudibus Dei* are written with clear Christian overtones and clearly Christian subject matter. His *Romulea* and *Orestis tragoedia*, however, stand as ostensibly pagan works. Yet, it would seem that no contradiction was seen to have been inherent in this by the learned circles of the time. In prose writing, Boethius' *Consolatio Philosophiae* gives us another example of seemingly purely pagan literature coming from the pen of a Christian.⁶⁸ While this has led some to doubt Boethius' Christianity in his final days, this is unnecessary, as the composition of both pagan and Christian works by the same writer was common throughout the period.

For the most part, however, the Late Antique Christian poets did write about Christian subjects. They 'mixed classical idioms, Christian themes and biblical allusions to produce their verses'.⁶⁹ Clover, however, sees this as somewhat problematic. 'Not all of their mixtures are felicitous', he writes; 'some classical

⁶⁷ The *Anthologia Latina* is an important Late Antique collection of poetry, some Classical, some Late Antique. Most of the Late Antique material is North African and dates to the Vandal period. For the *Anthologia Latina* see especially N. M. Kay, *Epigrams from the Anthologia Latina: Text, Translation and Commentary* (London: Duckworth, 2006) and D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Towards a Text of the 'Anthologia Latina'* (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1979). The text of the *Anthologia Latina* is to be found in *Anthologia Latina: sive poesis latinae supplementum*, ed. by Francis Buecheler and Alexander Riese 2 vols, 5 parts (Leipzig: Teubner, 1894-1926).

⁶⁸ Boethius, of course is not entirely in prose, but prose certainly does constitute the majority of the *Consolation*. For Boethius, the best starting place is Henry Chadwick, *Boethius: the Consolation of Music, Logic, Theology and Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981) and the collection of essays in Margaret Gibson, ed., *Boethius: his Life, Thought and Influence* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1981).

⁶⁹ Frank M. Clover, 'The Symbiosis of Romans and Vandals in Africa', in *Das Reich und die Barbaren*, ed. by Evangelos K. Chrysos and Andreas Schwarz (Vienna, Cologne: Böhlau, 1989), pp. 57-73 (p. 63).

expressions and biblical references, taken literally, suggest beliefs which are at variance with the poems' Christian tone'.⁷⁰ As a prime example of this, he lists Dracontius' *Satisfactio*, which, he states, is 'full of such unfortunate amalgamations'.⁷¹ It is indeed true that Dracontius uses such amalgamations: the example given by Clover of his use of *Tonans*, a common epithet for Jupiter, for the Christian God is a good case in point. Yet, these mixtures may not be as infelicitous as Clover asserts. Certainly, the use of *Tonans* for God may strike the modern reader as rather odd. Yet it is a term used for God throughout the works of Dracontius, alongside *Auctor*, *Omnipotens*, and others. It certainly seems that it did not strike the Late Antique mind as odd, otherwise Dracontius would perhaps not have used it in both the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*, the latter a very Christian work. In essence, this use of pagan epithets for the Christian God is really no different from the couching of biblical stories in Vergilian verse. *Tonans* itself echoes both pagan literature and Christian: God is often associated with thunder in the Hebrew Old Testament.⁷² Whatever the merit of such 'amalgamations' may be, they represent a distinctly Late Antique style, a distinct embracing of two cultures, and the amalgamation of them into a new learned Christianity.

Not all Late Antique poets took this path, however. In the fourth century, as before, many Christians reacted against pagan Classical culture, seeing an irreconcilable dichotomy between pagan and Christian culture.⁷³ Certainly, in the early years of Christianity, the pagan culture of Rome was seen to be at enmity with

⁷⁰ Clover, 'The Symbiosis of Romans and Vandals', p. 63.

⁷¹ Clover, 'The Symbiosis of Romans and Vandals', p. 63.

⁷² The association of God with thunder and thundering can be found, for example, in Exodus 9:23, Job 37:5, 1 Samuel 7:10, 12:17-18, 2 Samuel 22:14, Psalms 18:13, 29:3 and Isaiah 29:6.

⁷³ For this, see, among others, Marrou (pp. 543-545 for the conclusion) and more generally Robert Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

the new religion. Indeed, it often very much was: the divers imperial persecutions attest strongly to this. The persecutions were not forgotten by many Christians, even long after the conversion of Constantine. Least of all were they forgotten in North Africa, where the Donatist schism, whose origins lie in the Great Persecution and before, lasted into the Vandal epoch.⁷⁴ Suspicion, and even distaste, of all things Classical, and therefore, by association, pagan, was a strain in early Christianity. Yet only one strain.

Many theologians and leaders of the Church saw in pagan Classical culture a strong enemy, one capable of destroying their own religion, whether as a whole, or within themselves. Therefore, they shifted the focus of their work to solely Christian topics and forms, essentially turning their back on Classical culture. Tertullian was a great exponent of this line of thinking, yet even his work is adorned with the trappings of Classical rhetoric. The influence of Classical thinking and Classical forms was very far-reaching, and learned pieces required some level of engagement with them. Jerome himself, while he rejected Classical ideas, embraced Classical form and style. This can be seen even in the hymns of St Ambrose. These hymns, while written in a simpler Latin for the non-elite and employing a greater freedom from Classical models than is normally seen, still bear a strong resemblance to the work of Vergil and, more especially, Horace.⁷⁵ One genre where a general rejection of the Classics can be seen, however, is hagiography. Hagiographers sought to make their work accessible to those outside of the educated classes, and embraced as their model the Latin of the Bible, rather than that of Vergil or Cicero. Indeed, the oldest

⁷⁴ For Donatism, see especially W. H. C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952).

⁷⁵ Jacques Fontaine and Marie-Hélène Jullien, 'Introduction', in *Ambroise de Milan: Hymnes. Texte établi, traduit et annoté*, ed. by Jacques Fontaine (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992), pp. 11-123 (pp. 25-26).

versions of the Bible, called collectively the *Vetus Latina*, are essentially devoid of Classical influence, and, as St Augustine attests in his *Confessions*, the style was distasteful to the educated classes. This ‘poor’ Latin style of the *Vetus Latina*, however, was to an extent remedied by Jerome’s *Vulgate*, which, while more influenced by the Hebrew and Greek originals than by the Latin Classics, bore a style more palatable to the educated classes. The rejection of the Classics at times became fairly widespread, and it would even appear that for a time in the sixth century it was considered inappropriate for bishops to engage with the Classics, both in their writing and their reading.⁷⁶ Indeed, a reaction against the Classics was one of the facets of the new monasticism which began to change the face of Christianity in the fifth and sixth centuries.⁷⁷

Yet, many Christians of the period were intractable men of letters, who refused to give up their beloved Classics, and while Classical learning had its opponents, it was widely influential, and the vast majority of Late Antique writing is heavily influenced by it. St Augustine, the great North African bishop, gladly acknowledged his debt to the Classics, and used the forms of Classical literature repeatedly in his own works.⁷⁸ By its very nature Christian poetry embraced the Classical: it was still driven by Classical metres, composed in Classical forms and interwoven with Classical references and resonances, not to mention Classical rhetoric. Early Christian poetry is as marked by Vergil as it is by the Bible, if not

⁷⁶ Riché, *Education and Culture*, pp. 97-99.

⁷⁷ Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity*, esp. pp. 204-05.

⁷⁸ In Late Antiquity, the division between poetry and prose was not defined as it is today. The theory of writing, especially in relation to the reception of Classical culture, was identical for both genres. During this period, and, on a lesser scale during the Silver Age, poetry had a good deal of influence over prose, and, for its own part, prose had some influence over poetry. This can be seen in poets’ choice of source material, which will be discussed later on in this paper. The relationship between Augustine and the Classics is, of course, well known and widely discussed, but see especially the full discussion at Marrou, pp. 105-157.

more so.⁷⁹ Lactantius, Juvenecus, Paulinus of Nola, Prudentius, Sedulius, Arator, Avitus, Venantius Fortunatus and Dracontius were all steeped in the Classics, and they made this evident in their work. Dracontius, among other Christian poets, wrote pieces of a wholly pagan nature, as discussed above, yet his Christianity is beyond doubt.⁸⁰ Late Antique letter writing is another area in which the influence of the Classics is evident. The Antique school of learning had won out over its opponents, if not permanently. The great Christian poets of Late Antiquity, as well as the prose writers, embraced the Classics, and combined them with Christian themes to create their works. Certainly most fifth-century Christian literature is classically influenced, and the poetry of the period exhibits an intense association with the Classics. Yet, even when embracing the Classics, a reservation was sometimes given. We can see this in Avitus' dedicatory letter to his biblical poem, the *De spiritalis historiae gestis*, when Avitus warns of the danger of emphasizing the Classical over biblical truth, when regarding 'serious matters'.⁸¹ On the other hand, Eugenius of Toledo shows us that, at least in seventh-century Spain, it was perfectly acceptable for a bishop to write classicising poetry.

While Classical culture may have become dominant in the works of Late Antique writers, they began to use the Classics in varying ways, and 'in many cases a deeper exploration of this will reveal many interesting differences and possible

⁷⁹ White, 'Introduction', p. 19.

⁸⁰ This, of course, raises the question of what was considered pagan, and what Christian, still a much debated topic in the study of Late Antiquity. This aside, even the fully 'pagan' works of Dracontius frequently bear a distinctive Christian stamp: such is the persuasive argument of Bright, *Miniature Epic* pp. 43-45 as regards the Christian-influenced mythological subversion found in his *Hylas (Romulea 2)*.

⁸¹ Avitus of Vienne, 'Dedicatory letter for *De spiritalis historiae gestis*, to Apollinaris, bishop of Valence', in Avitus of Vienne, *Letters and Selected Prose*, trans. by Danuta Shanzer and Ian Wood, *Translated Texts for Historians*, 38 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2002), pp. 259-262 (p. 261).

intentional ironies as well as similarities and absurdities.’⁸² This shows us that the poets of Late Antiquity engaged with their sources and used them in original ways. It also shows us that they expected their audience to engage with their writing within the framework of the Classics, and to understand it within the knowledge of a greater context. In essence, the approach to poetry, and the minds behind it, had changed little since the days of Vergil, indeed, since the days of Plautus. What had changed, however, was the subject and theme of the poems, which exhibited the growing cultural change coming about with the birth of the Christian world. White sums this up very well:

In considering these Christian poems produced during the course of several centuries, it is possible to hold both that there was a strong element of continuity between the pagan and Christian – that the Latin poetic tradition was still a living one in the fourth and following centuries – and that a break in continuity occurred as regards the poetic subject: the combination of this continuity and break in continuity together produced a poetry of great richness, for the Christian poets could not only use the polished forms of pagan poetry but revitalize these forms by means of an infusion of new subject matter and the consequent lively tension between old and new.⁸³

This mixing of the Classical and the Christian constitutes the very substance which distinguishes the period of Late Antiquity and its literature. The study of the Late Antique poets, therefore, is a very rewarding one, and can indeed lead to a better understanding of the transformation of the Roman world as a whole.⁸⁴

⁸² White, ‘Introduction’, p. 19.

⁸³ White, ‘Introduction’, p. 11.

⁸⁴ A very good literary study of Late Antique writings, and their analogues in the art of the period, can be found in Michael Roberts, *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989). Roberts, however, does not really address the historical implications of the change in the literature, on which the current thesis is more particularly focused.

4. The Method: Cultural Mindset through Poetic Composition

Having now laid down something of the poetic arts, something more must be said as regards method: both that of the poets being studied, as well as that of the present investigation. The study of Late Antique poetry is a difficult and complex exercise. Poetry itself is not meant to be simple: it is an involved literary form; it creates, and is created in, a world of its own, complete with its own rules, logic, and language. Poetry is difficult, but in its difficulty lies a splendid mirror within which we can see the reflection of a different time and place. Like all reflections, it is imperfect, and the scholar needs to approach it with caution. But it is, nevertheless, of immense value, as poetry embodies the art, the tastes, the very life-blood of the culture of the time and place within which it is written. In a way, the works of Dracontius were, for the wealthy and learned of Vandal North Africa, what the works of Robert Frost or Gerard Manley Hopkins are for many people today, or even indeed what the lyrics of Bob Dylan were for the American youth of the 1960s and 1970s.⁸⁵ In other words, they embodied the culture, interests, and values of a specific set of people in a specific time and place. They embody the values, aesthetics, ideas, and beliefs of their audience. If they fail to do so, then they quickly pass into obscurity, for if they speak to no one, then no one will listen to them, no one will preserve them. This is true of ancient and medieval poetry, as well as of modern poetry, whether it be in the form of traditional 'poetry' or in the guise of song. Just as Bob Dylan is a mirror for at least some aspects of the 1960s, so too are Dracontius and Eugenius for their own time and contexts.

⁸⁵ Song lyrics, of course, are simply another form of poetry. Indeed, when one considers not only the style of ancient poetry, but also its method of performance and its strong connection to music, modern songs are actually much more the heir of the ancient poetic tradition than most of contemporary poetry is.

In fact, the similarity is deeper than a mere shared reflection of their cultural contexts. Both sets of verse mentioned actually function in a similar way. The *carmina* of Dracontius and of Eugenius contain narratives and material that are entertaining or enriching in their own right. Lying beneath this initial layer, however, is a complex web of cultural and literary references, joining the Christian Bible and Christian exegesis to contemporary (or at least recent) secular and religious poetry, to the authors' own works, and to the enormous Classical corpus. This web of references allowed Dracontius and Eugenius to speak to various levels of audience, and for their audiences to experience and enjoy their work on several different levels. On the surface, the vivid descriptions, the engaging stories, and the beautiful language were enjoyable in their own right. A little deeper, the more learned listener could spot the *loci similes*, hear where the poet worked in Vergil or Prudentius, or spot a familiar biblical verse.⁸⁶ Even deeper, the highly educated listener could see the connections which underlie the work: they could see the allegory and the delicate oxymora which depended upon the context of the *loci similes* in their own original pieces. Dracontius and Eugenius, of course, were not unique in this, for this is the way in which Classical poetry had always worked. The number of references simply

⁸⁶ Due to its importance for the present thesis, the term *locus similis* needs to be defined. *Locus similis* is, in effect, a blanket term for various types of textual references or parallels. These references can take on several different forms, and cover a wide spectrum. The most obvious are, in effect, direct quotations from other works. While in prose works these are sometimes named references, in poetry they are not. These direct quotations can be whole lines, but most often take the form of half-lines. Following on from these are verbal parallels, where several words are taken from another text, but either not necessarily in the original order, or with other words added in. These verbal parallels are one of the most common forms of *locus similis*. Verbal resonances, where one or two words serve to make the parallel, are the next step down. These often involve slightly unusual, or at least identifiable, words, so as to make the connections more apparent. These verbal resonances were also achieved by changing the grammar and syntax, but not the vocabulary, to fit the new context. Lastly there are purely contextual resonances, where the words have been changed, but the sense of the passage, or its central idea or perhaps even its grammar and syntax, attests a debt to another text. This last form is the hardest to pin down, but is also quite common.

increased with time, as was indeed the case in classical antiquity. The same is true, in the modern day, for the songs of Led Zeppelin. The band's songwriters, Jimmy Page and Robert Plant, both highly intelligent and well-read individuals, intertwined a large number of musical and literary references into their lyrics, most notable among them being the works of J.R.R. Tolkien. Led Zeppelin's audience, then, is able to experience their lyrics on different levels, which, while separate, are all equally important. This analogy helps to better show the importance of *loci similes*: they were not simply a cultural hangover, or mindlessly retained pieces of a long-dead culture. When employed correctly, *loci similes* form part of a living culture and their treatment by the artist can tell us a great deal. They can tell us what resonated with a given cultural context, they can tell us what people felt was important, what people valued and, perhaps most importantly, what people *thought*.

The study of source use and the employment of *loci similes* are important but yet neglected and ill-treated aspects of literature. In the past, *loci similes* were frequently employed off-the-cuff to assert the derivative nature of Late Antique verse, without any real discussion or analysis. Lists of *loci similes* tend either to lie dormant at the backs of editions, or to be used only as peripheral evidence.⁸⁷ Yet, *loci similes* are far more important than that. Instead of following the standard academic literary approach, the present thesis proposes to look at the texts in a different way. Instead of looking *principally* at the language, style and narrative elements used in any given poem, the approach used here intends to seek the actual methods of construction by looking not so much at *what* is said, but *how* it is said. When they hold the principal place in an investigation, and are allowed to show

⁸⁷ Moussy, I, pp. 67-77, for example gives a brief discussion of Dracontius' *exempla*, but no more.

themselves in full, *loci similes* can tell us a great deal. In effect, they do not simply tell us what books a given author was familiar with, but rather how authors viewed their sources, what they held important and what they did not. Most importantly, *loci similes* can tell us how authors viewed themselves. Stated differently, the study of the use of *loci similes* in poetic composition allows us insight into the cultural mindset, the cultural mores and values, and the priorities and perceptions of the poet. The methodological push of the present thesis, then, is to take the study of *loci similes* out of the dark, and by looking at them in different, novel, and deeper ways, to shed greater light on the Late Antique mind.

Part I: The Vandalic Context

1: Dracontius and the Classics

In all of his poetry, Dracontius employed a great deal of material and exemplars from Classical sources. All of his poetry was composed in Classical metres. His favourite authors, by far, were Vergil and Ovid. He did not bind himself to these two, however, but instead used a wide range of authors, most notably Lucretius, Horace, Lucan, Martial and Statius. In addition to these, he occasionally dabbled in prose sources, and among these are Cicero, Seneca, Pliny and Suetonius, although their use is always dwarfed by that of the poets. This use of prose sources for poetry is an example of the blurring of the line between prose and poetry characteristic of Late Antique literature.⁸⁸ Dracontius certainly worked in the same fashion as the other poets of Late Antiquity. His *De Laudibus Dei* is, in part, a hexameter biblical epic on the book of Genesis, which bears some resemblance to the *De spiritalis historiae gestis* of Avitus of Vienne, which also deals with Genesis.⁸⁹ While many of Dracontius' works exhibit clear Christian influence and theme, some are very pagan indeed. He wrote two *epithalamia* (wedding songs) replete with 'the traditional pagan ornamentation'.⁹⁰ This means that Dracontius' writing career is very much in line with those of other Late Antique poets, such as Claudian and Sidonius Apollinaris, whose *opera* represent a similar range. Dracontius was well educated, well read and operated in the same manner as a Classical poet. Some of his works are less personal, such as the *De Laudibus Dei*, and some of his works are very personal, such as the *Satisfactio*, which is written in elegiac couplets. Both poems

⁸⁸ Roberts, *The Jeweled Style*, pp. 49-50. This blending is also an example of the idea of *decadence* found in Marrou. This blending reaches its apex in the work of Isidore of Seville.

⁸⁹ The similarities between these two texts are intriguing, and are of great importance. An investigation into these similarities below, pp. 81-98.

⁹⁰ White, 'Introduction', p. 18.

reflect Classical models. The *Satisfactio*, while unique to its own particular situation, deals with personal matters not unlike the work of Ovid in his *Tristia*, which Dracontius does indeed reference often in this work.⁹¹ Dracontius is, in essence, fairly representative of late-fifth-century Latin poets, both in his use of sources and subject matter, and in his choice of genre, even if the *Satisfactio* is unique for this period.

i. The Overall Picture of the Classical *Loci Similes*

Our first line of inquiry, then, is into Dracontius' use of the Classical canon. One can learn a great deal not only from what texts an author is using, but also from the way in which they are used. The investigations in this chapter will generally follow these two lines of inquiry, the 'what' and the 'how'. While much information can be gleaned from looking at each original edition of the poems individually, more, and different, conclusions can be drawn by looking at the differences in the use of Classical authors between Dracontius' original and Eugenius' redaction. This chapter, therefore, will look both at the work of Dracontius in its own context, and then through the lens of the redaction.

In his poetry, Dracontius uses a varied and diverse list of Classical sources. Dracontius' favourite Classical sources for the *De Laudibus Dei* are Vergil's *Aeneid* and *Georgics*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Lucan's *Pharsalia*, and Statius' *Thebaid*. There are roughly two hundred *loci similes* throughout Book I the *De Laudibus Dei*, and approximately half of these are with Classical works.⁹² Dracontius uses the

⁹¹ There exist several intriguing similarities between the two works, and Dracontius' *Satisfactio* has a heavy debt to the *Tristia*, not least in terms of conception and theme. This will be discussed in fuller detail below.

⁹² For a list of *loci similes* in the *De Laudibus Dei*, see Appendix.

Aeneid more than any other source, with thirty-two *loci similes*. His use of the *Aeneid* spans all twelve books of the work and shows that he most certainly had access to entirety of the poem.⁹³ He does, however, favour books three, six, and eight.⁹⁴ Dracontius also shows a sound knowledge of the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*.⁹⁵ Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is Dracontius' second most used Classical source, with fourteen *loci similes*. In addition to the *Metamorphoses*, Dracontius shows knowledge of the *Fasti*, the *Amores*, and the *Tristia*, as well as one of Ovid's epistles.⁹⁶ In addition to Vergil and Ovid, perhaps the two most influential of all Latin poets in Late Antiquity, Dracontius uses Statius' *Thebaid* eight times and Lucan's *Pharsalia* nine, displaying a high level of engagement with these particular works. These, however, are only his most-used authors.

In Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, Dracontius pulled material from a very wide range of Classical sources, both prose and poetry, including Ennius, Cicero, Lucretius, Sallust, Horace, Seneca, Pliny and Apuleius.⁹⁷ Dracontius seems to have been quite familiar with Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis Historia*, and he appears to use this text on five separate occasions, more than any other prose source (and more than many poetic, as well). Dracontius uses both philosophical and legal texts from Cicero. This is fitting, considering that Dracontius was an *advocatus*.⁹⁸ Dracontius' knowledge of Cicero's philosophical texts attests the richness of the libraries of Carthage in his day. He also knew the *Bellum Catilinae* of Sallust, two of the works of Seneca the Younger, the work of Aulus Persius Flaccus, Marcus Manilius'

⁹³ Dracontius does, in fact, use Book XI of the *Aeneid* in Book II of the *De Laudibus Dei*.

⁹⁴ There are six *loci similes* with Book III, and five each with Books VI and VIII.

⁹⁵ There are eleven *loci similes* with the *Georgics*, and four with the *Eclogues*.

⁹⁶ There are five *loci similes* with the *Fasti*, two with the *Amores*, one with the *Tristia*, and one with *Epistle 10*.

⁹⁷ See Appendix 2.

⁹⁸ Whatever *advocatus* might have meant in the Vandal kingdom, it is reasonable to expect it to have been in some way a legal profession.

Astronomica, Lucretius' *De rerum natura*, Ennius' ancient epic, and the *Metamorphoses* of his fellow African, Apuleius. All told, Dracontius' library of Classical and Late Roman sources, as evidenced by Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, is a substantial collection, ranging from the great pieces of literature which formed the basis of Late Antique poetry, namely the combined works of Vergil and of Ovid, to much less well known authors such as Persius and Manilius, and even the highly controversial Apuleius.⁹⁹

As with Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, Dracontius' favourite sources for the *Satisfactio*, by far, come from the pens of Vergil and Ovid. As above, Vergil's *Aeneid* is his most-used source, and is employed roughly three times as much his other most-used works, Ovid's *Tristia* and *Metamorphoses*. There are approximately sixteen *loci similes* between the *Satisfactio* and the *Aeneid*. However, instead of favouring Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, as he does in the *De Laudibus Dei*, Dracontius focuses his attention on Ovid's *Tristia*, for several reasons which will be discussed below. Curiously, while the *Satisfactio*, less than half the size of Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, has roughly half the number of *loci similes*, these *loci similes* come from a much wider range of authors. For the *Satisfactio*, Dracontius makes reference to a number of other major Classical authors, such as Horace, Tibullus, Statius, Martial, Cicero, Seneca, Suetonius, Livy, Tacitus, Catullus, Lucretius and Lucan.¹⁰⁰ He also shows his knowledge of a number of rather lesser authors, namely Valerius Flaccus, Aulus Gellius, Fronto, Eutropius, Phaedrus and Silius Italicus.¹⁰¹ Roughly three-quarters of the *loci similes* found in the *Satisfactio* are drawn from Classical

⁹⁹ The controversy about Apuleius stems, of course, from his treatment of the Isis cult in his *Metamorphoses/Golden Ass*.

¹⁰⁰ See Appendix.

¹⁰¹ See Appendix.

texts. Again, Dracontius is pulling material from both prose and poetic sources. Indeed, Dracontius employs sources from a wide variety of genres, including philosophical, historical and legal prose along with drama, epic and personal poetry.

Even the most cursory glance at his sources for the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*, therefore, indicates that Dracontius had an impressive library of Classical authors at his disposal. At some point, Dracontius must have had access to nearly all of the works of the major Classical authors, and a good smattering of the lesser as well. This clearly shows that the literary sources available in Vandal Carthage in the years in which Dracontius learned and wrote were little diminished from the days of Augustine, when Carthage was one of the major centres of learning in the West.¹⁰² Dracontius' library, as attested by the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*, certainly serves to confirm Riché's assertion that late-fifth-century North Africa was a great centre of learning and education.

While both of these works are replete with Classical resonances and references, Dracontius' method was not simply to fill his poetry with bits and pieces from the Classics solely for the sake of appearing more learned or of merely revelling in the works of the past. Rather, Dracontius employed his sources selectively, using them when relevant or appropriate. Certainly, he used them often, but they never outstrip his own work in terms of volume. This is true of both the *De Laudibus Dei* and the *Satisfactio*. While the *De Laudibus Dei* testifies to Dracontius' knowledge of the complete *Aeneid*, in the *Satisfactio* Dracontius strongly favours

¹⁰² Riché, *Education and Culture*, pp. 37-40. Riché believed that the level of Classical education in Vandal Africa was considerably higher than elsewhere in the West, and little diminished from the Classical period.

Books I, VI and VIII, and also uses II and XII, but no others.¹⁰³ A similar pattern can be seen in his use of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, where Dracontius favours Book I, and excludes all others but IV and XV.

Dracontius does this because he finds these particular books of the *Aeneid* and the *Metamorphoses* the most suited to his purposes. This is solidly confirmed by his favouring of the *Tristia*, a work which shares many similarities with the *Satisfactio*. Certainly Books I and VI of the *Aeneid* stand out as amongst the best of Vergil's writing, and, as such, the best of all Latin writing. With Books I and II, books IV and V of the *Aeneid* constitute the Carthaginian episode; these, of course, are very appropriate for an African author to cite.

Dracontius shows this intentional selection of sources just as clearly in the *De Laudibus Dei*. As the *De Laudibus Dei* is indeed an epic, Dracontius employed a wide range of Latin epic sources in its composition. Vergil's *Aeneid* is, of course, his most-used source although this is in keeping more so with the reality of post-Vergilian Latin poetic composition than the writing of epic specifically. For his biblical epic, Dracontius pulls heavily from Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Statius' epic *Thebaid*, as well as a selection of Late Antique epics. While these do appear in the *Satisfactio* as well, their use in the *De Laudibus Dei* is much heavier.

Another point of interest is the general lack of Catullus references in the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*. There is only one *locus similis* between the *Satisfactio* and the entirety of Catullus' corpus.¹⁰⁴ There are none in Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*. Considering Catullus' place in Classical literature this is, at first glance, rather surprising. Tibullus also receives similar treatment. Yet, Dracontius

¹⁰³ Dracontius uses Book I four times, Book II twice, Book VI five times, Book VIII three and Book XII two.

¹⁰⁴ This *locus similis* is to be found at line 243.

regularly quotes Silver Age authors, such as Lucan and Statius. Several possible explanations for this exist. On the one hand, this could result from a relative lack of access to the writings of Catullus in late-fifth-century North Africa. On the other hand, this could spring from Dracontius' own process of source selection, as evidenced above in his use of Vergil and Ovid.

The position that the works of Catullus were unavailable in late-fifth-century North Africa is not a very tenable one. The list of the *loci similes* found in the texts of Dracontius alone attests a wide and varied library of Classics, ranging across both centuries and genres. Since Dracontius had access to the works of Phaedrus, Silius Italicus, and Lucretius, it would be hard to assert that he did not have access to those of Catullus. While the one *locus similis* between the *Satisfactio* and Catullus' *Carmen* 63 may only verify Dracontius knowledge of one of Catullus' poems, it does indeed do so. This, then, bears witness to the presence of Catullus' work, at the very least in partial form in the Vandal kingdom.

The second position, that Dracontius restrained his use of Catullus for artistic reasons, is considerably stronger. Just as we see Dracontius restrict his use of Vergil's *Aeneid* to only a few books in the *Satisfactio*, whilst the *De Laudibus Dei* attests his knowledge of the work's entirety, so too we see Dracontius restrict his use of Catullus to one reference to that author's work. This tells us something about Dracontius' method of composition. He is not simply trying to ornament his poetry with vast quantities of Classical resonances, like the writers of centos, but rather he is actively engaging with his sources to make a more considered and aesthetic product. This is to say that his use of the Classics is not a vain exercise to show his knowledge and intellect, but rather an effort to produce a genuine original piece of poetry. Of course, the matter is not really so black and white. While Dracontius'

main goal is not vain bragging, he does nevertheless wish his audience to know that he is a highly learned poet, and hence his work is replete with single references to various Classical texts. This ostentatious eruditeness, however, was part of the standard protocol for Late Antique poets, and all poets working in this tradition filled their works with Classical *loci similes* and revelled in rare and obscure Latin vocabulary in a way far more pronounced than their Classical predecessors.¹⁰⁵

Dracontius' use of the Classical tradition can be witnessed even more clearly in his 'secular works': the *Romulea* or *Carmina Profana* and the *Orestis Tragoedia*. These texts, as already mentioned briefly, contain ostensibly pagan material. The *Orestis Tragoedia* is a heroic epic firmly situated in the tradition of Seneca's 'tragedies', which relates the story of Agamemnon's death and Orestes' vengeance, in a new, yet firmly Classical, way.¹⁰⁶ The *Carmina Profana* retell a variety of Classical myths, legends, and tropes, one of the most notable of which is Dracontius' versification of the Labours of Hercules. These poems are fully imbued not only with Classical subject matter, but Classical resonances as well.¹⁰⁷ Dracontius' secular

¹⁰⁵ This elaborate and opaque style, of course, is a prominent feature of *décadence*, and the work of Marrou is important here; but see also his retraction for his recognition of Late Antique literature's occasional subtlety as well. The most accessible account of this style in English remains Roberts' *The Jeweled Style*. These characteristics only apply to the more 'high-brow' works of poets like Dracontius or Sidonius Apollinaris, and not to the hymn writers, such as St Ambrose, whose works required a different set of vocabulary more suited to their intended audiences.

¹⁰⁶ Seneca's so-called tragedies were really epic poems, and while they use stories and material gleaned from the Ancient Greek originals, they retell the stories in a much darker way. Dracontius, in turn, captured this darkness in his own 'tragedy'. This work will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter. The secondary literature on the *Orestis Tragoedia* and the *Carmina Profana* is fairly well developed; see especially Bright, *Miniature Epic*, for a comprehensive study and commentary on a selection of Dracontius' secular works.

¹⁰⁷ Additionally, the secular works point strongly towards Dracontius' knowledge of and familiarity with not only Latin letters, but Greek as well. Bright, *Miniature Epic*, pp. 23-24, for example, argues for the presence of Greek material in the *Hylas* (*Romulea* 2).

works, then, serve strongly to confirm the poet's connection to the Classics witnessed in both the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*.

While looking at the works of Dracontius in general can, and indeed does, tell us a great deal about the author and his times, a great deal more can be gleaned from looking at his works more closely, and it is to this investigation that we shall now turn.

ii. The Classical *Loci Similes* in Detail: Two Case-Studies

As is the case with poetry, a great deal can often be garnered from one or two lines, even one or two words. Even seemingly mundane references can yield important information. At lines 89-90 of the *Satisfactio* Dracontius gives us his conception of the world. He writes: 'temperies caeli medium nec possidet orbem,/ nam de quinque plagis vix habet ipsa duas'.¹⁰⁸ This description is very short, and we must build upon it to get a fuller picture. To do this, we should attempt to look at Dracontius' sources. Vollmer, in his edition, lists Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, 1.45-51 as a possible source for this.¹⁰⁹ Ovid's passage, which does express a similar world view, follows:

utque duae dextra caelum totidemque sinistra
 parte secant zonae, quinta est ardentior illis,
 sic onus inclusum numero distinxit eodem
 cura dei, totidemque plagae tellure premuntur.
 quarum quae media est, non est habitabilis aestu ;
 nix tegit alta duas ; totidem inter utramque locavit
 temperiemque dedit mixta cum frigore flamma.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Trans: 'The temperate climate does not hold the middle circuit of the world,/ for of the five zones it itself barely holds two'.

¹⁰⁹ Vollmer, p.118

¹¹⁰ Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, ed. and trans. by Frank Justus Miller, Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1925), 1, p. 5-6. Miller's translation: 'And as the celestial vault is cut by two zones on the right and two on the left, and there is a fifth zone between, hotter than these, so did the providence of God mark off the enclosed mass with the same number of zones, and the same tracts were stamped upon the earth. The central

This description of the world can serve to fill out Dracontius'. The heavens are divided into five zones, which imbue the earthly regions beneath them with their climate. In comparing these two passages, however, one finds some subtle differences. For Dracontius, the temperate climate 'barely holds two' of the five zones. In Ovid's passage, however, there is no indication that the temperate climate occupies a smaller piece of the world than the other, or that its hold is perhaps tenuous.¹¹¹ Another parallel can be found in Vergil's *Georgics*, 1.231-39:

Idcirco certis dimensum partibus orbem
per duodena regit mundi sol aureus astra.
quinque tenent caelum zonae : quarum una corusco
semper sole rubens et torrida semper ab igni ;
quam circum extremae dextra laevaue trahuntur
caeruleae, glacie concretae atque imbribus atris ;
has inter mediamque duae mortalibus aegris
munere concessae divom, et via secta per ambas,
obliquus qua se signorum verteret ordo.¹¹²

While Dracontius' uses his description in a context much different from those of Ovid and Vergil, it is safe to see them as literary sources for it. However, they do not account for Dracontius' use of *vix*. It is possible that Dracontius invented this concept himself, but it may also be that he has another source.

This third source is likely to be Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* (the end of the sixth book of his *De Re Publica*) While this text may, as a piece of philosophical

zone of these may not be dwelt in by reason of the heat; deep snow covers two, two he placed between and gave them temperate climate, mingling heat with cold'.

¹¹¹ While different, the Dracontius passage does bear a striking resemblance to that of Ovid: 'vix habet ipsa duas' (Dracontius, of the 'temperies caeli') compared to 'nix tegit alta duas' (Ovid, of the poles).

¹¹² Vergil, *Georgics*, in Virgil, *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I-VI*, ed. and trans. by H. Rushton Fairclough, Loeb Classical Library, rev. edn, 2 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1965), I, pp. 80-237 (p. 97). Fairclough's translation: 'To this end the golden Sun rules his circuit, portioned out in fixed divisions, through the world's twelve constellations. Five zones comprise the heavens; whereof one is ever glowing with the flashing sun, ever scorched by his flames. Round this, at the world's ends, two stretch darkling to right and left, set fast in ice and black storms. Between these and the middle zone, two by grace of the gods have been vouchsafed to feeble mortals; and a path is cut between the two, wherein the slanting array of the Signs may turn'.

prose, seem an odd source for a poem, Dracontius does elsewhere use a speech, Cicero's *Pro Marcello* (line 199), and the *Somnium Scipionis* was certainly known in Late Antique Africa. Indeed, the use of prose texts as *exempla* for poetry is a very old practice in Classical verse, and Vergil himself used them. Its use here, therefore, should not be surprising. Cicero's description of the world in the *Somnium Scipionis* is essentially the same as those found in Ovid and Vergil. The nature of Cicero's passage, coming, as it does, at the end of a philosophical work modelled upon Plato's *Republic*, is rather different from its poetic parallels, and contains quite a lot more detail. The passage's emphasis is also very different: it emphasises the smallness of the world which is inhabited by the Romans. Cicero writes:

hic autem alter [cingulus] subiectus aquiloni, quem incolitis, cerne quam tenui vos parte contingat. omnis enim terra, quae colitur a vobis, angustata verticibus, lateribus latior, parva quaedam insula est circumfusa illo mari, quod Atlanticum, quod magnum, quem Oceanum appellatis in terris, qui tamen tanto nomine quam sit parvus, vides.¹¹³

While Cicero's description includes much that is not reflected in Dracontius' lines, such as the southern 'temperate zone' being unreachable from the northern, the same sense of smallness is present in both.

If Dracontius is indeed thinking of Cicero's account when he writes his description of the world, there remains the question of how he knows it. The *Somnium Scipionis* was known to the Middle Ages through the agency of Macrobius and his *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*, which preserves the original text along with Macrobius' commentary on it. Most probably, Macrobius was an African who

¹¹³ For the Latin: Cicero, *De Re Publica*, in Cicero, *De Re Publica, De Legibus*, ed. and trans. by Clinton Walker Keyes, Loeb Classical Library, 28 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1970), XVI, pp. 12-285 (6.20.21). Trans: 'but this other band placed under the North Wind, in which you dwell, see that it holds you in a slender (*tenuis*) region. For the whole land which is inhabited by you is narrowed at its poles, broad at its flanks, is a certain little island surrounded by that sea which you call in your land the Atlantic, the Great, the Ocean; which, you see, despite such a great name, is small itself.'

wrote sometime around the beginning of the fifth century, which would make him well placed as a source for Dracontius' knowledge.¹¹⁴ However, in view of Dracontius' use of *vix*, the likelihood of his having Macrobius in mind becomes slim. Macrobius' commentary on Cicero's description of the world varies quite a lot in sense from the original. He writes:

inter extremos [cingulos] vero et medium duo [cinguli] maiores ultimis, medio minor, ex utriusque vicinitatis intemperie temperantur, in hisque tantum vitales auras natura dedit incolis carpere.¹¹⁵

Dracontius' passage does not seem to be influenced by Macrobius, but rather by Cicero directly.¹¹⁶ That Dracontius is using Cicero as his model is further supported by looking at line 75 of the *Satisfactio*, where Dracontius' use of 'auris vitalibus' clearly resonates with Macrobius' 'vitales auras': Dracontius knew Macrobius' text, and his diversion from it here supports his use of another source, namely Cicero.

While this may seem a trivial matter, it may in fact be of some importance. Certainly, it is possible that Dracontius did not have Cicero's description in mind when he wrote his own, and certainly it is his use of *vix* that links the description to its greater context. Yet this still remains an important line of inquiry and can, if corroborated by evidence from further study of Dracontius' text, give us a fairly accurate account of the sources at Dracontius' disposal, and thus an account of the sources available to the Vandalic court in the late-fifth century. If Dracontius appears

¹¹⁴ William Harris Stahl, 'Introduction', in Macrobius, *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*, trans. by William Harris Stahl (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966), pp. 3-65 (pp. 4-5) The fact that Scipio himself is inextricably linked to Africa should also be noted here.

¹¹⁵ Macrobius (Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius), *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*, ed. by Jacob Willis (Leipzig: Teubner, 1963), 2.5.12: Trans. 'Indeed, between the outer belts and the middle there are two belts, larger than the remote ones, smaller than the middle, made temperate from the intemperate weather of both neighbours. Only in these does nature give the life-giving breezes for the inhabitants to take.' The parallel is not as strong as that with Cicero's version.

¹¹⁶ It should be noted that Macrobius himself was aware of Vergil's description of the world from the *Georgics* discussed above, and makes reference to it.

to know Cicero's *De Re Publica* in its own right, it means that it was not yet lost, and that it was still being read in its full and independent form, instead of in fragment form (as in Macrobius). While one possible reference to Cicero does not give enough evidence to establish Dracontius' knowledge of him, it does give us grounds for inquiry, and further work may yield a great deal in terms of the sources available in Africa in the late-fifth century.

Looking at this passage in its wider context can also shed important light on Dracontius' work. These lines form part of a discourse depicting the world as a mixture of good and evil. Dracontius tells us that 'with its waves, the deep sea supplies delights and death' and continues in a fashion reminiscent of Ecclesiastes 3: 'a time to get, and a time to lose; a time to keep, and a time to cast away'.¹¹⁷ He finishes the passage with what his point really is: 'what the sky, the earth, the sea, what the purer air/ have not earned the right to have [that is, the good without the bad, joy without sorrow] how should man have this?'¹¹⁸ He then explains his own sin, which earned him his prison sentence, and compares his own error to that of the Israelites, when they worshipped the golden calf in the wilderness.¹¹⁹ This is an important passage, as it explains to us what Dracontius did to earn his imprisonment: the writing of the panegyric to the *ignotum dominum* discussed above. It also holds another, more easily overlooked, importance. In it, Dracontius mixes the biblical with the Classical, moving from Ovid, to Vergil, to Ecclesiastes and Exodus. He is arguing his case to a barbarian king, and doing so with verse interwoven with both Christian and pagan learning. This gives his text a particularly Late Antique feeling,

¹¹⁷ Dracontius, *Satisfactio*, 73: 'delicias mortisque parat mare fluctibus altum', and Ecclesiastes, 3.6.

¹¹⁸ Dracontius, *Satisfactio*, 91-92: 'Quod caelum, quod terra, fretum, quod purior aer/ non meruere simul, hoc homo quando habeat?'

¹¹⁹ Dracontius, *Satisfactio*, 93-98.

and places him solidly in the literary developments going on in the successor kingdoms in Europe, and even in the Byzantine East.

His mixing of the biblical and the Classical also shows us his ease within the learning of both worlds. Dracontius is comfortable switching from one world to the next, and expects his audience to be so as well. This would suggest at least some level of understanding and familiarity in his audience with the received knowledge of both traditions.¹²⁰ This indicates some degree of learning on the part of the Vandalic court of Gunthamund. At the very least, it should dispel any image of a truly barbaric court: these men, the king in particular, to whom this poem is addressed, were expected to appreciate the Classical references and it was hoped that they would be persuaded by the biblical arguments for forgiveness couched in Classical terms. This is very much in line with what we know of the next Vandal king's court, that of Thrasamund.¹²¹ In fact, Thrasamund's court was one of the most culturally enlightened courts of Late Antiquity. This passage certainly suggests that the Vandalic court of Gunthamund was far from 'barbaric', and that it may, in fact, have had some fairly erudite members.

Lastly, the brevity of Dracontius' passage should be brought to mind. It is only two lines. Two lines which tell us that the temperate climate barely holds two of the five zones of the earth. What of the other zones? Clearly, Dracontius expected his audience to infer the existence of the three additional zones and, more importantly, to know that they were bad. This description is part of a discussion of good and evil; where is the evil? Dracontius leaves the description of it out, so as to

¹²⁰ Yitzhak Hen, *Roman Barbarians: the Royal Court and Culture in the Early Medieval West* (Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 72-73, believes that Latin was a spoken language among the Vandals. Dracontius' poems would seem to confirm this.

¹²¹ For an excellent and in-depth analysis of the court of Thrasamund, see Yitzhak Hen, *Roman Barbarians*, pp. 59-93.

emphasize it: two zones are temperate, yes, but two are frozen, ‘set fast in ice and black storms’, and one, the biggest, is ‘ever glowing with the flashing sun, ever scorched by his flames’.¹²² But in order for the emphasis to work, the audience must know of the other zones and their natures, or the lines do not work, or at least not well. This is very important, and can inform us a good deal about the knowledge and learning of his audience. Dracontius’ audience, his poems strongly suggest, was, among other learned individuals, the court of the Vandal king.

The lines immediately preceding Dracontius’ description of the earth, lines 87 and 88, also show us an intriguingly Classical viewpoint. Dracontius writes that ‘omnia nec mala sunt nec sunt bona sidera caeli;/ Lucifer hoc docuit, Sirius hoc monuit’.¹²³ To think of Lucifer in a Christian context as being neither good nor evil is difficult. Isaiah 14.12 tells us that Lucifer thought himself greater than God, and so was cast down into Hell. Therefore, in a Christian context, one would expect Lucifer to be nothing but evil. So, why does Dracontius say this? In the Classical tradition, Lucifer, the ‘light-bringer’, is simply the Morning Star, that is, the planet Venus, much as Sirius is the Dog Star. Dracontius, therefore, can only be thinking of Lucifer in a Classical mindset, or his statement would not make any sense whatsoever. It does not have a bad connotation in Classical Latin. If anything, it possesses a generally good connotation. In Classical terms, Sirius is the more questionable of the two, as it brings with it the blazing heat of the late summer. It is possible that Dracontius is unaware of the passage from Isaiah, yet it is highly improbable, for he appears otherwise to know the Bible very well. An explanation might be found,

¹²² Vergil, *Georgics*, 1.233-34, trans. by H. Rushton Fairclough,.

¹²³ Dracontius, *Satisfactio*, 87-88. Translation: ‘All of the stars of heaven are neither good, nor are they evil: this Lucifer [the Morning Star] shows, this Sirius [the Dog Star] teaches us’.

however, in that the Judeo-Christian notion of Lucifer as the Devil had not yet supplanted the Roman notion of Lucifer as the Morning Star. A fourth-century bishop of Cagliari, Lucifer Calaritanus, who fought viciously against the Arians and eventually entered into schism himself, shows that the name could be used without difficulty in a Christian context. Dracontius' use of the term in the Classical sense, then, might indicate that Lucifer was not yet fully associated with the Devil. Indeed, this conclusion is fully supported by Dracontius' contemporaries, who, when they use the word *Lucifer*, are always referring to Venus, the Morning Star.¹²⁴

Again, Dracontius' audience was meant to distinguish the difference. If they were thinking in purely biblical terms, and had no real exposure to the Classics or Classical culture, they would not understand this line. This tells us that his audience must have been aware of the Roman connotations of 'Lucifer', as was the case with Lucifer Calaritanus in the fourth century. This implies a high level of contact with, and quite possibly an engaging in, late Roman culture, or at least a fluency in spoken Latin on the part of his audience. This can shed important light on the Vandal court culture to which Dracontius belonged. It implies that the Vandal court was something much more along the lines of an Imperial Roman court, than the court of a wild and barbarous Germanic king. Indeed, this latter idea should be thrown out entirely. While this one quotation from Dracontius, like the one discussed above, cannot give us any definite proofs or answers, corroboration from further analysis of other passages can serve to confirm its implications.

Taken together with the wider evidence of the *loci similes*, these two passages can show us quite a lot. They show us a poem skilfully interwoven with

¹²⁴ Prudentius is really the only poet to compare with, as he is the only Christian poet of the period, besides Dracontius, to use the word. However, Prudentius uses it three times, and, each time, he uses it in the sense of the Morning Star.

ideas and influences from two fundamentally different cultures. This union, however, is nothing unique. It is a characteristic of Late Antique literature as a whole. Dracontius' contemporary poets did it, as did the other men of letters. St Augustine did it to perfection, infusing a love of rhetoric and Classical philosophy into his theological works which have laid the foundation of Western Christendom. This, however, tells us something very important. While Dracontius is firmly connected to and rooted in the Classical past, he is nonetheless part of the same trends and attitudes as his contemporary poets. He is not cut off, not isolated. Indeed, there are great similarities between the poetry of Dracontius and that of Avitus of Vienne, which suggest some relationship between these almost precisely contemporary texts.¹²⁵ The culture of Vandal North Africa, at least the high culture witnessed in the works of Dracontius, appears as Classical and, indeed, as solidly Late Antique as the cultures of Italy, Spain, or Gaul. Even the most cursory investigations into Dracontius' text reveal how deeply interconnected Vandal North Africa was with Rome and the other successor kingdoms.

iii. Through the Lens of the Redaction

That Dracontius possessed a large cultural inheritance, however, is not surprising, and is indeed one of the more well-known aspects of his verse. What is rather more interesting, and important, is the continuing presence of the Classical cultural mindset in his works. There is another source of evidence, and one rarely studied, which can shed a great deal of light on Dracontius' cultural mindset. This source is the seventh-century redaction of Eugenius. This redaction, which will be discussed

¹²⁵ The relationship between these poems remains to be fully established, but the similarities are clear, and worth study. As stated earlier, this relationship, and the scholarship on it, will be discussed later in this thesis.

in its own right later in the thesis, serves here as an excellent foil through which Dracontius' employment of the Classics can be better viewed. As Dracontius' poetry shows, the state of Classical learning in Vandal North Africa was very high, perhaps the highest in the Latin West.¹²⁶ The case of seventh-century Spain, in fact, bears some resemblance to late-fifth-century North Africa. It was a time of great learning, especially at the monastery of the Eighteen Martyrs in Zaragoza, where Eugenius resided for a number of years.¹²⁷ This period of great learning in Spain was fostered in part by an infusion of North African monks fleeing troubles in their homeland in about 570.¹²⁸ Certainly, the influx of North African monks had a great deal of impact on Visigothic monasticism, and 'Africa is undoubtedly a very important source for Iberian monasticism for this century'.¹²⁹ Regardless, both Dracontius' time and Eugenius' represent something of high periods of literary and intellectual output: the 'Vandal Renaissance' and the 'Isidoran' period. On the outside, then, it would appear that the cultures of both times could be very similar. At both times the respective kingdoms were undergoing some level of assimilation between barbarian and Roman, and *Romanitas* retained a strong presence.¹³⁰ Eugenius' redaction,

¹²⁶ Riché, *Education and Culture*, pp. 37-39.

¹²⁷ Charles H. Lynch, *Saint Braulio, Bishop of Saragossa (631-651): His Life and Writings* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, 1938).

¹²⁸ Riché, *Education and Culture*, pp. 298-99 and more fully Roger Collins, *Visigothic Spain, 409-711* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), pp. 147-161. The monks were fleeing from the Byzantine Church, due to conflict involving the Three Chapters heresy. For this see Celia Chazelle and Catherine Cubitt, eds, *The Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the failed quest for unity in the sixth-century Mediterranean* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007).

¹²⁹ Pablo C. Díaz, 'Monasticism and Liturgy in Visigothic Spain', in *The Visigoths: Studies in Culture and Society*, ed. by Alberto Ferreiro (Leiden, Boston, Cologne: Brill, 1999), pp. 169-99 (pp. 174-76).

¹³⁰ Riché, *Education and Culture*, p. 37 (Vandal Africa), pp. 255-56 (Visigothic Spain). Also Andreas Schwarz, 'The Settlement of the Vandals in North Africa', in *Vandals, Romans and Berbers: New Perspectives on Late Antique North Africa*, ed. by A. H. Merrills (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 49-57 (p. 57) and Clover, 'The Symbiosis of Romans and Vandals' for Vandal Africa; and Alexander Demandt, 'The Osmosis of Late Roman and Germanic Aristocracies', in *Das Reich und die Barbaren*, ed. by Evangelos K. Chrysos and Andreas

therefore, provides us with a method of comparing the authors' respective methods, which, in turn, allows us not only to investigate those methods more fully, but also to view their cultural implications as well.

In the passages of the *Satisfactio* cited above, the text of Eugenius is identical to that of Dracontius. This would indicate that Eugenius was in touch with the Classics, something which is very much in line with what we know regarding the man. However, Eugenius did in fact change many of Dracontius' Classical references. This is a curious thing, and implies that Eugenius either knew less of the Classics than Dracontius, which is unlikely, or he was consciously changing the references for some reason. To investigate what the underlying differences in Eugenius' approach are, we must once again return to the texts.

To do this, we shall investigate two passages from the *Satisfactio* and one passage from the *De Laudibus Dei* in which Eugenius' recension differs importantly, if sometimes subtly, from Dracontius' original. The first of these is found in lines 61 through 64 of the *Satisfactio* and lines 55 through 58 of the recension. Dracontius writes:

littera doctiloquax apibus cognata refertur,
 quis datur ut habeant vulnera castra favos:
 cera dat ingenium pueris, primordia sensus,
 inde fit ut praestet littera vel noceat.¹³¹

His use of *castra* for 'beehive' has a strong Vergilian resonance, as the use comes from Vergil's *Aeneid*.¹³² This passage forms part of Dracontius' discussion on the mixture of good and bad in the world, as the passage itself illustrates. Certainly bees

Schwarz (Vienna, Cologne: Böhlau, 1989), pp. 75-86 for a more general look at the assimilation of Romans and barbarians focusing primarily on marriage.

¹³¹ Trans: 'Learned and eloquent writing is said to be like the bees,/ to whom it is given that they have the power to wound, hives and honey-combs:/ Wax gives children their talent, the origin of understanding,/ thence it comes that letters can either do good or evil.'

¹³² Vergil, *Aeneid*, 12.588-89.

latter option seems really quite unlikely. This shows Dracontius' intention to incorporate a great deal of Classical resonances in his texts, and shows Eugenius' greater willingness to shed them from the work. This can begin to build a picture of the changes between the times of the two authors. It attests a greater devotion to the Classics on the part of Dracontius, and a greater freedom from them on the part of Eugenius.¹³⁴

This is further corroborated by the passage from the *De Laudibus Dei*. In Dracontius' original, line 408 reads 'uel dum terra fretum, dum terram subleuat aer'.¹³⁵ This line forms part of a speech in which God, having created mankind in the Garden of Eden, is now instructing Adam and Eve on what they are, and what they are not, allowed to eat. This line in particular forms the beginning of a brief passage in which God outlines the timeframe for his instructions:

vel dum terra fretum, dum terram subleuat aer,
dum solis micat axe iubar, dum luna tenebras
dissipat et puro lucent mea sidera caelo,
sumere quidquid habent pomaria nostra licebit.¹³⁶

The point of the passage is clear: this is meant to be a permanent situation. Line 408 is, however, at first glance somewhat obscure: in what way can the air be thought to lift up or support land? Certainly, the biblical account of the division of the lands, sea, and air found at Genesis 1.6-10 differs greatly from this model. In the book of Genesis account, water plays the dominant role, and in no way could Dracontius' line be seen to fit into this worldview.

¹³⁴ This is discussed more fully below in Part II.3.

¹³⁵ Trans: 'Even while the land lifts up the sea, even when the air lifts up the land.'

¹³⁶ *De Laudibus Dei*, 1.408-11. Trans:

'Even while the land lifts up the sea, even when the air lifts up the land,
even when the light of the Sun quivers in the sky, when the moon scatters
the shadows and my own stars shine in a clear sky,
it will be permitted for you to take whatever my orchards contain.'

This line does make sense, however, when one looks at Dracontius' source for it. This source is Lucan's *Pharsalia*. At lines 89-90, the *Pharsalia* reads 'dum terra fretum terramque levabit/ aer'. Dracontius' line, as becomes quite obvious, is pulled almost verbatim from Lucan. Indeed, this represents about as solid a *locus similis* as one could ever hope to find. If we take Dracontius' passage to be not a depiction of a worldview but rather simply a reference to Lucan, then it makes much more sense. Lucan's *Pharsalia* represents one of Dracontius' more favoured sources, and the author employs this work for both the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*.¹³⁷ This line from the *De Laudibus Dei* really only works on the strength of the Lucan quote as the logic of the line is otherwise a bit questionable.

Eugenius, however, substantially alters this passage. Line 292 in the *Hexaemeron*, which corresponds to line 408 of the *De Laudibus Dei*, reads 'dumque freta terra, dum caelum sublevat aer'.¹³⁸ As even the most cursory of glances attests, Eugenius has altered this line substantially. In essence, Eugenius' alterations here have nearly obliterated the Lucan reference which was so strong in the *De Laudibus Dei*. There still exists an echo of Lucan in the line, but the closeness of the reference is destroyed: in the first clause the reversal of *fretum* and *terra* and the addition of the enclitic *-que* certainly weaken the parallel, and the amendment from *terra* to *caelum* in the second clause completes the reference's deletion. These substantial changes make this a very informative line in terms of the present investigation.

¹³⁷ In the *De Laudibus Dei* there are nine *loci similes* with the *Pharsalia*, making Lucan Dracontius' sixth most-used author for this work. We cannot now know if Dracontius used any of Lucan's other works, as all other works solidly attributed to him are now lost. The *Laus Pisonis*, however, a work historically attributed to Lucan, but now considered dubious, is used by Dracontius in the *Satisfactio*. The *Satisfactio* itself has three *loci similes* with Lucan.

¹³⁸ Trans.: 'While the land lifts up the sea, while the air holds up the sky.'

Eugenius' reasons for altering this line almost certainly come from his stated purpose of improving the clarity of Dracontius' original works.¹³⁹ While Eugenius' changes do not always add much meaning to Dracontius' originals, and sometimes they serve to muddle the text more, in this particular case they do add a little bit more to the sense of the passage. While both versions of the passage contain a vision of the world that appears somewhat odd, Eugenius' does come closer to what one might have expected. In the Dracontius/Lucan passage, the air supports the land; in Eugenius, the air supports the sky. Interestingly, neither passage reflects the water-focused picture drawn in Genesis. Eugenius', however, does represent what simple observation could put forth: the 'heavenly vault' is supported by the air. The change in favour of logic or clarity in this line is further supported when its context is taken into consideration. The section of text running roughly from *De Laudibus Dei* lines 400 to 420, lines 284-302 in the *Hexaemeron*, undergoes relatively heavy emendation. Indeed, Eugenius cuts lines 412 and 413 from his recension, most probably due to their redundancy with line 411. In this section of the text Eugenius is making a concerted, if not always successful, effort at improving the logic and clarity of the text: the changes in line 408/292 are simply a part of this effort.

As seen in the previous passage, Dracontius tends to have a greater affinity for the Classics than Eugenius in terms of textual composition. While it is possible that Eugenius is unfamiliar with the works of Lucan, and so his deletion of the Lucan reference is merely accidental, this is rather unlikely. While no manuscripts of Lucan come from Spain, this cannot really tell us anything either way, for Lucan's

¹³⁹ Eugenius outlines his purpose in revising the texts of Dracontius in the *incipit* to his recension of the *De Laudibus Dei* (referred to as the *Hexaemeron*). This can be found on p. 27 of the MGH edition of the texts of Dracontius. The prefaces are discussed below, pp. 178-184.

manuscript tradition is remarkably weak, with no complete manuscripts predating the later Middle Ages.¹⁴⁰ Lucan, however, was originally a Spanish author, and one of the major authors of Silver Age Latin, and, hence the absence of his works in later Visigothic Spain, especially in the learned circles in which Eugenius existed, would seem highly unlikely. The likelihood of Eugenius' ignorance becomes even thinner when one considers the presence of two *loci similes* with Lucan found in his original poems. Again, as in the above passage, Eugenius' alterations most likely spring from a differing approach to the Classics.

Indeed, this change in attitude to the Classics is more pronounced in this passage than in the previous. In his version, Dracontius goes out of his way to make a strong reference to Lucan. Dracontius goes so far as to sacrifice some of the passage's meaning, and much of its logic and clarity, in an effort to more closely resemble the work of Lucan. Firstly, this tells us that Dracontius' method of poetic composition focused much more heavily on aesthetics than on the narrative or on clarity of meaning. On the other hand, Eugenius' alterations show the bishop's priorities to be different. For him clarity of meaning and the narrative overtake aesthetics as the primary focus of poetic composition.¹⁴¹ Eugenius, in other words, takes a more austere approach to poetry than Dracontius, who revels in his own sumptuous, and characteristically Late Antique, style. Secondly, as above, this shows us that Dracontius is much more concerned with, and focused on, the Classics than Eugenius. Dracontius sees the speech in this passage, which poetically expresses the concept of 'as long as the world lasts', as the perfect point at which to include a

¹⁴⁰ A. Bourgery, 'Introduction', in *Lucain. La guerre civile (la Pharsale)*, ed. by A. Bourgery, 2 vols (Paris: Les Belles-Lettres, 1926), I, v-xx (pp. xi-xiv).

¹⁴¹ This fits with Eugenius' statement of intention in his preface to the redaction. See the arguments in Part II, sections two and three below.

quotation from Lucan, as Lucan also narrates a speech expressing this same concept. This line in Dracontius really only works in terms of the *locus similis*: on its own, it seems somewhat out of place. Eugenius appears to have thought this as well, and so he cut the reference to make the passage clearer, again showing that his focus was less on the Classics than that of Dracontius.

In the third passage the two versions differ in a very subtle, yet very meaningful, way. Speaking of the glories of the Roman Empire, Dracontius writes in lines 199-200 of the *Satisfactio*: ‘Gloria bellorum ducibus populisque triumphos/ in commune datos diuidit armipotens’.¹⁴² This passage can be translated in several different ways.¹⁴³ This passage has Ciceronian resonances, bearing a resemblance to his *Pro Marcello*.¹⁴⁴ While the dispute regarding this passage centres around the word *bellorum*, and all agree on the Ciceronian resonances, we should instead bring our attention to Dracontius’ use of the word *triumphos*. *Triumphus* can have two or three different meanings, namely ‘victory’, as we would use the word in English, or ‘triumph’, as in the victory parade and celebration granted to victorious generals, and their soldiers, in the Roman Republic, and lastly in a more figurative sense, such as *Victoria*. The first and third definitions are relatively uncommon in Classical Latin, and the second, that of ‘triumphal celebration’, is by far the most common. This definition, ‘triumphal celebration’, appears more appropriate to this context, translating the passage as ‘the glory of war, powerful in arms, shares between leaders and the people the triumphs given in common’. While ‘triumphus’ could perhaps be

¹⁴² Trans: ‘The glory of wars, powerful in arms, shares between leaders and the people the triumphs given in common.’ (Reading ‘populus’ here in the medieval sense of ‘a person’ rather than the Classical sense of ‘a people’)

¹⁴³ There is some degree of dispute as to the grammatical relationship of *bellorum*. The translators of the *Satisfactio*, Moussy and Sister St Margaret, both take it differently. St Margaret takes *bellorum* to modify *ducibus*, whereas Moussy takes it with *triumphos*. In translating this, I have taken a third route, and have taken it with *gloria*.

¹⁴⁴ At 6 and 11.

taken here as meaning ‘victory’, the passage works better if it is taken as meaning ‘victory parades’, as it is only in the physical celebration that the common people would be able to participate alongside the Emperor. If we look at this passage in the context of the following lines, the taking of this *triumphus* in the sense of a victory parade becomes even more justified. The lines read: ‘nam ducibus solis praestat clementia laudem,/ non habet haec comitem participemque negat’.¹⁴⁵ When Dracontius speaks of *clementia* he is not discussing the abstract concept of mercy, but rather the action of mercy, the actual sparing of the vanquished.¹⁴⁶ This contrast really only works well if one takes the *triumphus* of the preceding lines as an action itself.

Dracontius’ use of *triumphus* in this sense is very telling. The idea of the triumph is a very Roman one, and this is the most common use of the word in Classical texts. The triumph was an important celebration in Republican and Imperial Rome which celebrated the victory of the *imperator*, the victorious commander, and his soldiers, as well as the victory, and glory, of Rome itself.¹⁴⁷ Triumphs included the common people (as spectators) along with the leaders, and as

¹⁴⁵ Dracontius, *Satisfactio*, ll. 201-02. Trans: ‘Indeed clemency provides praise for leaders only, this does not have a companion and denies sharers.’

¹⁴⁶ This is further confirmed by looking at this passage in its context: an exhortation to Gunthamund to be merciful. The central theme here is *clementia*, and not *clementia* in terms of lofty ideals, but in terms of physically sparing Dracontius himself.

¹⁴⁷ This, of course, is a basic outline. For a recent and in-depth study of the Roman triumph, see Mary Beard, *The Roman Triumph* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007). For a discussion of the eventual fate of the Roman triumph, with a focus on art history, see Sabine G. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1981). She argues that the triumph became incorporated into the imperial *adventus*. For an in-depth historical discussion of the triumph and victory ceremony from Late Antiquity through to the end of the Early Middle Ages, see Michael McCormick, *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986). In Republican Rome generals held the title of *imperator* and celebrated the triumph, but after Augustus, it was only the emperor himself who held this title and the right to triumph that went along with it. It is not until the Byzantine Empire that we see a general (Belisarius) once again celebrate a triumph.

such, fit the context of Dracontius' lines very well. His use of the word shows that his mind is still very much imbued with Roman culture and a Roman way of thinking. This, in turn, suggests that he expected to find the same *Romanitas* in his audience. This can tell us something important about the culture of Vandal North Africa. It shows that Roman ideas had not yet passed and that the 'Vandal mind' was still possessed of Classical Roman culture. This, indeed, should not come as a surprise, since the Vandalic Hasding royal line was tied to the Imperial Roman Theodosian house.¹⁴⁸ It does show us that the Classical learning prevalent at the time of Dracontius was not solely an academic enterprise, as Classical concepts and ideas were still understood and deemed relevant in a Vandalic context.¹⁴⁹ Indeed, we know from our sources that the Vandals practised triumphal celebrations.¹⁵⁰ Combined with what we know of the state of Classical learning in Late Antique North Africa, this practice makes a good argument for the continuity of Classical culture during the period of Vandal rule. In fact, the triumph as we see it in these lines of Dracontius bears a closer resemblance to the Classical triumph than does that of the Byzantines, which had already begun the shift to a smaller audience, which less involved the

¹⁴⁸ Gaiseric had secured the marriage of Eudocia, the daughter of Valentinian III, to his own son Huneric. While Gunthamund and Thrasamund belonged to another line of the family, Hilderic, who reigned from 523-530, was a member of the Theodosian line through his mother, Eudocia. For an analysis of this marriage and of Vandalic royal succession, see Ian Wood, 'Royal succession and legitimation in the Roman West, 419-536', in *Staat im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. by Stuart Airlie, Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, II (Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2006), pp. 59-72.

¹⁴⁹ Justinian's triumph after his conquest of the Vandals shows that the tradition of the triumph was still alive in the Byzantine East several decades after the time of Dracontius' writing. This furthers the argument that the idea was alive and well throughout the Mediterranean.

¹⁵⁰ McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, p. 261-66.

common people.¹⁵¹ This evidence suggests a strong continuity with the late Roman past.

Eugenius' edition of this passage tells us equally as much about his own context. Eugenius adapts the passage as follows:

gloria bellorum ducibus populisque triumphus,
 in commune datum diuidit omnipotens;
 nam ducibus tantum praestat clementia laudem,
 non habet haec comitem participemque negat.¹⁵²

Eugenius' passage differs in a few places. The most important for us are his changing of *triumphos* and *datos* into *triumphus* and *datum*, making *triumphus* the subject of *diuidit* instead of the object. His editing makes this passage rather obscure, and is not an improvement upon the text of Dracontius. While it is somewhat garbled, sense can be made out of it easily enough, and one thing is clear: the sense of *triumphus* has changed. *Triumphus* here is a synonym for *victoria*. It represents an abstract idea, not the physical triumphal celebration of Dracontius.

This shows us that there had been a cultural shift from the time of Dracontius, and that Classical culture, at least as an active way of living, had begun to lose ground. Certainly the level of Classical learning was very high in Eugenius' Spain, but it was beginning to become exactly that: learning. In Dracontius' North Africa Classical culture was still very much alive, it was something which people could take part in, but this passage suggests that in Eugenius' time it was starting to slip. With the loss of public ritual, Classical culture was becoming only an activity of

¹⁵¹ McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, p. 35-79.

¹⁵² Eugenius, *Recension*, ll. 171-74. Trans: 'Glory and all-powerful victory share in common between leaders and people the gift of wars. Indeed clemency provides praise to leaders alone, this does not have a companion and denies sharers.' Alternatively, one could take 'omnipotens' with 'gloria bellorum' in apposition to 'triumphus'. If one does this, it is possible to read 'triumphus' as 'triumphal celebration', but I still prefer to translate it here as 'victory', because victory makes more sense as the 'glory of wars' than does the celebration of the triumph.

the mind, and not of both the mind and the body. Eugenius changed the meaning of *triumphus* to something more recognizable in late-seventh-century Visigothic Spain, to the abstract idea. His use is approaching more to the medieval usage of later centuries than to the more Antique usage of Dracontius. Eugenius may have believed that Dracontius' use was not applicable to Visigothic contexts. Yet, we know that the Visigoths held victory celebrations.¹⁵³ However, the Visigothic victory celebration appears, as McCormick accurately points out, incredibly similar to that of contemporary Byzantine Constantinople.¹⁵⁴ The 'triumph' of Wamba may indeed spring more from the imitation of the Byzantine emperor, than from continuity with the Roman past. Certainly, the victory celebration of the Visigoths, with its heavily Christian liturgical elements, would have been largely unrecognisable to the *triumphatores* of the preceding centuries, and may have been viewed as a different ceremony altogether.¹⁵⁵ Eugenius' alteration lends credence to this view.

This passage allows us not only to compare the reception, and the condition, of Latin Classical culture in Vandal North Africa with that of late Visigothic Spain, but it also allows us some insight into the workings and individual culture and *mores* of the authors and the culture of their kingdoms. While the image of the Roman triumph was relevant to Vandal North Africa, it was not to Late-Visigothic Spain.

What had changed?

¹⁵³ McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, p. 302ff. McCormick gives one solid example of a 'triumph' in Visigothic Spain, held by King Wamba in 673. Some of McCormick's evidence for triumphs in Visigothic Spain can be rendered invalid by reading *triumphus* in the fashion we have done above, but he does indeed show that the victory celebration was alive in Visigothic Spain.

¹⁵⁴ McCormick, p. 314.

¹⁵⁵ While the late Roman triumph had become more and more Christianised, and the Byzantine celebration even more so, the Visigothic seems to have had the strongest ecclesiastical element of them all, and differs substantially from that of the late Roman Empire in the West, if less so from that in the East. See McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, who spends several chapters on the Christianisation of the triumph. A summation regarding this can be found on pp. 391-92.

iv. Conclusion

The answer to this question is, indeed, the central investigation of this thesis, and requires further investigation into both the texts and their wider contexts. These differences between the texts of Dracontius and Eugenius taken together can tell us a great deal about the places and times in which they were written. It is important also to remember that, while there are differences in the texts, there are also similarities, and Eugenius treats the Classics with no less skill than Dracontius.¹⁵⁶ What is different is their perception of the Classics and Classical culture, and their priorities. Dracontius incorporated a great deal of Christian material into his poetry. Eugenius, who was a bishop, incorporated even more. Certainly, both men were part of the same Late Antique tradition of poetry, as will be seen later in this thesis. Yet, their work does differ in significant ways. The changes made by Eugenius help to chronicle the changes experienced in Late Antique culture in the years between 490 and 650. Certainly a great deal had changed politically in this time, the end of the Vandal kingdom not the least of these changes. Certainly, then, we should expect some cultural transformations to be taking place. This can be seen in the four passages discussed above, and can be made ever clearer with the further study into this work undertaken below. What we must finally note here is that Dracontius was in many ways part of a *living* Classical culture: his style may have been Late Antique, but his entire frame of reference and the cultural foundations upon which he was working were Classical. Dracontius considered himself, and indeed was, a *vir togatus*, a Roman senator: for him Rome was still a living, breathing, thing, yet it was not a political reality, but a cultural one. His cultural mindset was Classical.

¹⁵⁶ This can be seen most clearly at line fifty-five of the *Satisfactio*, where Eugenius seizes upon an opportunity to employ a Vergilian resonance which Dracontius had not.

2: Dracontius' *Opera* and the World of Late Antique Poetry

i. Introduction

That Dracontius did not compose his poetry in a vacuum applies equally as much to his engagement with contemporary, or near-contemporary, works as it does to those of Classical Antiquity. Dracontius' literary knowledge did not end with the last of the Classical authors, but rather continued undisturbed through to his own day. Just as Dracontius' poetry was imbued with the Classics as discussed in the last chapter, so too was it imbued with the works of Late Antiquity. This is evident from his writings, as he used the work of other Late Antique poets as *exempla* in exactly the same fashion in which he used those of the Classical authors. Indeed, some of Dracontius' most favoured sources come from Late Antiquity. It is Dracontius' use of Late Antique sources, and his place within that cultural world, that are the concerns of this chapter.

The method of inquiry to be undertaken here is generally the same as for the Classics, yet it provides the answers to very different questions. Instead of rooting Dracontius' poetry in Classical literature and culture, it will show how far it is a part of contemporary Late Antique trends. The answer to this inquiry will shed considerable light on the extent of the cultural connectedness of Vandal North Africa to the rest of the post-Roman West. Additionally, the comparison of Dracontius' works with those of his contemporaries can serve to elucidate the cultural and literary motivations behind his poetry, and whatever the characteristics are that make it unique.

Before embarking on this investigation, however, it is useful to look at Dracontius' poetry in the more general context of Late Antique literature. In his verse, Dracontius shows himself to be a varied poet, skilled in several different

genres and knowledgeable in both Greco-Roman mythology and the Bible. His works strongly reflect the tastes and styles of Late Antiquity. The *De Laudibus Dei* represents his foray into the highly popular Late Antique genre of biblical epic.¹⁵⁷ The *Satisfactio*, although written in the same general style as the *De Laudibus Dei*, represents a different genre; that best exemplified by Ovid's poems of exile, but with a new, Christian, twist. As seen above, these poems are heavily laden with the collected literary inheritance of Classical Antiquity, yet they still remain very much Christian pieces. The *De Laudibus Dei* tells the story of the Creation found in the book of Genesis in language strikingly reminiscent of Ovid's treatment of the creation in the *Metamorphoses*. Yet, at times it contains fairly detailed references to the theological debates raging in the works of the prose commentators, not least of whom was St Augustine.¹⁵⁸ Dracontius moves freely back and forth between these two bodies of literature, and in doing so, creates poetry expressing Christian themes in Classical expressions. This fusion of Christian and Classical culture is the heart of Late Antique Christian literature. And literature is reflective of its time: Late Antique Christianity saw the introduction of Neo-Platonism into its exegetical framework, most notably in the thought of Origen and of Dracontius' fellow African, St Augustine. Stylistically, these two works of Dracontius do indeed bear a strong resemblance to the other biblical epics and to the works of other Christian authors more generally.¹⁵⁹ Even at the darkest moments in the *Satisfactio*, the tone and theme of these works remain Christian.

¹⁵⁷ For biblical epic, and Dracontius' place within it, see mainly the monographs of Michael Roberts as well as the work of Daniel J. Nodes.

¹⁵⁸ The best discussion to be found regarding exegesis in the *De Laudibus Dei* is in the chapters on Dracontius in Daniel J. Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis in Biblical Latin Poetry*, ARCA, 31 (Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1993).

¹⁵⁹ Origen, of course, significantly predates Dracontius. Augustine, on the other hand, was still a figure of recent memory for late-fifth-century North Africa.

Of a very different sort are the *Carmina profana*, or *Romulea*. These ten poems reflect, in one sense, a completely different literary world from that of the *De Laudibus Dei* and the *Satisfactio*. Their subject matter is exclusively pagan Greco-Roman mythology, ranging from the labours of Hercules, through various *epithalamia*, to the events of the Trojan War, as mentioned briefly in the previous chapter. Written primarily in the dactylic hexameter appropriate to epic, these poems, which resemble ‘miniature epics’, expound upon Classical subjects with the ornamentation characteristic of the Late Antique Latin style. Of Dracontius’ *Carmina profana* it has been said that ‘it seems as though the wreck of ancient literature had left the poet no pabulum but epic and no subject for his talents but the gods’, the author’s originality having been cut off by his ‘inescapable subservience to the ancients’.¹⁶⁰ This is an unfounded and untenable view. Dracontius’ use of epic is firmly in keeping with the poetic tastes of his day, and when he deems necessary, he uses other metres, such as the elegiac couplet of the *Satisfactio*. Surely Dracontius did use Classical mythological stories and motifs in his *Romulea*, but it would be an error to see these as ‘subservience’ to the Classics. In fact, Late Antiquity saw the compilation and codification of a vast quantity of ancient myths and legends, as well as other diverse pieces of Classical knowledge and learning, especially in North Africa, with the work of Fulgentius the Mythographer and Martianus Capella. The Classical myths and legends, stories that had been a part of the culture of *Romanitas* since its inception, were well known and well liked, and formed the basic framework within which poets could construct new pieces. Coming from a different part of Classical culture, the philosophical, the *Consolatio Philosophiae* of Boethius

¹⁶⁰ Mark J. Edwards, ‘Dracontius the African and the Fate of Rome’, *Latomus*, 63 (2004), 151-60 (pp. 153-54).

represents, at heart, what we find in the *Romulea*: a Christian finding comfort in the Classics.¹⁶¹ While outwardly appearing to be solely classically influenced pieces, these poems are in fact exceptionally Late Antique, and retell the old stories in new and innovate ways.¹⁶² This can best be seen in Dracontius' other long work, the *Orestis Tragoedia*.

The *Orestis Tragoedia* is a rather stranger creature. While its name would suggest that it is a tragedy in the traditional sense, it is nothing of the sort. The poem itself is, in essence, a hexameter epic, written in the more 'ornate' later Latin style and heavy with Vergilian resonances. While the *Orestis* does indeed read like an epic, its indebtedness to the tragedies of Seneca is evident in the scattered parallels and in the overall grimness and gloominess so characteristic of Seneca's tragedies.¹⁶³ It should also, of course, be noted that Seneca's tragedies also read rather more like epic than drama. While the subject matter and the style are taken directly from the Classical inheritance, what Dracontius does with the tale is unparalleled in the whole corpus of the Orestes story, from Aeschylus up to Dracontius' own time. Dracontius freely inserts new elements, and combines different pieces from varying sources together into this 974-line poem. His Agamemnon, while returning to Greece, finds the sacrificed-yet-spared Iphigenia in Tauris, but an angry Diana thwarts his attempt to bring her home.¹⁶⁴ Later in the poem, after the grisly events of Agamemnon's return have transpired, Orestes is spirited off by his sister, Electra. However, unlike in the standard versions of the story, Electra accompanies her brother, and sails with

¹⁶¹ For Boethius see, in general, Henry Chadwick, *Boethius*.

¹⁶² The best discussion of the *epyllia* (miniature epics) amongst the *Romulea* is Bright, *Miniature Epic*, in which Dracontius' innovative streak is frequently demonstrated and discussed.

¹⁶³ The similarities with Seneca go even deeper. Bright, *Miniature Epic*, p. 201 argues that, for the *Orestis*, Dracontius' whole conception of the work is indeed Senecan.

¹⁶⁴ Dracontius, *Orestis Tragoedia (Orestes)*, ll. 41-107. Euripides had Iphigenia in Tauris, but certainly did not have Agamemnon there.

him to Athens in the very ship, and replete with the very treasure, which Agamemnon had taken back to Greece.¹⁶⁵ Dracontius' account ends, as do the Greek tragic accounts, with Orestes being pursued by the *Erinyes*, the Furies, to the court of Athens to await trial. However, the trial in Dracontius differs from that found in the Greek tragedians (which differ from each other) in that Orestes is accused by the shade of Achilles, and the principal crime for which he is accused is the murder of Neoptolemus, Achilles' son, which he committed in revenge for Neoptolemus' theft of his promised bride Hermione. While this murder is found in Euripides' *Andromache*, the linking of it with the trial in Athens is unique to Dracontius. Thus we see Dracontius creating a framework of the standard events of the *Oresteia*, combining them with rather more obscure parts of the story, and then adding in his own elements and contributions.¹⁶⁶ This method of composition created a piece that contains surprises even for the most experienced fans of the Orestes saga. These, however, are just three examples of the way in which Dracontius reworks the existing myth into a new piece. There are many others. This retelling, with its new combinations of stories, all told in the language and style characteristic of Late Antiquity, fits squarely within the spirit of the poetic art of its age.

That these works, taken altogether, denote that Dracontius spent some of his life Christian, some of it pagan, as has often been purported and debated, is a weak case. When making a moral argument, as in the *Satisfactio* and, to a somewhat lesser extent in the *De Laudibus Dei*, Dracontius freely employs biblical passages and

¹⁶⁵ Dracontius, *Orestes*, ll. 284-90. Additionally, Pylades appears, in Dracontius' account, to be Athenian, as opposed to being a resident of Phocis, as he is portrayed in the Greek tradition.

¹⁶⁶ This poem can only be mentioned here in brief; for a full commentary and analysis (including both the original text and a comprehensive look at the secondary literature) see Bright, *Miniature Epic*, pp. 138-206, where this work is discussed in much greater length and detail than can be done here.

stories alongside those of Classical Greece and Rome, yet throughout a form of Christian ethic and thought pervades. In the *Satisfactio* his appeal for mercy is that of a Christian. These works show Dracontius as a Christian, but not as a theologian. His works should not be fully expected to contain the higher levels of Christian thinking seen in the ‘bishop poets’, most notably Avitus of Vienne. Yet at various points he does display a knowledge of the theological debates ongoing in the Christian community, and oftentimes incorporates his own opinion on the matter.¹⁶⁷ His opinions, however, are always subtle, and set within the flow of his verse. He is no theologian, but he is an intelligent and extremely learned Christian with a sophisticated understanding of the Bible. The pagan material should not lead us to think otherwise. The other Late Antique Christian poets expressed a love of the Classics, and utilized them heavily in their own work. That Dracontius’ poems are more apparently ‘pagan’ than those of his fellow poets does not necessarily indicate any paganism on their author’s part. Unlike most of the other major poets of the period, Dracontius was not a cleric.¹⁶⁸ Dracontius learned grammar with the ‘pagan’ works of the Classical authors as his basic texts, as the models from which he learned to read and write. Making variations on those existing models was a key part in the educational process, and some of these school exercises are extant in Dracontius’ own *Romulea*. That Dracontius did as he was taught should not come as

¹⁶⁷ Various examples are to be found in Daniel J. Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis*, in the sections relevant to Dracontius. While Nodes is thorough and his scholarship very good, he does, in my opinion, rather overemphasize Dracontius’ exegetical goals. He possesses them, but they are not as close to the forefront as Nodes suggests. This, however, is most probably due to the narrowness of focus of Nodes’ topic, which is focused, as the title does indeed suggest, on doctrine and exegesis. Certainly, though, Dracontius was familiar with exegesis; it was simply not his principle goal.

¹⁶⁸ For Dracontius’ biography, see the Introduction, with references. Sidonius, although he became a bishop, was not a cleric when he wrote his poetry, and his poetry is rich with Classical material, but not in the same way or to the same extent as some of Dracontius’ *Romulea*.

a surprise. Additionally, the Classics were often used for allegorical purposes, and Dracontius does certainly employ this technique.¹⁶⁹ Dracontius' *Romulea* and *Orestis* are not poems looking longingly backwards and glorifying the Classical pantheon; they are contemporary Late Antique pieces, artistically treating age-old, and entertaining, stories in a new fashion. Oftentimes, indeed, they treat them quite irreverently.¹⁷⁰ They are art, not theology, and reflect much more upon the culture and learning of their authors than on their religious beliefs.

ii. Dracontius' Late Antique Sources

As found with the Classics, Dracontius, while possessing a wide-ranging literary knowledge, refined his use, and favoured certain authors. For the *Satisfactio*, he principally used Sedulius' *Carmen Paschale*, composed circa 430, and the works of Prudentius.¹⁷¹ On a smaller scale, Dracontius employed the works of St Ambrose, Claudian, Damasus, Claudius Marius Victorius, Paulinus of Nola and Sidonius Apollinaris. As should be expected from the very different nature of the works, the *De Laudibus Dei* employs a rather different ratio of Late Antique sources, although most of the authors are themselves repeats from the *Satisfactio*. Principally, his Late Antique sources for this work are Claudian, Claudius Marius Victorius, Sedulius,

¹⁶⁹ On a basic level, Dracontius' use of various episodes from Roman history to substantiate his argument for Christian mercy in the *Satisfactio* testifies to this. It should also, of course, be noted that the use of Classical mythological motifs for allegorical purposes was nothing new in Late Antiquity, but rather was a use that stretched back deep into the Classical period itself.

¹⁷⁰ Dracontius often depicted mythological figures in his work in a less-than-positive light. Bright (*Miniature Epic*, pp. 33-45, regarding *Romulea* 2) argues not only for his upturning of the traditional portrayals of heroes (in this case Hercules), but for Dracontius' incorporation of elements from pantomime to make the reversal more complete.

¹⁷¹ To list only those in the first fifty lines of the *Satisfactio*, where references to these authors are most highly concentrated: 1 (Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale*, 1.60-61), 5 (Prudentius, *Contra Symmachum*, 2.95 and Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale*, 2.250), 15 (Prudentius, *Hamartigenia*, 763), 31-37 (Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale*, 1.206ff), 42 (Prudentius, *Apotheosis*, 216).

Prudentius, Sidonius Apollinaris, Merobaudes, St Cyprian and Paulinus of Nola. In terms of favourites, as far as regards authors, for Book I Dracontius favours the work of Claudian, and draws material from six of that author's poems. In terms of a favoured piece, Dracontius most used the *Aletheia* of Claudius Marius Victorius. This is very much in keeping with Dracontius' use of pieces relevant to his work. Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei* is, on a basic level, a biblical epic, and serves to relate the story of the Creation found in the book of Genesis. Likewise, Claudius Marius Victorius' *Aletheia* is a poetic rendition of the book of Genesis, but extending up until the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. This mutual coverage of the Creation story necessitated Dracontius' use of the *Aletheia*: the learned poet cannot, after all, appear to be ignorant of work in his own field. This use of previous Genesis-epic material leads to another set of parallels to be found in the *De Laudibus Dei*: those held with the *De Spiritualis historiae gestis* of Avitus of Vienne, Dracontius' direct contemporary. While this set of parallels has widely been overlooked by scholarship and presents its own set of difficulties, it is of especial importance and consequently will form a substantial part of this chapter.

At first glance, these *loci similes* can tell us a few things about Dracontius and his work. Firstly, they show Dracontius to be well read not only in the Classical inheritance, but also in the literary inheritance of the post-Classical world, in the works of Late Antiquity. Though he does tend to favour the better-known authors of the period, such as Prudentius and Sedulius, both noted writers of highly Christian works, as per the normal practice of Latin literary, and especially poetic, composition, Dracontius does indeed display a wide-ranging knowledge of fourth- and fifth-century authors. While his use of St Cyprian shows a local North African grounding (St Cyprian was a third-century Carthaginian author, bishop and martyr),

his knowledge of Prudentius, Claudius Marius Victorius, and Claudian, to name just a few, show his knowledge of the literary goings-on of Spain, Gaul and Italy, further illustrating his connectedness to the contemporary literary climate of the Latin world.

On a second note, the *loci similes* show the variety of genres and subjects of the works which Dracontius employed. While this has largely been discussed previously as regards Dracontius' use of the Classics, one additional point raises itself in regard to the Late Antique sources. As noted above, Dracontius did not draw a clear distinction, as is most commonly done today, between what was 'pagan' and what was Christian. Just as he ignored this distinction in his composition, so too did he in his source selection. While most of his Late Antique sources are Christian, this is only because Christians largely dominated the world of Late Antique poetry. Claudian, Dracontius' most-used author for Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, was, in all probability, a pagan.¹⁷² Certainly his works were on pagan themes; his *De raptu Proserpinae*, dealing with the rape of Proserpine/Persephone by Hades, is the work of his from which Dracontius drew most heavily for his *De Laudibus Dei*. His usage of Claudian, who did not possess the same level of authority as Vergil or Ovid, which would have contributed to their general acceptability in even the most Christian of works, suggests Dracontius was not concerned with the 'pagan-ness' of a work or its author, that he merely saw a story for a story, art for art. Put in other words, as Claudian lacked the literary canonicity of Vergil or Ovid, his use could feasibly be disqualified on religious grounds, but Dracontius' use of him suggests

¹⁷² Claudian is referred to as a pagan by both St Augustine and Orosius. The most comprehensive discussion of the religion of Claudian is Alan Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), pp. 189-227. Overall, Claudian appears as a pagan, but not one at enmity with Christianity.

that Dracontius did not view his work as religious, as myths about the gods, but rather as a story involving dramatic characters, without any religious overtones. The story of Proserpine need not be about the daughter of a goddess seized by a lustful god, but rather a story of (really fairly human) passions, and a girl taken from her mother, and her mother's quest to bring her back. This use of sources taken with Dracontius' own compositions shows this 'de-sanctifying' of pagan myths to be part of the author's *modus operandi*.

The third point regards the matters of source availability, and literary and cultural openness in late-fifth-century Vandal North Africa. Most of the authors whom Dracontius employed flourished during the fourth and very-early-fifth century. The works of these authors, therefore, could easily have been brought to Carthage before the Vandal invasion, and, indeed, almost certainly were, as Africa was a great Late Antique centre of learning.¹⁷³ For two authors, however, this is most certainly not the case. Sidonius, most probably of the generation directly preceding Dracontius' own, operated after the Vandal conquest of Africa, and the parallelism between his work and Dracontius' is of especial importance for this reason. Even more important for this question is Avitus of Vienne, most probably of the very same generation as Dracontius, and most certainly his direct contemporary in terms of literary production.¹⁷⁴ The connections between the Genesis epics of these two authors are of great importance to the study of Vandal Africa, as any shared points between them would indicate their immediate transmission. Accordingly, it is on the

¹⁷³ Riché, p.37, Hen, *Roman Barbarians*, pp. 59-93 and Merrills and Miles, pp. 215-216.

¹⁷⁴ In 494 Avitus already held an office; see Danuta Shanzer and Ian Wood, 'Introduction' in *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose*, trans. by Danuta Shanzer and Ian Wood, *Translated Texts for Historians*, 38 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2002), pp. 3-85 (p. 7).

parallels between Dracontius and both Sidonius Apollinaris and Avitus of Vienne that the present chapter will primarily focus.

However, before we more closely investigate Dracontius' Late Antique *loci similes*, we should first look briefly at his Latin style.¹⁷⁵ Dracontius' style stands as a good representative for the Latin style of his age and exhibits all of the general characteristics of Late Antique literature. This is not at all to say that Dracontius is derivative or unoriginal, but simply that his Latin exists as part of the trends of its age. Dracontius exhibits a notable enthusiasm for ekphrasis, for 'verdant' and 'jewelled' language, and for the enumerations or catalogues characteristic of Late Antique literature. This is all in keeping with the trends of his age. The enumeration, which in the Middle Ages was known as *articulus*, is especially characteristic of the works of Sidonius and Dracontius.¹⁷⁶ Indeed, it appears to be one of Dracontius' favourite techniques, as it appears frequently in his works. Dracontius' Latin style, then, shows us the first link between him and his contemporaries. They belong to the very same school: Dracontius' poems could have been written in Gaul, Sidonius' in Africa, and it would not make much difference. That is to say that, in terms of literary culture, Vandal North Africa was no different from, and in fact, fully integrated with, that of the other parts of the Latin West. Yet, was that integration due to contemporary contact, or the shared inheritance of the fourth and early-fifth centuries? Certainly, Dracontius shared in the inheritance of the earlier Late Antique

¹⁷⁵ We need only look briefly at Dracontius' Latin here, because both Michael Roberts' *The Jeweled Style* and his *Biblical Epic* have already ably addressed the style of Late Antique Latin poetry, including the works of Dracontius (most especially his *De Laudibus Dei*, which is essentially identical in style to the *Satisfactio*) in their analysis. I would refer the reader to these works for the elements of style which will here be taken for granted, as, in general, the patterns which he describes are fairly solid. As his conclusions do not largely depend upon the works of Dracontius, but can be supported by the other literature of the day, it is safe to speak of Dracontius in relation to the 'style', because he need not necessarily be a part of it.

¹⁷⁶ Roberts, *The Jeweled Style*, p. 59.

authors. Of this there can be no question, as the parallels with Sedulius and Prudentius testify.¹⁷⁷ But to answer the question, we must investigate the relationship of near-contemporary sources to the work of Dracontius.

Keeping to the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*, one finds two parallels with the works of Sidonius, one in each poem. That in the *Satisfactio* occurs at line thirty-nine, in a section of the poem particularly heavy with Classical, Late Antique and biblical resonances. Indeed, the passage in question is itself a biblical resonance. This resonance is a problematic one, though, as it depends upon a textual emendation. This notwithstanding, the emendation can reasonably be upheld, when its contexts are fully evaluated. The parallel comes at a point when Dracontius is attempting to excuse his wrongdoing, the praise of an *ignotum dominum* and his failure to praise the current king, as something which God had driven him to, and to insert it into a framework of people whom God had changed in some way. He starts with Nebuchadnezzar (in a passage laden with Vergilian and Ovidian resonances) and then moves to Zacharias, the father of St John the Baptist. It is with the latter that we are currently concerned.

Dracontius writes ‘liquit et antistes serus pater ille Iohannis/ elinguisque fuit uoce tacente silens’.¹⁷⁸ Sidonius, in his poem ‘Euchariston ad Faustum Episcopum’, written sometime between 460 and 469, when speaking of the great deeds of the Holy Spirit, refers to Zacharias by name, and, describing the binding of his speech, calls him *serum patrem*.¹⁷⁹ Clearly there is a resonance, both authors describe Zacharias as *serus pater*, but what is the nature of this resonance? Does this really

¹⁷⁷ See the list of *loci similes* in the Appendix for specific examples.

¹⁷⁸ Dracontius, *Satisfactio*, ll. 39-40. Trans: ‘He left and the priest, the aged father of the famous John, was speechless, and was mute with silenced voice’.

¹⁷⁹ Sidonius Apollinaris, *Poems, Letters: Books I-II*, trans. by W. B. Anderson (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1996), I, 16.37.

constitute a legitimate *locus similis*, or is it simply a coincidence? The answer to this can only be found if one investigates this with great care and detail.

The biblical account which both of these passages reference is the most logical place to start. Luke 1. 5-25 gives the story of Zacharias and the birth of John the Baptist. In the Vulgate version of the passage, Zacharias and his wife are described as ‘processissent in diebus suis’, ‘having advanced in their days’, and Zacharias declares himself a ‘senex’.¹⁸⁰ Nowhere in the biblical passage, whether in the Vulgate or the *Vetus Latina*, does one find the formula *serus pater*, although this formula does indeed represent the sense of the original perfectly well. The absence of *serus* from the biblical text helps to affirm the relationship between Dracontius’ text and Sidonius’, but it could still be coincidental, as variation in vocabulary is indeed one of the traits of Late Antique style.

We must, therefore, continue our investigation by looking at the passages in their contexts within the works in which they occur. A few lines above his use of *serus* for ‘old’, Sidonius uses *senex* to refer to the prophet Elijah.¹⁸¹ Therefore, his use of *serus* can be explained by a desire to avoid repetition with the previous *senex*. Dracontius’ use, however, cannot be explained in such a way. Neither *senex*, nor any other word meaning ‘old’, occurs in the vicinity of line thirty-nine, and so there is no need to choose *serus* in order to avoid repetition. While the desire for lexical diversity could explain his choice here, it stands as a weaker answer. The passage already possesses a substantial amount of variation, as is shown by his use of the word *antistes* for priest, instead of the more common *sacerdos*. Additionally, *serus* is

¹⁸⁰ Luke 1. 7, 18. *Senex* is also the reading found in the *Vetus Latina*, excepting one reading of *senior*, found in Itala Codex d. The *Vetus Latina* is most readily available through Vetus Latina Database, the online version of the texts supported by Brepols.

¹⁸¹ Sidonius, 16.32.

a fairly standard Classical Latin usage, and would not really contribute to the lexical variation of the passage. Therefore, Sidonius' use of *serus* is explained by his need to avoid repetition, but no such reason can be found for Dracontius. Indeed, the only reason for the employment of this phrase is that it fits the metre. While *serus* is a clever way to convey both of the phrases referring to Zacharias' age used in Luke, it is precisely this double use that would have allowed Dracontius to use multiple adjectives, as is often his wont. Yet he did not. Instead, he chose to employ exactly the same phrase as used by Sidonius of exactly the same person. This certainly suggests more than mere coincidence.

More light can be shed on this if we look at Eugenius' redaction. This passage is indeed one which Eugenius changes. The only real change Eugenius makes to this passage is, in fact, to the *serus*, which he replaces with *verus*. This seems a somewhat odd change. Certainly, the reference to Zacharias' old age finds its source in the Bible, and, while the allusion to his age is not strictly necessary either for the sense of the passage or the biblical reference, it does make the latter somewhat stronger. If Eugenius had retained *serus*, the biblical reference would have been clearer. This is interesting, because in the surrounding lines Eugenius alters Dracontius' text to make the Nebuchadnezzar reference stronger. Perhaps Eugenius simply wished to emphasize Zacharias' 'genuineness', or 'rightness', or simply that he was John the Baptist's real father, over the fact that he was old. He may have been trying to improve the overall sense of the passage, and this most probably represents the best answer, as the main idea behind this section of the *Satisfactio* is a rather unorthodox statement, in that Dracontius is essentially attempting to pass the blame for his actions on to God. Eugenius does, of course, remove this idea from his

redaction and replaces it with a more theologically acceptable one.¹⁸² The other possibility is that Eugenius was trying to make sense of a corrupted text.

Eugenius' modification tells us something. If he read *serus* only as a clever rendition of the biblical description of Zacharias, why would he have changed it? Generally, Eugenius' amendments on biblical matters tend either to clarify, or to correct, Dracontius' use. Thus, if Eugenius viewed it solely as a biblical reference, then it would be out of character for him to change it. However, if Eugenius viewed this as a Sidonius resonance, and felt as though he could improve Dracontius' text by removing it, then he certainly would have done so, as he does elsewhere. Indeed, we have already seen him remove a Vergilian reference, and not even improve the text by doing so. Because he changed it, we can reasonably assume that Eugenius viewed this use of *serus pater* as a Sidonian resonance. This is further supported by the nature of Sidonius' poem. It contains inaccurate Christian material, and the works of Faustus, to whom it was addressed, were later condemned as heresy. While this condemnation of Faustus of Riez occurred long after Dracontius' composition, and long before Eugenius', it deserves mention, as Eugenius himself was very much concerned with heterodoxy.¹⁸³ One can see why Eugenius, an orthodox bishop in the

¹⁸² The theological correction of the text was a crucial part of Eugenius' redaction, as will be discussed in the following part of the present thesis.

¹⁸³ Faustus of Riez, a native Briton serving as a bishop in Riez in Provence, was condemned for his affinity with Pelagianism. He was not really 'finalized' as a heretic until Caesarius of Arles in the early-sixth century. The fight to define orthodoxy in the fourth and fifth centuries was a very close-run thing, and the definitions of orthodoxy were still very much up for grabs in the fifth, and even the sixth, centuries. It should also be noted that Sidonius is absent from Isidore of Seville's *De viris illustribus* (the modern edition of which is Carmen Codoñer Merino, ed., *El 'De viris illustribus' de Isidoro de Sevilla: Estudio y edición crítica*, Theses et studia philologia Salmanticensia, 12 (Salamanca: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto 'Antonio de Nebrija', Colegio Trilingüe de la Universidad, 1964). For Eugenius' concerns with heterodoxy, see the section regarding the redaction below.

former Arian kingdom of the Visigoths, might wish to remove such a reference.¹⁸⁴ Yet, the very fact that Eugenius was operating in a post-Arian kingdom might also explain a certain amount of accommodation. Either way, his treatment of this passage is in line with his treatment of other literary passages, and suggests that he viewed it in the same way as he viewed Vergil or Sedulius.¹⁸⁵ As Eugenius almost certainly had the same evidence to hand as we do here, his decision serves to confirm the validity of this passage as a genuine Sidonian resonance.

Yet, if this *serus pater* does represent a genuine parallel with Sidonius, why are there no others? The answer to this question is fairly simple. The lack of Sidonian resonances and parallels in the *Satisfactio* owes itself to the separate natures of the works. Sidonius wrote several shorter pieces, mainly *epigrammata*, along with several longer works. His longer works, while essentially the same length as the *Satisfactio*, are of a much different nature. Three of these are imperial panegyrics, addressed to Anthemius, Majorian and Avitus. The rest are either *epithalamia* or somewhat flattering pieces addressed to important personages.¹⁸⁶ As we have already seen above, Dracontius engaged with his sources, and selected them not only because they were good literary pieces, but because they bore a relevance to

¹⁸⁴ While Sidonius is no heretic, this particular poem does exhibit a lack of biblical knowledge (for example, he gets the story of the taking up of Elijah wrong), and the poem is addressed in friendship to a man condemned as a heretic. Eugenius could logically have possessed a desire to distance himself from this particular work, without casting aspersion on the works of Sidonius as a whole. Then again, it may not have mattered to him at all. See the discussion in Part II.2 below. For Sidonius, see Jill Harries, *Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome AD 407-485* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994) and, additionally, P. Rousseau, 'In search of Sidonius the bishop', *Historia* 25 (1976), 356-77.

¹⁸⁵ Depending upon his preference, Eugenius frequently either adds or removes literary resonances (usually the latter). For more detail on this, see the chapter regarding the redaction below.

¹⁸⁶ As one would expect, however, there are several *loci similes* between the *Carmina Profana* and Sidonius. The best modern edition for the shorter works of Dracontius, which includes a very good *apparatus criticus*, notes and introduction, is J. M. Díaz de Bustamante, *Dracontio y sus Carmina Profana*.

his own work. This is seen most clearly in his use of Ovid's poems of exile. He focused primarily on them, rather than on the more well known and celebrated *Metamorphoses*. The same process of selection is at work here. Sidonius' poetry is largely of a secular nature, even if imbued with Sidonius' own Christianity.¹⁸⁷ The *Satisfactio*, while in a way secular in nature, is really a Christian poem, as it often argues its points in terms of Christian ideas or concepts. This is why Dracontius used several overtly Christian Late Antique sources for the work, such as the biblical epics of Sedulius and Prudentius. The parallel in question, however, is a place where the work of Sidonius and that of Dracontius touch.

As mentioned above, however, there is one distinct problem. The line in question, that is, line thirty-nine of the *Satisfactio*, appears corrupted in the more important of the two manuscripts which contain the poem, namely Vaticanus Reginensis Latini 1267, dating from the ninth century.¹⁸⁸ This manuscript appears to have 'senis', or possibly 'senex' written in the first hand, and 'senior' written in the second where the present study, following Vollmer's MGH and Moussy's *Belles Lettres* editions, has read 'serus'. The third modern editor, Speranza, has chosen to read 'sancti', following a similar passage in Dracontius' *De Laudibus Dei*, but with

¹⁸⁷ Though the 'pagan' aspects of Sidonius' culture have often been emphasised, Sidonius was always solidly a Christian. William M. Daly, 'Christianitas Eclipses Romanitas in the Life of Sidonius Apollinaris', in *Religion, Culture, and Society in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. by Thomas F. X. Noble and John J. Contreni (Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1987), pp. 7-26 (pp. 7, 17-18).

¹⁸⁸ Due to the closure of the Vatican Library for most of the course of the present thesis, the author has been unable to personally investigate this manuscript. Instead, this study relies on a careful cross-examination of the four modern editions of the work. The picture that the modern editors paint is of a generally good manuscript, but one which is heavily abbreviated, written in three different hands (only two of which are clear), and which is unclear or damaged at certain places. For this, see the various sections on the manuscripts to be found in the introductions to all of the modern editions, as well as the relevant discussion found at the beginning of part two of the present thesis.

seemingly no other merit, except a barely legible marginal note.¹⁸⁹ The second manuscript of the *Satisfactio*, Darmstadensis 3303, also from the ninth century, and, at parts, rather damaged, has the reading ‘senex’. ‘Senex’ and ‘senior’ both possess biblical parallels, the former Vulgate and the latter *Vetus Latina*. Yet none of the three function according to the scansion of the line, which is in dactylic hexameter, being the first line in an elegiac couplet. ‘Serus’ does, although it is rather spondaic. ‘Senis’, which is the original reading in the Vatican manuscript, does not make any sense in the line, as it would have to agree with ‘Iohannis’. While it may not necessarily be the case, it is even possible that Vollmer actually derived his ‘serus’ from the Sidonius poem, which would, of course, make the argument for it being a parallel circular. Yet, as is often the case with various hands, ‘senis’ and ‘serus’ can potentially look very similar on the page, as both contain the same number of minims, and a minuscule ‘ru’ can easily be turned into an ‘ni’ if the scribe is not careful and the hand is a confusing one. While the Benevantan hand in which this manuscript is written is a generally neat hand, the level of dissension on this word (as all three editors actually disagree on what the first hand wrote), suggests that some sort of scribal error may have taken place. Additionally, we do not know what type of manuscript the existing copies were made from, nor what hand that original was written in. A similar difficulty is to be found with the work of Zosimus, pointed out by Philip Bartholomew in relation to Romano-British studies, where the misreading of his Greek has led to a misreading of Late Antique British history that lasted for many years.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁹ This is, 2.686.

¹⁹⁰ Philip Bartholomew, ‘Fifth-Century Facts’, *Britannia*, 13 (1982), 261-70.

According to Vollmer, both of our extant manuscripts, along with the three Eugenius manuscripts which agree rather better with each other, form distinct stemmata from a lost manuscript somewhat removed from Dracontius.¹⁹¹ This leads us to the other piece of evidence we have at our disposal in determining the correct reading: the redaction of Eugenius. Now, it is dangerous to build too much from this redaction, as Eugenius' expressed goal is to change the original.¹⁹² However, in this circumstance, it is very useful. We must recall that Eugenius emended 'serus', or whatever word might have been in its place, to 'verus'. Eugenius' standard practice, as mentioned above, is to correct any place where Dracontius' biblical quotations are sloppy or inaccurate. If Dracontius' original reading was 'senex', as the Darmstadt ms. suggests, then there would be no reason for Eugenius to change it. It would mean his removing an actual solid biblical quotation, and replacing it with something that is, essentially, rather meaningless. The same would be true for 'senior': it would simply be out of character for Eugenius to replace either of these words. Metre should not be the reason: Eugenius routinely ignores metre, and his lines often do not scan.¹⁹³ If, however, the manuscript of Dracontius from which Eugenius wrote read 'serus' or 'senis', then it would not be out of character for Eugenius to change it, as he would either be deleting a Sidonius quotation, or correcting something which made no sense.

¹⁹¹ Friedrich Vollmer, 'Praefatio: De Draconti Carminibus Codicibus Editionibus', in *Fl. Merobaudis Reliquiae, Blossii Aemilii Dracontii Carmina, Eugenii Toletani Episcopi Carmina et Epistulae*, ed. by Frederick Vollmer, MGH, Auctores Antiquissimi, 14 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1905), pp. v-xxxvii (p. xxviii-xxix).

¹⁹² For this, see the prose *incipit* of Eugenius' recension of the *De Laudibus Dei*. It can be found on page 27 of Vollmer's MGH edition. See also the full discussion below in the present thesis.

¹⁹³ Again, see the discussion on Eugenius found below, in the third section of the present thesis.

Further evidence can be gathered when one compares the greater context of both passages. Sidonius' reference to Zacharias takes its place within a list of various biblical figures through whom the Holy Spirit worked the will of God, including Miriam during the flight from Egypt, the story of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego in the furnace, among others.¹⁹⁴ The purpose of the series in Sidonius is to ask God for the aid of the Holy Spirit to help him (Sidonius) write the praises of Faustus, in such a way as he inspired and helped these other great figures. In the *Satisfactio*, Dracontius includes the story of Zacharias within the framework of a series of examples set to show how God has worked his will upon people to make them act in a harsh or demeaning way. His list contains three figures: Pharaoh (of the Exodus story), Nebuchadnezzar, and Dracontius himself.¹⁹⁵ The similarities in the context are thus striking.

Firstly, while the themes of the passages are different, Dracontius explaining his misbehaviour as God 'hardening his heart' and Sidonius asking for God to inspire him to write as he inspired others to great action, the point of them is the same: both are pleading that God do for them what he has already done for others. While one is a request and the other an excuse, the thought behind both passages is identical. Secondly, the topics of the stories themselves are parallels. Although it is true that Sidonius' list of figures is more extensive than Dracontius', the two biblical figures which Dracontius did use are indirectly, but specifically, mentioned by Sidonius. Firstly, Pharaoh: Sidonius relates the flight of Miriam from Egypt and the dry passage of the Red Sea. While Sidonius focuses on Miriam and does not mention

¹⁹⁴ This section of Sidonius' poem runs from lines 5-67, and goes chronologically through Old Testament stories, but ends with Christ, theologically speaking the fulfillment of the Old Testament, and an appropriately chosen end to the series. Other figures included, but less relevant to the present inquiry, are Judith, Gideon, David, Jonah, and Elisha.

¹⁹⁵ This series runs from lines 11-48.

the other two, the reader's mind would, upon mention of the parting of the Red Sea, think of both Moses and Pharaoh. Dracontius, in his passage, mentions both Moses and Pharaoh by name, telling of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart at the words of Moses. As he would expect his audience to know, the hardening of Pharaoh's heart led to his pursuit of the Israelites with an army, which was subsequently swallowed up in the Red Sea, attempting to follow the Israelites in their dry passage.

Dracontius' lines, then, serve as a direct complement to those of Sidonius, referencing, but not overlapping: that key method to the art of Latin poetry.

Dracontius' second passage, already discussed in the previous chapter, deals with the transformation of Nebuchadnezzar into a bellowing ox and back again. This likewise provides strong resonance to the reading, but carefully avoids any overlap. Sidonius mentions the three youths placed into the Chaldean furnace who were miraculously saved by God. This story, regarding Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego (the names of the three youths, although not used by Sidonius), comes from chapter three of the book of Daniel. While Sidonius narrates the story well, what he does not name is the one who placed the youths in the furnace: King Nebuchadnezzar. Dracontius takes up the story of Nebuchadnezzar found in the fourth chapter of the book of Daniel: the transformation of the reigning king into a beast, and back again. Just as before, then, Dracontius gives the perfect complement to Sidonius' passage.

This then, taken with the other evidence compiled above, strongly suggests that Vollmer's emendation to 'serus' is correct, as the context so strongly points to Dracontius' having had Sidonius' poem at the forefront of his mind when writing this passage. However, this would still remain only one point of contact between the two authors' works, and we must look now at the parallel found in the *De Laudibus Dei*.

This parallel occurs during Dracontius' description of the Garden of Eden before the fall, and does, in fact, contain two parallels with Sidonius, these occurring at line 180 and line 199. This passage in Dracontius, however, is densely packed with resonances, and needs to be carefully unwound. The passage begins in a way relatively typical of descriptions of Paradise after Vergil. In Book III of the *Aeneid*, Vergil begins a description of Hesperia, that is Italy, as it were a 'paradise for the Trojans', with the words 'est locus'.¹⁹⁶ So too begins Dracontius' passage.¹⁹⁷ Sidonius, in his panegyric on Anthemius, gives a description of a paradise in the farthest East, 'proximus Indis', in which dwells Aurora, dawn personified.¹⁹⁸ He too begins with the same words.¹⁹⁹ So too with these words does Avitus of Vienne open his description of Paradise found in his poem, which begins at Book I, line 183.²⁰⁰ Others could be named. The phrase *est locus*, however, represents a rather stock method of beginning such descriptions of paradises, and, as such, cannot be distinguished from a genuine *locus similis*, except perhaps with Vergil, and so, on its own, does not tell us much. If accompanied with further parallels in the same passage, however, it can take on deeper meaning. Such is, in fact, the case with

¹⁹⁶ Vergil, *Aeneid*, 3.163. Lines 163-65 in Vergil read:

'Est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt,
terra antiqua, potens armis atque ubere glaebae.'

¹⁹⁷ The first four lines of the passage read:

'Est locus interea diffundens quattuor amnes
floribus ambrosiis gemmato caespite pictus,
plenus odoriferis numquam marcentibus herbis,
hortus in orbe Dei cunctis felicior hortis.'

¹⁹⁸ Sidonius, 2.407-23. The description of the place is followed by a description of Aurora herself.

¹⁹⁹ The beginning of Sidonius' passage, lines 407-411, reads as follows:

'Est locus Oceani, longinquis proximus Indis,
axe sub Eoo, Nabataeum tensus in Eurum:
ver ibi continuum est, interpellata nec ullis
frigoribus pallescit humus, sed flore perenni
picta peregrinos ignorant arva rigores'

²⁰⁰ This is of importance, and will be returned to later on.

Dracontius' passage here in question when compared to both the Sidonius and Avitus passages.

Lines 199 and 200 in Dracontius' passage constitute the principal parallel needed to prove the case. They read: 'ver ibi perpetuum communes temperat auras/ ne laedant frondes et ut omnia poma coquantur'.²⁰¹ Line 199 contains a rather good selection of resonances and parallels. Vollmer, in his MGH edition, suggests one solid, and four other probable references, whereas Colette Camus, the editor of Book I in the *Belles Lettres* edition, lists three.²⁰² The first given by both, and the only Classical one, is a link to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, 1,107, where, in his description of the Golden Age, Ovid uses the phrase 'ver erat aeternum', to describe the blessed state of mankind in that primeval age.²⁰³ The second parallel they give is with Prudentius' *Liber Cathemerinon*, which occurs at line 3,103 of that work, where Prudentius writes, also in a description of the Garden of Eden, 'ver ubi perpetuum redolet'.²⁰⁴ The third parallel mentioned by both occurs in Claudius Marius Victorius' *Aletheia*, in a passage highly reminiscent of Ovid's regarding the Golden Age, and again describing the Garden of Eden. Regarding the familiar eternal spring, he writes: 'aeternum paribus uer temperat horis'.²⁰⁵ The two parallels which only

²⁰¹ Trans: 'In that place perpetual spring moderates the shared breezes/ lest it damage the foliage and that all the fruits may ripen.'

This passage is also discussed in Daniel J. Niles, *Doctrine and Exegesis*, pp. 124-2-127. Niles' discussion, however, is limited solely to Dracontius and mainly focuses on exegetical as cosmological matters, and does not touch upon the matters here at hand.

²⁰² For Vollmer, see note the note for line 199 on page 32 of his edition. He additionally lists a later parallel with the work of Boethius. For Camus, see both the note for this line on page 274 and the list of *loci similes*, page 378.

²⁰³ It should be noted that, all the descriptions of the biblical Garden of Eden discussed here, owe a substantial debt to, principally, Ovid's account of the Golden Age. The actual passage in Genesis, 2: 8-16, is very brief, and mainly describes the four rivers; there is not any perpetual spring mentioned. When one reads these Late Antique passages, one's mind is instantly called back to Ovid.

²⁰⁴ Trans: 'Where spring perpetually emits its scent.'

²⁰⁵ *Aletheia*, 1,228.

Vollmer mentions, are the ones most relevant here, issuing as they do from Sidonius Apollinaris and Avitus of Vienne. Sidonius' passage, already discussed above, uses, to describe the climate in the Garden of Eden, the following words: 'ver ibi continuum est'.²⁰⁶ Avitus of Vienne, in his own biblical epic, uses the words 'hic ver adsidium caeli clementia servat' to describe this Ovidian springtime in the Garden of Eden.²⁰⁷

With all these various resonances in mind, then, we can move to discuss which among them are the strongest, and, therefore most able to sustain the burden of argument. Dracontius' debt to Ovid is both clear and unsurprising. Indeed all of these accounts are indebted to Ovid not only in language, but in the concept of the eternal spring. Firstly, looking simply at Dracontius' basic word choice, 'ver ibi perpetuum', the most obvious parallel is with Prudentius, whose wording is 'ver ubi perpetuum'. The echo in the word choice, with both being solid manuscript attestations, and not emendations, is obvious. Sidonius' 'ver ibi continuum est' also represents a close parallel, as *continuus* and *perpetuus* have very similar meanings, being very near to synonyms and as both passages contain *ibi*, 'there', which is not a synonym with *ubi*, 'where'. The parallel with the *Aletheia* has merit, but is not as strong as the others. The Avitus quotation, on the surface, seems rather weak. This, however, is not the case when one investigates more closely. Prudentius' passage mainly refers to the *smell* of spring ('ver redolet'), and not to the temperature. Claudius Marius Victorius largely refers to the daylight hours of spring ('ver paribus

²⁰⁶ Sidonius, 2,407.

²⁰⁷ Avitus, 1.222. The passage in Avitus, which runs from 1.193-298, conflates the accounts of the paradise of India, rich in its cinnamon, spices, et cetera, with the biblical Garden of Eden. The use of Ovid in poetic accounts of the Garden of Eden is, as can be seen in the previous examples, both widespread and well attested.

horis'), again differing from what Dracontius actually says. The two closest in meaning to Dracontius are indeed Sidonius and Avitus.

The Sidonius passage in which this second *locus similis* is found reads:

'There spring is continuous, the ground does not grow pale, having been disturbed by any cold weather, but painted with everlasting blossom the ploughlands know not foreign coldness'.²⁰⁸ This idea of temperature as critical to the eternal spring is much more in keeping with Dracontius' passage than Prudentius' concerned with smell. While Dracontius does not specifically mention the threat of cold, his word choice hedges the issue and refers to problems which could be caused by weather both too hot, or too cold. This similarity does help to confirm the verbal parallel.

Much stronger, however, is the parallel with Avitus. The passage in question in Avitus reads as follows:

Non hic alterni succedit temporis umquam
 Bruma nec aestivi redeunt post frigora soles,
 Sic celsus calidum cum reddit circulus annum,
 Vel densente gelu canescunt arva pruinis.
 Hic ver adsiduum caeli clementia servat;
 Turbidus auster abest semperque sub aere sudo
 Nubila diffugiunt iugi cessura sereno.²⁰⁹

In this description we find material more in line with Dracontius' description.

Avitus' description is of a springtime manifest not in the scent of flowers but in the temperateness of heaven, of the air, which of course is where Dracontius' breezes must lie. The latter part of the passage here deals, again, with weather patterns,

²⁰⁸ Sidonius, 2.409-11. The Latin reads:
 ver ibi continuum est, interpellata nec ullis
 frigoribus pallescit humus, sed flore perenni
 picta peregrinos ignorant arva rigores.'

²⁰⁹ Avitus, 1.218-224. Trans: 'Not here ever does the winter of changing time advance nor here ever do the summer suns return after the cold weather, as when the lofty orbit brings back the warm part of the year, or as when the ploughlands grow hoary from the frosts as the snow grows thick. Here the mercy of Heaven preserves a constant spring; the stormy south wind is absent and always beneath the clear, bright air the clouds disperse so as to give way to continual fair weather.'

which more closely links it with Dracontius'. The beginning of the passage, however, shows a likeness to Sidonius, and it is likely that Avitus had both authors in mind when he wrote his own account.²¹⁰ While Avitus' word choice does differ somewhat from Dracontius', most notably in the use of *hic* and *adsiduus*, the conception remains very much the same, and the inclusion of *caelum* complementing Dracontius' *aura* really drives home the parallel. Dracontius' line may be layered well beneath Avitus', but it certainly appears present.

Dracontius' passage, however, stands somewhat apart from the others. In Sidonius and Avitus, the lines regarding eternal spring are followed by lines describing the blossoming of flowers and the eternal bloom which ornaments that spring. Yet in Dracontius we have no flowers, only the leaves of trees and the fruit those trees bear. His use of the word *pomum* for the fruit present there grounds his description in a less exotic, in a more familiar, world. His picture is also a more agrarian one, focusing on fruit trees as it does, and moving to a creature itself industrious in an agrarian setting- the bee. Ovid's passage, although itself replete with flowers, notes, as does Dracontius, that the trees dripped honey of their own accord.²¹¹ This arboreal production of honey is also to be found in Vergil's *Eclogues* in the description of a return to the age of Saturn in Italy.²¹² While Dracontius does draw a great deal of inspiration from Vergil and Ovid for this passage, his description, while replete with both Classical and Late Antique resonances, is unique and particularly representative of Dracontius' own style. Dracontius himself is most clearly seen in his inclusion of *vivax medicina* in line 204, medicine and remedies

²¹⁰ For the dating of Avitus' poem, see below.

²¹¹ Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 1.112. It reads: 'flavaque de viridi stillebant ilice mella'.

²¹² Vergil, *Ecl.* 4, 29-30. The passage reads: 'incultisque rubens pendebit sentibus uva, et durae quercus sudabunt roscida mella'.

being a recurring theme in his works.²¹³ The recurrence of the topic of medicine in Dracontius, combined with the lack of mention of medicine in any of the other paradise accounts which influenced Dracontius, make this an original element. Further resonance with Late Antique style can be found in line 201. This line reads ‘non apibus labor est ceris formare cicutas’.²¹⁴ This reference to bees alludes to descriptions of the Golden Age, where one did not need to work to harvest one’s food. His use of *cicuta ceris* for a honeycomb is very characteristic of his works. The word *cicuta*, which literally means hemlock (especially the poison from the hemlock) but metonymically refers to the hemlock pipes used by shepherds, is here used to describe the tubes out of which a honeycomb is constructed. This somewhat roundabout metaphor is pretty typical both of Dracontius’ style, and that of later Latin poetry as a whole. This passage, then, displays very well his ability to move between Classical, Late Antique and biblical sources, and, while referencing them all, to include his own original material into a framework very much characteristic of his own day.

It is interesting here to note what Eugenius did with this particular passage. Generally, Eugenius left this passage as he found it, except at two points. Line 205, which is fairly obscure in Dracontius’ original version, was made somewhat clearer by Eugenius. This, of course, fully fits with the latter’s stated goal. The point of interest in regards to the present discussion is his alteration to line 200 of Dracontius’ text, which reads ‘ne [aurae] laedant frondes et ut omnia poma

²¹³ Various references to medicinal material can be found at *Satisfactio*, 65 and 296, and *De Laudibus Dei*, 1. 204 (here discussed), 291, 516, 743-44, and 2. 263, 282, 284, 607, 729, and 773.

²¹⁴ Trans: ‘There is no labor for the bees to form tubes with wax’. In other words, the bees do not need to make honeycombs to store honey (because, as the next line states, honey just drips from the trees).

coquantur'. Eugenius, however, changed the *frondes* to *flores*, flowers. This then shows Eugenius pulling the text more in line with the other Late Antique descriptions with which it already resonated. Eugenius, in including these flowers, incorporates one of the traditional elements of paradise, in an effort not only to make the passage a bit more standard, but also a bit more colourful. It is also possible that Eugenius was attempting to insert a bit of logical progression, as fruit does indeed come not from leaves, but flowers. Either way, it remains well worth noting that, at least here, we see Eugenius drawing Dracontius' poem more in line with other Late Antique works.

Leaving aside any conclusions for the time being, this passage leads us to investigate more fully Dracontius' parallels with Avitus of Vienne. These parallels are of great significance, as these authors wrote their works at nearly the same time. Additionally, Dracontius' *De Laudibus Dei* and Avitus' *De spiritualis historiae gestis* are both biblical epics, and at points deal with the very same material.²¹⁵ Although Avitus most probably wrote his work after Dracontius, the parallels between the two authors are of great importance; for, while they do not tell us anything of Dracontius' literary knowledge or technique, except as through a mirror, they do tell us about the literary knowledge and techniques of his exact contemporary. This comparison is of tremendous value for any study, such as this one, of the literary culture of the late fifth and early-sixth centuries.

Before embarking on this investigation, however, we should first look into the dates of composition for the works of Avitus and those of Dracontius. While the

²¹⁵ Really it is only Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei* that is a biblical epic, but its story of the Creation does overlap with the work of Avitus and is therefore of great interest in comparing the two authors and in constructing a picture of the literary culture of their day, which is, of course, one of the main goals of this thesis. Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei* is also, along with the *Satisfactio*, the main material for this study, due, of course, to Eugenius' redaction.

dates of composition are rather less than solid for both authors, relatively narrow parameters can be set. Dracontius was slightly older than Avitus, with his career starting roughly in the 480s, and the *De Laudibus Dei* and the *Satisfactio* of Dracontius can be set, with some certainty, to the early 490s, and without doubt before 496, as that year saw the death of King Gunthamund, to whom the works were written.²¹⁶ Avitus' *De spiritalis historiae gestis*, on the other hand, must be dated to some time before 506/7, and could possibly have been composed sometime in the 490s.²¹⁷ It is relatively safe, therefore, to place these works of Dracontius as earlier than the *De spiritalis historiae gestis* of Avitus.

While there are no parallels between the works of Avitus and the *Satisfactio*, several do exist between the *De Laudibus Dei* and Avitus' own biblical epic, the *De spiritalis historiae gestis*. One rather solid parallel occurs at Book I, line 412. This comes in a passage which sees Dracontius narrating God's speech to Adam, in which he granted to Adam dominion over all creatures of the land, sea and air and licence over all things in the Garden, save only the one tree. Dracontius writes:

sumere quidquid habent pomaria nostra licebit;
nam totum quod terra creat, quod pontus et aer
protulit, addictum vestro sub iure manebit
deliciaeque fluent vobis et honesta voluptas:
arboris unius tantum nescite saporem.²¹⁸

²¹⁶ David F. Bright, 'The Chronology of the Poems of Dracontius', *Classica et Mediaevalia: Revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire*, 50 (1999), 193-206 (199-200).

²¹⁷ Dedicatory letter for the *De spiritalis historiae gestis* and introduction, in *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose*, trans. by Danuta Shanzer and Ian Wood, Liverpool Translated Texts for Historians, 38 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2002). The best Latin edition is that of Peiper in the MGH. See also Ian Wood, 'Avitus of Vienne, The Augustinian Poet', in *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul: Revisiting the Sources*, ed. by Ralph W. Mathisen and Danuta Shanzer (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 263-277 (p.275).

²¹⁸ Dracontius, *De Laudibus Dei*, 1.411-15. Trans: 'It will be possible for you to take whatever my orchard contains; for everything that the Earth brings into being, all that sea and air advance, that which has been awarded to you shall remain under your rule and joys and honorable delight shall flow for you. Only know not the taste of the one tree.'

This poetic passage elaborates rather nicely on the well-known story of the licence and dominion given to Adam, with the notable exception of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. Dracontius places these words in the mouth of God, as instructions to the newly created man. Subsequently to this passage, Dracontius elaborates, for almost forty more lines, upon the blessed and shameless life of Adam and Eve in the Garden, before the Fall.

Avitus' passage both parallels and contrasts with Dracontius'. The passage in question lies in Book II of Avitus' epic, which deals with the introduction of original sin. His passage reads as follows:

Quod caelum, quod terra creat, quod gurgite magno
 Producit pelages, vestros confertur in usus.
 Nil natura negat, datur ecce in cuncta potestas.²¹⁹

The strength of the verbal parallel between the two passages is striking. Both share the phrase, 'quod terra creat' with no change in meaning, and, albeit with different wording, cover the sky and the sea, and do this using two verbs, the second of which is located in the following line in both passages. Additionally, the second verbs used in these passages, *proferre* and *producere*, bear a fairly strong resemblance to each other, and are quite close in meaning. Of equal importance to word choice in these lines, stands scansion. Both lines (which, as genre dictates, are in dactylic hexameter) scan identically, with two initial spondees followed by a dactyl, a spondee, and the customary dactyl and spondee ending. The phrase 'quod terra creat' occupies the same exact place in both lines, further strengthening the parallel. Taken together, these factors give us a solid *locus similis*.

²¹⁹ Avitus, 2.154-56. Trans: 'That which the sky, which the earth creates, which the sea produces from its great surge, is bestowed upon you for your use. Nature denies you nothing, Behold, power over all things is granted to you.'

When one looks at the two passages' contexts, however, there is also a great contrast. Dracontius' passage, as we have already seen, represents the words of God to Adam. Avitus' passage, on the other hand, is spoken by the tempting serpent, so often identified with the Devil. Spoken, in other words, by the exact opposite of God. Yet, again paralleling each other, both passages immediately progress from the bounty which is allowed Adam and Eve to the fruit of the one tree which they cannot have.²²⁰ Indeed, while appearing at first to be in sharp contrast to each other, this contrast may, in itself, serve to solidify the parallel between the two texts. Avitus is known both to employ in his poetry exegetical material and to employ his poetic material in an exegetic fashion.²²¹ Indeed, Avitus' primary focus in writing his poetry is, in fact, exegetical, as his own dedicatory letters and his heavy debt to Augustine testify.²²² It is possible that Avitus used this Dracontian reference to convey the point that often the Devil, or a tempting spirit as it were, can use what is ostensibly good and true for evil purposes. In corrupting the logic of God's message to Adam in order to encourage Eve to commit the first sin, Avitus shows the Devil in his perhaps most frightening guise, that of the corrupt sweet-talker. The reminder that the Devil corrupts the word of God to his own ends is also a strong warning against heresy, as heresy itself depended upon a non-orthodox reading of the Scriptures, the Devil warping and misusing the Word of God, which is exactly what we see the serpent doing in this passage. Certainly, Avitus was very much concerned with heresy, as

²²⁰ At line 415 in Dracontius and lines 157-59 in Avitus.

²²¹ Ian Wood, 'Avitus of Vienne, The Augustinian Poet', and Daniel J. Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis* in the relevant chapters. See also M. Hoffmann, 'Principles of Structure and Unity in Latin Biblical Epic', in *Poetry and Exegesis in Premodern Latin Christianity: The Encounter between Classical and Christian Strategies of Interpretation*, ed. by Willemien Otten and Karla Pollmann (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 139-45.

²²² Ian Wood, 'Avitus of Vienne, The Augustinian Poet', pp.263-277 (p. 275).

several of his letters attest.²²³ This warning against heresy would be especially strong if Avitus' audience was familiar with the *De Laudibus Dei*, as they would see the word of God corrupted into a logic-based argument for sinning. Indeed, the warning partly depends upon previous knowledge of Dracontius. The strong exegetical possibilities of this reference, combined with Avitus' known employment of exegesis in his poetic works, serves to strongly confirm this as a genuine parallel.

While further resonances do exist between the *De Laudibus Dei* and the work of Avitus, none of them are terribly strong. Points of similarity do occur in various passages in all three books of the *De Laudibus Dei*, being most frequent in Book I, but this could potentially be explained at least partially by subject overlap. At several points Avitus describes something which Dracontius himself described, but using rather different word choice. Normally, this could be explained away as coincidental, as both authors, in discussing the same topics, are bound to overlap at some point. This explanation, however, cannot stand in light of the three references discussed above. Indeed, three such references actually make a fairly strong case for Avitus' knowledge of Dracontius' text. The other points of vague likeness between the texts, then, could indeed be a result of Avitus' desire not to show too much of debt to Dracontius. This is the way in which Ovid treated the works of Vergil when writing his *Metamorphoses*. As both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Aeneid* dealt occasionally with the same material, Ovid, in a desire to remain original while still paying homage to Vergil, tended to skirt the latter's stories, and focused instead on peripheral matters. Avitus, on the other hand, could not skirt these stories, because they were all critical to his piece. Instead, he artfully navigated both through the Bible, and through the biblical epics.

²²³ See, for example, *Eps.* 7, 26, 28.

This story of the creation of Eve from Adam's rib stands a solid example of this technique. The story of Eve's creation, which occupies five verses in Genesis, occupies forty-two lines in the *De Laudibus Dei* and forty-eight in the *De spiritualis historiae gestis*, although, in the latter, ten of these are devoted solely to exegesis.²²⁴ The same story, with roughly the same length, also occurs in Claudius Marius Victorius' *Aletheia*.²²⁵ The narratives of all three works follow the flow of Genesis fairly well, at least at this point, and all contain pretty much the same elements, although in different measure. Claudius Marius Victorius' account rather differs from the other two, indicating that the two later authors, while still resonating with their predecessor, succeeded in making their own versions different. All three versions do, however, use the verb *subducere* for the action of removing the rib from Adam's side.²²⁶ The Vulgate uses the verb *ferre*, and the various forms of the *Vetus Latina*, although varying heavily in this passage, do not use *subducere*.²²⁷ This then, is most probably Claudius Marius Victorius' invention, and should be seen as a parallel with him in the later authors.²²⁸ In using this verb, both Dracontius and Avitus are showing their knowledge of the *Aletheia*, but by otherwise departing from it, they are likewise showing their intent to cut new ground, as it were. The strongest parallel between Dracontius and Avitus is not in their choice of words or phrases, but rather in their stories. Both authors include descriptions of the beauty of Eve, which are lacking in the brief narrative of Genesis, although Dracontius spends rather more

²²⁴ The line references for the accounts are; Genesis 2, 21-25; Dracontius, *De Laudibus Dei*, 1, 360-401; Avitus, 1, 144-192.

²²⁵ The passage here runs from 355-391.

²²⁶ Dracontius, *De Laudibus Dei*, 1, 381; Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia*, 1, 363; Avitus, 1, 154.

²²⁷ The Vulgate text drawn from here is the *Vulgata Clementina*.

²²⁸ It is, however, possible that this word was used on account of metrical constraints. That all three authors used 'subducere' does seem rather more than coincidental, especially as the latter two authors' use of Claudius Marius Victorius is strongly attested elsewhere in the texts.

time on this description than Avitus. Additionally, both authors use this story as an opportunity for a speech from God, although they take these speeches in different directions. Thirdly, they both use this story as an opportunity for a short tangent. Avitus' tangent is, as typical for him, exegetical, while Dracontius' is, likewise typical for him, pretty much just tangential. These similar, yet decidedly different, approaches to the story are somewhat suggestive, and taken with the solid parallels, point towards a relatively high level of interaction between the texts.

Whether or not the passages regarding this story form a parallel, they do serve to elucidate something of the poetry and culture of these two authors. On a basic level, both authors are seeking to create a poetic, and therefore learned and literary, version of the Genesis narrative. In doing this, they are also forcing the material found in Genesis, which is at times quite disjointed, into a smoother and more orderly narrative. They are, of course, also substantially elongating and ornamenting the Genesis material. This indeed is the norm for all biblical epic. Yet, while they are both working in the same fashion on a basic level, they do indeed work in a very different fashion from each other on a more detailed level. In this passage, we see Avitus doing something very particular. His exegetical purpose is clear: the sleep of Adam and the subsequent creation of Eve is allegory for the crucifixion of Christ and the resulting creation of the Church. This he tells us straight out.²²⁹ The speech which follows, placed in the mouth of God, includes a brief but poignant reminder as to the nature and sanctity of marriage. That the exegesis and God's speech form the larger part of this passage shows that this was the most important point for him, that this was what he wanted his audience to get from the

²²⁹ Avitus, 1, 160-69.

story. His version of this story thus bears a fairly strong didactic and exegetical tone throughout.

The emphasis in Dracontius' version, however, is very much different. Dracontius begins his version where Avitus ends: a speech in the mouth of God pertaining to marriage. While Avitus' focuses on the bearing of children (actually mostly taken from the first account of humanity's creation in Genesis, which occurs in chapter one), Dracontius' focuses on the equality and partnership of the married couple, more on pleasant companionship, shared wishes and a joyously unified will. The tone and content of Dracontius' version of God's speech, which unlike Avitus' is not directed to the new couple, but simply God musing to himself, is noticeably more upbeat and happy than Avitus'. Also, Dracontius' version adapts the relevant passages from Genesis rather more freely, as this speech evidences. While Dracontius does indulge in a little bit of exegesis here, by giving an explanation as to why God made Eve out of Adam's rib and not from the dust, this reads less as an analytical or didactic passage, and more as a sentimental one.²³⁰ The part of the story which Dracontius gives the most attention to, however, is Eve herself. His slightly racy description sees Eve come forth as a fully formed young woman (*virgo adulta*), beautiful (*decora*), wild-looking (*rudis*), and shapely (*matura tumentibus annis*).²³¹ After Adam awakes, he sees Eve, and 'fertile sleep brought forth the occasion for the

²³⁰ The reason he gives is that if Eve were made from Adam, he would recognize his own self in his wife, and therefore love her with his whole heart. It has also been said that *all* biblical poetry is essentially exegetical in nature. While this is in effect true, I believe that Dracontius shows us that the author of biblical poetry need not focus on exegesis, but indeed can move the focus quite far away from it. For this see Hoffmann, 'Principles of Structure and Unity', and, in the same volume, A. Arweiler, 'Interpreting Cultural Change: Semiotics and Exegesis in Dracontius' *De Laudibus Dei*', in *Poetry and Exegesis in Premodern Latin Christianity: The Encounter between Classical and Christian Strategies of Interpretation*, ed. by Willemien Otten and Karla Pollmann (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 147-72. Arweiler's article is indeed an excellent piece on the structure and nature of the *De Laudibus Dei*.

²³¹ Dracontius, *De Laudibus Dei*, 1, 383-84.

raw material of love and charming sleep begot new passions'.²³² In furtherance to this, he gives a description of Eve as Adam sees her:

She stands before his eyes covered with no veil,
with body nude and at the same time snow white like a nymph of the deep:
elegant uncut hair, cheeks beautiful with redness,
possessing everything which is beautiful, eyes, mouth, neck and hand,
and whatever the fingers of the Thunderer were able to shape.²³³

Even though Dracontius does give credit to God for this beauty at the end of the passage, it does little to change its decidedly sensual nature. That it is God, 'Deus et Princeps', who joins them as one (*coniunxit*) in the following line also does not detract from the obvious sensuousness of the passage. This tells us several things. Firstly, that while Dracontius does indeed have a Christian mind, it is perhaps best seen as a secular Christian mind. It is certainly not a monastic one. From a basic Christian point of view, there is nothing wrong with this passage: it celebrates a legitimate marriage, it describes only Eve, who was, after all, unashamed of her nakedness before the Fall, and glorifies God through espousing the beauty of His creation. Indeed, its language reminds the reader somewhat of the Song of Solomon. And so Eugenius neither cuts it nor seriously alters it. But, on the other hand, Avitus does not include it, except for a brief line.²³⁴ While this passage is of a rather more sexual nature, Dracontius does elsewhere exhibit a tendency towards the sensual,

²³² Dracontius, *De Laudibus Dei*, 1, 391-92. The text reads: 'materiem fecunda quies produxit amoris affectusque nouos blandi genuere sopores.'

²³³ Dracontius, *De Laudibus Dei*, 1, 393-97. The text reads: 'Constitit ante oculos nullo uelamine tecta, corpora nuda simul niueo quasi nympha profundi: caesaries intonsa comis, gena pulcra rubore, omnia pulchra gerens, oculos os colla manusque, uel qualem possent digiti formare Tonantis.'

²³⁴ Avitus, 1, 156.

such as in his vibrant description of the Third Day.²³⁵ Secondly, Dracontius effectively uses this as an opportunity to insert a nymph into his story. Descriptions of nymphs, of course, represent a recurring element in Classical poetry of pretty much all genres, and Dracontius seized upon this opportunity to include one of his own.²³⁶ This fusion of Classical trope with biblical material is at the heart of Late Antique culture. Indeed it is partly this fusion of two different worlds, of the Classical and the Christian, which made Late Antique culture so vibrant. Thirdly, these lines bring us to Dracontius' purpose in writing this passage, which is aesthetic. This is not to say that his writing is devoid of meaningful content, far from it. But it is to say that beauty, whether in the language, the style, or in the things described, was at the heart of Dracontius' poetic method. This is in sharp contrast to Avitus, whose main concern here is didactic and exegetical, as he pointedly tells us in the dedicatory letter to his poem. Again, this is not to say that Avitus is unconcerned with aesthetics or Dracontius with exegesis; both statements would be quite far from the truth. But it is to say that Dracontius is *more* concerned with the beauty of his verse, although exegesis remains important to him, as he employs it even here alongside one of his perhaps most aesthetically motivated passages. Likewise, while Avitus focuses more heavily on exegesis in this passage, it is nonetheless written in verse, the very nature of which was aesthetic. Thus the same can be said of Avitus as of Dracontius, only with their focuses reversed. This passage, therefore, whether or not it includes a legitimate *locus similis*, provides us

²³⁵ This description runs from *De Laudibus Dei*, 1, 149-205. It includes his description of paradise, but also vivid images of the separation of the seas and the creation of the land with its plants.

²³⁶ They appear with some frequency in the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, and a cursory glance at that text will provide the reader with several examples.

with valuable information and a valuable comparison between two contemporary authors.

iii. What the Sources Tell Us

Taking a step back, then, the *loci similes* discussed here tell us a great deal. Going back to the first parallel discussed in detail, if we take ‘serus pater’ to be a valid reading, and as a genuine parallel with Sidonius, then these two words have much to tell us. That we are justified in doing so is strongly supported not only by the evidence included within the passage itself, but by the *locus similis* found in the *De Laudibus Dei*. Dracontius’ *Carmina Profana* provide further evidence for the author’s knowledge of Sidonius. In this corpus, there exist four *loci similes* with the works of Sidonius. These are found in poems six, seven, and eight.²³⁷ The first two of these poems are indeed *epithalamia*, the genre in which Sidonius normally worked. These parallels do not come solely from Sidonius’ poetic works however, and two of the resonances are actually with Sidonius’ epistles. Taken altogether then, the evidence for Dracontius’ knowledge of Sidonius is very strong.

On a basic level, these *loci similes* show that Dracontius had access to several of the works of Sidonius Apollinaris. Dracontius’ knowledge of Sidonius is further confirmed by the strong similarity in style and usage between the two authors. This means that at the very least a selection of Sidonius’ works, both prose and poetry, was transmitted to Vandal North Africa. Sidonius was born in Lyon either in 431 or 432 and died at some point in the 480s.²³⁸ Sidonius, therefore, belongs to the

²³⁷ They are at 6, 60-71; 7, 147; 8, 381 and 8, 477.

²³⁸ The best and most recent biography of C. Sollius Modestus Apollinaris Sidonius is Jill Harries, *Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome, AD 407-485* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994). Also useful for Sidonius is Philip Rousseau, ‘Sidonius and Majorian: The

generation directly preceding Dracontius, and the end of Sidonius' career most probably overlaps with the beginning of Dracontius'. Bishop Faustus of Riez, to whom Poem XVI is addressed, became bishop of that see for which he is named in about AD 460, and, although evicted from his see in 476/7, he was later allowed to return.²³⁹ The collection of poems published by Sidonius in 469 included this work.²⁴⁰ This means that the poem was written at some point between 460 and 469, after Sidonius' visit to Faustus, which took place sometime in the first half of the 460's. We can most likely assign this poem, therefore, to the years between 466 and 469. The poem in question, therefore, must have been written during the reign of King Gaiseric.

Dracontius wrote the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei* during the reign of Gunthamund, most probably in the early 490s, as discussed above. Since his imprisonment, which was most probably a fairly comfortable house arrest, as witnessed by the authorship of his two major works during this time, must have placed at least some restraints on him, it would seem most likely that he would have encountered Sidonius' poem before the accession of Gunthamund. This would mean that the work of Sidonius most probably reached Vandal-occupied North Africa in the decade or decade and a half following its composition. This is very important, for it would tell us that Vandal North Africa, even under two of its most feared monarchs, King Gaiseric and King Huneric, famed for their persecution of Catholics, was not at all isolated or separated from the rest of the West. Following Victor of Vita's narrative, it is probable that the poem arrived in Africa during the earlier years

Censure in "Carmen" V', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, vol. 49.2 (2000), pp. 251-57.

²³⁹ Sidonius, *Poems, Letters*, p. 241-42, n. 5.

²⁴⁰ Harries, pp. 3-7.

of the reign of Huneric, as, in those years, he was said to have been a tolerant ruler.²⁴¹ Yet it need not be so. On several occasions Victor makes indirect reference to Imperial embassies, and one such embassy could have borne along literary material.²⁴² However long the transmission of this work did take, it could not have been that long. If Dracontius had the poem, this would mean that Vandal North Africa, in its supposedly most closed-off and isolated days, was nothing of the sort, at least not on a constant basis.²⁴³ It would have been fully connected with the literary and therefore cultural trends of the remainder of the West. The Sidonius references serve to confirm what Dracontius' poetry itself tells us: Dracontius fully belongs to the contemporary literary trends of the West of his own day.²⁴⁴ His style bears a strong resemblance to that of Sidonius not because they independently arrived at the same point as, for example, Newton and Leibniz in the invention of calculus, but because they are both part of an ongoing aesthetic development, the same Late Antique movement or 'school'. Thus Dracontius, and the North Africa of his day, was as much a part of the Latin West as Visigothic Spain or the Kingdom of the Burgundians.²⁴⁵

²⁴¹ Victor of Vita, 2.1-8.

²⁴² Such references can be found, for example, at 1.51 (under Gaiseric) and 2.2 (under Huneric); both examples were sent by Zeno and dealt with the church in Carthage. It is evident in these, and other, passages that Zeno is well-informed in regards to the condition of the Catholic Church in Carthage, which strongly implies that there was some sort of interchange between Vandal North Africa and the Roman Empire.

²⁴³ Most probably, these works reached the Vandal Kingdom by way of Visigothic Spain. Even if Vandal North Africa was only in contact with Visigothic Spain, Visigothic Spain was in contact with the rest of the Roman West, and so the line of transmission to Africa is perfectly solid, if perhaps a little slow or indirect.

²⁴⁴ For the various *loci similes* occurring in the *Satisfactio*, which serve to confirm this point, see the Appendix. See also Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Jewelled Style*.

²⁴⁵ While the present thesis has reached this conclusion via literary investigation, the work of Jonathan Conant, published too recently to be fully considered in the present thesis, affirms this via other means. Conant's full discussion can be found in *Staying Roman*, pp. 67-129.

This is further confirmed by the parallels with Avitus of Vienne, albeit in the opposite direction. If Avitus did indeed have access to a copy of Dracontius' *De Laudibus Dei* when writing his own biblical epic, as the parallels argued above strongly suggest, then the text must have had a fairly rapid transmission to Burgundian Gaul. Avitus' efforts to avoid overlap with the piece, as well as a subtle warning against heresy dependant upon knowledge of Dracontius' text further suggest a relatively wide readership for Dracontius in Gaul, at least among the circles in which Avitus' own work travelled. Certainly this genre still had currency in Gaul, as the composition of Avitus' own epic testifies. The world of the 490s, however, was not the world of the 460s. Gaiseric and Huneric were dead, and Gunthamund and Thrasamund presided over the new Vandal order. This was the period of the Vandal renaissance, and North Africa saw a plethora of works, both prose and poetry, composed by various authors, including, of course, Dracontius. The transmission of Dracontius' work to Burgundian Gaul shows that the culture of Vandal Africa was not just confined to its own borders. It testifies to a wider cultural influence, to a more interconnected cultural and literary world, where authors could draw on sources, both Classical and contemporary, from all over the Latin-speaking world. Africa was not cut off from Europe. We know from Avitus' *Epistula* 26 that African Donatists were in Lyon in the early-sixth century. It could be that Donatists such as these brought the text of the *De Laudibus Dei* with them. The transmission also attests stronger connections between the two regions. Regardless of how it was transmitted, at the very least it shows a degree of cultural and intellectual interconnectedness between Vandal North Africa and Gaul. The strong relationship also shows a Late Antique literary culture that continued to exist, to be shared, to be

transmitted, and to be built upon by the heirs of the Classical tradition throughout the old provinces of the Western Empire.

iv. Conclusion

Dracontius' poetry, then, can be seen as belonging to the cultural and literary trends exhibited elsewhere in the lands which bore the stamp of the Roman Empire. Dracontius' choice of genre fits well into the tastes and literary developments of his period of Late Antiquity. Old Testament biblical epic reached its apogee at the turn of the sixth century. Dracontius' *De Laudibus Dei* and Avitus' *De spiritualis historiae gestis* represented the highest form of that genre.²⁴⁶ His language and his style, his use of obscure or learned vocabulary, his employment of synonymic lists, and his penchant for bright and voluptuous descriptions place him firmly in the aesthetic traditions of Late Antiquity. That in his style he most resembles Sidonius Apollinaris, the most influential Latin poet of the mid-to-late fifth century, shows him to be in dialogue with the literary tastes of his day. He is not a lone Roman survivor, marooned on an island of *Romanitas* and surrounded, as it were, by a sea of barbarism. Rather he is part of a vibrant North African literary culture which influenced the rest of the Latin world as much as it was influenced by it. It should be remembered that this period in North African history saw a flourishing of theological writing, most especially those of Fulgentius of Ruspe, whose influence long outlasted the Vandal kingdom itself.

Dracontius' writing techniques, especially his use of sources, are also telling.

His knowledge of Late Antique prose and poetry is extensive. His employment of

²⁴⁶ See Daniel J. Niles, *Doctrine and Exegesis*, who outlines the highly sophisticated nature of these two texts. A mere glance at the amount of this monograph that is dedicated to Dracontius and, especially, to Avitus, can solidly demonstrate this.

the various Christian and pagan sources of Late Antiquity shows them to have become part of the literary canon, and indeed shows them to bear at times similar weight to the greatest of the Classics. His heavy use of Claudius Marius Victorius places that writer alongside Vergil as one of Dracontius' preferred sources. Dracontius' use of Late Antique sources also proves that he was no slave to the Classics. Although his mode of composition, that is the combination of tradition and originality, the interweaving of the old with the new, is decidedly Classical, his language, his expressions and his Christian themes are decidedly Late Antique. Indeed, Dracontius represents the cutting edge of Late Antique culture at the turn of the sixth century. His poetry shows a deep and learned interest in the culture and mythology of the pagan past, but an interest that is only aesthetic. On the other hand, his equally deep and learned interest in Christian literature and exegesis shows him to have possessed both a sophisticated understanding, and a profound belief, in the doctrines of that faith. He did, after all, address the *De Laudibus Dei*, a poem which time and again stresses Trinitarian Catholic dogma, to the Arian king who held him in prison. Dracontius' poetic method, favouring aesthetics over exegesis, places him on the opposite side of the spectrum from Avitus, for whom exegesis mattered more than anything else. Both approaches, however, are opposite sides of the same coin. While Dracontius does favour aesthetics, his *De Laudibus Dei* is nevertheless one of the most exegetically sophisticated of the Late Antique biblical epics, surpassed only in this regard by the work of Avitus himself.²⁴⁷ Dracontius' poetry ranges from the serious, dealing with hotly debated doctrinal issues such as the dual nature of Christ, to the purely artistic, recanting the labours of Hercules in ornate lines. In his *opera*

²⁴⁷ Daniel J. Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis*, p. 39 and pp. 55-61.

we see the full gamut of Late Antique intellectual culture on display, and thus they provide us with valuable insight into the world in which they were written.

3: The Use of the Bible in Dracontius' *Opera*

While the Classics and the writings of other Late Antique authors provide Dracontius with much of his source material, whether in the form of direct quotations, oblique references, or language and style, there exists a third group of texts which exerts an equal, or indeed greater, influence on our author's poetry. These texts are the Christian Scriptures, the books of the Bible, both the Old and New Testaments. Dracontius draws a great deal of material and inspiration from the Bible, whether for his language, his subject matter, or his underlying themes and ways of thinking.²⁴⁸

As we have seen from the examples in the previous chapters, the secular (whether Classical or Late Antique) and the biblical are never truly divorced in the poetry of Dracontius. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to approach Dracontius' work from the direction of his biblical sources. This direct approach can bring to light information that would go unnoticed if this poetry was approached solely from the 'secular' perspective. This type of inquiry can proceed in several different ways. Using the methodology employed in the previous chapters, the investigatory path chosen here will address several different questions. Firstly, what is the state of Dracontius' biblical knowledge? Secondly, how is Dracontius using, and engaging with, the Bible? Thirdly, how does Dracontius view the Bible?

²⁴⁸ For the sake of this chapter we will distinguish between what is biblical, and what is merely Christian. Many themes, ideas, and narratives can be Christian and at the same time not biblical. For example the story of the martyrdom of St Peter is certainly Christian, but is also certainly not biblical. Dracontius' works have many Christian elements, drawn from various sources, such as the works of other Late Antique Christians. The largest source for all of Dracontius' Christian material, however, is the Bible, and it is solely with the Bible, and not with other Christian works, that we shall here be concerned. A discussion on Dracontius' not insubstantial use of the Church Fathers can be found in the works of Daniel J. Niles dealing with Dracontius, principally his *Doctrine and Exegesis in Biblical Latin Poetry*, ARCA, 31 (Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1993).

That Dracontius drew from the Bible is clear: Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei* is, as already noted, a versification of the story of the Creation in the book of Genesis. While this genre of biblical epic, even more especially the versification of the Creation story, forms a keystone of Late Antique Latin literature, and Dracontius surely draws from his predecessors in the field (such as Prudentius, Sedulius, and others, as outlined in the previous chapter), the inspiration, and source material, for these epics is, ultimately, the Bible. The raw material from which Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei* is constructed, and indeed much of the other two books of that work and also of the *Satisfactio*, is drawn from the Bible. Dracontius' major works are fully imbued with biblical imagery, biblical themes, and biblical resonances. This use, along with its implications for the literary culture and the literary method of Dracontius, provides a fertile field for study.

i. Dracontius' Knowledge of the Bible²⁴⁹

As we have seen in the two previous chapters, Dracontius possessed a deep and wide-reaching knowledge of secular Latin literature from the Golden Age up to, and including, his own day. The same holds true with the Bible. Dracontius makes reference, whether by direct quotation, indirect resonance, or by linguistic borrowings, to a wide selection of the books of the Bible.²⁵⁰ The initial line of

²⁴⁹ Due to the natures of Dracontius' poems, this section will focus on evidence from the three books of the *De Laudibus Dei* and from the *Satisfactio*. The *Orestes Tragoedia* and the *Carmina Profana*, due to their focus on decidedly secular or, rather, mythological, topics, themes and narrative materials, contain little or no reference to the Bible. The *De Laudibus Dei* and the *Satisfactio* are, however, rather more representative as a whole of the poetry of Dracontius. As such, they can be used by themselves to demonstrate the biblical knowledge of Dracontius.

²⁵⁰ The question of which version of the Bible Dracontius used is also of great importance. The short answer is that Dracontius, like most intellectuals of his day, used both the Vulgate and the various forms of the *Vetus Latina* at his disposal without any clear distinction between them. The discussion of the question of which versions Dracontius used, while of

inquiry to take here, then, is into Dracontius' basic use of the Bible. To begin this investigation, it is best to start with Dracontius' biblical epic, that is to say Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*. Firstly, the Book of Genesis serves as the narrative framework for this book. The main characters, settings, and events are all drawn straight from Genesis, and more specifically from the Creation narrative occupying its first two chapters. While Dracontius greatly expands upon the biblical narrative, he at no point wholly departs from it, and it always remains visible underneath. Dracontius, however, does not simply use the biblical narrative as source material or as a mere framework for his verse. Rather, Dracontius engages with the biblical text on a level that bears witness to his deep understanding of the texts themselves and the doctrine and exegesis built upon them.²⁵¹

In addition to his fundamental use of Genesis, Dracontius makes heavy use of several other books of the Bible. In much the same way as the poet uses his Classical and Late Antique sources selectively, so too does he employ the Bible. For Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, he used the Psalms more heavily than any other biblical text. There are nineteen resonances with the Psalms, possessing varying degrees of solidity and directness.²⁵² Dracontius' heavy use of the Psalms in the *De Laudibus Dei* makes perfect sense: the poem is written in praise of God's faithfulness and care for humanity, and so too are many of the Psalms. That the Psalms fit perfectly with Dracontius' theme in the *De Laudibus Dei*, however, is only one reason for his heavy use of them. The Psalms were written in poetic language, and stand at the summit of Hebrew poetic style, and, as such, at the summit of biblical style. The

obvious relevance here, would in truth draw attention (and words) away from the central inquiry of this chapter, which is the investigation of Dracontius' use of the Bible as a work of literature.

²⁵¹ See Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis*, pp. 45-54.

²⁵² See the *loci similes biblici* lists in the Appendix.

language of the Psalms gives praise to God in a grand way, and Dracontius pulls from it both directly and indirectly in writing what is, in essence, his own grand psalm. The influence of the Book of Psalms, then, is not only in quotations and resonances, but also in genre and purpose: the *De Laudibus Dei* is a hymn of praise in much the same way as the psalms are. That of Dracontius is merely longer and more involved. Thirdly, the Book of Psalms was widely known, and its prominent place in both the Christian liturgy and Late Antique/Christian education assures that even those without substantial training in the Bible *per se* would recognize many passages from it.²⁵³ These resonances with well known texts would help Dracontius bring his audience into the thought-world of his poetry, as well as increase their enjoyment of it. In addition, it allows him to add another layer of meaning to his verse, as each resonance is meant to call to mind the text it refers to.

While Genesis and Psalms stand as Dracontius' favoured biblical sources for Book I of his *De Laudibus Dei*, they are but a small fraction of the books used. Dracontius' third most-favoured book, the Book of Wisdom, comes from the Deuterocanon, those books of the Old Testament not found in the Masoretic Text of

²⁵³ While we know little for certain about the liturgies used by Catholics and Arians in Late Antique North Africa, the Psalms certainly hold a central position in most liturgies which we have knowledge of, including those of North Africa. For the use of the Psalms in the liturgies of the Late Antique West see especially Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, rev. edn (London: Continuum, 2005), pp. 451-453. In terms of education, by the sixth/seventh century, but in reality almost certainly from the fourth century onwards, the Psalms had become a central part of Christian-oriented education. This is attested by St Jerome, in his letters to Laeta (CVII) and Pacatula (CXXVIII), where he exhorts the young girls to study the Psalms. For these texts see (with the Latin and English) *Select Letters of St Jerome*, trans. by F. A. Wright (London: Heinemann, 1933). For the secondary literature see, for example, Riché, 281-289 (regarding principally Spain and Gaul but with wider implications) and Suzanne Reynolds, *Medieval Reading: grammar, rhetoric and the classical text*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 27 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 9, regarding especially the emphasis on the Psalms placed by Jerome and also Gregory the Great.

the Tanakh (the Hebrew Bible).²⁵⁴ Dracontius makes reference to eight passages from Wisdom in Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*. Next in line is the Book of Job, seven passages of which Dracontius makes reference to. Dracontius' use of these books varies. The references to Job tend to be more substantial or solid and rather more spread out. The references to Wisdom, on the other hand, tend to be more suggestive and closely packed. Lines twenty-nine through thirty-four of Book I, for example, make reference to six verses of Wisdom, not all of which are consecutive.²⁵⁵ While these texts, like the two mentioned above, are Old Testament, Dracontius' use of them differs from the previous two. While Genesis and the Psalms influence the theme and structure of Dracontius' poetic narrative, as well as lend it language and expression, Wisdom and Job do not. They do, however, lend support or wording to particular points or statements which Dracontius makes, and in doing so, give Dracontius' argument more weight. If one recalls, this is the same method used by Dracontius in his employment of Classical and Late Antique texts that are not central to his argument.

In addition to these four books, Dracontius utilizes, for Book I of his *De Laudibus Dei*, fourteen other books of the Bible. These come from all sections of the Bible: from the Torah Deuteronomy, from the Prophets Joshua, Isaiah, and Ezekiel, from the Writings Ecclesiastes, from the Deuterocanon Judith, from the Gospels Matthew, Luke, and John, and from the rest of the New Testament the Epistles of James, 1st John, 2nd Peter, 1st Thessalonians, 1st Corinthians and Ephesians. This wide use attests a broad knowledge of the various parts of the Bible, but especially of the New Testament. While these texts appear between one and three times in

²⁵⁴ I have chosen to use the term Deuterocanon, at it is the neutral Eastern Orthodox/Catholic term, but these are indeed the books known to Protestantism primarily as the Apocrypha.

²⁵⁵ The verses referenced are Wisdom, 11: 24-26; 12: 10; 12: 20; and 16: 11.

Dracontius' biblical epic, their use parallels that of Dracontius' use of Job, serving to reinforce Dracontius' argumentation or narrative at various points throughout the work. Nevertheless, while the Bible figures very prominently in Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, and the influence of Genesis in particular is profound, the actual number of biblical parallels is relatively few when compared with those from the Classics or Late Antique authors.²⁵⁶ This, however, is largely due to the high number of Classical and Late Antique texts employed by Dracontius (there are forty-six) in comparison to the eighteen biblical texts. In terms of parallels per text, Psalms is second only to Vergil's *Aeneid*. Wisdom and Job rank among Dracontius' ten most used-sources. The remainder of the biblical texts appear about as frequently as Dracontius' average Classical or Late Antique sources do. In terms of individual texts, then, Dracontius' biblical sources appear in roughly the same numbers as his non-biblical sources.

The picture is rather different when one looks at the second book of the *De Laudibus Dei*. Interwoven amongst the 818 lines of hexameter found in this book are one hundred and sixty-four biblical *loci similes*. These *loci similes* exhibit a wide biblical knowledge and make reference to thirty-five separate books.²⁵⁷ This book shows Dracontius' most prolific use of the Bible in all his verse, and is the only one in which there are roughly the same number of biblical resonances as there are secular.²⁵⁸ Even at the most cursory of glances, these verses bear witness to a deep familiarity with the Bible.

²⁵⁶ Excluding Genesis, there are sixty-three biblical parallels in Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*. There are 162 Classical and Late Antique parallels.

²⁵⁷ In other words, Dracontius here makes reference to about half of the total number of books in the Christian Bible.

²⁵⁸ There are 162 references to Classical and 'secular' Late Antique literature.

For Book II, Dracontius most heavily employed the Gospels. Of course, it is not always fully possible to pinpoint the exact Gospel Dracontius is referring to in any given resonance due to the parallel nature of the Gospel narratives. While it is sometimes possible to do so, on most occasions it is not. This, however, is not solely due to the nature of the Gospels. Much of this is actually due to Dracontius' substantial intertwining of the narratives. A basic sketch of Dracontius' use of the Gospels shows eighteen *loci similes* with Matthew, thirteen with Mark, fifteen with Luke and six with John.²⁵⁹ The Synoptic Gospels are Dracontius' three most-used sources for this book, counting both secular and biblical texts. Taken together, the Gospels account for a substantial proportion of the overall *loci similes* employed in this book. As this book praises God's faithfulness and outlines God's dealings with mankind, using substantial biblical examples, this heavy use of the Gospels is unsurprising. While many of these *loci similes* take the form of verbal resonances or parallels, many also take the form of stories and narratives lifted from the Gospels. This, of course, represents the most obvious use of the biblical texts when one is trying to give examples of God's relationship with mankind. This particular use of the Bible is, unsurprisingly, most common with the historical books, whereas the former use is more common with books like the Psalms and Proverbs.

The best examples of this use of the biblical texts for supporting *exempla* are to be found in two of Dracontius' most-used books: Genesis and Exodus. After the Gospels, Dracontius' most-used biblical source for *De Laudibus Dei* Book II is the Book of Genesis.²⁶⁰ Dracontius draws rather heavily on the post-creation historical

²⁵⁹ These numbers represent total possible resonances; in fact the figures overlap, as in a Venn diagram.

²⁶⁰ Genesis and the Psalms actually have the same number of *loci similes*, but Dracontius employs Psalms in a very different way, and therefore will be discussed shortly.

narrative of Genesis, and makes reference to the book twelve times. Dracontius highlights, among others, the stories of Noah and Abraham. The lives of the patriarchs, of course, fit Dracontius' purpose well, and are tucked nicely into his narrative. Following Genesis and Psalms in number of references is Exodus, with eleven *loci similes*. Like Genesis, the Book of Exodus lends itself very well to this type of use and Dracontius employs it accordingly. Further examples of his use of the Bible for the stories within it can be found in the New Testament as well as the Old. One such use is the resurrection of Lazarus found at and around line 132 in Dracontius. This story from the life of Jesus is found in the Gospel of John, chapter eleven. The previous line in the *De Laudibus Dei* relates Christ's resurrection of the daughter of Jairus, found in all three Synoptic Gospels.²⁶¹ This use of the Bible for historical *exempla* further attests Dracontius' intimate knowledge of the texts. In addition, Dracontius' ability to condense and meaningfully juxtapose material from throughout the entire biblical corpus, in not necessarily chronological order, for use as demonstrative examples shows that the poet possessed a deep familiarity with, and ability to navigate within, the biblical text.

The 755 lines of Book III of the *De Laudibus Dei* provide us with somewhat different testimony. On the surface, the biblical parallels found in this book are quite noticeably fewer than those found in the previous ones. Whereas Book II had the extraordinary count of one hundred and sixty-four, Book III has forty-seven. These references come from sixteen different books of the Bible, and range from both Old Testament and New. They do, however, provide a fairly good representation of the various types of book found within the Bible. The biblical text which Dracontius

²⁶¹ Dracontius makes solid reference to the story, but, following Matthew, does not name the father.

most heavily employs here, with seven parallels, is, unsurprisingly, Psalms. After Psalms, Dracontius most often employs the Gospels (excepting Mark) and the Acts of the Apostles. Following these in frequency of use come Daniel and Ezekiel, which are both used four times. The remaining books, with one or two parallels, are drawn from the Torah (Genesis), the Prophets (Jeremiah), the Writings/Books of Wisdom (Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes), the Deuterocanon (Sirach), the Letters of Paul (Ephesians) and the General Epistles (1st John and James). This variety of texts, albeit on a substantially smaller scale, complements the evidence of the previous two books of the *De Laudibus Dei*, and further attests Dracontius' substantial knowledge of the Bible.²⁶²

The picture is somewhat different again for the *Satisfactio*. While the 754 verses of Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei* have, excluding the debt to Genesis, sixty-three biblical parallels, the 316 verses of the *Satisfactio* have eighty-two. The overall proportion of biblical references to text size is therefore far larger for the *Satisfactio* than it is for the *De Laudibus Dei*, even taking into consideration Book II. The *Satisfactio*, in other words, employs biblical parallels in a denser fashion than the *De Laudibus Dei*.²⁶³ This having been said, no biblical source used in the *Satisfactio* is employed as heavily as the Psalms are in the *De Laudibus Dei*. Of the twenty-seven biblical texts which Dracontius parallels in the *Satisfactio*, nineteen occur two or three times, and twelve occur only once. These numbers are fully consistent with Dracontius' normal practice and reflect the wide reading and the wide literary

²⁶² The reason there are fewer biblical parallels in this particular section of the *De Laudibus Dei* owes more to the subject of the verses and the nature of the narrative therein than to any other factors.

²⁶³ The same is also true of its employment of Classical and Late Antique sources. The *Satisfactio* is, in essence, a rather dense piece of verse, as its 316 verses have roughly the same number of references within them as does Book I or Book III of the *De Laudibus Dei*.

engagement standard for this author. Nevertheless, as is typical with the poetry of Dracontius, one source stands out among the rest. For the *Satisfactio*, this source is the Gospel of Matthew, with twelve parallels. After Matthew, Dracontius most employs the Gospel of Luke and Ecclesiastes, with seven parallels each. The last tier before the occasional or single-use texts are the books of Exodus, Proverbs, Psalms and the Gospel of John all with six parallels each. The heavier emphasis on these books, which deal both with God's mercy and forgiveness on the one hand, and the cruelty of men and life on the other, show Dracontius once again to be using the most relevant texts in his poetry. That the *Satisfactio* is a poem written with a single purpose is reflected in the biblical resonances which its author employed, as these help to focus the poem's argument. Nevertheless, the *Satisfactio* retains the characteristic wide range of biblical sources from which it draws its material.

Taken together then, Dracontius' two principal works, and the ones most concerned with Christian matters, possess a great debt to the books of the Bible. All told, there are 356 *loci similes* between the *De Laudibus Dei* and the *Satisfactio* and the various texts which compose the Christian Scriptures. Dracontius makes reference to forty-five different books evenly spread throughout the entirety of the biblical canon. Many of the books most heavily referenced are the most widely known, such as Psalms and the Gospels. Dracontius did not, however, restrict himself to well-known texts. Dracontius makes reference to the books of Nahum, Micah and Malachi, among others of the Minor Prophets: books which seldom get referenced at all, even by those learned in the Bible. Additionally, Dracontius has a substantial knowledge of the books of the Deuterocanon, especially Sirach and the Book of Wisdom. Dracontius has an intimate knowledge of the New Testament as

well, and refers to seventeen of its twenty-seven books. His knowledge of the Gospels is especially sound.

While it is correct to view the biblical texts separately, it can be useful also to view them as one whole: the picture they then give is a striking one. While the biblical parallels seem always, except in the case of *De Laudibus Dei* Book II, to be overshadowed in number by the ‘secular’ ones, the picture is very much different if the Bible is viewed as a single work. When looked at this way, the Bible stands as the most-used source by a landslide. The maximum Vergil, Dracontius’ most-used single author, ever gets, counting all of his works, is forty-seven references. The fewest references the Bible gets is forty-seven, the most one hundred and sixty-four. The Bible, then, is the single largest source for Dracontius. His ability to move so freely around it, going from section to section and book to book with apparent ease, testifies to Dracontius’ profound knowledge of the texts, as the Bible is a very long and substantial work indeed.

All of these *loci similes*, therefore, confirm Dracontius’ deep and profound knowledge of the Bible. Just as Dracontius is extremely well versed in the literature of Classical and Late Antiquity, so too is he in the Christian Bible. Dracontius’ ability to comment on the Bible and its meaning, his ability to write verse exegesis on its text, bears further witness to this knowledge and understanding.²⁶⁴ Secondly, the depth of Dracontius’ knowledge would seem to suggest a lifelong acquaintance with the Bible. His ability to keep so many different pieces of it in his head while composing suggests a mind thoroughly steeped in its contents. While the mind of a recent convert could feasibly attain this level of knowledge and understanding, it more reasonably suggests someone who studied the Bible from an early age.

²⁶⁴ Again, for Dracontius and exegesis, see Nides, *Doctrine and Exegesis*, pp. 45-54.

Dracontius' deep familiarity with the Bible, then, serves to confirm the argument of his lifelong Christianity mentioned in the previous chapter. Thirdly, these citations imply a relatively high level of biblical knowledge on the part of the intended audience; namely King Gunthamund. Certainly, at the very least, Dracontius believed that his audience would be moved by biblical stories of mercy, as he included several, such as that of the Protomartyr St Stephen praying for the souls of those who were at that very moment stoning him.²⁶⁵ Dracontius was, ostensibly, writing to Gunthamund to earn his release from prison. The fact that the *Satisfactio*, especially, is so heavily imbued with biblical resonances is surely not coincidental or unintentional. Dracontius layered the Bible so prodigiously into his argument for mercy that it argues for a knowledge of, or at least a reverence for, the Bible on the part of Gunthamund, or at least his closest advisors. Dracontius' heavy use of the Bible, therefore, not only testifies to his own profound knowledge of the Scriptures, but to some extent to that of the learned society of Vandal North Africa, and most especially the royal court.

ii. Dracontius' Use of and Engagement with the Bible

While the study of the frequency and basic use of biblical texts in Dracontius' poetry can be rewarding, much more can be learned from looking at *how* Dracontius used these texts.²⁶⁶ The first, and perhaps most obvious, line of inquiry will be into

²⁶⁵ *Satisfactio*, 170-171.

²⁶⁶ While the following investigation will go into some detail, it can only give a brief but representative picture of Dracontius' full use of the Bible. A complete discussion would, in truth, require a monograph unto itself, and, as the discussion here is part of a larger discussion of the implications of Dracontius works as a whole, must suffice for the time being. This chapter will discuss Dracontius' direct involvement with the Bible (and to some extent also exegesis); for Dracontius' role as a poet in the 'sacred tradition' see the previous chapter of the present thesis and (in the existing published scholarship) especially the relevant chapter(s) in Charles Witke, *Numen Litterarum: the old and the new in Latin poetry*

Dracontius' employment of biblical exegesis in his poetry. Secondly, looking at the poems in greater detail, we shall seek the other ways in which Dracontius is employing the Bible, both as a philological and a literary source. Thirdly, we should inquire as to how Dracontius views the Bible.

ii.a. Dracontius and his Exegesis

Dracontius' employment of exegesis in his poetry has, to an extent, already been discussed in the scholarship.²⁶⁷ Daniel J. Nodes' important work *Doctrine and Exegesis in Biblical Latin Poetry* provides a suitable introduction to the study of exegesis in the Late Antique biblical epic.²⁶⁸ While Nodes' *Doctrine and Exegesis* covers the entire genre of biblical epic and is only partly concerned with Dracontius' *De Laudibus Dei*, a good deal of discussion on this text is included, and Nodes rightly places it into the wider context of the genre, alongside the *Alethia* and the *De spiritualis historiae gestis*. Nevertheless, this topic requires our notice here. The genre of biblical epic, to which Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei* belongs, necessarily involved some level of exegesis.²⁶⁹ The mere selection of which passages to include or exclude, and of which passages to expound upon, and which ones not to, required

from Constantine to Gregory the Great, *Mittelalterliche Studien und Texte*, 5, ed. by Karl Langosch (Leiden: Brill, 1971), with its references. It should be noted, however, that Witke's discussion is concerned centrally with a survey of all the Christian/biblical poets, and not simply with Dracontius as is the present thesis.

²⁶⁷ Chiefly in Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis*, which has already been referenced above. Also useful is Daniel J. Nodes, 'Benevolent Winds and the Spirit of God in *De Laudibus Dei* of Dracontius', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 43.3 (1989), 282-292. Of importance especially are Kurt Smolak, 'Die Stellung der Hexamerendichtung des Dracontius (laud. dei 1,118-426) innerhalb der lateinischen Genesispoesie', in *Antidosis: Festschrift für Walther Kraus zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. by Rudolf Hanslik et al. (Vienna: Hermann Böhlaus, 1972), pp. 381-397, and also the introduction and commentary contained within the *Belles Lettres* edition of Dracontius' texts along with its substantial references.

²⁶⁸ Nodes is, for English, still the basic work for Dracontius. It is useful for the purposes of inquiry, however, to look beyond Dracontius; at least in terms of Avitus of Vienne, Nodes does not go far enough and the work to see here is Ian N. Wood, 'Avitus of Vienne, The Augustinian Poet', in *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul: revisiting the sources*, ed. by Ralph Mathisen and Danuta Shanzer (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 263-277.

²⁶⁹ Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis*, p. 6.

a basic form of exegesis. This fundamental exegesis, however, as Nodes points out, goes further than the mere selection or exclusion of passages. The rewording and reworking of the Bible practised by the authors of biblical epics demanded that they understand the meaning of the original text, as any unconsidered change could substantially alter it.²⁷⁰ The biblical epic poets, however, were very much concerned with accurately portraying the Bible, and as such all their words were carefully chosen both for their aesthetic and doctrinal value.²⁷¹ One of the areas with which Dracontius is especially concerned is the nature of God. While not in fact a biblical topic, the nature of God is, of course, one of central importance to Christianity. In Dracontius' time, and more especially in his *place*, the nature of God and the Trinity was an immensely controversial issue. Writing against the Arian thought on the issue, Dracontius worked solid Trinitarian doctrine into his reworking of the biblical narrative of Genesis, and his own commentary reflects not only his own interpretation of Genesis, but also that of other exegetes, especially that of Tertullian.²⁷² Another substantial exegetical theme of the *De Laudibus Dei* is that of the *Pietas Dei*, the 'dutiful goodness of God'.²⁷³ Dracontius' portrayal of the *Pietas Dei* 'is identical in many respects with the Augustinian doctrine of grace as far as a near contemporary can be expected to have understood it'.²⁷⁴ Dracontius, then, produces exegesis not only by writing commentary on various biblical passages, but also on a broader scale by juxtaposing various biblical passages together and by

²⁷⁰ Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis*, p. 6.

²⁷¹ For the importance of correctness to the poets, see firstly Avitus of Vienne's preface to the *Spiritualis historiae gestis*. Additionally, Dracontius provides a clear outline of his exegetical intent in the opening lines of the *De Laudibus Dei*.

²⁷² Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis*, p.20 and pp. 48-51.

²⁷³ See Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis*, pp. 45-46, which also provides a summary of the scholarship on the topic, notable among which is A. Hudson-Williams, 'Notes on the Christian Poems of Dracontius', *The Classical Quarterly*, 41.3/4 (1947), 95-108.

²⁷⁴ Nodes, *Doctrine and Exegesis*, p.46.

putting his own twist on the biblical narrative. Dracontius' exegetical commentaries, while they typically include material from the Church Fathers, ultimately spring from the biblical narrative.

While most exegetical scholars focus their efforts on the *De Laudibus Dei*, the employment of exegesis is not, however, limited to this text. The *Satisfactio*, indeed, also makes use of biblical exegesis, if in a rather different way. Whereas the *De Laudibus Dei* is primarily concerned with the nature of God and the Trinity, along with the idea of *Pietas Dei* mentioned above, the *Satisfactio* is primarily concerned with both divine and human mercy. Over and over again Dracontius hammers home the importance of mercy, and supports his argument with examples from the Bible. The most notable is his mention of St Stephen 'ante alios lapidum sub grandine martyr' already referenced above.²⁷⁵ As seen above, Dracontius employs a vast number of biblical references here, and in doing so makes the *Satisfactio* something of an exegetical exercise. Rather than taking one passage and explaining it, as usual with exegesis, Dracontius takes the Bible as whole and, taking the theme of mercy, collects and expounds on all the passages related to this central theme.

Biblical exegesis, then, stands as one of the most profound ways in which Dracontius employed the Bible. As we have seen, exegesis involves a great many more texts than just the Bible, with which the present chapter is primarily concerned. Nevertheless, exegesis is only one way in which Dracontius employs the Bible. As

²⁷⁵ *Satisfactio*, l. 171.

this method is the best represented in the scholarship, this chapter will focus rather more on Dracontius' other methods.²⁷⁶

ii.b. The Bible as Lexicon

Leaving exegesis aside then, the second line of inquiry into the ways in which Dracontius employs the Bible can also tell us a great deal about his poetic method. In investigating Dracontius' verse, three primary methods for the employment of biblical material become apparent. Firstly, Dracontius is employing the Bible on a philological level. This is to say that Dracontius is using the Bible as a grammatical and lexical source. The Latin Bible, whether the Vulgate or the *Vetus Latina*, employs, at times, some words and usages that are at a variance with those of Classical Latin.²⁷⁷ Whether in Latin or in its original languages, the Bible is rich in *hapax legomena* and near *hapax legomena*.²⁷⁸ True *hapax legomena* occur only once

²⁷⁶ The study of exegesis in Dracontius' poetry is a fruitful exercise, and, while the current scholarship on it provides a good foundation, especially that of Moussy, Nides, and Smolak, more work needs to be undertaken.

²⁷⁷ This is a result of various factors, far too diverse and involved to discuss here. While it is somewhat introductory, a good, straight-forward, discussion (specific to the Vulgate) can be found in W.E. Plater and H.J. White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate: Being an introduction to the study of the Latinity of the Vulgate Bible* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926). There are, of course, many others, but Plater and White are a good starting point. For an excellent in-depth but also fairly comprehensive study of the language of the *Vetus Latina* (among other aspects of the texts) see Philip Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

²⁷⁸ By 'near *hapax legomena*' is meant very rare words, with only a handful of appearances in the existing record. While the Bible is particularly rich in unique or rare words, most texts have at least some rare or unique words, Dracontius included. These words can be informative in a number of ways; that outlined below is one of them. For a brief survey of 'lexical peculiarities' in the Vulgate, see Plater, pp. 54-64. For a more in-depth discussion and analysis not only of the concept of *hapax legomena* themselves, but more especially of *hapax legomena* in the Hebrew Bible, the best work is Frederick E. Greenspahn, *Hapax Legomena in Biblical Hebrew: A Study of the Phenomenon and its Treatment since Antiquity with special reference to Verbal Forms* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984), pp. 1-33 (for discussion of *hapax legomena*) and pp. 33-35 (for the relative frequency of *hapax legomena* in the Hebrew Bible). While the same is not true of the Latin, *hapax legomena* make up a little under one third of the Hebrew original. Another good work, but shorter, dealing centrally with Biblical Hebrew but with wider implications is Frederick E. Greenspahn, 'The Number and Distribution of *hapax legomena* in Biblical Hebrew', *Vetus Testamentum*, 30.1 (1980), 8-19. For a discussion of *hapax legomena* in a Classical context, with reference to

in a linguistic corpus, and as such can only provide evidence regarding the text in which they are found. Rare words with only a handful of occurrences, however, are useful tools for tracking the relationships between different texts. While the mere repetition of a rare word in different texts does not prove a link between them, it can be suggestive. Yet, some words only appear in the record two or three times, and would seem to hint at more than mere coincidence. Taken within their context, however, these separate occurrences can sometimes be proved to be textual links. In addition to the occurrence of rare words stands another, similar, phenomenon. This is the attribution of a rare denotation to a known word. It is common, of course, for Latin words to have several different meanings. Nevertheless, all of these different meanings tend to be fairly well used in the linguistic corpus. Sometimes, however, a word is ascribed a meaning that it should not normally have. This is something which occurs frequently enough in the Bible. When such a word is employed in another text with the same not strictly lexical meaning, it operates much as would a *dis legomenon* under the same circumstances. These usages are, at times, sufficiently distinctive to merit their classification as *loci similes* when used in separate works.

These rare words and rare denotations, then, constitute a different type of *locus similis* from those already discussed in the previous chapters.²⁷⁹ Nevertheless, they can be illuminating pieces of evidence. Line 154 of the *Satisfactio* gives us a prime example. This line forms part of an argument for princely mercy (obviously quite frequent in the poem) and comes at the end of two couplets comparing the

methodology, see Andrew Fossum, 'Hapax Legomena in Plato', *The American Journal of Philology*, 52.3 (1931), 205-231.

²⁷⁹ *Loci similes* of this type have, however, been included in the *loci similes* counts found in the Appendix and referenced throughout the philological sections of this thesis. They have not been treated separately, except that they have not been specifically mentioned until now. These types of parallel do not only occur with the Bible as there are examples of them from secular authors as well.

kingdom of a *principis augusti* to the Kingdom of Heaven. Lines 151-154 of the *Satisfactio* read:

Principis augusti simile est ad regna polorum,
 ut canit ad populos pagina sancta Dei,
 sacrilegis referens caelestia iura cateruis
 cinctus apostolica discipulante manu.²⁸⁰

The *discipulante* of the final line is the present participle of the rare verb *discipulare*.

The verb's meaning here is 'to serve, to be a disciple to/pupil of'. As can be readily seen, this word has for its root the Latin noun *discipulus*, meaning 'student, scholar' and, of course, 'disciple' both in a secular and in a biblical sense. The verb constructed from this noun, *discipulare*, while its meaning is relatively clear and it is essentially a logical usage, is a word that will not be readily found in most Latin dictionaries.²⁸¹ In this line Dracontius uses the verb intransitively and as a near synonym for *famulari*, meaning here 'to serve, to be in the service of' with the added connotation of 'to be a disciple to'.²⁸² While the usage makes perfect sense, it is in fact a very rare verb and an even rarer meaning. According to Claude Moussy, 'le

²⁸⁰ This is actually a fairly difficult passage, with several grammatical oddities. Trans: 'Like is the kingdom of the august prince to the Kingdom of the Heavens,/ as the Holy Page of God sings to the peoples,/ bringing back the celestial laws to the sacrilegious crowds,/ He [Christ, the figurative 'pagina sancta Dei' but with the vague suggestion that the 'he' might be a temporal ruler] surrounded/girt by the apostolic hand learning from him/serving him.' The text was ambiguous in antiquity: while Vollmer (p.122) sees 'cinctus' as referring to Christ, Eugenius changed the word to 'vinctus', a very strange and unlikely sentiment for a bishop to hold if the word refers to Christ and not to a secular ruler. Both translations, of course, would require a *constructio ad sensum*, instead of one based on grammatical concord.

²⁸¹ The only English-language lexicon one will find this entry in is Alexander Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to AD 600* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), p. 107. Souter quotes three uses of the word; two are the texts here in question, and the third is a letter of Faustus of Riez, but with a separate meaning from the other two (that is, 'to teach', which does not work here).

²⁸² Moussy, II, p. 209, note 154. Moussy writes: '*discipulare*, verbe rare, est employé ici intransitivement comme synonyme de *famulari*, «servir, être au service de». I believe, however, that the similarity of the two words might not be as close as Moussy thinks it, and that the sense of 'being a disciple to/pupil of', that is, the exact sense of the word in the Matthew page discussed below, is much more close to the way in which Dracontius is using the word here. This is indeed how Souter (p. 107) defines it as well.

seul emploi comparable' to this usage, 'est dans la *Vetus Latina* [...] où il signifie «être disciple»'.²⁸³ This use is located in one of the *Vetus Latina* versions of Matthew 27: 57, the text of which reads 'ipse discipulus erat et discipulavit Iesu'.²⁸⁴ This line describes Joseph of Arimathea, the wealthy disciple of Christ who secured his body after the Crucifixion. In the Vulgate, it reads: 'Ioseph, qui et ipse discipulus erat Iesu'.²⁸⁵ Jerome's version, as can be seen, is rather more clean and crisp than that found in this version of the *Vetus Latina*. The verb *discipulare*, however, only appears in the latter. That the only other attested use of this verb with this meaning is in the *Satisfactio*, which heavily employs the Gospel of Matthew, is highly suggestive. Nevertheless, it is far from conclusive.

Further evidence, however, is available when we view these verses in context. As we have seen, the use in Dracontius comes at the end of two couplets instructing princes to rule by the Word of God and to bring the 'sacrilegious multitudes' back to the heavenly laws by leading 'surrounded by the serving

²⁸³ Moussy, II, p. 209, note 154, although Moussy himself is citing the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, at V, 1, 1327, 65. Confirmed by Souter, p. 107.

²⁸⁴ Moussy, II, p. 209, note 154. This is the text cited by Moussy and confirmed by Souter, and is a reading of Codex δ (Codex Sangallensis Stiftsbibliothek 48), which is a ninth-century Greek manuscript with an interlinear Latin text, see Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: an introduction to the critical editions and to the theory and practice of modern textual criticism*, trans. by Erroll F. Rhodes, 2nd edn rev. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1995), p. 118 (albeit with only very brief mention). While it is possible that this represents a post-Dracontian tradition, it need not be so, and the ninth-century manuscript quite probably reflects a significantly older version of the biblical text (noting that Dracontius' own MSS. date to about this period as well).

²⁸⁵ Vulgate, Matthew 27:57. The original Greek text, reconstructed by Westcott and Hort along with that reconstructed by Nestle and Aland, reads 'Ἰωσήφ, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ' (Matthew, 27:57 from *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, rev. by Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D. Fenton John Anthony Hort, D.D. [New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1885], and *Novum Testamentum Graece*, ed by Eberhard Nestle & al., rev. by Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, rev. edn [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979]). The verb in the Greek version, ἐμαθητεύθη, is the passive aorist of the verb μαθητεύω, which, in the New Testament, means 'to make a disciple of, instruct', or, otherwise, 'to be a pupil of' (*Liddel and Scott's Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*, seventh ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, [n.d.]), p. 483.).

apostolic hand'.²⁸⁶ In other words, the line forms the culmination of an argument for rulers to lead their people by the Bible, to the Bible, all the time enveloping themselves in the Bible.²⁸⁷ The couplets, in turn, form a part of the extended argument for princely mercy which runs through the whole of the *Satisfactio*. The message of these lines, then, is that a ruler should exercise authority in a merciful and right manner, as supported and sanctioned by the Scriptures. This compares interestingly with the passage in Matthew. Firstly, it should be noted that the verse of Matthew in question comes towards the end of that Gospel's passion story. This section of the Bible would be well known to any practising Christian, such as Dracontius and his audience were. The verse itself introduces Joseph of Arimathaea, and those which follow describe his procurement of the body of Christ from Pilate, and its subsequent interment in Joseph's own new tomb. While the likenesses between these two passages may not at first be apparent, there are a few intriguing links. Firstly, the verse in Matthew comes at the end of the ultimate Christian example of mercy, the Crucifixion. Secondly, to those who knew the passage, this unusual verb would draw their mind to Joseph of Arimathaea, who provides one of the New Testament's best examples of an upright rich man. Indeed, Joseph, in this passage, appears as a man of great generosity, giving away his own unfinished tomb. This, then, would add a subtext of generosity, a concept not entirely divorced from mercy, to the line in Dracontius. Lastly, this passage in the Gospel makes reference to Pilate. Pilate here is something of a double-edged sword. While Pilate is

²⁸⁶ *Satisfactio*, ll. 153-154.

²⁸⁷ I have taken *apostolica discipulante manu* to indicate the writings of the New Testament, which, in a poetic fashion, one could say were 'written by the apostle's hand in the service [of Christ]'. This metaphorical reference to the Bible fits with the *pagina sancta Dei* of line 152. Two different metaphors for the Scriptures so close together fit nicely with Dracontius' style. To have called them the *Verbum Dei*, would not have.

ultimately a cruel character in the Passion, he is nevertheless not without some semblance of mercy. This passage is one of Matthew's more merciful depictions of Pilate, as he assents to the request of Joseph and hands him Christ's body. Either way, the connection with Pilate that this verb has, then, would likely serve to call to the mind of Dracontius' royal reader the image of an unjust ruler. All together, then, the verb's context in Matthew would serve to confirm Dracontius' message of right living.

Looking at these shared uses of *discipulare* from a different point of view can also help to confirm them as a *locus similis*. In a logical sense, the participle *discipulante* does not really add much to the meaning of Dracontius' line. Some other participle could perhaps be more appropriate, as 'serving apostolic hand' doesn't really say a whole lot. *Exhortans* or *monstrans* could have made more sense, given the context. Nevertheless, Dracontius chose the obscure *discipulante*. The use appears quite clever, however, if one takes a more literal view of these two couplets. The main point of these four lines, as we have already seen, consists in encouraging princes to bring the people to God's laws by means of the Holy Scriptures. In the last line of this admonition, when he exhorts his princes to act in a biblically correct way, Dracontius uses a uniquely biblical word. This biblical word, then, would serve to reinforce the image of the Bible in the reader's mind. It almost looks like an attempt at lexical humour, as well.

So, what does this tell us? Firstly, this provides evidence for Dracontius' use of at least one of the *Vetus Latina* versions of the Bible.²⁸⁸ Secondly, and most

²⁸⁸ This, then, confirms for us that in late-fifth-century North Africa the *Vetus Latina* was circulating alongside the Vulgate, to the latter of which Dracontius makes frequent reference, as would already have been assumed. It also suggests that all the different

importantly, this shows the linguistic influence of the Bible on the Latin of Dracontius, as this biblical word is used in preference to other more widely attested Latin words with the same meaning such as *servire*, *ministrare*, and *famulari*. This shows Dracontius' Latin as beginning to move in a direction away from Classical Latin.²⁸⁹ Dracontius' Latin is indeed highly influenced by the various version of the Bible; biblical usages show forth in all his works.²⁹⁰ Additionally, as we have already seen, it shows that Dracontius is embedding the Bible in his texts in much the same way as he embeds non-biblical literature, giving his verses secondary and tertiary meanings. Lastly, this serves simply to show the heavy influence of the biblical text on the poet's work, exhibiting itself not only in his thought, but in his language and expression.

ii.c. The Bible as a Source of Ideas

The second of the ways in which Dracontius is employing his biblical material is rather different. A prime example of this method lies in lines 305 and 306 of the *Satisfactio*. These lines read: 'Qui poscit hac lege Deum ut peccata relaxet,/ debet et ipse suo parcere ubique reo.'²⁹¹ The biblical verses which this passage parallels, read, in the Vulgate: 'et dimitte nobis debita nostra sicut et nos dimisimus debitoribus nostris'.²⁹² These verses, of course, come from Matthew's version of what is probably Christianity's most central prayer, the Our Father. The Our Father,

versions, whether Vulgate or *Vetus Latina*, were perceived as having literary merit, contrary to St Augustine's own famous bias against the Old Latin.

²⁸⁹ There is actually a substantial amount of evidence showing Dracontius' movement away from a more Classical form of Latin. Vocabulary, as seen here, is one piece of this evidence.

²⁹⁰ Word choice, such as discussed here, is really only one area of a much wider influence, which includes especially Vulgate/biblical grammatical constructions. Non-Classical grammatical constructions (such as Late Latin purpose clauses and differing uses of the gerund) are quite frequent in Dracontius' poetry.

²⁹¹ *Satisfactio*, 305-306. Trans: 'On this basis he who asks God to overlook sins, ought also himself to spare everyone liable to him.'

²⁹² Matthew 6: 12. Trans: 'And forgive us our debts just as we have forgiven our own debtors.' The *Vetus Latina* versions of this passage vary, but mostly in terms of orthography.

however, has two biblical forms. The first is that of the Gospel of Matthew quoted above. The second is found in the Gospel of Luke. In Luke, the passage in question reads: ‘et dimitte nobis peccata nostra siquidem et ipsi dimittimus omni debenti nobis’.²⁹³ The influence of both texts on Dracontius is very clear.²⁹⁴ Dracontius’ choice of *peccata* comes from the passage in Luke, and his use of *debeo* reflects both passages. The exact passage which Dracontius used here, however, is not the central issue. It is most likely that he was influenced by both Vulgate passages as well as by the variety of *Vetus Latina* passages which give readings between the two passages, possibly alongside a separate liturgical version (such as exists in the Gregorian liturgy). Regardless of his direct source, this passage shows us one of the ways in which Dracontius interacts with his biblical material. In these lines Dracontius takes a well known and theologically important piece of the New Testament and subtly changes it to fit his own uses and contexts. In Matthew, the text speaks of debts and debtors. The fiscally-suggestive words indicate spiritual ‘indebtedness’, that is to say sin, but the language is purely metaphorical. Luke, however, uses both the metaphorical debtors, and the literal *peccata*, sins. Those are the biblical versions, their meaning is clear and their differences in language are relatively minor. Dracontius, however, presents the same idea with markedly different language. It is true that he uses *peccata* and that his *debet* is a nod to both biblical texts, and that the overall meaning of his passage is identical to that of both Gospels. His language, however, comes from the courtroom. The word *lex* directs us first to Dracontius’

²⁹³ Vulgate, Luke 11:4. Trans: ‘And forgive us our sins if indeed we ourselves forgive all our debtors.’ The *Vetus Latina* versions of this passage include, with significant orthographical variations, both *peccata* and *debita*, giving a combined reading somewhere between the two Vulgate versions.

²⁹⁴ This is indeed true regardless of which versions, Vulgate or *Vetus Latina*, he was employing.

legal rendering of the Our Father. Instead of God forgiving our debts, he would have Him ‘loosen’, ‘relax’, or ‘overlook’ our wrongdoings, our crimes, our sins. The other side of the coin, for Dracontius, is that we should ‘spare’ those ‘liable to us’ or really, ‘those who have taken us to court’. The word Dracontius employs here, *reus*, is the standard word for a party in a lawsuit, more especially referring to the guilty party in a lawsuit.

Taking a step back, then, what we can see Dracontius doing here is two-fold. Firstly, Dracontius is pulling ideas from the Bible and clothing them in his own words. While neither passage from the Gospels closely resembles that of Dracontius here, their influence is nonetheless obvious. The structure, sense, and meaning of Dracontius’ passage come directly from its scriptural forebears, but its wording does not. What we see here is Dracontius working biblical ideas, and lessons, into his verse. The Bible, then, is not only affecting his language and style as seen above, but his thought and his argument. Secondly, we see Dracontius reworking the Bible into his own contextual world. As discussed earlier, Dracontius was described as an *advocatus*. Whatever role an *advocatus* might have played in Vandal North Africa, some association with the practice of Roman law would be logical, and this passage could potentially strengthen that link, at least in terms of Dracontius. His rephrasing of the Our Father into legal terminology is therefore very suggestive. The idea expressed in these verses is one that is central to the practice of Christianity and their application of mercy would certainly have been at the forefront of the mind of the imprisoned Dracontius. Dracontius’ choice to put them into legal language also helps to drive home the main point of the *Satisfactio*; it helps to further Dracontius’ argument by moving somewhat more theoretical biblical morals into a practical, legal theatre. This passage comes very near the end of the poem, and helps to sum up

his argument that King Gunthamund should be merciful. These two lines remind Gunthamund that it is his Christian duty to forgive those who have sinned against him, and that if he does not, he too will have no forgiveness. On top of that, they serve to bring Dracontius' argument back to himself. They remind Gunthamund that Dracontius himself is *suus reus*, his own offender, and that the Our Father isn't hypothetical at all, but meant to be put into practice.

From a literary standpoint, then, this reference provides closer insight into Dracontius' poetic method. This passage shows that Dracontius is employing the Bible in his verse for moral and didactic ends. That he gives this biblical command for forgiveness at the end of his *Satisfactio* shows that Dracontius views the Bible as the ultimate source of authority.

ii.d. The Bible as Source Material

This, then, leads us to the third way in which Dracontius employs the Bible. The third way, and the most common, is the use of the Bible for narrative material and *exempla*. This use closely parallels Dracontius' use of the Classical and Late Antique sources as outlined in the previous two chapters. As already mentioned, Dracontius used the Bible heavily in composing his *De Laudibus Dei*. For Book I, he mostly employed the Book of Genesis for narrative, and the remaining references he used take the form of verbal resonances or the borrowing of ideas as seen above. The remaining books of the *De Laudibus Dei* chiefly employ the Bible for *exempla*. This applies to the *Satisfactio* as well, as the two *loci similes* discussed above represent the minority of references. The general picture of these references on their own is given above. When one takes a step back, however, and views the biblical resonances in their context, a definite pattern emerges.

This pattern stands out most clearly in the *Satisfactio*. In this poem, Dracontius builds an impressive, if ultimately unsuccessful, argument for royal clemency. To do this, Dracontius stacks the work with relevant examples from the Bible. Nestled at the beginning of the poem, in lines seventeen and eighteen, are a few solid references to the Book of Exodus, where Dracontius recounts the famous ‘duraturus cor Pharaonis’, the hard heart of Pharaoh. In the context, Dracontius points this reference to himself, and alludes to his own hardened heart, which led to his own failings.²⁹⁵ Regardless of how it is packaged and who it is directed at, however, the Exodus story of Pharaoh carries with it the strong connotation of an unmerciful ruler who gets his due. This passage then, tucked as it is into Dracontius’ own apology for his actions, plants the seed of Dracontius’ main theme. Following this, he then begins to nourish this seed with choice passages from both the Psalms and Proverbs, passages which lament the anger of kings and the hardening of hearts.²⁹⁶ He builds on these literary references with biblical examples of royal cruelty, ranging from Nebuchadnezzar to David and Absalom. Taken together, all of these references and parallels lead to a lesson on mercy. The passages from Exodus warn against hard-heartedness in a ruler, those from Proverbs and the Psalms warn against anger and the sin in one’s own heart. Dracontius gives his final biblical quote, at the end of the poem, when he writes ‘etsi peccavi, sum tamen ipse tuus’.²⁹⁷ This line, which Dracontius ascribes as ‘uerba prophetae’, sums up the powerful language of both Psalms 118: 94 and Wisdom 15: 2.²⁹⁸ These references drive the

²⁹⁵ *Satisfactio*, l. 19.

²⁹⁶ For example Proverbs 19:12, references at line 137, which reads in part ‘fremitus leonis, ita et regis ira’. (Vulgate).

²⁹⁷ *Satisfactio*, l. 310.

²⁹⁸ *Satisfactio*, l. 309.

message of mercy and forgiveness home, and place Dracontius' life into the hands of the intended reader.

This overarching thread exhibited by the biblical resonances in the *Satisfactio* shows us the true nature of Dracontius' biblical *exempla*. In the *Satisfactio*, he uses them to teach mercy, forgiveness, and royal clemency. This use is paralleled in the *De Laudibus Dei*, where Dracontius uses his biblical resonances to show God's favour and faithfulness to His Creation. Taken together, then, these show that Dracontius employs his biblical material in a moral, ethical, and, ultimately, in a didactic way. He uses it to show how one should live their life, how it is best to act and behave. Ultimately, Dracontius employs the Bible to strengthen his arguments and to make sure that he gets his desired points across.²⁹⁹

Overall, then, Dracontius both uses and engages with the Bible in several different ways. Firstly, Dracontius uses the Bible as a source for his Latin. This use can be seen in the evolving nature of Dracontius' vocabulary, as evinced by his use of the biblical verb *discipulare* outlined above. The second resonance discussed above shows that Dracontius used the Bible for its ideas. Dracontius' poetry engages with the Bible's thought, and, while recasting it in different language and circumstances, nevertheless retains its original intention. Dracontius' use of the Bible for moral ideas and examples segues into his use of the Bible for didactic or argument-related examples. This prodigious use of the Bible for *exempla*, especially in reference to a central theme, shows very clearly Dracontius' heavy engagement with the Bible. Not only does Dracontius know the Bible, he also *understands* it. His mind is heavily engaged with the thought-world of the Bible, and he is able to move

²⁹⁹ Of course, Gunthamund might not have enjoyed being preached at in such a way: perhaps one of the reasons why the *Satisfactio* was unsuccessful in earning Dracontius' release?

freely throughout it, taking expressions, ideas, and stories from its entire corpus and weaving them together to create his poetry.

iii. Dracontius' Views regarding the Bible

This leaves us the last matter in our investigation of the Bible's place in the poetry of Dracontius: how does Dracontius view the Bible? As we have seen, Dracontius possesses both a deep knowledge and a profound understanding of the Bible. Yet, as we have also seen, the same holds true for his knowledge and understanding of the unified corpus of Classical and Late Antique authors. How then, does Dracontius view the Bible? To answer this question we must look at how Dracontius treats the Bible. His treatment of the Bible is multi-faceted, and while the evidence for this is varied, it does provide us with a picture of three general trends.

Firstly, Dracontius appears to treat the Bible as a body of texts analogous to the works of Classical and Late Antiquity. In other words, he ostensibly treats his biblical sources in much the same way as he does his other sources. This is to say that, in one sense, Dracontius views the Bible as a literary work, no different from Vergil's *Aeneid*. This is seen in Dracontius' treatment of the text. As outlined at the beginning of this chapter, Dracontius employed his biblical material in much the same way as he did his Classical and Late Antique material. He used the Bible for narrative elements, for *exempla*, for wording and for style. The same is true for his use of the Classical and Late Antique corpus. This basic employment, discussed above, indicates that Dracontius viewed the Bible as a valuable literary text disconnected from its religious aspect. The Bible stands, of course, as the fundamental text of Christianity. Dracontius shows us, at least for his own thinking, that this fundamental standing applied not only to its religious importance, but to its

aesthetic and literary importance as well. This can be seen, for example, in Dracontius' lengthy imitation of the Psalms in his *De Laudibus Dei*. Dracontius heavily uses the Bible as a literary source, from which he pulls expressions, ideas, themes, poetic modes, and, as argued above, language and expression. This matches up very closely with his use of other authors, such as Vergil and Cladius Marius Victorius. In this way, Dracontius' use of the Bible in the *De Laudibus Dei* roughly parallels his use of the Classics in the *Carmina Profana*, where the basic narrative and thematic material is borrowed from Classical mythology. This, however, is only one side of Dracontius' multi-faceted view of the Bible, and needs to be seen alongside the next.

The second way in which Dracontius viewed the Bible is as a source of great authority. Firstly, this view is seen in the pride of place given to biblical *exempla* in Dracontius' argumentation, outlined above for the *Satisfactio*. On the one hand, this usage parallels that in which Dracontius employs the Classics, but, on the other, the Bible holds a rather more pronounced sense of authority in the works of Dracontius. For example, while Dracontius takes his description of world geography from the Classics, his description of the underlying principles of the world are rooted in the Bible.³⁰⁰ Dracontius' description of the Garden of Eden provides us with another example. This description, discussed in the previous chapter, pulls heavily from the Classics and from the other authors of Late Antiquity. Nevertheless, the underlying current is completely biblical, and the material from Ovid is made to fit the biblical

³⁰⁰ For his description of world geography, see *Satisfactio*, ll. 89-90, which are discussed above (p. 35-38) as regards their reference to the work of Cicero. For his discussion of the fundamental principles of the world, which he outlines largely as the Holy Spirit, see *De Laudibus Dei*, I, ll. 340 ff. See also Nodes, 'Benevolent Winds', throughout. The phrase 'rooted in' is employed here as this discussion, while indeed rooted in the Bible, is completely steeped in and entwined with the prose, and poetic, biblical exegesis on Genesis.

narrative, and not the other way round. While Dracontius does accord the Classics a great deal of authority, they in no way rival, for him, that of the Bible. This can be seen both in the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*. Interestingly, it is also attested in the ‘pagan’ *Orestes Tragoedia*. Throughout this work, which narrates anew the story of Orestes, Dracontius drops little judgements which indicate a mind imbued with Christian morality. The last three lines give the best of these:

ecce Mycenaea triplex iam scaena profanat
 Graiugenum famam: vestro iam parcite mundo
 atque usum scelerum miseris arcete Pelasgis.³⁰¹

While not overtly biblical, this condemnation of the events of one of the central dramas of Classical mythology shows that the morality at work in the mind of Dracontius comes from his Christianity. This Christian morality, ultimately, is founded in the Bible. The founding of the overall structure and driving force of Dracontius’ Christian poems in the Bible, especially in the Psalms, stands as further evidence of this authority. The view of the Bible as the principal authority is, of course, a central trait of Christianity. Dracontius’ poetry, while it does bear witness to his view of the Bible as literature, also attests his possession of this rather more orthodox view of the Christian Holy Scriptures.

Another facet of this view also warrants mention. In his use of the Bible as an authority, Dracontius refers, as we have seen, to a great portion of the biblical canon. Among the sources which he uses for demonstrating his arguments stands the book of Tobit.³⁰² Tobit, of course, comes from the Deuterocanon. In his discussion of God’s faithfulness to those who pray silently, Dracontius refers to a number of

³⁰¹ *Orestes Tragoedia*, ll. 972-74. Trans: ‘Behold, already the triple Mycenaean stage profanes the reputation born of Greece: now spare your world and ward off from the wretched Pelasgians the custom of wicked crimes.’

³⁰² There are several instances; one example can be found at *De Laudibus Dei*, 2.659-664, to be discussed presently.

biblical examples.³⁰³ These examples include the patriarch Abraham and King David, between which is nestled that of Sarah, the daughter-in-law of Tobit, and Tobit himself.³⁰⁴ This pride of place allotted to the characters of Tobit shows the high esteem, and high authority, in which Dracontius held the book. This would indicate, therefore, that Dracontius viewed the books of the Deuterocanon, leastwise Tobit, not only as being fully canonical, but as being on the same level even as the books of the Torah.³⁰⁵

Dracontius, then, was capable of viewing the Bible both as a literary work separate from its religious aspect, and as a source of truth and authority intimately entwined with its position as Christianity's central religious text. There remains, however, another aspect of the way in which Dracontius viewed the Bible: as a much-read and beloved text. That Dracontius was very much acquainted with the Bible has been demonstrated above. Dracontius' feelings towards the Bible, however, do merit some discussion. From his poetry, it is clear that Dracontius held a great fondness for the different books of the Bible. While it is also clear that he enjoyed the Classics and the works of other Late Antique authors, there exists some evidence to suggest that the Bible was dearer to his heart. One piece of this evidence is Dracontius' clear and repeated use of certain biblical narratives. One example of this is the story of the birth of John the Baptist. This story is a striking one, and a place is found for it, and with sufficient length for description, in both the *Satisfactio*

³⁰³ This discussion, found in Book II of the *De Laudibus Dei*, runs roughly from line 600 to line 700.

³⁰⁴ *De Laudibus Dei*, 2.659-664.

³⁰⁵ Dracontius makes analogous use of the deuterocanonical book of Judith as well, most notably at *De Laudibus Dei*, 3.480 ff. This view is in keeping with the list of canonical books prescribed by the Council of Carthage in 397. This view of Tobit is likewise held by Gregory of Tours, as firmly attested by his use of a cure both taken from and ascribed to Tobit in his *De Gloria Confessorum*, chapter 40.

and the *De Laudibus Dei*.³⁰⁶ The adultery of David and the life of Nebuchadnezzar also receive Dracontius' attention in both the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*.³⁰⁷ Dracontius pays particular attention to the life of Abraham.³⁰⁸ This recurring use of particular biblical stories and characters shows that Dracontius held certain biblical passages at the forefront of his mind. That Dracontius used these stories in different contexts and in getting across different points shows that these stories were of particular meaning for him. That Dracontius viewed the Bible as a piece of literature, but one which also possessed strong religious authority, and that he held various stories from it dear, can tell us a few things. Firstly, it underlines why the Bible figures so centrally in his poetry. Secondly, it serves to show us the sincerity of his Christianity. That Dracontius had favourite biblical passages, taken with his ability to view the Bible as a literary piece, points to someone who was comfortable and confident in their Christianity, and most likely not to someone who was a recent convert from paganism.

iv. Conclusion

Taking a step back, then, it is clear that the Bible is central to the poetry of Dracontius. Both the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei* fully engage the Bible: its themes are interwoven into theirs, its stories flesh out their arguments, its voice echoes in their lines. The Bible provides narrative frameworks and thematic strands, along with a plethora of *exempla*. It provides words and expressions along with thoughts and ideas.

³⁰⁶ The story is told, to different ends, at *Satisfactio*, 39 ff. and *De Laudibus Dei*, 2.686 ff.

³⁰⁷ David: *De Laudibus Dei*, 2.664 ff. and *Satisfactio*, 158 ff. Nebuchadnezzar: *De Laudibus Dei*, 3.718 ff. and *Satisfactio*, 31 ff.

³⁰⁸ There is a lengthy discussion of Abraham at *De Laudibus Dei*, 2.625-658.

Dracontius had an intimate knowledge of the Bible, and incorporated it into his verse in as many different ways as he could. Not only does he expand upon its narratives, but he explains them. He introduces advanced exegesis into his descriptions, yet, at the same time, he takes the driest passages and illuminates them brilliantly with the poetic expressions of Late Antiquity. He fully engages with the Bible, using not only its stories and its ideas, but its very words. In his arguments he pulls examples from throughout the entirety of the biblical canon and interweaves them, along with examples from the Classics, into a single thread, a single idea.

Yet, this is not all. The Bible stands as the single largest source for Dracontius' poetry. It is also, perhaps, the chief source for his thought. At the same time, he is able to view the Bible in both a very sophisticated and a very simple way. Dracontius is able to view the Bible as a piece of literature, standing on its own merits and in the company of the great works of Classical Antiquity. At times, he employs it no differently from the way in which he does Vergil. He is, nevertheless, able to view it as a religious text of profound truth and authority. In the two poems upon which his freedom rested, his arguments for mercy and forgiveness always rest, ultimately, on the Bible. When it really mattered, it was on the Bible that Dracontius put his money.

4. Dracontius in Conclusion: Appropriation or Continuity?

Now that we have investigated Dracontius' sources and explored their implications in detail we must turn to consider one last question. Does Dracontius' use of sources, especially as regards the Classics, bear evidence of appropriation or continuity? Is Dracontius 'classicising' or is he himself 'Classical'? To answer this question, we must examine a little further, using the evidence we have already gathered, Dracontius' own cultural mindset; or rather, the way in which Dracontius perceived himself, his art, and his place within the poetic tradition.

As we have seen, the Classical literary canon is ever present in the works of Dracontius. For Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, which is a versification of the first chapters of the Book of Genesis, Dracontius incorporates nearly 120 *loci similes* from twenty-seven different Classical works. In the 315 lines of the *Satisfactio*, there are just over ninety parallels with forty-one different Classical works, including both prose and poetry. These *loci similes* strongly attest Dracontius' wide range of Classical reading. His more mythologically leaning works give further evidence for Dracontius' wide knowledge of, and indeed intimacy with, the culture and literature of his Classical Roman past. Dracontius is fully versed in the Classical canon, and is able to navigate freely within its framework: in composing his own verse, he is able to move quickly and seamlessly from the works of Vergil, to those of Ovid, to those of Horace, Statius, Lucan and Lucretius. Sometimes he borrows a half-line, sometimes a few words, sometimes only a concept or an idea. At other times, he borrows even more, such as his strikingly Ovidian description of the Garden of Eden, where he applies the language and imagery of the *Metamorphoses*' Golden Age to Genesis' Paradise. Additionally, Dracontius gives a great deal of weight to the Classics, and his treatment of them, especially in the *Satisfactio*, tells us that he

viewed them as works of great moral and historical authority. Finally, Dracontius utilised Classical tropes and genres, and Classical imagery along with the Classical mythology already mentioned. Dracontius heavily employed *ekphrasis*, and did so with reference to those found in earlier works, such as the description of Ovid's Golden Age mentioned just before. The *Satisfactio*, while in some ways unique, is also in some ways an emulation of Ovid's works written in exile, to which Dracontius' apology is profoundly indebted. His *Orestes Tragoedia*, while far from being a performable tragic play, bears a strong resemblance in tone and overall feeling to the dark, and equally un-performable, tragedies of Seneca, while its form and style more resemble the epics of Homer than anything else. As regards Classical imagery, the works of Dracontius abound: his descriptions of the natural world, even when very much Christian, are very much Classical, and both the natural and the man-made world are routinely Classical in language: the Sun is still Phoebus, the Christian Heaven Elysium. But Dracontius does not just employ the Classics at random. Instead, his employment is well thought out and allows his own work to interact with his sources in a deep and multi-faceted way. In other words, Dracontius does not just use his Classical sources to show off his learning; rather, he is using them to add more and more layers of meaning and to bring his own verse into closer dialogue with that of his predecessors. For his *Satisfactio*, Dracontius uses Ovid's *Tristia* more than his *Metamorphoses*, because the *Tristia* resonates more strongly with his purpose, as well as with the message he is trying to get across. This, then, is Dracontius' use of Classical sources.

As we have seen, his use of Late Antique sources follows a similar pattern, confirming the same usages as well as the same intentions. Just as Dracontius employs a wide and varied range of Classical sources, so too does he employ a wide

and varied range of Late Antique sources. While the Late Antique *loci similes* in Dracontius' verse may, at first, appear to be of less importance than their Classical antecedents, due largely to their smaller number, this is not really the case. Rather, Dracontius gives the literature of Late Antiquity equal weight alongside that of Classical Rome. Sedulius' *Carmen Paschale* is tied with Ovid's *Metamorphoses* for Dracontius' third most-cited non-biblical work in the *Satisfactio*. In Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, Claudius Marius Victorius' *Aletheia* is the fourth most-employed work, with ten citations. In this book also the works of Prudentius and Claudian outweigh the works of Horace and even of Ovid, excluding the *Metamorphoses*. Indeed, the only texts which really outstrip those of Late Antiquity in Dracontius' verse are the *Metamorphoses*, and, of course, Vergil's *Aeneid*. But both of these are really monoliths in Latin literature, and if one takes them out of the equation, the average number of *loci similes* for both Classical and Late Antique texts is fully consistent.

Dracontius employs his Late Antique sources in the same fashion as he does the Classics. He uses them for verbal resonances to enliven his own language as well as to bring the referenced texts to mind, so as to add more layers to his verse. He uses them for ideas and imagery, and, even more especially for style and genre. While Dracontius' *Carmina Profana* are little Classically oriented mini-epics, his *De Laudibus Dei*, or rather one third of it, is a foray into the fashionable Late Antique genre of biblical epic. Dracontius finds the same type of inspiration in the Late Antique authors as he does in the Classical. He borrows freely from both, regardless of what he is writing. He does not discriminate; he simply employs whatever is useful, wherever it is useful. For Dracontius, there is no real distinction between Claudius Marius Victorius and Vergil: he treats the work of Late Antique authors

exactly as he does the Classics. Both groups heavily influence his verse, and both do so in a way which affirms that Dracontius viewed both not as two different groups, but rather as one far-reaching corpus of Latin literature. For Dracontius, there was no perceivable difference between Latin literature contemporary with him, and that contemporary with Augustus: to Dracontius, it was all the same.

The third group of texts we have examined are the Christian Scriptures. The Bible, with all its books taken together, is the single most-referenced text in both the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*. When conceived of as a collection of separate texts, along the lines of the Classical corpus, the average number of *loci similes* per biblical text is slightly higher than, but still comparable with, their secular counterparts. In the 315 lines of the *Satisfactio*, there are about eighty parallels with the various books of the Bible. In Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, there are sixty-three biblical parallels, excluding the ever present parallel running through that book with Genesis. In terms of single works, the various books of the Bible compete rather successfully with their Classical and Late Antique counterparts. The most-used sources in terms of *loci similes* in Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei* are the *Aeneid*, followed not by the *Metamorphoses*, but by the Psalms. In the *Satisfactio*, Vergil is, of course, the top source, but he is followed closely by the Gospel of Matthew, then by the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Ecclesiastes. Ovid's *Tristia* ties with four other biblical texts for fourth place. In other words, numerically, the Bible is on at least an equal, if not slightly superior, footing with the works of Classical Antiquity.

Yet, as we have seen, the usage is ostensibly the same. Dracontius exploits the Bible, in many ways, as a literary work. In other words, Dracontius draws on his biblical sources in much the same way as he does his Classical and Late Antique

material. He uses the Bible for narrative elements, for *exempla*, for wording and for style. At times Dracontius pulls vocabulary from the Bible, at other times expressions, or ideas, and, again, even genre. The *De Laudibus Dei*, is, in one sense, nothing more than an elaborate elongation of a psalm in praise of God. It bears strong resemblance to the Psalms in terms of theme, that is, the theme of God's faithfulness to mankind, which is common both to the *De Laudibus Dei* and a wide swath of the Book of Psalms. But Dracontius also views the Bible as a great source of authority in keeping with its status as the Christian Holy Scriptures. Nevertheless, Dracontius uses it as an authority alongside the examples of Classical history. His argumentation for mercy in the *Satisfactio*, for example, relies on the authority of both the Bible and Classical history, and Dracontius appears to consider both as complementary sources of authority, even though his weight on the Bible is somewhat heavier.

Overall, both the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei* fully engage with the Bible: its themes are interwoven into theirs, its stories flesh out their arguments, its voice echoes in their lines. The Bible provides an invaluable quarry for narrative frameworks, thematic strands and a plethora of *exempla*. It provides words and expressions along with thoughts and ideas. The same is also true of the Latin literature, both Classical and Late Antique, which Dracontius inherited from his forebears. Dracontius, then, is not only widely read, but widely engaged with his reading, and he knows intimately, and is able to meaningfully interact with, both the Bible and the full corpus of his Latin literary inheritance.

These, then, are Dracontius' sources, and they give us a clear picture of the textual thought world in which our poet operated: these form the literary framework upon which Dracontius was constructing his own poetry. Having laid down this

foundation, we can now look at exactly how it was that Dracontius composed his verse. Firstly, Dracontius was composing his poetry strictly according to the Classical notions of tradition and originality laid out by Gordon Williams. Much like Vergil, Dracontius took various bits and pieces from his predecessors and wove them together, using, as it were, traditional methods, to make something new, something original. Dracontius pulled narratives, themes, subject matter and wording, among other things, from his sources and put them together in new and unique creations. His *Orestes Tragoedia* takes narrative details, characters and subject matter from the Classical Orestes tragedies, but, at the same time, it incorporates new elements, details, and chronologies, and, in combining them with the old, creates an *Oresteia* which can be surprising even to the seasoned reader of Aeschylus, Euripides and Sophocles. In a way, then, Dracontius is working exactly like his Classical forerunners. But is this appropriation, or continuity?

More evidence can be found in the poet's style. Dracontius' poetry is very noticeably different from that of Vergil and Ovid. His style is decidedly Late Antique, as it were, and is littered with the various peculiarities of Late Latin, as laid out by Marrou, Fontaine and Roberts. Dracontius characteristically employs, for example, sentences incorporating long sequences of nouns in the same case lined up one after the other, sometimes for several lines of hexameter, and oftentimes all describing the same thing. This, of course, is very non-Classical, but is, on the other hand, very Late Antique. The heavily varied and ornate vocabulary, along with the sumptuous descriptions and imagery, found in the works of Dracontius are also indicative of the Late Antique poetic style.³⁰⁹ Dracontius is not only fully imbued

³⁰⁹ These trends, of course, form part of the idea of *décadence* discussed by Marrou in his work on Augustine.

with this Late Antique style, but is, in many ways, representative of it. In addition to his style, much of Dracontius' grammar diverges, at times, from the standard uses of Classical antiquity. In short, Dracontius' Latin is of his own age, and is not written in a false imitation of a perceived and constructed Classical past. Dracontius writes in his own Late Latin, echoing the tastes and styles of his day much as Vergil and Ovid wrote in their own Latin, echoing the tastes and styles of their own day.

So, where does this leave us? In essence, the poetry of Dracontius combines the Classics with the Bible and the works of Late Antiquity. While permeated with the Classics, and embellished with references to them and material from them, the poetry of Dracontius is not Classical: while it uses the same metres and the same techniques it feels and sounds very different from its Classical antecedents. So then, does Dracontius' use of the Classics represent appropriation, or the continuity of a Classical poetic tradition? The answer lies with Dracontius' use not of the Classics, but of the Bible and the Late Antique sources. That Dracontius used the Classics is well established and his knowledge of, and respect and admiration for, the Classical corpus are clear. The facts that he combined the Classics freely with Christian and Late Latin sources, that he gave preference to Christian material while at the same time employing seemingly overtly pagan Classical material tell us how Dracontius wrote his poetry. Dracontius was not intentionally classicising when he composed; far from it. If he was, then he did a very poor job. But Dracontius was not a poor poet: he was very learned and very skilled, and while not always so, his verse is capable of rising to moving and elegant heights. Dracontius was not classicising, because he freely and blatantly employed Christian material, and Christian morality, in his works. He did not try to be 'Classical', because that was not a distinction in his mind: what he was trying to be was a poet, and he used the poet's tools: Classical

Greek metres, copied in the same way as his forerunners copied them; tradition, using the old stories and literary works which his culture possessed and making them live again in new ways. This is Vergil's method, this is Dracontius' method.

Dracontius just had a bigger pool to choose his sources from. Even more, Dracontius' language is not the corrected and calculated pseudo-Ciceronian Latin of the twelfth century, but the voluptuous and savoury Latin of the fifth: his Latin is an organic Latin, an evolving Latin, a Latin that did not *need* to see itself as Roman, because there was nothing else it could be. That was simply not a question it needed to ask itself. Dracontius composed his poetry exactly as the poets before him, and his poetry shows him to have considered himself just the most recent in a long line of poets stretching all the way back to Homer. The poetry of Dracontius, then, *is* a poetry of continuity. But continuity is not to say, 'no change'. The works of Dracontius are very different even from the works of the Silver Age, but so too are the works of the Silver Age different from those of the age of Vergil. The Classical tradition was not a static one. Yet, for all its changes, the poetic tradition, that is the poetic mindset, stayed fundamentally the same. Dracontius, then, came across the Classics honestly. They are the poems he learned in school and they are his direct cultural inheritance. Dracontius himself is so confident in the continuity of his poetry, that he puts whatever he wants into it. Sometimes this is the Classics, other times the Bible, at other times the authors of his own age. He perceived himself as part of the Classical tradition, and continued to think of himself and his art in the same way as his predecessors did. Dracontius did not feel the need to *make* his poetry look Classical because, to him, it already was. In Dracontius, the Classical cultural mindset was alive and well.

Part II: The Visigothic Context

As we have seen in the previous chapters, Dracontius conceived of himself as a Latin author standing firmly upon, and working firmly within, the cultural traditions which he inherited, and which we today study as the Classics. Unlike modern scholars, Dracontius did not feel the strong intellectual compulsion to compartmentalize: for him the Christian literary tradition (whether biblical or secular) was fully compatible with the secular, 'pagan', traditions of Greece and Rome. For Dracontius, the threads of all three strands discussed in the previous chapters, those of the Classical tradition, of the biblical tradition, and of the Late Antique Christian tradition could all be woven together on the loom of poetry with perfect synthesis and harmony, with none of the jarring 'colour clash', which later generations, not understanding the true syncretic culture of the time, saw as irreconcilable. But we must now leave Dracontius behind, for the time being at least, and shift focus to the other side of our case-study, and investigate the culture, and cultural inheritance, of our second author.

1: Introduction

In many ways, Eugenius II of Toledo is a very different figure from Dracontius. As borne out in great detail in the previous chapters, the Late Antique Dracontius is best seen as part of the Classical tradition. His methods are almost entirely Classical, even if his product, at first glance, bears a different stamp. In the verse of Dracontius and his European contemporaries, however, we do see very clearly the integration of the Classics with the new cultural capital of Late Antiquity: the literature, traditions and beliefs of the Christian Church. Dracontius shows us the growing, but not yet fully dominant, Christian presence in the literary culture of the fifth-century Latin West. In a way, Dracontius' poetry is the last great attempt to engage Classical mythology in a living, and not in an academic, endeavour. Even amongst his contemporaries, the move towards Christianity as the *principal* font of cultural source material was already under way. Indeed, it can be seen in Dracontius' own works. In the century and a half following the composition of Dracontius' verse, however, Latin poetic culture moved ever closer to Christianity, or rather the developing culture of Christianity and the growing influence of monasticism. The Classical/Christian dualism of Dracontius made way for a far more biblically centred literary world, and one far more ready to break with long-standing traditions.

This shift coincided with a general decrease in the number of poets whose work survives into the present. While the fifth and early-sixth centuries saw a great proliferation of Latin poets, such as Claudius Marius Victorius, Sidonius, Dracontius, Avitus, Ennodius, and Luxorius, among others (including the anonymous authors of the *Anthologia Latina*), the later-sixth and seventh centuries saw far fewer. The major poets of this period are largely confined to Corippus,

Venantius Fortunatus, Eugenius II of Toledo, and the Anglo-Saxon Aldhelm.³¹⁰ Even while taking into consideration the fact that only a fraction of the poetry of this period survives and there are a decent number of minor poets, the seventh century did not possess the proliferation of great poetic figures experienced in the fifth and sixth.³¹¹ Indeed, many of the great authors of the era focused their poetic efforts on developing the various early medieval liturgies, with the Mozarabic or Visigothic Rite being perhaps the most notable.

In addition to the general decrease in the number of major poets, this period also saw the completion of a shift from secular to religious authors.³¹² This shift had begun in the fifth century, and can even be seen in the fourth, with the works of St Ambrose. Indeed, Dracontius and Corippus, along with the rest of the African school, represent the last of the poets whose careers were purely secular, but who were also among the most prolific of their age. While the Africans' Gallic contemporaries Sidonius and Avitus may (or may not) have penned their works prior to ordination, their lives moved in a different direction, and both ended with the episcopate. While Dracontius and Corippus pursued secular careers alongside their literary endeavours, all the poets after Corippus pursued clerical ones, and ended

³¹⁰ The minor poets from both periods actually represent a not insignificant amount of capable, competent, and indeed entertaining verse, but both sides are about equal in these terms. The earlier period produced, most notably, the Late Antique sections of the *Anthologia Latina*, whereas the later period produced the poem of King Sisebut along with the poetry attributed to an anonymous Visigothic noble, the so-called Pseudo-Eugenius (discussed below).

³¹¹ While Eugenius is himself the only poet whose major works survive from seventh-century Spain, Ildefonsus' *De Viris Illustribus* alone attests several other poets/writers of hymns whose work has failed to survive. Nevertheless, the number of poets from this period was indeed lower, as the Vandal material in the *Anthologia Latina*, combined with the works of Dracontius and Luxurius, bears witness to a much greater number of active poets.

³¹² This shift involved not only a movement away from secular (or rather 'pagan') subject material, but also a move towards something of a 'clericalisation' of the authors themselves.

their lives as priests or bishops.³¹³ With this shift necessarily came a corresponding change in Latin poetry. This is not to say that poetry became more Christian, or that authors such as Dracontius were in some way less Christian, but simply that along with a shift in life and career focus came a shift in literary values, inspiration and culture. What was important to, and what motivated and inspired, an *advocatus-cum-court poet* from the bustling ‘cauldron’, the ‘sartago flagitiosorum amorum’ that was the busy port city of Carthage, the capital of the rich and powerful Vandal thalassocracy, was likely very different from that which spoke to the cloistered monk engaged in the then cutting-edge phenomenon of Visigothic monasticism or the bishop, or even archbishop, of a large area with ever increasing responsibilities.³¹⁴ This shift in priorities and lifestyle, in day-to-day culture, created an inevitable shift in the literature and in the intellectual culture of the period.³¹⁵ The comparison between the works of Dracontius and the works and redaction of Eugenius found in this chapter and the next will bear this out.³¹⁶

In addition to the shift from secular to religious authors, there was a shift in the perception of the art of poetry itself. Avitus of Vienne bears witness to a perceived danger of poetry in his dedicatory letter to his own work, and thus devotes his poetic efforts to a didactic and religious end, in order to resist the lying tendency

³¹³ This, obviously, is to confine ourselves to the Early Middle Ages. The shift was, of course, not permanent, and secular poets reappear after the linguistic reforms, and the cultural changes, of the Central Middle Ages.

³¹⁴ This, of course, is the famous description of Carthage given to us by Saint Augustine himself, in his *Confessiones*, 3.1.1.

³¹⁵ The reverse corollary is of course also possible: that change in literary/intellectual culture brought about a change in the culture of every-day life. We must first look at what aspects of culture (if any) changed, however, before we can judge which came first. And in the end, of course, it might simply be a question of the chicken or the egg...

³¹⁶ This, indeed, is of great importance, and will bear further investigation in the concluding historical chapters of this thesis.

of verse.³¹⁷ For Avitus, then, poetry could no longer solely be *ars gratia artis*, solely for entertainment; rather it needed to be oriented towards Christian ends, whether in the form of hymns or didactic works. Quantitative poetry, as part of secular Classical culture, came to be seen as less serious, beneath the *gravitas* of a bishop, even inappropriate to the office.³¹⁸ Such was the opinion of Caesarius of Arles, who distrusted ‘*secularis scientia*’, secular or worldly knowledge, and rejected Classical literature, and the poetry which featured so prominently within it.³¹⁹ For Caesarius and others like him, Classical poetry, as well as later poetry with Classical themes and tropes, had simply too much in it that was ‘pagan’ and was no longer welcome in the ascetic Christian culture they were building. Yet, not all Christian thinkers agreed with this perception of poetry and the Classics. Many refused to put verse, or indeed the Classics, forever aside. Some, following the example of Ambrose and Augustine, employed their pens in versification long after assuming the episcopal

³¹⁷ In the dedicatory letter to the *De spiritalis historiae gestis*, published in English in the Shanzer and Wood Liverpool edition. For a discussion of this see Shanzer, Wood, ‘Introduction’, in the aforesaid edition, pp. 66-67; and also Michael Roberts, ‘The Prologue to Avitus’ *De Spiritalis Historiae Gestis*: Christian Poetry and Poetic License’, *Traditio* 36 (1980), 399-407.

³¹⁸ See Riché, pp. 97-99, for (primarily) Gaul. Also should be quoted here Shanzer and Wood’s statement, from their introduction to the Avitus’ prose, pp. 66-67: ‘Episcopal (and other) culture in Gaul may have been subject to ascetic influences emanating from Lérins. The *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiquae*, for example, sought to prevent the bishop from reading secular works. Later in the century, the classical reading and teaching of a subsequent bishop of Vienne, Desiderius, would elicit a papal reprimand’, with references to R. Bartlett, ‘Aristocracy and Asceticism: The Letters of Ennodius and the Gallic and Italian Churches’, in *Culture and Society in Late Antique Gaul*, ed. by Danuta Shanzer and Ralph Mathisen (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 201-16 as regards the influence of Lérins.

³¹⁹ For the primary sources see Cyprianus et al. *Vita Caesarii*, 1.9, and, in his own words, *Sermones* 99.2-3, 100.3, 163.1. For the secondary scholarship see especially William E. Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles: the Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 19. The vitae can be found in *Vita Caesarii episcopi Arelatensis libri duo*, in *Passiones vitaeque sanctorum aevi merovingici et antiquorum aliquot*, ed. by Bruno Krusch, MGH Scriptorum rerum merovingicarum, 3 (Hannover: Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1896), pp.433-501; and an English translation can be found in *Caesarius of Arles: Life, Testament, Letters*, trans. by William E. Klingshirn, Translated Texts for Historians 19 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1994). The sermons can be found in Caesarius of Arles, *Sermons au peuple*, ed. by Marie-José Delage, 3 vols (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1971-1986).

office. But they could not wholly ignore the influence emanating from the Gallic monasteries and cathedrals, and this new thinking had a strong effect on the literature of the following centuries. Like Ambrose and Augustine, they began to turn their pens not to the ‘pagan’-inspired verse represented by Dracontius, but to the rather more ‘vernacular’ outlets of hymns and rhythmic verse, along with quantitative pieces of either a more personal, or more holy, nature. While the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei* might still be considered acceptable, the *Orestis Tragoedia* no longer could be.

In Iberia, however, these new Gallic ideas met the cultural heritage of Isidore of Seville, whose work in integrating the Classics into Christian culture effectively passed Classical learning on to the Middle Ages.³²⁰ Visigothic culture was dominated by the Visigothic Church, and that Church, with its impressive figures and its strong independent streak, never fully abandoned the Classics.³²¹ Like Augustine before them, they knew well what to do with the treasures of the Egyptians. Such is the case with Archbishop Eugenius II of Toledo, who composed a substantial number of poetic works while holding the principal archiepiscopate of Visigothic Spain.³²² For Eugenius, there was no conflict between the seriousness of the cathedral and the writing of poetry. Nor did he see any conflict between serious monastic Christianity and secular learning, as he himself was imbued with Classical literature.³²³ Yet, the verse of Eugenius displays a very different perception of poetry from that held by his

³²⁰ The central work on Isidore of Seville remains that of Jacques Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville: Genèse et originalité de la culture hispanique au temps des Wisigoths* and *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l’Espagne wisigothique*.

³²¹ Of Visigothic culture Orlandis states: ‘La cultura en el Reino de Toledo fue, sin embargo, una cultura prevalentemente eclesiástica y sus protagonistas son obispos y monjes’. José Orlandis, *Historia de España: La España visigótica* (Madrid: Gredos, 1977), p. 204.

³²² The archbishop of Toledo was, in effect, the primate of Spain, as Toledo was the royal city of the Visigoths, although the arrangement was only formalized later on. For this see footnote 335, below.

³²³ This is clearly attested in the *loci similes* found within his verse.

rather more famous predecessors, whether they were the bishops in Gaul, or Dracontius himself. For Eugenius, poetry was very much an outpouring of both personal and religious sentiments, and for him the authorship of poetry fitted perfectly with the office of bishop.³²⁴ Eugenius wrote in a whole range of genres: some of his works are didactic, some occasional, some highly personal lamentations, some prayers to God, and some are rather hard to pin down. But, at the same time, he avoided anything which could be construed as overtly pagan.³²⁵ Eugenius, then, did not shy away from poetry, but he did make sure that his verse was either very personal, and thus inoffensive, or directed to a higher purpose. The same is indeed true of Eugenius' predecessor Venantius Fortunatus, writing about fifty years earlier in Gaul.³²⁶ In keeping with the Gallic trends, many of Venantius' poems are of decidedly religious flavour and some are associated with the liturgy.³²⁷ Venantius was indeed a celebrated author of hymns.³²⁸ On the other hand, he also penned a rich and substantial body of more secular verse, including a range of occasional verse

³²⁴ Indeed, for him both jobs sometimes overlapped, principally in his work on the Visigothic liturgy: poetry written expressly for the active practice of praising God and part of his role as bishop. This will be discussed further in the chapter on Eugenius' independent works.

³²⁵ As in the *carmina profana* of Dracontius. Eugenius does, however, still occasionally use 'pagan' metonyms (for example *Phoebus* instead of *sol*).

³²⁶ A fair bit of work exists regarding Venantius Fortunatus, and while his religious works are important, the focus, in the modern scholarship anyways, tends to favour his secular works. The two most notable modern works are Judith W. George, *Venantius Fortunatus: A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), which is focused solely on his 'secular' works, and Michael J. Roberts, *The Humblest Sparrow: the poetry of Venantius Fortunatus* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009), which includes both the secular and religious, looking especially at Venantius' panegyrics and hagiographical material. See also the most recent edition: Marc Reydellet, ed. *Venance Fortunat: Poèmes*, 3 vols (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1994-2004).

³²⁷ Venantius was a fairly prolific writer of verse hagiography, for example, especially as regarded Saint Martin, to whom the poet was particularly devoted. See Roberts, *The Humblest Sparrow*, pp. 165-243 for an in-depth discussion of this hagiography.

³²⁸ Indeed, one can still find a selection of Venantius' poetry, in English translation, in the various modern hymnals used by both the Roman Catholic and Anglican churches. For Venantius as a hymnist, see especially the chapter (pp. 164-200) in A. S. Walpole, *Early Latin Hymns* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922).

addressed to friends, colleagues, and rulers.³²⁹ This again holds true for the Anglo-Saxon abbot, bishop, and scholar Aldhelm, writing some thirty to fifty years after Eugenius' death, whose work covers a range of secular and religious topics.³³⁰ The implications of this shift and its effects are far-reaching, and are elucidated quite well in both the redaction and the independent poetry of Eugenius, which will be the focus of the next two chapters respectively.

This change in perception is, of course, part of a much larger shift in Western Latin culture. In many ways, this shift is fundamental to the study of both Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. As such, it has received a great deal of scholarly attention. As Peter Brown points out in his rightly, and hugely, influential work, 'the late-sixth and seventh centuries were truly seminal. Between AD 550 and 650, Western Christianity finally took on the face which it would wear throughout the Middle Ages'.³³¹ Brown points to this change as a fundamental change in 'imagination'.³³² The major implications of this change, however, are rarely discussed in relation to Latin poetry. There are many perfectly acceptable reasons for why this is the case, including the fact that verse texts represent only a small fraction of surviving documents from this period. The fact that the poetry does change has typically been seen as a logical consequence of the general changes of the period. This, indeed, is another reason that it has lurked quietly in the background of most major discussions of the period. The discussion of poetry is, however, worth the

³²⁹ See George, *Venantius Fortunatus*, along with the translations, introductory material, and commentary found in George's *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems*, Translated Texts for Historians 23 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1995) for this corpus.

³³⁰ For Aldhelm see principally Andy Orchard, *The poetic art of Aldhelm*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 8 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). Aldhelm (of Malmesbury/Sherborne) is typically known as the first of the Anglo-Saxons to write Latin poetry, as well as for his collection of riddles.

³³¹ Brown, *Rise of Western Christendom*, p. 220.

³³² Brown, *Rise of Western Christendom*, p. 220-221.

scholar's attention. Ancient poetry was, in many ways, a highly conservative art: almost like law, it was always more comfortable with precedent than with innovation. Whatever changes did occur within it, then, will have been made in the face of over a thousand years of Classical literary customs and traditions. Each change, in other words, is significant for the very simple fact that it occurred. In addition to this, poetry was, up until the age of mass media, a central pillar of cultural capital in general, and a keystone of high culture. Poetry reflects the tastes, priorities, and indeed the perceptions, of the time and place in which it was composed. Pre-modern poetry held in its time essentially the same role that music holds in our own culture today. There was poetry designed for the masses and poetry designed for specific purposes or groups, whether social, intellectual, or religious. The same is true for modern music, and we must always bear in mind that the Classical Latin word for a poem is also the word for a song. Changes in poetic culture, then, should not be viewed as trivial or foregone conclusions, but as an important body of evidence worthy of close investigation. Poems, after all, were not only intended for performance, but were, and are, meant to strike a chord with their audience. If they were culturally out of touch, then they would not have achieved this effect, and the fact that those we now possess were preserved by those very audiences means that we ignore them to our own loss.

To study this change, we must investigate both a poet before it, and one after it. As Dracontius has supplied the former, so now Eugenius will supply the latter. While not generally well-known outside of Spanish circles, or to people unfamiliar with Visigothic Spain, and while not particularly well studied, Eugenius II of Toledo (otherwise, confusingly, Eugenius III of Toledo or Eugenius III the Younger) is

perhaps the most prolific poet of the seventh-century Latin West.³³³ As a brief biography outlining what little we know about Eugenius can be found above in the Introduction, a few short words should suffice here.³³⁴ Eugenius spent his life in the Church. From what we know, he personally sought for and desired a life of contemplative monasticism. Yet, he was never to fully enjoy that life, as unsought-for promotions and responsibilities were thrust upon him, culminating in his appointment to the archbishopate of Toledo, the city of the Visigothic kings, in 646.³³⁵ During his tenure as archbishop he oversaw, along with Kings Chindaswinth and Recceswinth, four Councils of Toledo (VII through X) which brought together a great many of the bishops of Iberia. Eugenius served as archbishop until his death in 657.

At the time of his episcopal consecration Eugenius was already an established poet, and continued to work as such after assuming the office, for it was in this period that he redacted the works of Dracontius at the request of King Chindaswinth. By the time of his death, Eugenius had written over one hundred poems which survive to the present day along with four prose epistles to various

³³³ As regards the naming difficulty, Eugenius II was the contemporary (and correct) numbering, which counted the poet himself along with his immediate predecessor in the archbishopric of Toledo, Eugenius I. The later-medieval and early-modern period, however, saw a renumbering following the introduction in the twelfth century of another (probably non-existent) Eugenius at the very beginning of the list of archbishops of Toledo. See Fear, *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, p. 118 n. 54 for details. As for the scholarship on Eugenius, while there is not a great deal on the author, he does still possess a few loyal followers, most notably Carmen Codoñer and Paulo Farmhouse Alberto, who have done a considerable amount of work on Eugenius, including the first edition of his works in a hundred years (by Alberto).

³³⁴ For the full biography, see the Introduction to the present thesis, with references.

³³⁵ While the Archbishop of Toledo almost certainly exercised some level of authority outside of his archdiocese on account of Toledo's ecclesiastical authority and its association with the Visigothic kings (as evinced by the plethora of important councils held there in the mid-seventh century, especially by Eugenius himself), it was not until Toledo XII in 681 that the primacy of the Archbishop of Toledo over all Iberia was established.

important figures of his day.³³⁶ These poems, written throughout the course of his life, were most likely published in a collection either during the last few years of his life (654-657) or shortly after his death.³³⁷ While many of his poems are short and the overall number of lines is smaller than that of Dracontius, Eugenius makes up for it with his impressive diversity of metre, genre, subject matter and language. Eugenius' poetry is extremely learned, and represents the efforts of a highly educated individual, and indeed the apex of seventh-century poetic accomplishment. On the other hand, it appears, at first glance, a more simple, and even prosaic, poetry coming from a very different place from that of Dracontius. Fortunately for the modern scholar, the relatively substantial amount of Eugenius' poetry which remains allows for an in-depth analysis of the author's cultural context.

Unfortunately for Eugenius, however, his time, place and individual poetic style have conspired to confine him to a grey area between those poets regarded as Late Antique or Late Latin authors and those seen as belonging to the Middle Ages: in discussions of either, Eugenius is frequently left out.³³⁸ Yet, for this very reason, Eugenius provides us with an important route through which to analyse the very shift

³³⁶ In addition to these solidly attributed poems are about fifty dubious and spurious works historically attributed to Eugenius but which have been argued, and with good merit, to instead represent the works of an anonymous Visigothic aristocrat dating from the late-seventh century (named as Pseudo-Eugenius of Toledo). These poems are to be found separately edited and discussed in Nicolò Messina, *Pseudo-Eugenio di Toledo. Speculum per un nobile visigoto. Introduzione, edizione critica e traduzione. Concordanza e Lista di frequenze* (Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 1983). The Pseudo-Eugenius is also present in Vollmer's edition of Eugenius. While these poems could be useful to the present thesis, the poems of Eugenius proper (being a diverse and large collection in and of themselves) are sufficiently numerous to cover the topic (and the allotted time and words).

³³⁷ Paulo Farmhouse Alberto, *Eugenii Toletani Opera Omnia*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina CXIV (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), pp. 16-17.

³³⁸ There is, however, a small body of scholarship focused on Eugenius of Toledo. In addition to the principal scholars already mentioned above, there are several others who work on Eugenius, including A. T. Fear, H.-J. Diesner, and Nicolò Messina. Eugenius also appears in the work of Dag Norberg on linguistics. Eugenius, however, generally only holds a peripheral position in the scholarship even of these authors.

from the Late Antique to the Early Medieval worlds, coming, as he does, from the very start of the latter. This opportunity, moreover, is greatly enhanced by Eugenius' redaction of Dracontius' *Satisfactio* and *De Laudibus Dei*, mentioned so frequently above. The changes undergone in the culture of the Latin West by this time, literary and otherwise, are, in many ways, borne out in the works of Eugenius. As one of the most prolific poets of his age Eugenius and his poetry provide us an invaluable snapshot of Late Visigothic Spanish culture. Furthermore, his redactions allow us to compare directly the flourishing Vandal culture witnessed in the works of Dracontius with the flourishing Visigothic culture of Eugenius' own world. The present part of this thesis, therefore, will analyse these two bodies of verse with a view towards the cultural material and implications within them.

i. The Manuscript Traditions

There remains, however, one last matter to discuss before the central investigation can take place. This is the all-important matter of the manuscripts. During the medieval period, the texts of the two versions of the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei* were treated, for the most part, as being separate works, and both the original and the redaction, therefore, have separate manuscript traditions. The Dracontian originals, furthermore, travelled separately from each other. On the other hand, the Eugenic pieces, both his originals and the so-called Dracontiana, mostly travelled bound together. The Dracontian originals and the Eugenic redaction were only reunited in the modern editions. Unfortunately, the manuscript tradition is somewhat

fraught, and needs to be considered in the investigation as a whole.³³⁹ As always, we shall begin with Dracontius and his *Satisfactio*.

For Dracontius' version of the *Satisfactio* there are only two manuscripts: *Darmstadtensis* 3303 (*D*) for the first eighty lines and *Vaticanus Reginensis Latinus* 1267 (*V*) which contains the entire poem.³⁴⁰ *V* is the more solid manuscript (not only because it is the most complete) and was written in Beneventan minuscule during the ninth/tenth centuries.³⁴¹ According to Vollmer, neither *V* nor *D* possess genetic links to Spain and both represent separate manuscript traditions from each other and from Eugenius' putative manuscript.³⁴² According to Moussy and Kuijper, however, the ninth-century *V* is the only genetically non-Spanish manuscript, with *D* being a descendant of the text redacted by Eugenius (but not Eugenius' redaction).³⁴³ Regardless of the source of *D*, however, *V* represents a distinct tradition from that possessed by Eugenius. *V*'s tradition is an old one, as this version is the one quoted by other authors, such as Columbanus (or pseudo-Columbanus), which could place its existence either prior to or concurrent with that used by Eugenius.³⁴⁴ Although

³³⁹ While the manuscript tradition must indeed be discussed here, to discuss all the details of it would not here be productive. Instead this chapter will principally summarise the traditions in brief (relatively speaking), and direct the reader to, especially, Moussy's discussion in his introduction to the Budé edition (I, pp. 110-136 for the *De Laudibus Dei* and II, pp. 160-169 for the *Satisfactio*). The following summary is largely reliant upon Moussy, along with Vollmer, Kuijper and Alberto.

³⁴⁰ For a brief discussion in English of these manuscripts see Frank M. Clover, 'Commodus the Poet', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 32 (1988), 19-33 (p.24). For a more full account see (in Latin) Speranza, pp. xvii, xix-xx (which Clover uses) and (in French) Moussy, II, pp. 160-163, 164-165. For an even more full account (also in Latin) see Vollmer, pp. xxviii-xxix.

³⁴¹ See Moussy, II, p.162. He states, for example, of *D*: 'l'état du manuscrit rend difficile, parfois même impossible, la lecture de certains vers de la *Satisfactio*'.

³⁴² Vollmer, p. xxix.

³⁴³ Moussy, II, p. 164-165. Kuijper, pp. 45-46.

³⁴⁴ The parallel in question is with the *Epistola ad Sethum*, is solid, and reflects a non-Eugenian reading. There is some level of debate as to the genuineness of its attribution to St Columbanus, the late-sixth- to early-seventh-century Irish missionary. G. S. M. Walker, who edited and translated the works of Columbanus into English in 1957, believed that the poem, written in hexameter, was genuine ('Introduction', in *Sancti Columbani Opera*, ed. and

one would wish that *Satisfactio* possessed a better manuscript tradition, the manuscripts which we do possess are nevertheless sufficiently backed by references and parallels in other texts.³⁴⁵

For Dracontius' *De Laudibus Dei* the picture is somewhat different. In a way, the manuscript tradition for the *De Laudibus Dei* is both stronger, and considerably weaker, than that of the *Satisfactio*. The tradition for this poem is discussed in substantial detail in Moussy's introduction to the work, with full reference to the detailed work of Vollmer, and as this discussion is sufficient, only a recapitulation need be made here.³⁴⁶ The *De Laudibus Dei* is witnessed in a substantial number of manuscripts and *florilegia*. The three *florilegia* are the more ancient witnesses and date from the ninth and tenth centuries.³⁴⁷ Of the five manuscripts which witness the full text of the *De Laudibus Dei*, four are fifteenth-century copies based on the fifth, which was copied from an earlier manuscript in the twelfth century. This twelfth-century witness, *Bruxellensis bibl. reg.* 10615-729 (*B*), discovered by Nicolas of

trans. by G. S. M. Walker [Dublin: The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1957], pp. ix-lxxxii [p. lvii]. More recently, however, Michael Lapidge asserted that the poem was indeed not genuine, and the work of a Carolingian abbot named Columbanus (most recently, 'Epilogue: did Columbanus compose metrical verse?', in *Columbanus: Studies on the Latin Writings*, ed. by Michael Lapidge, Studies in Celtic History [Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997], pp. 274-85; however, his principal argument is to be found in his 'The Authorship of the Adonic Verses "ad Fidolium" Attributed to Columbanus', *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 18.2 [1977], 249-314, which lists, at p. 250, a brief summary of the argument up to 1977). Moussy accepts the Columbanan poem as genuine (II, p. 102). See also Conant, p. 109.

³⁴⁵ The *Satisfactio* led a relatively busy life after its composition and enjoyed a rather substantial level of popularity.

³⁴⁶ This discussion, with full references, is to be found in Moussy, I, pp. 109-121 and pp. 127-131.

³⁴⁷ These manuscripts are *Berolinensis Phillips* 1824, from the ninth century, *Bambergensis* B.11.10, from the tenth century, and *Parisinus lat.* 8093, from the eighth/ninth century, the last of which also includes Eugenius' redaction separate from the Dracontius, and as such will be discussed in more detail below. For Moussy's discussion of these, see I, pp. 116-121. While tangential, it is worth noting that *Bambergensis* is associated with Alcuin of York (Moussy, I, p. 119), whose poems bear witness to his knowledge of Dracontius. *Parisinus* 8093 is associated with Theodulf of Orleans (Moussy, I, p. 129), whose work also bears witness to his knowledge of Dracontius.

Cusa in the fifteenth century, is most probably based on a manuscript from Spain.³⁴⁸ This putative Spanish manuscript represented a separate tradition from that used by Eugenius, but both traditions (*B*'s and Eugenius') derived from another text, which Vollmer identifies as being Spanish (and which Moussy does not).³⁴⁹ The *florilegia* represent both the manuscript Eugenius worked from and *B*'s source.³⁵⁰ In essence, then, the *De Laudibus Dei*'s principal witness is late, and the only early corroboration comes from *florilegia* which preserve the text in a very different manner from the original. In addition to this late and rather weak manuscript tree stand some problems inherent in *B* itself. These problems reside mostly in the fact that the manuscript is missing certain lines (which Vollmer unhelpfully 'restored' from Eugenius' redaction).³⁵¹ In addition to the missing lines, there are a number of scribal corrections (made in the same hand as the main text, but larger and in darker ink), made after the initial copying of the text.³⁵² Whether these represent a scribe correcting earlier scribal errors, or the correction of perceived errors in the original text, is difficult to say. Ultimately then, the manuscript tradition for the *De Laudibus Dei*, while solid enough to be used for the analysis already undertaken on it in the previous chapters, is somewhat weak for the close analysis to be employed here in the comparison of the redaction and the original. The *De Laudibus Dei*, therefore, must still be discussed, and can still hold weight, but the principal burden of proof must lie with the *Satisfactio*, as that has the stronger tradition.

³⁴⁸ Vollmer, p. xi, and Moussy, I, pp. 110-112.

³⁴⁹ Moussy, I, pp. 129-130.

³⁵⁰ *Parisinus lat.* 8093 represents a separate tradition from all other manuscripts, save the redaction with which it travelled. The other two depend upon *B*'s source.

³⁵¹ For summary see Moussy, I, p. 112.

³⁵² See Moussy, I, p. 112.

The manuscript tradition for Eugenius' redaction stands well apart from those of Dracontius' originals. Eugenius' version was far more popular in the early Middle Ages than the original, and survives in six manuscripts. Five of these were copied in the ninth century. The first of these ninth-century copies, favoured by Alberto and viewed by both Vollmer and Moussy as the most faithful, is *Matritensis* 10029 (*M* or *Ma*, formerly *Toletanus* 14.22) dating from the latter half of the century, written in Visigothic minuscule (probably at Cordoba) and containing both the *Satisfactio* and the *Hexaemeron*.³⁵³ This manuscript does, however, have *lacunae* and also lacks the verse preface.³⁵⁴ It also tends to have a higher rate of 'non-Dracontian' variants than the other witnesses to the texts, which could be seen to represent later changes.³⁵⁵ Nevertheless, it is generally regarded as the most faithful and it does indeed represent a separate tradition from the other five manuscripts, and is the only fully Iberian text. The origins of the other five manuscripts have been the source of some debate. Vollmer and Moussy regard them all as stemming from one single exemplar, whereas Alberto views them as two distinct lines.³⁵⁶ Either way, these manuscripts descend from Carolingian-era Iberian influences at the monastic scriptoria of

³⁵³ Vollmer, pp. xviii-xix, where he describes it as 'fidelissimus testis' (p. xviii). See also Moussy, I, p. 123-125 for discussion of this codex, with references. Moussy writes (I, p. 125) that '*M* peut être considéré comme le témoin le plus fidèle de la recension eugénienne'. See also Alberto, p. 296. Alberto describes the manuscript in full, pp. 88-95, with another mention on p. 282. It should be noted that *Ma* is one of the principal Iberian witnesses not only to the redaction, but also to the independent works of Eugenius. The redaction appears at the beginning of the manuscript.

³⁵⁴ The prose preface is removed to the end of the work. See Moussy, I, p. 124. The *lacunae* result from missing leaves, and not from failures in copying or pieces missing from the exemplar.

³⁵⁵ Gregory Hays, 'Review of P.F. Alberto, ed. *Eugenii Toletani Opera Omnia*', *The Journal of Medieval Latin*, 19 (2009), 291-294 (pp. 293-294).

³⁵⁶ Alberto, p. 300 for the stemma, and pp. 296-299 for argument. Vollmer's stemma can be found on p. xxii, with his full discussion from xvii-xxix. Moussy's discussion can be found in I, pp. 127-131, with his stemma on p. 131.

Lyon.³⁵⁷ The most important of these other manuscripts is *Parisinus lat. 8093 (F)* mentioned briefly above as containing a *florilegium* of the *De Laudibus Dei*.³⁵⁸ This manuscript contains both the *Hexaemeron* (complete with both prose and verse prefaces, placed at the beginning) and the *Satisfactio* (which is listed as *liber secundus*).³⁵⁹ The folios in *F* which contain the redaction (along with the *florilegium* and several other important Late Antique texts, including Eugenius' other poetry) date from the first quarter of the ninth century and, as in *Ma*, are written in Visigothic minuscule.³⁶⁰ Unlike *Ma*, *F* possesses no *lacunae*. On the other hand, its readings are thought to be less faithful by Vollmer, who says of the text: 'codex exaratus ab homine indocto scatet vitiis pronuntiationis et scripturae eius aevi Hispanicae'.³⁶¹ Moussy also views it as a less certain manuscript.³⁶² Alberto, on the other hand, views its characteristically Visigothic orthography merely as evidence of its immediate Iberian connection.³⁶³ It is on these two manuscripts alone that Moussy (and his co-editor Camus) base their edition, whereas Vollmer and Alberto use a larger sampling, with Alberto including several other previously unavailable

³⁵⁷ Alberto, pp. 54-65.

³⁵⁸ Like *Ma*, this manuscript also contains Eugenius' *carmina*.

³⁵⁹ Moussy, I, p. 122.

³⁶⁰ Alberto, pp. 55-56. Moussy places the manuscript in the ninth century (I, p. 122), Vollmer (p. xix) places it between the eighth and ninth centuries.

³⁶¹ Vollmer, p.xx. His discussion is to be found on pp. xix-xx.

³⁶² Moussy, I, p. 123. It is worth quoting Moussy's passage in full: '*F* est le témoin qui transmet le texte le plus complet de la recension eugénienne du livre I du *De Laudibus Dei*. Mais il reproduit un texte qui diffère parfois de celui qu'a transmis *M* et il est moins sûr que ce dernier manuscrit. Le copiste de *F*, malgré son ignorance, paraît avoir recopié assez fidèlement le texte qu'il avait sous les yeux; la seconde main (*F*²) a apporté des corrections parfois judicieuses, qui coïncident avec les leçons de *M*¹, mais a aussi introduit des fautes qui sont probablement le résultat d'une collation avec le *Parisinus 2832 (P)*, témoin encore moins sûr que *F*.' It is also worth noting Moussy's references, which are not confined to Vollmer.

³⁶³ Alberto, pp. 55-56. It should be noted, however, that Alberto does remark upon the generally poor state of preservation which the manuscript is now in, pointing out the poor quality of the vellum and the presence of damage caused by humidity (p. 55). For the orthography, see the following chapter.

sources.³⁶⁴ The third manuscript, used by both Vollmer and Alberto, is *Parisinus lat.* 2832 (*P*) which also contains both the *Hexaemeron* and the *Satisfactio*. This manuscript also dates from the ninth century, probably around 850/860, and the similarity of its readings to those of *F* indicates that both were copied from the same source, and most probably, as with *F*, at the scriptoria of Lyon.³⁶⁵ Both Vollmer and Moussy, however, warn about the use of this manuscript, as its copyist, identified by Alberto as Manno of Saint-Oyen, ‘tentant de corriger le texte qui lui servait de modèle, a introduit de nombreuses erreurs’.³⁶⁶ These are the only three manuscripts to carry both the redaction of the *Satisfactio* and the *Hexaemeron* (along with the other works of Eugenius). Of the three remaining manuscripts two are twins descended from a ‘proche parent’ to the source of both *F* and *P*, both of which were copied in Laon in the ninth century.³⁶⁷ Both of these manuscripts contain collections of texts dealing with the Creation story (including Avitus of Vienne), and hence contain only abridged versions of the *Hexaemeron*. The final manuscript, *Parisinus lat.* 14758 (*Z*), is either, following Vollmer and Moussy, a fourteenth-century copy of *L* (*Laudunensis* 279) or, following Alberto, a copy of a different manuscript from *L* possessed by the eighth-century theologian Wigbod.³⁶⁸ Both Moussy and Vollmer

³⁶⁴ Moussy penned the introduction to the *Belles Lettres* edition of Dracontius and edited the *Satisfactio*. Colette Camus edited Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*.

³⁶⁵ Moussy discusses this manuscript in great detail on I, pp. 125-126, as does Alberto, pp. 61-65. Vollmer more briefly on p. xx. For the date and attribution to Lyon, see Alberto, p. 62.

³⁶⁶ Moussy, I, p. 126. Alberto does not seem as sceptical of the text. For the attribution of the copy to Manno of Saint-Oyen, see Alberto, p. 62, with references in note 32.

³⁶⁷ They are *Laudunensis* 279 (*L*) and *Laudunensis* 273 (*Q*). For these manuscripts see Vollmer p. xxi and Moussy, I, p. 126 with references (especially as regards Peiper’s MGH edition of Avitus of Vienne, listed in the bibliography). For Alberto’s detailed discussion see pp. 285-287 (*L*, identified therein as *La*) and p.287-289 (*Q*, identified as *Lb*).

³⁶⁸ Alberto, pp. 297-302. See Moussy, I, p. 136-137 and Vollmer, p. xxii. It should be remembered that Wigbod was noted for his use of the verse of both Dracontius and Eugenius within his own writings.

agree on the *stemma*.³⁶⁹ Alberto, however, views *FP* and *LZ* as coming from a common model, but with the latter not being dependent upon the former, as in Vollmer.³⁷⁰ *M* and *F*, therefore, with the possible addition of *P*, are the critical manuscripts for the redaction. They provide us with a reading based on two separate, but equally ancient, manuscript traditions, and allow us to reconstruct the text with a level of certainty, although with the caveat that there exists both a more Dracontian and more non-Dracontian version.³⁷¹

Caution, however, must still be exercised when studying these texts closely, as there is indeed a second matter of concern. This is the fact that one cannot be entirely certain about the provenance of a particular difference between the original and the redaction. Alberto is not wrong when he writes:

It is very hazardous to determine which modifications are due to Eugenius, or whether they were already present in his model. The extremely small body of witnesses to this Hispanic exemplar prior to Eugenius advises us to be cautious.³⁷²

This second problem, then, is that we cannot, with certainty, know the readings contained in the text from which Eugenius worked. It has been theorised that a portion of the independent Dracontian manuscripts represent this lost exemplar, but this is not something which we can know for sure. Karl Reinwald, who was the first to undertake the comparison in 1913, believed that Eugenius' starting manuscript could be predicted with some certainty from the readings of both the extant traditions.³⁷³ While other scholars who have addressed this question to any extent,

³⁶⁹ The *stemma* is to be found in Vollmer, p. xxii, and Moussy, I, p. 131.

³⁷⁰ Hays, 'Review', p. 293.

³⁷¹ As will be seen in the next chapter, however, the differences between the traditions are not really very prominent in the grand scale of things, and this will be discussed further below.

³⁷² Alberto, p. 19.

³⁷³ Karl Reinwald, *Die Ausgabe des ersten Buches der Laudes dei und der Satisfactio des Dracontius durch Eugenius von Toledo* (Speyer: Jäger, 1913), pp. 19-23 and throughout.

including the present author, have tended not to accept this, some readings from Eugenius' model can indeed be discovered with reasonable certainty.³⁷⁴ It is likely that some of the differences between Eugenius' redaction and Dracontius' original predate the redaction itself and lie not with the Bishop but his exemplar: such is the use of '*mutabilis*' in line 13 of the redaction, which matches a Dracontian *locus similis* in King Sisebut's poem (dating prior to the redaction) but differs from the '*maculabilis*' employed by the original.³⁷⁵ These independent confirmations of the pre-Eugenian Visigothic text are, however, few and far between, and do not in any way permit us to reconstruct Eugenius' starting text. On the other hand, it must also be said that several of the changes seen in the redaction, some of which will be discussed below, are of such a nature to strongly suggest that they were intentional removals by Eugenius and not the incidental errors of a scribe. In the end, we cannot truly know for certain which differences belong to the pen of Eugenius, and which belong to the pen of the scribe (or scribes) responsible for the text from which he worked. As Eugenius himself tells us in his prefaces, the text was badly corrupted and contained weak and obscure readings.³⁷⁶ Even Eugenius' corrected text contains such weak and obscure readings. Outside of these few references and Eugenius' own statement, everything we can say about Eugenius' source, then, other than that it is now lost, is pure speculation.

³⁷⁴ Most notably, Alberto holds this view, as the above quotation indicates.

³⁷⁵ See Alberto, p. 19, note 25. Of course, one cannot rule out that it was Sisebut altering the text for his quotation, and Eugenius in turn preferring the reference to Sisebut over the still extant Dracontian reading.

³⁷⁶ Reinwald does, however, rightly point out that, if the text of Dracontius available in Visigothic Spain was really that awful, it would not have received the attention of both Isidore of Seville and King Chindaswinth. Reinwald, p. 22.

ii. Navigating the Problematic Waters

Now, while these problems are important and must be heeded, and while it is true that a direct comparison is indeed ‘hazardous’, there are ways around them, and ways of conceiving of the project that allow us to study the differences between these two documents.³⁷⁷ Even though most scholars who have worked on the subject consider it sufficient grounds to avoid the study which we are here making, the first problem, that of the manuscripts, is actually the easiest to deal with. While the combined manuscript tradition by no means represents a perfect one, it is, nevertheless, sufficiently solid for such ‘peripheral’ Late Antique/Early Medieval poetic texts as those here discussed.³⁷⁸ Although one must always proceed with caution, the separate traditions of the *Satisfactio*, the *De Laudibus Dei* and the redaction of Eugenius can indeed stand the weight of close analysis. This caution, however, is not so significantly greater on the whole than that required to analyse any other Late Antique or Classical poetry.³⁷⁹ For the *Satisfactio* there are two good ninth-century manuscripts; for the *De Laudibus Dei* a collection of *florilegia* and a bunch of manuscripts based on a twelfth-century copy; for the redactions, there are a selection of good ninth/tenth-century copies with two (albeit slightly different) traditions. Taking a step back, this means that most of the manuscripts post-date the

³⁷⁷ And ways indeed of avoiding a possibly uncomfortable proximity to the work of Karl Reinwald, mentioned previously, which will be discussed more below.

³⁷⁸ It is very important to note here that, in the case of *both* texts, the political entity within which their authors flourished collapsed through violent invasion within sixty years of their authorship. While it should not be particularly surprising that these texts survive, as they were early circulated outside of their respective geographic areas and received a generally wide readership, one should not expect a plethora of early manuscripts, or, indeed, a plethora of manuscripts at all. As for many of the works of Classical Antiquity, a ninth-century date (a date in the Carolingian era, in other words) is a perfectly acceptable date.

³⁷⁹ One can take, for example, Ovid’s *Remedia Amoris*, the earliest attestation of which is ninth-century. The same is true for Ovid’s *Ars amatoria* and *Amores*. For none of these are there more than two from this century, and all others are eleventh or later. For these traditions see E. J. Kenney, ‘The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid’s *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria*, and *Remedia Amoris*’, *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, vol. 12.1 (1962), 1-31 (pp. 1-2).

originals they represent by at most four hundred years in the case of the *Satisfactio*, seven hundred for the *De Laudibus Dei*, and only two or three hundred for the Eugenic redactions. While many high or late medievalists (even many early medievalists) have the opportunity of working with manuscripts contemporaneous with the texts within them, the students of the Classics most decidedly *do not*. Indeed, the traditions for the works of Dracontius and their redaction are significantly stronger than that possessed by many texts of the Classical canon. One good example of this is the poetry of Catullus, which depends upon three fourteenth-century copies, which have been described as ‘extremely faulty’, of a single now lost witness.³⁸⁰ This means that the earliest, and indeed only, witness to the poetry of Catullus post-dates the original by some 1400 years. Compared to Catullus, whose texts are considered able to bear scrutiny, Dracontius’ tradition is iron-clad. Why, then, should it not be thought able to support investigation? Another very good example can be found in the tragedies of Sophocles, for which the earliest extant manuscripts are late-thirteenth-century. This means that for Sophocles, whose works form a crucial part of the Ancient Greek corpus and frequently bear a great deal of scrutiny and analysis of all kinds, the gap between his own writing and his earliest witness is at least 1700 years. The Budé edition of Dracontius only post-dates the original by 1500 years. Yet, the works of Catullus and Sophocles, not to mention the many other Classical authors who shared the same fate, can support countless generations of articles, books, and discussions, along with countless conclusions

³⁸⁰ D.F.S. Thomson, *Catullus: Edited with a Textual and Interpretive Commentary* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), pp. 22-23. For the full study see this work, pp.22-40 with reference both to the extant mss. and parallels with Catullus in the works of other authors. For further work on this see also the relevant section of James L. Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), which work is also used by Thomson.

which are taken to be firm and reliable. Should we not hold Dracontius and Eugenius to the same standards to which we hold their forebears? Furthermore, the modern editors of the texts have done a good and thorough but not invasive job of editing these texts. This is especially true of Vollmer, whose edition of the Dracontian originals, while it does include judicious emendations, remains loyal to the original texts, and fully elucidates any changes made to the texts in his fairly extensive *apparatus criticus*.³⁸¹ His failings in the recension are rectified by Alberto's excellent critical edition of Eugenius.³⁸² Alberto, who edited only the redaction, uses a wide range of manuscripts and prefers always the Dracontian reading (when there is one), and generally otherwise does not take an interventionist approach.³⁸³ The accuracy of Vollmer's and Alberto's scholarship and editing, and their generally non-interventionist approach, combined with the other editions, allows this analysis to be conducted using only the editions.³⁸⁴ Yet, Vollmer's tendency to prefer the non-Dracontian readings means that Vollmer must be used in conjunction with Alberto, who prefers the Dracontian, and whose edition of the redaction is rather more critical

³⁸¹ Speranza's edition of the *Satisfactio*, which includes the recension, is also a useful text. Moussy and Camus are more loyal to the 'better' reading than to the original text. This is a perfectly acceptable tactic, but their relatively substantial use of Eugenius' recension to correct Dracontius hinders rather than helps the present analysis. While their text has been used for this thesis, it is only ever used in conjunction with the other editors.

³⁸² Vollmer's Dracontius is excellent, but his Eugenius is not quite as firm, as he seems to have been principally concerned with the former author. Alberto, however, is focused solely on Eugenius, and his edition is both the most comprehensive, the most accurate, and the most critical.

³⁸³ He does, however, correct the orthography of the text to a perceived Classical standard, whereas Vollmer appears not to. These corrections are listed at the beginning of the edition (pp. 164-165), but are not marked in the text. While this makes the text look cleaner, and will perhaps help to 'rehabilitate' Eugenius for a modern audience more accustomed to Classical Latin as opposed to Late Latin, it does rather hinder the investigation of Eugenius' own orthography.

³⁸⁴ The use of the editions solely was facilitated by sufficiently good editions, but was mandated principally by temporal and financial restraints (not least of which was the closing of the Vatican library for most of the duration of the author's PhD). Additionally, Vollmer facilitates the comparison with his exceptionally convenient side-by-side publishing of the two versions of the text, with separate *apparatus*. This format is not repeated in any other edition.

in general.³⁸⁵ To assuage any doubts, we must simply focus the analysis on to a course which the textual tradition can firmly support, a course which will be described presently. The comparison, however, still remains valid. The redaction and the original differ significantly, but not so much as to cast doubt on the accuracy of the surviving manuscripts or on the editions created from them.

Now we must address the second, and rather more difficult, problem of Eugenius' lost model. Approached on a theoretical level, the problem appears at first to be unsolvable. The obvious question to ask of these two different versions of the same text is: 'what did Eugenius change?' But this, the most straightforward conception of the redaction, has problems, chief among which is the one posed by Alberto and with which we are here concerned: 'how do we know what Eugenius' exemplar looked like?' The answer to this question, of course, is that we do not know: while unlikely, it is possible that Eugenius' editing represents only a tiny fraction of the differences between the two texts.³⁸⁶ The first to undertake this project, Karl Reinwald, thought that he could predict Eugenius' exemplar via the other manuscript traditions, but, as already discussed, this is circular and really quite fraught and unsatisfactory. We simply do not know what Eugenius started with, and so cannot know what Eugenius actually did. But this is only one way of conceiving Eugenius' effort. What needs to be done, and what this thesis intends to do, is to

³⁸⁵ In creating his text of the redaction (but not the original), Vollmer used principally notes inherited from his predecessor Peiper. Alberto's edition represents a significant advance from Vollmer (whose text is nevertheless very accurate), especially as regards his *apparatus criticus*, which includes a significant amount of new information.

³⁸⁶ I have here employed the term 'unlikely' in deference to Eugenius' own statement of the extent of his changes to the text, as well as my own impressions of the differences I have studied. It is also, of course, entirely possible (and to some degree almost certainly true) that Eugenius rather overstated the problems of the text with which he began. Nevertheless, the task was not begun at his own volition, and, if he were to have handed back an unchanged copy to King Chindaswinth, I suspect there would have been some ramifications for that particular action.

conceive of Eugenius' work in a different way. To understand the redaction, we must change the questions being *asked* of the texts. In the most obvious line of questioning we cannot provide a truly satisfactory answer. Yet, there is a subtly, but fundamentally, different question which we can ask these works that circumvents this problem, and which can indeed provide valuable evidence for the study of cultural transformation. We must turn the obvious question on its head and ask in its place: 'What did Eugenius find acceptable, what did he deem worthy and relevant to his own context in the text, that is, what did he keep, and what did he get rid of, what did he like, and what did he not?' In other words, to study these two texts, we should look not at the changes, *per se*, but rather at the *differences* in the final product. We need to look at what Eugenius found acceptable, and how this differed from the other traditions of Dracontius, which were only preserving a text, not updating it, and what this can tell us of the differences in culture between the two places. We must look not at what Eugenius changed, but what he was content to have in the poem: if he regarded his redaction as fixed up and repaired, then what does that tell us as both an independent text and as regards the differences between it and the independently preserved original. This line of inquiry should be much less impeachable, because while it looks at much the same evidence, it does so looking for different answers: not changes, but simply differences. This approach avoids the problem of the lost exemplar, and still allows us to undertake an investigation into the differences between the two texts.

We must then, in the end, proceed with caution when evaluating these texts, but we can still evaluate them. While the manuscript tradition is imperfect, it is, in relative terms, sufficiently solid to bear the scrutiny of close textual analysis. For the sake of avoiding criticism, however, we shall lean more heavily upon the *Satisfactio*

than the *De Laudibus Dei*. Nevertheless, both texts can, and will, be examined in the next chapter. As for Eugenius' lost model, the problem is not as damning as it could be, when we view it from a different vantage point. So long as we address the *differences* instead of the *changes*, and consider their cultural implications, our investigation is not hindered. Although we need to analyse the texts with caution, a great deal of information can nevertheless be gathered from the comparison of these two versions. This, then, allows us to move to the next chapter and the investigation at hand.

2: Eugenius and his Redaction: Dracontius in Spain

i. Introduction

What has been laid out in the previous chapter is the analytical theory behind the investigation of the redaction which will be undertaken here presently, along with the necessary background which underlies it. But theory can only ever be one half of the equation, especially in an endeavour such as this, and, therefore, we must move to applying this theory in actual practice. As always, a theory that looks simple on paper, such as the investigation of the ‘differences’ between two texts to be undertaken here, is necessarily more complicated when actually undertaken. Thus, before we can engage in any analysis, we must first look at the practicalities. Unfortunately, one cannot simply place the two texts side by side, look at the differences, or lack thereof, and see what they tell us. The process is rather more complex than this. To help analyse our two texts, and to retain some degree of a logical and scientific process while doing so, the various differences will be placed into discrete categories, if only so that more sense can be made of them.³⁸⁷ Within these discrete categories, this investigation will seek to find patterns and trends in the redaction, so as to better understand its processes. What these divisions are will be discussed at the start of the philological analysis to follow.

Firstly, however, a few parameters need to be set. The present chapter will focus solely upon the redaction. The implications of Eugenius’ original poetry, which are indeed most telling, must wait until the next chapter. As discussed above,

³⁸⁷ As much modern academic thought rightly points out, separating anything into ‘discrete categories’ is a treacherous thing. Nevertheless, when undertaking a practical and scientific investigation of aspects of the past such as this, some degree of compartmentalization is necessary to proceed in a fashion that does not come across as random. The categories I shall deploy here are not intended to project a set of discrete divisions to the various factors at work in the redaction, but are merely used to facilitate investigation and understanding of the texts.

the redaction of the *Satisfactio* stands upon a stronger manuscript tradition and, as such, must be the principal support for our analysis. Yet, the *Hexaemeron* also contains valuable evidence, and while it cannot be the principal focus, the analysis must, nevertheless, cover both texts. The first part of the investigation into the works of Eugenius, then, will start with an analysis of his redactions of the *Satisfactio* and the *Hexaemeron*. This analysis allows us to bring together the culture of Eugenius and the Visigoths with that of Dracontius and the Vandals in order to facilitate not only a comparison, but also investigation into them individually. Taking into consideration the material discussed in Part I regarding Dracontius' cultural context, the present investigation should help us discern what was different between these two cultural settings. That Chindaswinth asked for an updated version of Dracontius' works likely tells us that there were parts of it that he was unhappy with. Whatever motives or reasons he might have had for this, he clearly felt the poem was relevant and desirable in a Visigothic context, but just not exactly as it was. Close analysis of the two versions of the text allows us to compare the two cultures and to approach an understanding of the Visigothic motivations and of Visigothic intellectual culture in general.

This chapter's inquiry, then, will seek within the texts the answers to three questions: why did Eugenius change the text, how did he change the text, and what are the implications. Because these three lines of approach cannot be fully divorced from each other, as they are all mutually informed, this chapter will begin with the investigation of the stated 'historical' reasons for the redaction, and place them within their greater historical context. From there, it will address the question of how, that is, what changes Eugenius actually made. Finally, by combining the

historical evidence with the philological, it will address the implications of the evidence.

ii. Why?: the historical ‘prose’ answer

Essentially, this question boils down to the historical reasons for the redaction, both immediate and more general. The immediate reasons, that is, those directly and solely involved with the redactions, will give us our starting point. There are, in effect, two direct sources through which one can investigate this question: Eugenius’ own preface to the redactions and Ildefonsus of Toledo’s *De viris illustribus*.³⁸⁸ Once these have been discussed, the investigation can move into the wider realm of Visigothic culture and the redactions’ place within it.

In addressing the direct sources, it is best to begin with Ildefonsus. His rather lengthy mention of the work provides us with its perception in the decade after its completion.³⁸⁹ Ildefonsus records that Eugenius corrected *cantus*, songs or poems, ‘through his knowledge of music’, his *melodiae cognitione*.³⁹⁰ After mentioning this along with Eugenius’ own original works, Ildefonsus outlines his predecessor’s work on the redaction:

He took the works of Dracontius concerning the creation of the world, which antiquity had handed down to us in a corrupt fashion and finding the errors in them by removing these or correcting them or adding improvements, brought

³⁸⁸ Ildefonsus’ *De viris illustribus* is a continuation of Isidore of Seville’s, which is, of course, a continuation of Jerome’s. Ildefonsus was Eugenius II’s successor in the archiepiscopate of Toledo who came to the See immediately following the death of the latter in 657. Ildefonsus was himself an eye-witness of Eugenius’ episcopate and, in his *De viris illustribus*, dedicated the final entry to Eugenius. Eugenius’ treatment is also one of the longest given in Ildefonsus’ continuation.

³⁸⁹ It is lengthy relative to this type of work. It would otherwise seem very brief to most modern eyes.

³⁹⁰ The Latin is from Ildefonsus Toletanus, *De viris illustribus*, ed. by Carmen Codoñer Merino, in *De virginitate Sanctae Mariae, De cognitione baptismi, De itinere deserti, De viris illustribus*, ed. by Carmen Codoñer and V. Yarza Urquiola, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 114A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 597-616 (p. 614); for the English translations I have used Ildefonsus of Toledo, *On the Lives of Famous Men*, trans. by A. T. Fear in Fear, *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, pp. 107-122 (p. 119).

them into an acceptable form, so that their beauties seem to be due more to the skill of their corrector than the hand of the original author. Since Dracontius appears to have left the work half-finished as he is altogether silent about the seventh day, [Eugenius] added a summary of the six days in six individual lines of verse and then added an elegant discussion of what seemed appropriate to him concerning the seventh day.³⁹¹

Indeed, Ildefonsus puts great emphasis on this endeavour, as more words in his biography of Eugenius are devoted to the redaction than to anything else. In a laconic work such as the *De viris illustribus*, this scale of treatment not only serves to show to the reader the importance of the redactions, but also underlines how major Eugenius' achievement was in creating them. In essence, Ildefonsus' attention here places the redaction as one of the most noteworthy events of the recent past, and one of the more important pieces of Toledo's intellectual output.

In practical terms, Ildefonsus' summation gives us a fairly exact representation of the work of Eugenius' redaction: the correction (*immutandum*) of errors (or perceived errors), the removal (*subtrahendum*) of other errors, the addition of 'improvements' (*meliora coniciendum*), and the addition of the summation of the six days and the short account of the seventh. This description, of course, fails to mention explicitly the *Satisfactio*, and it is in fact probable that the two works were seen as being parts of the same whole.³⁹² This passage also suggests that the text of Dracontius circulating in mid-seventh-century Visigothic Spain was damaged and

³⁹¹ Ildefonsus, *DVI*, trans. A. T. Fear, p. 120. The original Latin, from Codoñer's edition, reads: 'Libellos quoque Dracontii de creatione mundi conscriptos, quos antiquitas protulerat uitiatos, ea quae inconuenientia reperit, subtrahendo, immutando uel meliora coniciendo, ita in pulchritudinis formam coegit, ut pulchriores de artificio corrigentis quam de manu procesisse uideantur auctoris. Et quia de die septimo idem Dracontius omnimodo reticendo semiplenum opus uisus est reliquisse, iste et sex dierum recapitulationem singulis uersiculis renotauit, et de die septima quae illi uisa sunt, eleganter dicta subiunxit.'

³⁹² It is generally accepted by modern scholars that this is indeed the case. This is based largely on the manuscript traditions and statements such as this. The Dracontian originals did indeed travel together. As will be seen below, Eugenius himself strove to unify the two works, and while he may initially have viewed them as two pieces, he certainly made them one.

corrupt. This, of course, is of central importance to any discussion comparing Dracontius' original to Eugenius' redaction, and will shortly be discussed in detail. Lastly, the passage tells us that, regardless of what state the text may have been in, the lack of discussion on the seventh day of Creation was perceived as an indication that Dracontius had not completed his work; this is something which will be discussed later. In short, then, Ildefonsus' stated reason for the redactions was that Dracontius' original text was corrupt and that, even before its corruption, was an unfinished piece.

The second, and by far the most important source, however, is the statement of the reasons which Eugenius himself recorded.³⁹³ At the beginning of his redaction (covering both the *Satisfactio* and the *Hexaemeron*) Eugenius helpfully provides two prefaces, one in prose, and one in verse. It is in these that Eugenius recorded his own reasons for undertaking the redaction of Dracontius' *Satisfactio* and *Hexaemeron* (Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, viewed as an independent unit).³⁹⁴ The prose preface (really a brief dedicatory letter), which precedes the verse, is the most informative from an historical perspective. Addressing King Chindaswinth, Eugenius explains the process of his redaction thus:

Being subject to the orders of your clemency, most serene prince, rather more in terms of willingness than of ability, I have lightly corrected the poor little books of a certain Dracontius hitherto enveloped by many mistakes, with the Lord Christ assigning courage in place of the poverty of my thought, with this rule, one may see, having been observed, that I should remove the redundant, should complete (*supplerem*) the half-finished, should strengthen where broken and should change that which is frequently repeated. Certainly,

³⁹³ Of greater import especially when one considers that Ildefonsus certainly read this preface, and that it might very well have highly influenced his own account.

³⁹⁴ It is possible that Eugenius only possessed Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, or else viewed it as a work on its own apart from books two and three. It is certain that he only redacted Book I, and he appears, for all intents and purposes, to have viewed it as a work entire of itself, hence the title *Hexaemeron* (the Greek word which refers either to works on the six days of Creation, or the six days themselves). Yet, he does at times reference the other Books in his original poetry.

I have thought there to be in this work verses needing to be removed which are shown to be weak in sense, inelegant in expression and founded upon no rational principle; nor in these lines is anything found by which the mind of a reader or the learned man would be soothed/delighted or the unlearned man be taught. And seeing that the aforementioned author kept altogether silent regarding the seventh day, the little work seemed to me unfinished, if something were not held for that day in this little codex. Therefore, at the end of the little book, although in pedestrian speech, I have written a recapitulation of the six days in single verses, which I added formerly; indeed I have appended what seemed necessary to say regarding the seventh day and accomplished the divine decree and if not as I wanted, at least as I was able [...].³⁹⁵

This, then, is Eugenius' own testimony as regards his redaction, and while he supplies a fairly direct statement, some analysis is nevertheless necessary.³⁹⁶

The primary motivation Eugenius gives us for his undertaking the redaction, then, is the command of King Chindaswinth. Aside from this, Eugenius, effectively, lists three essential principles which govern the work of his redaction. First is that of setting out to correct the many mistakes found within Dracontius' texts: 'to remove the redundant, complete the half-finished, strengthen where broken and change that which is frequently repeated.' In effect, this principle of correction involves two different types of perceived errors: scribal/manuscript errors, and errors as regards the texts' Latin (in terms of both language and style). Both aspects of this principle

³⁹⁵ Eugenius of Toledo, Preface to the *Hexaemeron*. Trans. by the present author. The original Latin reads: 'Clementiae vestrae iussis, serenissime princeps, plus volendo quam valendo deserviens, Dracontii cuiusdam libellos multis hactenus erroribus involutos Christo domino tribuente valorem pro tenuitate mei sensuli subcorrexī, hoc videlicet moderamine custodito, quo superflua demerem, semiplena supplerem, fracta constabilirem et crebrius repetita mutarem. Versiculos sane quos huic operi detrahendos esse putavi, et sensu tepidi et verbis inlepidi et nulla probantur ratione subnixi; nec in eis aliquod reperitur quo lectoris animus aut mulceatur doctus aut doceatur indoctus. Et quoniam de die septimo praefatus auctor omnino reticuit, semum mihi opusculum videbatur, si non inde aliquid in hoc codiculo haberetur. Idcirco in fine libelli, quamvis pedestri sermone, sex dierum recapitulationem singulis versiculis, quos olim condidi, renotavi; de die vero septimo quae visa sunt dicenda subnexui decretumque divale ac si non ut volui, vel ut valui consummavi [...]'. For the Latin, Alberto, p. 325.

³⁹⁶ Prefaces should never be taken completely at face value, even from the pens of bishops, as they are governed by strong conventions, notable among which is the ubiquitous disavowal of the task or the figure's ability to complete the task.

are, in a way, subjective, as Eugenius himself, working from his own contextual mindset and aesthetic, made the ultimate choice as to what fit and what did not. On the other hand, Eugenius was working within a substantial literary framework with its own standards and expectations. By correcting Dracontius in this way, Eugenius was bringing the manuscript which he held in his own hand into line with the literary norms of Late Visigothic Spain. Whether this means that the manuscript was indeed as corrupt as Ildefonsus would have us believe, or whether Dracontius' fifth-century language, style, and orthography, or what had happened to them in the intervening years, were simply seen as being incorrect in the seventh century remains a question the redaction itself will have to answer. Regardless of the state of Eugenius' copy of Dracontius, it was *perceived* as having a great number of errors either inherent in the original or as the result of later emendations. The principle of correction outlined here represents a slightly higher-than-mid-level approach to editing: Eugenius intended to change not only scribal or manuscript errors (such as misspellings, incorrect alterations or incorrect abbreviation/expansion of abbreviations) which would be standard practice, but to cut out some of the 'redundancy' and half-lines which he thought existed in, and detracted from, Dracontius' work, but might very well have been authentic original readings.

The second essential principle is the removal of lines perceived to be weak, poor, nonsensical (or not 'rational'), or not aesthetically pleasing, as well as those perceived to be of no entertainment value to the learned, and of no didactic value to those learning. This represents, of course, a quite substantially interventionist approach to editing. This principle moves far beyond the first, which could have been conceived at the time as something of a 'restorative' approach (merely to make the Latin 'correct' to seventh-century Visigothic standards), and involves the *active*

changing of the original text to fit a different context. It is this method of Eugenius' that really makes his text a *redaction* and not a *recension* of Dracontius. This approach tells us that Eugenius wanted to fully adapt the text to his own context, and also that certain materials within it were deemed inappropriate to this context, or at least of no value. This approach also suggests either that Eugenius' Latin, or his sense of aesthetics, differed from those of Dracontius and he found his own more relevant, or that he believed those of Dracontius to be incorrect. It also suggests a different perception of what the art of poetry entailed. It further suggests unease on Eugenius' part with certain ideas or statements made by Dracontius. These two factors, of course, are central aspects of the investigation to be carried out in the philological analysis.

The third principle employed by Eugenius is rather more particular than the two previously mentioned. While his stated method here is narrow in scope, simply to add in the seventh day of Creation which Dracontius had omitted, this action suggests an effort of significantly wider implication. Eugenius' underlying thought here is that Dracontius' original works, while replete with biblical material, are not sufficiently biblically accurate, or perhaps not sufficiently orthodox: as such, they need changing. While this is represented by the addition of the seventh day, it is indeed a wider undertaking. This as well must be borne out in the philological analysis, as no theoretical discussion here can be in any way conclusive.

The general gist of the prose preface, then, is that Dracontius' original was flawed, whether by original defect or by subsequent carelessness, and needed to be fixed. To do this, Eugenius saw the need to fix, emend, cut, trim and, finally, to add. These, however, are the officially stated reasons, and it remains to be seen how they play out in the actual redaction.

The verse preface, on the other hand, is shorter and its chief contribution to the question of motivation lies in its affirmation of the prose which precedes it, and in some of the parallels which it draws.³⁹⁷ The twenty-five lines of dactylic hexameter which make up the verse preface take the form of an invocation of the work itself (called *libellus*, ‘little book’) and a justification or apology for Eugenius’ own undertaking of the work. The initial lines make two things clear: firstly, that the work was done in response to an order of the king, and secondly, that the poem needed to be freed from ‘baseness’ (*sorde*) and from a ‘cloud of errors’ (*nube errorum*).³⁹⁸ In addition, Eugenius employs an extended metaphor of dirt and cleaning as regards the ‘little book’, the basic point of which is that the original work was received in a damaged or corrupted (or corrupt) state, and needed to be repaired.³⁹⁹ This lines up perfectly with the reasons stated in prose. The last vital piece of evidence included in the verse preface is a hexameter likening the work of Eugenius to that of Aristarchus of Samothrace, Tucca, Varius, and Probus.⁴⁰⁰ Although Eugenius compares himself to these four figures in a rather offhand way as he is attempting to allay any scorn or charges of hubris, the comparison is nevertheless quite telling. These four figures were some of the most well-known literary critics of the ancient world: Aristarchus of Samothrace created the first critical edition of Homer, Plotius Tucca and Varius Rufus edited and published the

³⁹⁷ The verse preface does indeed follow directly after the prose at the beginning of Eugenius’ redaction of the *Hexaemeron*.

³⁹⁸ The reference to the king is found in the first five lines, which read:

‘Principis insignem faciem visure libelle,
cuius ad imperium meruisti sorde carere
et capere nitidam longo post tempore pallam,
coeperis ut limen aulae regalis adire
atque auro rutilo radiantem cernere sedem’

The references to ‘baseness’ and the ‘cloud of errors’ are to be found in lines 2 and 7 of the verse preface respectively.

³⁹⁹ The principal cleaning metaphor is to be found in lines 11 and 12.

⁴⁰⁰ Line 22.

Aeneid after Vergil's death, and Marcus Valerius Probus created a number of critical editions of various Latin poets.⁴⁰¹ Moreover, this comparison was made 'en empruntant à Servius certaines des expressions dont il s'était servi dans la Préface de son commentaire de Virgile'.⁴⁰² This use of Servius, Vergil's great commentator, further underlines the comparison.⁴⁰³ This comparison suggests that Eugenius did not necessarily view himself as altering and changing Dracontius to 'improve' the poems in some way, but to make them more true to the original, to restore their pristine state, or at least as Eugenius perceived this pristine state to be. Or perhaps simply he thought to make more sense of it. It also shows us that Eugenius did not view the redaction as something undertaken simply at the whim of King Chindaswinth, but rather as part of a long-standing tradition going back some 800 years to the time of Aristarchus and continued most recently by Isidore of Seville. In other words, for Eugenius, it was a perfectly acceptable job for a poet and scholar, a job with solid and esteemed precedents.

These two texts, Ildefonsus' short *vita* and Eugenius' joint preface, agree, for the most part, in the 'historical' motivations behind the redaction. The manuscript was corrupt, the text damaged or otherwise unsatisfactory, the piece was half-finished (Dracontius had forgotten the seventh day!) and the whole text was in need of help; help which Eugenius provided. Yet, there remains an important piece of evidence that both texts do not agree upon. Ildefonsus implies that Eugenius edited the texts simply because they needed it, but Eugenius himself makes it clear: King

⁴⁰¹ For a brief but sufficient introduction to these figures see their entries in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (note that while Eugenius employs the *cognomen* Probus, he is listed in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* under his *nomen*, Valerius).

⁴⁰² Moussy, I, p. 107, citing also Vollmer, p. 27.

⁴⁰³ It also shows that, like Dracontius, Eugenius uses references and verbal parallels to give further levels to his work.

Chindaswinth was the driving force. Eugenius is clear on this, and reiterates it several times, but not in such a way as to imply the opposite. Therefore, King Chindaswinth should be seen as the prime mover in the creation of this redaction.⁴⁰⁴ This is a very important piece of information and warrants some discussion.

That King Chindaswinth would order the correction of two 150-year-old poems seen as being corrupt tells us several things. Firstly, it shows Chindaswinth and his court actively seeking to continue literary methods and techniques inherited from their predecessors. Isidore of Seville twice undertook the redaction of the Eusebius-Jerome chronicle, both versions of which come down to us as the *Chronica maiora*, and indeed produced a redaction of his own *Historia Gothorum*.⁴⁰⁵ The commissioning of new redactions should be seen as a continuation of this tradition, and as signifying Chindaswinth's interest in resuming the previous level of Visigothic scholarship. Secondly, that he chose to have redacted not history but poetry strongly suggests either the king's possession of a high level of culture, or his desire to project the image of his possessing a high level of culture, in that he was associating himself with literary endeavours. Whichever the answer might be, he would by no means be the only Visigothic monarch with a high degree of culture, as King Sisebut, in the early-seventh century, was strongly associated with Isidore of

⁴⁰⁴ This, of course leads one to ask: 'Then why did Ildefonsus write Chindaswinth out of his account?' The answer to this question is far from simple and lies most probably in the realm of late-Visigothic politics: Chindaswinth, of course, was a rather divisive figure.

Additionally, Ildefonsus' aim was to glorify the archiepiscopate of Toledo, not its kings.

⁴⁰⁵ For both a discussion of the redactions of the *Chronica maiora* and an English translation of both versions see Sam Koon and Jamie Wood, 'The *Chronica Maiora* of Isidore of Seville', *e-Spania*, 6 (2008) <<http://e-spania.revues.org/15552> [accessed 12 June 2012]. For the attribution of both redactions to Isidore see Koon and Wood, paragraphs 3-4 of 25, which ultimately depends upon the work of José Carlos Martín.

Seville and was himself the author of a Latin poem.⁴⁰⁶ This also tells us that King Chindaswinth's Latin, or if one is being conservative, the Latin of his court, was quite sophisticated as he saw the need for the old text to be corrected. It is, of course, a sign of proficiency in a language to be able to spot what is right and what is wrong. His desire to have these errors corrected would seem to show his own proficiency. In addition to Chindaswinth's own culture and grasp of Latin, this tells us that the Visigothic court possessed a strong cultural aspect. The royal court at Toledo was not simply a political, military, and legal institution, but a cultural one as well, with interests not only in history, but in literature. This, of course, parallels the court of King Chindaswinth with the court of Augustus. Whereas Augustus had Maecenas and his circle, including Vergil and Horace, Chindaswinth had Eugenius. This parallel might at first seem something of a stretch, but it is, in fact, obliquely referenced in Eugenius' verse preface to the redaction. The reference would only make sense to someone who knew the historical figures involved, but it is nonetheless present. As mentioned before, Eugenius likens himself to Plotius Tucca and Varius Rufus.⁴⁰⁷ Both Tucca and Varius were, of course, members of Maecenas' literary circle. Thus when Eugenius compares himself to these figures, he is also, if ever so subtly, comparing Chindaswinth to Augustus.

This princely interest in the redaction also bears witness to the popularity of Dracontius' texts in Late Visigothic Hispania. Further interest in Dracontius' texts can be seen in the parallels between his works and several of the most important authors of the period from Spain, principally Isidore of Seville and Eugenius

⁴⁰⁶ For a solid discussion of King Sisebut and his relations with Isidore of Seville and for the Visigothic kingdom at the time of his rule see the relevant chapter in Hen, *Roman Barbarians*, pp. 124-152.

⁴⁰⁷ With exemplary episcopal humility, Eugenius compares himself only to minor figures.

himself.⁴⁰⁸ Even more tellingly, there is an epitaph from Léon dating to about 630 which ends with line 611 from Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*.⁴⁰⁹ This epitaph shows, if not necessarily a high level of circulation, then certainly a respectable knowledge and appreciation of the work in certain circles. The example of Chindaswinth's command is indeed part not only of a Visigothic interest in Dracontius, but of a Visigothic interest in North Africa in general. This North African interest, also witnessed in the *loci similes* used in Eugenius' original works, played out on a wider scale.⁴¹⁰

In summary, then, the 'historical' reasons for the redaction start with the various motivations which led King Chindaswinth to order its undertaking. After this initial push, the official reasons for the redaction were the poor state of the text, errors inherent in the original poems, stylistic or literary 'grievances', especially involving repetition and redundancy or material thought to be of no value, and finally a perception of the original work as being unfinished. There should also be added to this list something which is not stated, but is rather implied by the language in the verse preface: Eugenius intends also to expunge items which were culturally

⁴⁰⁸ A solid parallel with Isidore can be found, for example, at *Satisfactio*, 63, and another at *De Laudibus Dei*, I.514, but there are many more than this.

⁴⁰⁹ Moussy, I, p. 106, gives an account of this with references. See also Vollmer, p. 56, who gives the last line of the epitaph in question (*mos* is changed to *mox*), again, with references.

⁴¹⁰ In general, Visigothic Spain appears to have had a very strong interest in North Africa. There were indeed strong connections, both cultural and otherwise, between the two areas. Ildefonsus used a number of African grammarians for his own Latin grammar and there exists also the well-known African element in the Mozarabic rite. Certainly North African clerics were present in Visigothic Spain, two examples which we know of being the Abbot Nactus mentioned in the *Vitas Patrum Emeretensium* (3.1) and the monk Donatus mentioned by Ildefonsus in his *De viris illustribus*, 3. It should be noted also that this certain Donatus brought with him a substantial collection of books (possibly including those of Dracontius?). Translations of these texts can be found in *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, trans. and ed. by A. T. Fear, Translated Texts for Historians, 26 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997). The Latin originals can be found in *Vitas sanctorum patrum Emeretensium*, ed. by A. Maya Sánchez, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 116 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1992) and the recent edition by Codoñer referenced above. See also, Fontaine, *Isidore et la culture classique*, pp. 854-856 and especially Collins, *Visigothic Spain*, pp. 147-61. For Eugenius' use of African authors see the following chapter.

sensitive, or deemed inappropriate in a Visigothic context, or viewed as unorthodox; this will be seen in the analysis which follows. These, then, are the ‘historical’ answers to the question of why, but we must now look at what the text itself can tell us.

iii. How?: What the Text itself can Tell Us

Having considered what it was that Eugenius set out to do, we can now discuss what it is that Eugenius actually did: the ‘how’ of the redaction. This philological analysis is a necessarily complex, and indeed difficult, undertaking.⁴¹¹ To simplify the process somewhat, this investigation will be split into four lines of inquiry. The first of these is orthography. Orthography, however, warrants the most caution, as it could as easily issue from the pen of the scribe as from that of the redactor, or from a difference of opinion between modern editors, or, as is often the case, be tidied away by them altogether. Nevertheless, it is an area where change can be seen, and needs to be addressed, even if only briefly. The second line of inquiry regards lexical and morphological changes. This includes not only changes in word choice and changes in case, number, and tense, but also their resulting alterations to metrical scansion. While some changes of this type could be viewed as scribal in nature, this is less likely to be the case, especially as regards word choice, since these changes can substantially alter the meaning of the passages in which they are found. Caution, however, is still necessary here, as changes, especially as regards case endings, could feasibly come from scribal errors. The third line of inquiry will analyse that which Eugenius appears to have removed from the text. These removals could also be seen

⁴¹¹ The literary aspects of the changes will principally be discussed in the following section concerned with Eugenius’ motivations.

as scribal errors, if it were not for the fact that Eugenius himself testifies to this method and also for the fact that many such deletions reveal a logical process at work. Nevertheless, some could be scribal omissions, or indeed errors of transmission, and each deletion must be evaluated individually. The fourth and final also stands as the most solid. This line of inquiry seeks to analyse that which Eugenius added. As these additional passages are not recorded in any of the manuscripts transmitted as Dracontius' but only in the redactions, they cannot reasonably be assumed to be otherwise than coming from Eugenius, since this would be to ignore his redaction altogether. As is standard with literature, however, the separation of such trends into discrete compartments is problematic, even in terms of a precise endeavour such as this redaction. Frequently, lexical changes are closely related to deletions. The same is true for additions: adding one line often requires the deletion of another. The only category which can truly be studied on its own is orthography. Therefore, these four lines of inquiry will, in practical terms, be reduced to two discussions: one regarding orthography, and one regarding all other changes. For the latter section, the differences give a much clearer picture when one searches for general trends exhibited by the categories together, rather than by each individually. Thus, the latter discussion will search for general trends, as this approach better fits the nature of the evidence. When these have all been laid out, we must then investigate the metrical implications of the differences as well as the changes to the poetic style of the texts.

These combined analytical routes, along with the scansion and discussion of poetic style, can give us a solid impression of the method of the redaction as a whole. In addition to this, it can tell us Eugenius' underlying motives in choosing to redact the text in the way in which he did. Finally, and perhaps most importantly,

this four-pronged analysis can illuminate the poetic culture of the period, not only in terms of aesthetics and language, but in terms of cultural values, norms, and sensitivities. It can also help us to see what exactly the changes were between Dracontius' Vandalic and Visigothic contexts. It is this final aspect which the present thesis most especially seeks to answer.

Before embarking on this analysis, however, we should first look at the historiography of the topic, as this will inform the analysis given here. Since there exists little written on the redaction, this can be done in brief. In general, there has been an assumption that the text of Dracontius existed in Eugenius' Hispania only in a short, mutilated form.⁴¹² This belief has been, in part, an expansion on what Eugenius himself writes in his prose preface discussed above. Taking up this idea of a damaged manuscript, Carl Weyman wrote in 1926 that Eugenius possessed a 'verstümmeltes Exemplar der Dichtungen des Dracontius [...] das nur Laudes Dei I 118-754 und Satisfactio 1-251 enthielt' based on the fact that Eugenius did not include the beginning and the end of the two works respectively.⁴¹³ Weyman, nevertheless, characterised Eugenius' redaction as 'einer nach seiner eigenen Angabe gelinden, tatsächlich aber tief einschneidenden Umarbeitung'.⁴¹⁴ Weyman also asserted that Eugenius saw within the works of Dracontius Arian material that needed to be expunged, and that this (unfounded) suspicion underlay his redaction.⁴¹⁵ This statement is frequently discussed in later scholarship on the subject without very much analysis, and will be addressed in the analysis below. Moussy

⁴¹² This has been the generally accepted view, but should now be rethought. The evidence of the *loci similes*, compiled by Alberto for his edition of the text, appears to show a much wider knowledge of Dracontius on the part of Eugenius.

⁴¹³ Carl Weyman, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der christlichlateinischen Poesie* (Munich: Max Hueber, 1926), p. 148.

⁴¹⁴ Weyman, p. 148. This is, indeed, an accurate statement, and largely reflects Ildefonsus of Toledo's own opinion on the matter.

⁴¹⁵ Weyman, p. 148, with Moussy, I, p. 108, and Langlois, p. 808.

discusses the redaction briefly, but refrains from trying his own hand at discovering Eugenius' motivation, saying simply 'il n'est pas facile de découvrir les intentions d'Eugène'.⁴¹⁶ Langlois, in his article on the redaction, concluded that Eugenius was no more than an editor working 'purement et simplement' in the same vein as the editors of the Late Roman tradition.⁴¹⁷ Alberto does not analyse the redaction in any great depth in his edition of the text, but his version, along with its *apparatus criticus*, is key to the investigation of the redaction.⁴¹⁸ The main thrust of the scholarship has tended to focus on the theological implications of the changes.⁴¹⁹

These works, however, only view Eugenius' redaction either tangentially, in brief, or as something of an afterthought. There is, however, one particularly substantial piece of scholarship which deals directly with the redaction. This work is Karl Reinwald's *Die Ausgabe des ersten Buches der Laudes dei und der Satisfactio des Dracontius durch Eugenius von Toledo* published in 1913.⁴²⁰ Reinwald's work divides the changes (*Änderungen*) into four general categories: textual changes

⁴¹⁶ Moussy, I, p. 108, with the summary occupying pp. 106-109. Moussy does, however, provide some discussion of what others have suggested, mainly with reference to Weyman, Reinwald, and Langlois.

⁴¹⁷ Pierre Langlois, 'Notes critiques sur l'Hexameron de Dracontius et sa recension par Eugène de Tolède: A propos d'une édition récente du De laudibus Dei' in *Latomus*, 23 (1964), 807-817 (p. 808, 816-17)

⁴¹⁸ Alberto does discuss the redaction, but not as it is here discussed. Alberto's work will mainly be used here in terms of the critical edition of the redaction, as there is little overlap between the present investigation and his introduction and commentary found in his edition of the work.

⁴¹⁹ This is the mindset most emphasized throughout by Reinwald. This is also Weymann's idea (p. 148), although, as Alberto (p.20) points out, Weymann provides no specific examples. Langlois (p. 815-816) suggests alternatively 'vulgarization' as the main impetus, without, as Alberto (*ibid*) again points out, sufficient evidence. The concept of 'vulgarization' is even more suspect when one takes into consideration the work of Roger Wright on the existence of Proto-Romance in Visigothic Spain, for which see Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, esp. pp. 51-61. The real answer must certainly be multifaceted, and involve not only linguistic and theological concerns, but cultural and political ones as well.

⁴²⁰ The full citation, also cited above, is Karl Reinwald, *Die Ausgabe des ersten Buches der Laudes dei und der Satisfactio des Dracontius durch Eugenius von Toledo* (Speyer: Jäger, 1913).

(*Textliche Änderungen*), metrics and prosody (*Metrische Untersuchungen*), linguistic changes (*Sprachliche Änderungen*), and substantive changes (*Sachliche Änderungen*). In investigating the first three categories, Reinwald is predominantly focused on evidence from the *De Laudibus Dei/Hexaemeron*, and it is really only with the fourth section, that of significant changes of substance, that he brings in a discussion of the *Satisfactio*.⁴²¹ This focus on the *Hexaemeron*, however, as discussed in the previous chapter, is quite dangerous in light of the manuscript traditions. The philological sections of Reinwald (that is, the first three general categories) mainly work on a process of predicting the reading of Eugenius' lost exemplar (named therein as *X*) and considering the emendations from there. While Reinwald attempts to justify this in terms of the manuscripts, it is, as discussed above, a highly fraught endeavour.⁴²² It must also be remembered that Reinwald was not working from as critical an edition as is now available. Nevertheless, Reinwald does provide detailed descriptions, complemented by linguistic analysis, of many of the changes between the two versions and his work is a highly valuable one. While Reinwald's work is thorough, there nevertheless remains plenty of room in which to further analyse Eugenius' redaction, as well as some areas which one must be cautious of. Therefore, in much the same way as Ovid navigated around Vergil, so too will this study attempt to navigate around Reinwald. This will naturally be the case anyway, as the present study focuses on the *Satisfactio*, and not the *De Laudibus Dei*.

⁴²¹ In the first two sections, little is said at all of the *Satisfactio*; in the third there is some discussion, but in the fourth the *Satisfactio* receives something more of the attention it deserves. Nevertheless, the *Satisfactio* is treated throughout as distinctly subordinate to the *Hexaemeron*.

⁴²² See Reinwald's introduction (pp.3-19). The present author, following to some extent Alberto's strong warning, remains skeptical of the ability to project Eugenius' lost exemplar.

With this having been laid out, we can finally proceed to the analysis. As done in the discussions of Dracontius above, we shall start here with the *Satisfactio*. One of the first details to strike the student of these two works is just how similar they actually are. From the 316 lines of Dracontius' original poem, Eugenius' redaction deletes ninety-eight lines, contains five newly added lines, and differences between the texts occur in 108 lines. These changes occur throughout the whole of the text. Typically, lines are neither added nor deleted in large blocks, the largest such deletion being ten contiguous lines and the largest such addition being three.⁴²³ For the most part, deletions are limited to couplets. This means that Eugenius' redaction differs from Dracontius' original in about 65% of verses in the *Satisfactio*. Many of these differences, however, are very slight, and a line may have only one morphological change in it, or one or two words switched or altered, or a slight change in word order. Only nineteen of the altered lines have three or more changes, and only a handful of these lines exhibit a complete alteration. While these figures may at first appear to confirm the complete overhaul of the text described by Ildefonsus, the actual differences themselves are, in general, not terribly great from the text of Dracontius. Indeed, when looked at side by side, the majority of the text remains unchanged. Aside from the deletion of a substantial number of lines (almost a third), the text as Eugenius presents it to us would seem to argue against the traditionally dismal view of Dracontius' manuscript tradition in Visigothic Spain.⁴²⁴ For, in truth, if Eugenius' exemplar was as corrupt as indicated by the bishop himself or as bad as sometimes assumed by modern scholarship, then the (perfectly sound and acceptable) independent Dracontius which we now possess must basically be

⁴²³ This excludes, however, the end of the piece.

⁴²⁴ This figure includes the cut ending.

one and the same as the ‘corrupt’ copy available to Eugenius himself, leastwise for the *Satisfactio*. It is important to keep this fact in mind while investigating the *differences*: the change is actually dwarfed by the continuity.

iii.a. The Orthographical Differences

Yet we must still look at these changes. The smallest category of textual differences for the *Satisfactio* is, by a wide margin, those involving our first line of inquiry: orthography. It is also one of the trickiest aspects of the overall analysis.⁴²⁵

Throughout the entirety of the work there are only about a dozen differences in spelling between the two versions, a very small number indeed when one considers the length of the poem. Although not evident in the cleaned copies of the printed texts, the most noticeable difference between the original and the redaction is Eugenius’ rather prominent use of Visigothic orthography. Given what we know of Late Latin, this makes sense.⁴²⁶ Dracontius, for the most part, follows the traditional Classical Latin orthography of the later imperial authors. He does, however, include some less standard spellings. Most of these spellings are attested in manuscript *D*, but the separate tradition of *V* exhibits some as well.⁴²⁷ These ‘non-Classical’

⁴²⁵ The danger springs from the general exclusion of references to ‘odd’ orthography in the actual text of the editions, which generally conform to the accepted Classical Latin spellings found in the major modern Latin dictionaries. The critical texts must always be looked at alongside the *indices orthographicae* found hidden at the back of their editions. It is here that the peculiarities of regional orthography are to be found.

⁴²⁶ There are several ways of viewing Late Latin, especially regarding its relationship with/the existence of Vulgar Latin. The present author has found the work of Roger Wright, most notably in *Late Latin and Early Romance*, and Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz in his ‘El latín de la liturgia hispánica’, in *Estudio sobre la liturgia mozárabe*, ed. by J. Rivera Recio (Toledo: Diputación Provincial, 1965) by far the most convincing. Essentially, Late Latin should be viewed as one language with two different registers, not two languages, one Vulgar and one Classical. If there was a higher Classical Latin still being spoken, certainly Eugenius, writing Classically-leaning quantitative verse, would have used it.

⁴²⁷ See the discussion in the previous chapter regarding the manuscripts. In brief, *D* is of possible Spanish provenance, and *V* is most probably solely Italian (but, could possibly have a Spanish source as well).

spellings are not the norm in the text and are indeed quite few, but they do exist.⁴²⁸

Those that exist match the orthography of the Latin of Visigothic Spain. The principal trends in Dracontius are the melding of 'b' and 'v', the melding of 'o' and 'u' and the use of 'ph' and 'f', of 'm' and 'n' and of 'qu' and 'c' interchangeably. One also finds the 'inappropriate' dropping and adding of aspirations. All of these are central aspects of Visigothic orthography. These trends are even more pronounced in the *De Laudibus Dei*.⁴²⁹ These orthographic shifts are not consistent in Dracontius and it must be remembered that they are minority spellings: whether they come from Dracontius himself or his copyists is impossible to say, but one would have expected more 'errors' if the scribe was adapting it to their own (later) orthography.

What Eugenius does in the redaction is to bring these orthographic shifts to full fruition. While in Dracontius' version of the *Satisfactio* we find only two examples of 'b' shifting to 'v', and both occur in the same word stem (*favos/favor* becomes *fabos/fabor*), in Eugenius this is effectively the normal spelling for manuscripts *F* and *Ma*.⁴³⁰ The opposite switch, 'v' in place of 'b', is also frequent in the redaction.⁴³¹ This confusion of 'b' and 'v' came to the attention of Isidore of Seville, who condemned it (in the case of *bibit/vivit*) in *Differentiae* 602.⁴³² This reinforcement is true of the other spelling shifts as well. Eugenius also added several more orthographic variations, such as the halving of twinned consonants (*aggestis*

⁴²⁸ Vollmer, in his orthographic index, lists fourteen.

⁴²⁹ Along with a great many additional trends: the orthographic differentiation from the Classical norm is much more pronounced in this text, as would be expected from the manuscript issues discussed above. For the trends themselves see the orthographic index in Vollmer, pp. 448-451.

⁴³⁰ These examples can be found in lines 16 and 62 of Dracontius' text.

⁴³¹ It should be noted, however, that this shift never occurs on the *-ibus* ending of the dative and ablative plural.

⁴³² Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, pp. 82-85.

becomes *agestis*) along with the twinning of single consonants (*fama* becomes *famma*).⁴³³ ‘Ae’ is often cut down to ‘e’, especially in the case of *haec*, which becomes consistently in *F ec*.⁴³⁴ ‘P’ shifts to ‘b’, and ‘t’ to ‘d’, and vice versa, with great frequency, and, in the case of *mihi*, the aspiration shifts to a ‘c’ or ‘ch’.⁴³⁵ We also find ‘g’ for the consonantal ‘i’, ‘o’ for short ‘u’, and, very occasionally in *Ma*, ‘i’ preceding initial ‘s’. All of these *res orthographicae* found in the redaction of the *Satisfactio*, exist also in that of the *De Laudibus Dei*. As identified by Wright, these are all features of Visigothic Latin.⁴³⁶ All of these things, of course, are what we would expect of a text from seventh-century Visigothic Spain. While these features occur in Eugenius, and are indeed very noticeable, most of the text does indeed conform to the Classical norm. Most words are spelled ‘correctly’.

What changes there are could be the result of the work of later scribes. Yet, the general pattern of occurrence these shifts possess in Eugenius, and their minor presence in Dracontius point to a different answer. *F* does not employ the ‘i’ before initial ‘s’, for example, and there is a general compatibility with Classical orthography. This on-going shift suggests that the language of the text was probably set down in the mid-seventh century, and not in the ninth or tenth, when these changes had become more concrete. Why would a scribe change some but not all of the spellings? There is a noticeable inconsistency with spelling, such as the presence of both *avis* and *abis* (for *avis*) in line 72 and of *avet* and *abet* (for *habet*) in line 59. This inconsistency points much more towards the language of an author than to the

⁴³³ *Agestis* in Eug. 2.73, *famma* in Eug. 2.269.

⁴³⁴ Examples can be found in lines 142, 149 and 174.

⁴³⁵ These are very frequent, and I would refer the reader to the orthographic index in Alberto, pp. 459-468.

⁴³⁶ See especially the second chapter of *Late Latin and Early Romance*.

corrections of a scribe.⁴³⁷ What the orthography tells us then is that Eugenius ‘corrected’ the text of Dracontius to the norms of seventh-century Visigothic Spain. Eugenius felt that updating the text to his own context included an updating of the spelling. This is not terribly surprising, but it does tell us a few things. Firstly, it suggests that Eugenius is far from a slave to Classical conventions.⁴³⁸ He is not trying to replicate the ancient language in his verse. Instead, he is adapting the older language to that of his own time and place. This use also tells us that Eugenius viewed this collection of ‘vulgar’ Visigothic spellings as the legitimate, and indeed the desirable, expression of the Latin language. The spelling shifts, and the shifts in pronunciation which underlie them, that mark Eugenius also mark the Iberian Romance that eventually became Spanish and Catalan. Eugenius is not writing, or reciting, ‘educated’ Classical Latin: nor is he using ‘Vulgar’ Latin, for surely the learned vocabulary and the quantitative metre which he employs, along with his generally correct grammar, would eliminate this as a possibility. Eugenius, like the other authors of Visigothic Spain, views his own contemporary and regional form of Latin as simply Latin.⁴³⁹ All told, then, Eugenius’ correction of Dracontius’ Latin to

⁴³⁷ See also Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, pp. 73-78, for genuineness of Visigothic orthography, and its presence in the seventh century.

⁴³⁸ This is a factor which will be borne out in more detail in the following chapter.

⁴³⁹ In much the same way as modern speakers of English from both sides of the Atlantic view their form of English as simply English. Both forms of the language are mutually intelligible (with the exclusion of some dialectal vocabulary), but the difference in pronunciation (as well as in grammar and syntax) is oftentimes very noticeable. But they are not separate languages. For the full development of this lack of distinction between educated and ‘Vulgar’ Latin see Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, pp. 45-103 and throughout. While Eugenius does not appear to clip vowels between consonants (a feature discussed thoroughly by Wright) this is likely due to the nature of quantitative verse, which counted vowels. Indeed, as poetry is so rarely written in normal everyday speech, the presence of any orthographical shifts makes a fairly strong argument that we are seeing here authentic evidence for seventh-century Iberian Latin. The inconsistency is due to the transitional nature of mid-seventh-century Visigothic Latin.

the norms of Visigothic Spain tells us both that Eugenius used this later orthography, and that he considered it the correct and desirable mode of recording the language.

iii.b. The Other Set of Differences

Lexical and morphological changes, along with deletions and additions, form the next body of our inquiry. Lexical and morphological differences, although oftentimes minor, are fairly frequent, and sometimes quite important. The same is essentially true of deletions and additions, although they often at first appear to be more meaningful due to their greater severity. Many of the changes, in all three categories, often appear rather superficial. Some are, but many of them, in actual fact, are not. Related to the orthographic shifts already seen in the redaction is the trend towards the clarification, or really the perceived clarification, of Dracontius' Latin. To effect this clarification Eugenius employed all three categories of changes discussed. Many of these differences are minor, and clarify only minimally.⁴⁴⁰ A clear improvement, involving a lexical change, can, however, be seen at *Satisfactio*, 246/215.⁴⁴¹ The original line reads: 'damna vel augmentum dant quae elementa ferunt'. While the line is translatable, the sense is rather muddled, and the phrasing obscure. Eugenius alters this to 'damna vel augmenta rebus elementa dederunt'. The Eugenic reading is significantly less obscure, and provides a very clear reading of the same idea which Dracontius struggled to get across. On many occasions,

⁴⁴⁰ Such an example can be found at *Satisfactio*, 34/32, where Eugenius changes a dative of the possessor to the rather more typical possessive genitive. At *Satisfactio* 174/150, Eugenius makes slightly more sense of the line than does Dracontius. In this line, in the context of a discussion on mercifulness, which includes both St. Stephen and Caesar, Dracontius writes: 'vir sine morte gerens nil habet ipse necis.' Eugenius, on the other hand, reads: 'vir sine morte furens nil habet ipse necis.' While both lines make a certain sense, and neither is particularly spectacular, it does perhaps make more sense for one to 'be in a rage without [causing] death' than for one to 'be carrying oneself without death'. Examples from the *Hexaemeron* can be found at 499-500/380-381, 541/423 and 565/447.

⁴⁴¹ As numbering is different between the versions, the first number refers to the original and the second to the redaction.

however, Eugenius' alterations fail to produce clarity. Oftentimes, indeed, his 'corrections' further muddle the sense of the text.⁴⁴² Regardless of these obscure changes, Eugenius is, overall, attempting to 'correct' Dracontius' Latin. The difficulty in this lies in the fact that 'correctness' of language, especially in the pre-modern era, and especially at the hands of a native speaker such as Eugenius, is largely a subjective thing. The modern reader, trained in Classical norms, often finds the 'clarifications' to be exactly the opposite. What Eugenius felt to be correct Latin was not necessarily what Dracontius felt, and was certainly not what Cicero perceived as right Latin. Eugenius, then, clarified the language of Dracontius in accordance with his own time and place, and also with his own taste and ability as a poet and Latin thinker. This, then, together with the orthographic evidence, bears witness to the first of Eugenius' trends in the redaction: the correction of Dracontius' Latin to the norms of Visigothic Spain.

Leaving aside the perceived clarification of the texts' Latin, the first changes one notices when examining the text of the *Satisfactio* are those in the first line. Dracontius' original reads: 'Rex immense Deus, cunctorum conditor et spes'. Eugenius turns this into: 'Rex aeternae Deus, auctor rectorque serenus'.⁴⁴³ These changes are solid, as Eugenius in fact used Dracontius' opening phrase in the opening line of his first poem.⁴⁴⁴ The lexical differences seen here represent both the consequential and inconsequential changes in the redaction. Firstly, the replacing of *immensus* with *aeternus* has some subtle theological implications. The term

⁴⁴² This is especially common in the *Hexaemeron*. Examples from the *Satisfactio* can be found at lines 27-28/25-26 and 221/189, to give but two.

⁴⁴³ Dracontius reads: 'God, King, immeasurable, of all things the founder and the hope', whereas Eugenius reads: 'God, King eternal, tranquil/bright founder and guide'.

⁴⁴⁴ Eugenius, 1: 'Rex Deus immense'. The change, therefore, could not be inherited from Eugenius' lost model.

immensus, ‘immeasurable’ or ‘boundless’, has physical implications, and could be seen as placing God in the corporeal.⁴⁴⁵ *Immensus* does not necessarily do this, and usually does not, as its frequent use in hymns would suggest, but, if sensitivities were high enough and if context was sufficiently suggestive, it certainly *could*.⁴⁴⁶

Aeternus, ‘eternal’, on the other hand, while fundamentally changing the meaning of the sentence, does not possess a sense of physicality, and places God firmly outside the corporeal.⁴⁴⁷ The subtleties of this language do not come through into the modern world, where a description of God as ‘boundless’ would generally not rankle, but in

⁴⁴⁵ The problem being that belief in a corporeal God was condemned by all the major Church Fathers, nevertheless it was still a belief that persisted among the Christian populace. See below. This is the principal difficulty, but Arianism might also be a factor. Heteroousian Arians believed Christ to be ‘not of the same substance of the Father’. Arian beliefs, however, were complex, and typically showed very little unity (there were several ‘types’ of Arians) and remain little understood. One of the principal ways of approaching Arianism is via its opponents (especially Athanasius), but studies do exist, two being *Arianism after Arius: essays on the development of the fourth century Trinitarian conflicts*, ed. by Michael R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams (Edinburgh: Clark, 1993), and Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, 2nd edn (London: SCM Press, 2001).

⁴⁴⁶ As defined by the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, *immensus* has both corporeal and incorporeal denotations. The underlying meaning in both sets of definitions, however, is the concept of something too big to be measured. The incorporeal definitions tend to involve intellectual material and time. The corporeal denotations tend towards concepts of geographical size, or, in terms of animate objects, hugeness of form/size. Therefore, while the word is capable of incorporeal meanings, there would be a link with physical, corporeal ones as well. The entry is found on pp. 450-454. One should, however, note that *Satisfactio*, 1 has a resonance with Lactantius’ *Divine Institutes*, 5.1.1, where the latter author uses *immensus* to describe the physical world. Regarding its use in hymns, there are many instances, several of which are found in the Mozarabic Rite itself. Two such are (in Blume’s numbering) hymns 27 (and 32 which copies it) and 182. The relevant phrase in the first reads ‘Christe immense’ and in the second reads ‘Deus, immensa trinitas’. For the texts see *Hymnodia Gotica. Die Mozarabischen Hymnen des alt-spanischen Ritus*. ed. by Clemens Blume, *Analecta Hymnica medii aevi*, 27 (Leipzig: O.R. Reisland, 1897).

⁴⁴⁷ God was viewed as incorporeal by a significant body of the Church certainly from Origen on, if not before. Origen, however, argued strongly for the incorporeal nature of God largely because many believed the opposite. Stoicism, alongside a simple understanding of the Bible, or an understanding influenced by Jewish thought, underlies this corporeal conception of God. Such an example can be found in Tertullian, who argued for the corporeality of God. Origen and St. Augustine, showing their Platonic thought, reject this view; their rejection (and the idea of God as incorporeal) eventually became the dominant (and orthodox) theological position of the Church. See especially Carl W. Griffin and David L. Paulsen, ‘Augustine and the Corporeality of God’, *The Harvard Theological Review*, 95.1 (2002), 97-118 (esp. pp. 101-104; p. 101 for Tertullian), and Gedaliahu Stroumsa, ‘The Incorporeality of God: contexts and implications of Origen’s position’, *Religion* (1983), 345-358.

the context of Late Antique Spain, this word was rather more charged. In earlier Late Antique contexts one does find the description of God as *immensus*. Such an example can be found in Marius Victorinus' *Adversus Arrium*, 4.24, where the philosopher, in a catalogue of God's attributes, uses the adjective *immensus*.⁴⁴⁸ As the anti-Arian context makes clear, this word was not felt to have any heretical connotations, at least not by Victorinus writing at about the time of the Council of Rimini.⁴⁴⁹ It is in this vein that Dracontius, with his solid orthodox and Trinitarian credentials, must have employed the word. Dracontius' environment, however, was Arian, and this word, found as it is at the beginning of a poem addressed to an Arian monarch, was probably considered by the poet to be a nice, neutral choice, not particularly for or against either side. Indeed, the motivation for Dracontius' word choice here is most probably aesthetic.⁴⁵⁰

In truth, Dracontius' use is quite unremarkable and likely serves only to make a Lactantius resonance, and even more, simply to start the poem off with impressive imagery. The point of interest is that Eugenius changes it. Yet, Eugenius used the phrase himself in his own poetry: why not use it here? While there are several possible answers, all of which are probably more or less accurate, one does stand out in particular. This is the theological difficulty already discussed: the physical, corporeal implications of *immensus*. While Eugenius does use 'Rex Deus immense' elsewhere, the contexts between the two passages are actually quite different. In the *Satisfactio*, 'Rex immense Deus' is followed by 'cunctorum conditor et spes'.

⁴⁴⁸ Marius Victorinus, *Theological Treatises on the Trinity*, trans. by Mary T. Clark, The Fathers of the Church vol. 69 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1981), pp. 288-289. For the Latin, see Marius Victorinus, *Opera theologica*, ed. by Albrecht Locher (Leipzig: Teubner, 1976).

⁴⁴⁹ For the timing see F.F. Bruce, 'Marius Victorinus and His Works', *The Evangelical Quarterly* 18 (1946), 132-153 (pp. 133-134).

⁴⁵⁰ For Dracontius' emphasis on aesthetics, see Part I of the present thesis.

Conditor, of course, is a ‘founder’ or ‘builder’: in other words, a ‘job title’, like that held by Romulus and Remus, even by Leovigild when he founded Reccopolis. One *could* see here a picture of a corporeal, indeed of an anthropomorphic, God, but one need not. The language in Eugenius, however, is quite different. In place of *spes*, which is rather neutral in this context, Eugenius expands upon *conditor*, and refers to God as ‘auctor rectorque serenus’. All of these epithets, whether in Eugenius or Dracontius, are perfectly right and acceptable descriptions of God. Yet, if Eugenius were to read ‘Rex immense Deus, auctor rectorque serenus’ then the corporeal and anthropomorphic image of God would be quite strong here: the image would be of a huge, calm ruler, guiding the world which he built with his own hands. While this might be a good image for poetry, it might not be so good for one who was theologically minded. To dispel this corporeal image, Eugenius employed a word which cannot be pictured readily in the mind, and one which would serve well to move the image (and its subject) far from the corporeal earthly realm: *aeternus*.⁴⁵¹ After all, nothing is less eternal than the body. The perceived necessity of dispelling this image likely stems from heightened sensitivity to any language which could, in any way, be construed as suggesting heterodoxy. Eugenius was born around the time of Leovigild’s conversion, and the memory of Arianism would still have been relatively fresh in the minds of the archbishop and the aged King Chindaswinth. That the coupling of *immensus* with occupational terms actually suggests Arian doctrine or the actual conception of God as corporeal is highly unlikely, and besides, is not the point: if there was merely a suggestion of heresy, Arian or otherwise, and the sensitivities were high enough, then the change would be seen as necessary.

⁴⁵¹ There were other reasons for Eugenius to use this word which will be discussed below.

Arianism, however, is probably a red herring.⁴⁵² Given the context in seventh-century (*not* sixth-century) Hispania, the real theological debate going on here is most probably with Jewish theology. While Jewish theological belief was and still remains diverse, many traditional schools of Jewish thought, rooted in the language and imagery of the Torah, viewed God as corporeal and/or anthropomorphic.⁴⁵³

Given the fear of Judaism and Jewish influence on the Christian populace found in the Visigothic Church councils and even more in the later Visigothic Law Codes, this desire to avoid any wording with possible Jewish theological connotations fits well with what we know of the higher echelons of the seventh-century Visigothic Church and society.⁴⁵⁴ Isidore of Seville himself even composed a treatise against Jewish theology entitled *De fide catholica ex Veteri et Novo Testamento, contra Judaeos*.⁴⁵⁵ Whether in response to perceived Jewish influence, or that of Tertullian,

⁴⁵² What Eugenius is actually trying to dispute here is the notion of a corporeal God, not Arianism. It only dispels Arian belief in the subordinate and created nature of Christ (the main dispute between Arians and Orthodox) if one considers Christ to be fully God, as Trinitarians do. An Arian, of course, would also agree with this statement, as the word *Deus* indicates only the Father, and not the Son. Additionally, Arians, like most Trinitarians, were influenced by Platonism: the idea of an incorporeal God, then, was something both would have agreed upon. But the spectre of Arianism was strong enough that any heresy, Arian or not, needed to be expunged. This lingering fear of Arianism was discussed recently by Mary Lester. 'Ad nostram catholicam fidem: Remembering Religious Identity in Post-Conversion Visigothic Iberia', Paper presented at the *International Medieval Congress*, Leeds, 11 July 2012.

⁴⁵³ Griffin and Paulsen, p. 98, with references. Also David H. Aaron, 'Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 90.3 (1997), 299-314 (313-313). This was merely one school of thought in Judaism (Maimonides several centuries later argued for the incorporeality of God; see Harry A. Wolfson, 'Maimonides on the Unity and Incorporeality of God', *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series, 56.2 [1965], 112-136). It was, however, one school which was in direct opposition to Christian orthodoxy.

⁴⁵⁴ The problematic relationship between the Visigothic monarchy (sometimes in conjunction with the Church and sometimes not) and the Jewish inhabitants of Iberia is an unfortunate and fairly famous aspect of Visigothic history. For this see Thompson, *The Goths in Spain*, pp. 202-209, 315-316 (and elsewhere) and Collins, *Early Medieval Spain*, pp. 128-143.

⁴⁵⁵ This work is described by Collins as being 'concerned with controverting Jewish beliefs and arguments against Christianity, on the basis of passages from the Old Testament used to show that the Jews were confounded by their own scriptures': *Early Medieval Spain*. p. 62.

who also suggested this, or indeed of simple folk beliefs, Eugenius felt it necessary to avoid even the faintest suggestion of the corporeality of God. Thus, while there really was no legitimately heterodox material in the original, Eugenius' redaction nevertheless presents a more orthodox text. This in turn suggests that a high sensitivity to heterodox teaching was present in seventh-century Visigothic high culture. It might also suggest that there were still those who, despite the efforts of Augustine, still believed in a corporeal God. At the very least it tells us that Eugenius, as archbishop of Toledo, still felt that those beliefs were a threat.⁴⁵⁶ This also shows us one of the general trends of the differences in Eugenius' redaction: the correcting of material which could be viewed as theologically questionable.⁴⁵⁷

Theological reasoning, however, is not the only motivation behind this change. There is indeed a literary push behind this difference as well. In the Dracontian original there is a resonance with Lactantius' *Divine Institutes* but little

This desire on behalf of Isidore to argue against Jewish theology was logically passed down to his Toledan successor.

⁴⁵⁶ It also tells us the exact opposite for Dracontius. For him, *immensus* was a perfectly normal and acceptable epithet for God, whatever the context. This shows us that Dracontius had a much lower sensitivity to heterodoxy (or, perhaps, rather a *normal* sensitivity to it) and it also affirms his principal concern with aesthetics. This, of course, has interesting social implications when one considers that Dracontius wrote in a divided and Arian-dominated time and place, and yet was not as sensitive to heresy, but Eugenius, working in a united Catholic but post-Arian context, was.

⁴⁵⁷ See above, pp. 77-78. Another example of this can be found at *Satisfactio*, 190/166, where Eugenius removes a reference to Commodus Augustus as 'deus' and instead replaces it with 'dei', thus removing any possible allusion to the imperial cult and the decidedly non-Christian implications of imperial deification. There are also several examples from the *De Laudibus Dei*. In terms of orthodoxy/heterodoxy, one change, regarding the unity of the Trinity, can be found at 563/445, where Eugenius affirms both the single and triune nature of God, where Dracontius emphasized principally the triune (although Dracontius' passage was, again, perfectly orthodox, but could nevertheless be made more so). There is also the change at 39-40/35-36 discussed in Part I as regards Dracontius' use of Late Antique sources which deletes a Sidonian reference so as to erase the connection with the (by the time of Eugenius) heretical Faustus of Riez. For this, see the discussion above. In terms of more basic theological corrections or clarifications there is 130/13 (which changes 'numquam maculabilis' to 'numquam mutabilis': not a substantial change, but the latter is more typical) and the series of changes from 255/137 to 272/56 (including two new lines from Eugenius) which serve to clarify some biblical material.

more beyond this, unless one counts the relatively frequent use of *conditor* as an epithet of God.⁴⁵⁸ In Eugenius, on the other hand, the picture is very much different. The most noticeable parallel in the wording of the redaction, and that which would, without doubt, have stood out most strongly to Eugenius and his audience, is with the Visigothic liturgy. At the beginning of the Visigothic (or Mozarabic) Divine Office for Matins on the first Sunday of Advent, the first prayer, which follows immediately after the Ambrosian hymn ‘Aeterne rerum conditor’ which begins the service, starts with the line ‘Aeternum te auctorem, et Conditoem rerumque omnium Dominum omnis lingua confitetur’.⁴⁵⁹ The parallel with the Eugenic passage is strong.⁴⁶⁰ This liturgical prayer is clearly the source for both the *aeternus* and the *auctor* found in the first line. The presence of the verb *fateor* in the third line, which grammatically refers both to the *auctorem* in line four and the *quems* in lines two and three (which in turn refer to God as addressed in line one), further serves to confirm this resonance.⁴⁶¹ That these lines appear at the beginning of the poem further strengthens the link, as the liturgical passage also occurs in the beginning of the first hymn and the first prayer of the first service of the liturgical year. Thus, while theological concerns induced the removal of the original *immensus*, literary concerns

⁴⁵⁸ Such an example can be found in Ambrose, *Hymn* 1.1, which is important for the redaction as well. *Conditor* is commonly used of God in the early Latin hymns.

⁴⁵⁹ This Ambrosian hymn is indeed hymn 1.1. For the text of the liturgy: *Breviarium gothicum*, ed. by Antonius Lorenzana, in *Liturgia mozarabica secundum regulam beati Isidori*, ed. by J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 86, 2 vols (Paris: Migne, 1862), II, 21-22.

⁴⁶⁰ There is, however, one stronger. Hymn 200 in Clemens Blume’s *Hymnodia Gotica*, reads, in its first line, ‘Rex aeterne Deus, fons pietatis’. The phrases are obviously the same, but the present author would suggest that this hymn was indeed written by Eugenius himself, and thus does not enter into the present discussion. If it is not Eugenius, then it could very well stem from Ildefonsus writing after him. Without being able to accurately date it, nothing certain can be said about it here. It should also be noted that there is a possible resonance in the Mozarabic rite itself here to the Dracontian line in question which also itself, albeit somewhat weakly, references the Ambrosian hymn. This resonance, however, is made much stronger by Eugenius’ alterations.

⁴⁶¹ The *fateor* is also present in the original, but without Eugenius’ changes, is insufficient to make the parallel.

governed its replacement with *aeternus*. Yet, the fact that the literary work referenced is indeed the Visigothic liturgy itself serves a number of different and important purposes. Firstly, it ensures that the passage is orthodox, which was a matter of importance considering the original reason for the change. Secondly, it serves to make a nice, solid literary reference which even the most simple and uneducated listener could easily recognize.⁴⁶² Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, it serves to pointedly draw the mind of the listener or reader to God: not only does the passage itself address God, but it addresses God in the same language used regularly and repeatedly to address him in church. When heard by those whose principal experience of the Church was the Visigothic rite, these words would serve to bring the mind's eye straight to the Altar of God at the front of the church, and to the priest interceding before it. This passage, then, not only shows Eugenius engaging fully with his audience, but altering the text in such a way that his audience not only heard the poem, but experienced it.⁴⁶³

The reasoning behind the changing of *immense* to *aeterne*, then, is both theological and literary. What else, then, is going on in this line? Firstly, there exists one more implication for the switch to *aeterne*. With this word now in the first line, lines five and six of the original text, which describe the eternity and the never-changing immortality of God, become redundant. Eugenius, although he preferred

⁴⁶² In the seventh century Matins was relatively short and took place at sunrise, and would have been a widely attended service, as the texts, hymns and readings were set and this service allowed the congregation to take part in the liturgy, which the medieval Mass did not, since people could more easily memorize the texts and better participate in the service. The timing of the service also allowed people to attend the service without interruption to the rest of their day. For the Divine Office in Visigothic Iberia, see especially Robert Taft, *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West: the Origins of the Divine Office and its Meaning for Today* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1986), pp. 156-163 (regarding the cathedral usage) and pp. 115-120 (regarding monastic usage).

⁴⁶³ Of course, Eugenius was not always this effective. Like all poets, Eugenius' glimmers of greatness do not quite occur in every line.

the adjective *aeternus* for the reasons stated above, nevertheless wanted to avoid redundancy. To solve this problem, Eugenius simply cut the two lines in question from the poem. There was, after all, already a built-in redundancy between lines six and seven, and so the removal of the entire couplet did not at all lessen the meaning of the poem. The original lines were perfectly fine from a theological, metrical, and indeed poetic viewpoint: in fact, the couplet was a fairly eloquent summation of two theological concepts. Eugenius cut them simply because they were redundant. It should be remembered that Eugenius himself mentioned the elimination of redundancies in his preface.⁴⁶⁴ This cutting of redundancy is one of the factors at work throughout the redaction, but it is not a rule set in stone. In line four of the poem, Dracontius used the word *auctor* for God, and Eugenius, even though he inserts this word into the first line of his redaction, nevertheless retains this original *auctor* three lines later.⁴⁶⁵ Eugenius' attempts to eliminate redundancy appear to focus on redundant ideas and statements, and not on lexical redundancy which at times he actually increases.⁴⁶⁶ This illustrates another important facet of the redaction: there are certainly patterns perceivable in the differences, but there are no hard and fast rules, for every coherent set of changes there is always a counter-example, always an exception. Nevertheless, the general patterns do exist, and are worth looking at. The case-studies examined here show us quite a few of them.

The motivations behind the other differences in line one are a little harder to see. Why change 'founder (*conditor*) and hope of all things' to 'tranquil founder

⁴⁶⁴ See the discussion above. An example of Eugenius cutting a redundant passage in the *De Laudibus Dei* can be found at 412-13/295, where he cuts two lines.

⁴⁶⁵ Line four, in both versions, reads: '[fatentur] auctorem, Dominum saecula cuncta probant'.

⁴⁶⁶ Another example of Eugenius' penchant for a lexically redundant aesthetic can be found in line 88/82 of the *Satisfactio*, where Eugenius alters Dracontius' *monuit* to *docuit*, which had already been used in the line. The original reads, 'Lucifer hoc docuit, Sirius hoc monuit', whereas the redaction has 'Lucifer hoc docuit, Sirius hoc docuit'.

(*auctor*) and guide’? *Aeterne* and *immense* both have the same quantitative value (two longs and a short), and fill the same place in the metre: thus metrical motivations are out for the reworking of the second half-line. The most probable reason for this alteration is to be found in the differences between the ways in which Dracontius and Eugenius perceived of this poem. For Dracontius, this poem was an apology to his king intended to secure his release from prison; thus ‘hope’ was a central aspect of the work as he perceived it. Eugenius, on the other hand, saw the *Satisfactio* as an address to God appended to the versification of the Hexaemeron. Eugenius, therefore, perceived the poem as fundamentally concerned with the Story of Creation. In order to enforce a greater consistency in the work as a whole, Eugenius made this line more explicitly about the Creation, and replaced *spes*, which was otherwise perfectly fine, with *rector*, which was more appropriate to the context. The replacement of *spes* with *rector*, however, had several consequences. *Rector* contained an extra syllable, and to fit the metre, Eugenius needed to make further alterations. *Conditor* no longer could fit, and was replaced with *auctor*, in spite of the redundancy this caused. *Cunctorum* also no longer fit, and was replaced with the perfectly acceptable and neutral, if also rather weak, *serenus*. Yet, aside from metrical concerns, another factor influenced Eugenius’ word choice here. This factor is, once again, the literary use of *loci similes*. The resonance in Dracontius discussed above depended upon the use of *conditor*, but with Eugenius’ deletion of this word, the resonance was lost. In its place the latter author added not only the liturgical reference, complete with its nod to Ambrose’s first hymn, discussed above, but also an additional reference to the Ambrosian hymns. This second reference is not as strong as the first, but nevertheless shows us how Eugenius’ mind was working. The resonance is with Ambrose, Hymn, 2.1-2a, which reads ‘Deus creator omnium,/

Polique rector'. The similarity lies in the use of *rector* as an epithet of *Deus* juxtaposed with the notion of God as creator. While Eugenius does not use *creator*, which would have made the resonance concrete, because of metrical constraints and his desire to cement the liturgical parallel, the similarity nevertheless stands in view of the passage's context.

The half-line just discussed, then, shows us a few important patterns in the redaction. Firstly, there is a general attempt to make the two books of the redaction (which are distinct poems in the original, one of which was only the first part of a much larger and more diverse work) a more coherent whole. The changes here are only a small part of this, and the central aspect of this process was actually to readdress the whole of the *Satisfactio* to God, instead of to the king as Dracontius had done. This, of course, radically changes the poem. Eugenius makes this shift quite efficiently. The process starts with the changes at 22-24.⁴⁶⁷ The essential switch, however, is located in the differences in lines 113-117/107. The deletion of lines 113-116 and 193-196 eradicates references to royalty, and the complete overhaul of line 117/107 effectively readdresses the poem to God.⁴⁶⁸ Secondly, in this half-line we see the 'domino effect': one change oftentimes begets other changes.⁴⁶⁹ These changes can be caused by the need to adapt the metre to the new circumstances or to eliminate redundancy caused by the new words. These coincidental changes do not necessarily improve the text or even truly alter it:

⁴⁶⁷ Discussed by Reinwald, p. 105.

⁴⁶⁸ There is also a possible change in 110/104 that makes this switch to God all the more clear by altering the Vandalic title *rex dominusque*, to the more obvious 'rex Deus omnipotens', but this is only found in *Ma*, and the other mss. retain the Dracontian reading and so we must retain it here as well (Reinwald, p. 105, accepts it and discusses it in terms of the Vandal title). The change at 94/88, discussed by Reinwald, p. 104 is also part of this.

⁴⁶⁹ This is a fairly prominent trend. Examples from the *Satisfactio* can be found at lines 23-24/22 and also at 246/215 and indeed throughout both texts as many of the examples for discussion here bear out.

sometimes they make no difference at all, and sometimes they may even weaken the original expression. Thirdly, as we have already seen with *aeternus*, literary concerns, especially the use of *loci similes*, oftentimes underlie the alterations.⁴⁷⁰ Many of the differences found in the texts fall into these three categories.

Additional factors or trends can be discerned elsewhere in the text, especially when one looks more closely at Eugenius' deletions. One of the most noticeable is Eugenius' attempt at bringing the text more into line with contemporary Visigothic culture. The first place one sees this is Eugenius' deletion of *Satisfactio*, 22, which reads in the original '[possem narrare/] nominis Asdingui bella triumphigera'. The Hasdings, of course, were the royal family of the Vandal kingdom represented, at the time of the poem's composition, by its addressee, Gunthamund. While Vandal history was popular in Visigothic Hispania, and the Hasdings had long been extirpated, this line was nevertheless inappropriate in Eugenius' Iberian context. It was, therefore, simply removed.⁴⁷¹ Another cultural update can perhaps be found at line 117/107. The primary function of the changes in this line was, as mentioned above, to redirect the poem to God. Yet, this was done simply by replacing the original 'princeps' with 'summe'.⁴⁷² The remainder of the line could have stayed the same: Eugenius normally keeps Dracontius' suppliant imagery, and it indeed features prominently in his own original works. Instead of keeping it, however,

⁴⁷⁰ There are a few examples of this from the *De Laudibus Dei* as well. Such can be found at 388/272 where Eugenius strengthens a Vergilian resonance, and at 527/409 where he adds an additional reference to the *Georgics*. Yet, the opposite is also true, and Eugenius sometimes destroys Dracontius' resonances. Examples of this can be found at *Satisfactio*, 62/56 where Eugenius wrecks a Vergilian parallel (which was discussed in Part I above) and also at *De Laudibus Dei*, 567/450 where Eugenius ruins a reference to Cyprian.

⁴⁷¹ Of course, 'simply' does not accurately show the difficulty involved in removing a single line from a poem written in elegiac couplets. This removal required Eugenius to combine the following two lines, so as to keep the structure of the poem intact: lines 23-24 thus become line 22 in the redaction.

⁴⁷² The lines in question read: 'ad te nunc, princeps, mea vela retorqueo supplex' (original) and 'te nunc, summe, precor, magnorum maxime regum' (redaction).

Eugenius puts in a half-line in praise of God.⁴⁷³ The reason for this change most likely stems from the metaphor used by Dracontius: ‘*mea vela retorqueo*’, ‘I redirect my sails’. In Dracontius’ Carthaginian context this was a perfectly suitable image which would be widely understood, Carthage, after all, being one of the busiest seaports of Late Antiquity. Considering that many of the North African senators owned lands elsewhere in the Mediterranean (probably including Dracontius himself) and also the mercantile nature of Carthage, much of Dracontius’ audience would have been familiar with sailing and the language which dealt with it.⁴⁷⁴ Eugenius, however, spent his life between Toledo and Zaragoza and was redacting the *Satisfactio* in Toledo for an inland audience. The cutting of the nautical metaphor most likely made the line more palatable to the inland mountain-dwellers of the Visigothic court. Many might have gotten the metaphor, but seventh-century Visigothic Hispania was not the coastal, mercantile thalassocracy that Vandal Carthage was, and thus many might not have. As such, Eugenius did not deem it relevant, and so it was cut.⁴⁷⁵ Adapting the works to their new Visigothic context also meant, for Eugenius, adapting them to his own way of thinking. Such a change

⁴⁷³ While it would not generally be out of character for Eugenius to insert a passage in praise of God, he tends not to do so at random, usually preferring to keep what Dracontius’ himself wrote.

⁴⁷⁴ Vandal North Africa was a naval power, with a strong mercantile presence (keeping in mind the prevalence of Red African Slipware). This mercantile presence was principally maritime. See, for example, Conant, p. 71, and pp. 67-129 more generally.

⁴⁷⁵ Another change in this same vein can be found at *Satisfactio*, 199-200/171-172, discussed above, in Part I.1. This difference, it will be remembered, changed the meaning of the word *triumphus* from a triumphal procession (which is how Dracontius used it) to a victory, as Eugenius felt this denotation better represented the context of Visigothic Hispania, where the Triumph was no longer a part of the common psyche, as it had been in Vandalic North Africa. Another difference, related to those which will be discussed below, involves the cutting of lines 133-136. This alteration removes a reference to the treatment of captives which involves them being placed under a yoke. This removal, especially taken in context with the other difference yet to be discussed, suggests a general cultural sensitivity to the imagery of people being subjected to the yoke. It also suggests a general sensitivity to the treatment of captives/the conquered in Visigothic Hispania in general. This sensitivity makes perfect sense when one considers Chindaswinth’s bloody ascent to the throne.

can be found in *Satisfactio*, 19-20. Dracontius' original shifts the guilt for the author's prior sinning on to God, reading: 'sic mea corda Deus, nostro peccante reatu/ temporis immodici, pellit ad illicita'.⁴⁷⁶ In so doing, Dracontius parallels himself with Pharaoh when his heart was hardened against the Israelites, thus giving a biblical pretext to the redirection of his guilt.⁴⁷⁷ This 'passing the buck', of course, was unacceptable to Eugenius both on a religious and a personal level.⁴⁷⁸ His redacted text reads: 'sic mea corda, Deus, lingua patrans reatum/ noxia culpa ligans traxit ad illicita.'⁴⁷⁹ Eugenius, then, both apologises to God for his sins, and takes the blame for his own actions, or at least shifts that blame to the Original Sin present in all people. This new wording fits well with Eugenius' other poetry and serves to imbue the redaction with the bishop's own personality. The updating of the text to Eugenius' own way of thinking, then, is another facet of redacting the text to its new cultural milieu. As before, however, there exists a counter-example. At *Satisfactio*, 214/184 in a passage telling of God's granting victories in distant lands and seas to the king who does not seek blood (Gunthamund in Dracontius, but only by vocative address and not by name), both poets write: 'Ansila testatur, Maurus ubique iacet'.⁴⁸⁰ Ansila, of course, is not a Visigothic general, but an otherwise unknown Vandalic one.⁴⁸¹ Perhaps Eugenius felt that the name was suitably generic enough (it appears

⁴⁷⁶ Translation: 'In this way God drives my heart to wrongful things, my guilty sinning of younger times.'

⁴⁷⁷ This parallel is suggested in the preceding two lines of the text.

⁴⁷⁸ This change could be counted amongst the theological ones as well, and serves to illustrate again the mixture of motivations present in any given difference.

⁴⁷⁹ Translation: 'In this way, O God, with my tongue bringing guilt to its completion, harmful binding guilt dragged my heart to unlawful things.'

⁴⁸⁰ The full passage runs from 211-214/181-184, and contains no differences between the editions.

⁴⁸¹ The *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* lists him as a possible Ostrogothic naval commander, based on solely on the passage here discussed, without any particular reason given for so doing. John Robert Martindale, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), II (AD 395-527), p. 93.

to be a standard Eastern Germanic masculine name) or that examples could just as easily be drawn from Vandal North Africa as from Visigothic Spain.⁴⁸² It is also perhaps possible that Eugenius retained this line to encourage such peaceful behaviour in his own monarch, who was known for rather the opposite. Whatever the reason, this line retains a piece of purely Vandalic material unaltered from the original. The general cultural update is nevertheless present throughout the redaction, and represents one of the most significant trends within it.

In addition to this more general cultural update, Eugenius also changes the treatment of kings and kingship in the texts, as both authors perceive this institution quite differently. The first of these differences involves the deletion of lines 35-36 from the redaction of the *Satisfactio*. The deleted couplet reads: 'Agricolam timuit post Parthica regna bubulcum/ summisitque pauens regia colla iugo'.⁴⁸³ Despite the rather anachronistic *Parthica*, these lines refer to the famous biblical king of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar. The famous story of Nebuchadnezzar, originally from Daniel 4 and quoted here in both versions, is that he went mad on account of his hubris and, for a period of time, became wild and, eating grass, lived like an animal. Both the original and the redaction retell this, including the eating of 'mala gramina pastus'.⁴⁸⁴ Dracontius, however, includes this passage about the king being submitted to the yoke, which is an extremely humiliating image, especially from a Roman perspective.⁴⁸⁵ For Dracontius, this image is perfectly fine, and he is

⁴⁸² It is also possible that Eugenius felt there were no Visigothic examples at hand and so kept this one, although several come to mind for the modern student of Visigothic Iberia.

⁴⁸³ Translation: 'After ruling the Parthians, he feared the farmer and the plowman/ and, being terrified, he submitted his royal neck to the yoke.'

⁴⁸⁴ *Satisfactio*, 37/33.

⁴⁸⁵ This Roman horror of being submitted to the yoke stems in part from memory of the Battle of the Caudine Forks in 321 BC described by Livy (9.5-6), in which the Samnites forced the defeated Roman army to march under a yoke made of their own spears. The

perfectly willing to describe Nebuchadnezzar in such terms, and his audience, presumably, to hear it. Not so for Eugenius. As far as he was concerned, the image of Nebuchadnezzar *sub iugum* had no place in a Visigothic context. While it is possible that Eugenius deleted this couplet to make the passage more biblically accurate, as Daniel does not mention a yoke, Dracontius' version actually expresses the Bible's emphasis on the humbling of Nebuchadnezzar much better, and more fully captures its spirit than the redaction.⁴⁸⁶ We must remember, however, that the whole enterprise of the redaction was to update a text which retold the brief account of the Creation found in Genesis in over 700 lines of hexameter: extra-biblical material was bound to make its way in. This suggests another motivation for this deletion. Eugenius considered the image of a king being submitted to the yoke, and the suggestion of his subsequent use as a plough animal, as unsuitable to the political and social context of mid-seventh-century Visigothic Spain. When one considers not only the frequent civil wars which historically plagued the Visigothic kingdom but also Chindaswinth's violent accession to the throne, this sensitivity is unsurprising. Eugenius' desire to shield the image of the king and to preserve royal dignity is interestingly in contrast to Dracontius' willingness to do the opposite. Both texts, after all, were specifically intended for a royal audience. This in turn suggests that the Vandal king Gunthamund was much more secure in his rule or at least that he conceived of his office as less sacral and lofty and rather more civic, more Roman. It may also suggest that at least the Roman subjects of the Vandal Kingdom saw their ruler as a 'first among equals'. It certainly tells us that Dracontius, at any rate, did

memory of this humiliation became a part of the general *Romanitas*. See the reference made above to *Satisfactio*, 133-136 for this as well.

⁴⁸⁶ The *Parthica* would also be biblically inaccurate, as Nebuchadnezzar was king of Babylon, not Parthia/Persia, but this is not likely Eugenius' principal motivation here.

not see the king as inviolable. This difference in perception is made even clearer by the changes at *Satisfactio*, 203-204/175-176. The couplet in Dracontius reads: ‘dicit “in arma pares fuimus cum principe” miles,/ “me pugnante” comes “victor ab hoste redit”’.⁴⁸⁷ The altered couplet in Eugenius reads: ‘dicit “in arma simul fuimus cum principe” miles/ “me pugnante” comes “victor ab hoste redit”’.⁴⁸⁸ While Dracontius firmly places the contribution of the individual soldier on par with that of the prince, Eugenius merely states that they fight together. For Eugenius, while the prince and his soldiers fight together, and the actual fighting is indeed done by the troops, the prince is nevertheless due most of the credit. For Dracontius, the credit is due equally to the common man as to his ruler. Here again, then, we see Eugenius placing the office of the monarch on a higher plane and treating it with greater reverence and dignity.

In addition to this increased sensitivity regarding the treatment of kings stands a different conception as regards the role of the king himself. This ideological difference is most clearly seen at *Satisfactio*, 154/130. In the *Satisfactio*, Dracontius endeavours to present a perception of kingship which revolves centrally around the importance of royal mercy, and Eugenius keeps this.⁴⁸⁹ One of the key passages

⁴⁸⁷ Translation: ‘The soldier says “we were equal in arms with the prince,/ with me fighting, as a companion/soldier, you come back a victor from the enemy”’.

⁴⁸⁸ The *comes* in the second line of the Eugenius could either be taken as referring to the *miles* in the first (as it is typically done in Dracontius, due to the second person verb) or taken as the subject of *redit*. If it were taken as the subject of *redit*, however, considering the seventh-century context, *comes* would either mean ‘companion’ (making the *princeps* the companion of the soldier?) or ‘count’, which would read oddly in light of the *princeps* of the previous line. I have thus read the second line *ad sensum*. Translation: ‘The soldier says “with the prince we were likewise in arms/ with me fighting, as a companion/soldier, he brought victory from the enemy”’.

⁴⁸⁹ The argument for this is more fully discussed in Mark Tizzoni. ‘Dracontius’ Poetry and the Politics of Vandal North Africa’, Paper presented at *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity*, 25 June 2011.

which present this ideology is found in lines 151-154. The two couplets in Dracontius, the latter of which is not strictly speaking grammatical, read:

Principis augusti simile est ad regna polorum,
 ut canit ad populos pagina sancta Dei,
 sacrilegis referens caelestia iura catervis
 cinctus apostolica discipulante manu.⁴⁹⁰

The political concept here is fairly clear: royal power is akin to divine power, but only when the king lives and rules by biblical teachings, serves to bring the people back to God and does so 'girt by the serving apostolic hand' as if it were spiritual armour.⁴⁹¹ This idea of being 'girded' by spiritual armour, of being 'equipped' by the apostolic hand portrays the king as leading under his own authority, but nevertheless with ecclesiastical/biblical support. Eugenius, however, changes both the first and last lines of this passage. His text reads as follows:

'Principis inperium simile est ad regna superna,
 ut canit ad populos pagina sancta Dei,
 sacrilegis referens caelestia iura catervis,
 vincus apostolica discipulante manu.'⁴⁹²

While the changes here are not very great at first glance, they make the meaning of the passage very much different. The changes in the first line do in fact make very little difference, except perhaps to somewhat clarify the language. The use of *vincus* for *cinctus*, however, shows us a very different perspective than that found in

⁴⁹⁰ Translation: 'The kingdom of the august prince is like the Kingdom of the Heavens,/ as the Holy Page of God sings to the peoples,/ when the prince brings back the celestial laws to the sacrilegious people,/ when he is girt by the serving apostolic hand.' This passage is also discussed above in a different context, pp. 122-126.

⁴⁹¹ This phrase is rather vague, but I tend to take it as meaning either perpetually 'surrounded' by the apostolic teaching of the New Testament, that is to say having one's actions bound by New Testament teachings (which focus on mercy and forgiveness) or as being supported and 'bound to' the Apostolic Church, which is to say acting in accordance with/in conjunction with the Church authorities. Probably the answer lies in both.

⁴⁹² Translation: 'The authority/rule of a prince is like unto the heavenly kingdom,/ as the Holy Page of God sings to the peoples,/ when the prince brings back the celestial laws to the sacrilegious people,/ having been bound/restrained by the serving apostolic hand.'

Dracontius. The king is still meant to follow biblical teachings and to lead the sinful people to God, as in Dracontius, but he is now meant to do so not ‘girded’ by the New Testament and the Apostolic Church but ‘fettered’ by it, ‘restrained’ by it. The concept of kingship espoused here is one fully dependent upon, and subordinate to, the Church and its teachings. The image here is not of a king acting with the support of the Church and in accordance with New Testament principles but of a king acting in accordance with the wishes of the Church wearing its principles not as armour, but as bonds. Eugenius, so we can see from this, viewed the monarchy perhaps as demanding respect, but nevertheless fully subordinate to the Church. While for Dracontius the good king, the good emperor, rules over all, for Eugenius the good prince is ruled by the Church. In the redaction, then, we not only see Eugenius changing things which he felt were no longer relevant or appropriate, but also changing things for his own personal reasons, to assert his own ideas into the text.

Related to the desire to make the text more apparently orthodox is Eugenius’ push for greater biblical accuracy. Eugenius’ additions to the text, which are located primarily in the *Hexaemeron*, bear witness to this especially well. The addition of lines 155-156 (which fall between lines 272 and 273) provide an excellent example. This altered passage revolves around the events of the fifth and sixth days of Creation. According to the biblical narrative, God created both the creatures of the sea and the birds of the air on the fifth day, and on the sixth created all the animals of the land, including the first man. Dracontius’ description of the sixth day, however, includes a long description of birds which carries on, virtually uninterrupted, from his discussion of them within the framework of the fifth day. The only separation between the two descriptions of birds in Dracontius, in fact, is his introduction to the sixth day. In this same passage, at line 255/137, Dracontius ascribes the bringing

forth of grains, grass and flowers to the sixth day. This event, however, occurred on the fourth day. Now, certainly Dracontius, who did actually know the relevant biblical passage well, simply took poetic licence in this section: if the plants were created on the fourth day, and birds on the fifth, then both existed together on the sixth. This allowed him to create nice comparative imagery between the two.⁴⁹³ Yet, it does stretch the biblical passage perhaps a little bit too far. Eugenius, certainly, felt that it did. To remedy the perceived fault, Eugenius cut the ‘*sexta dies*’ from line 255/137, replaced it with ‘*ipsa dies*’, and added two new lines further down. The new lines, which introduce the sixth day in fine Late Antique style, do so after the passage regarding the birds. Eugenius’ redaction, then, keeps the two bird descriptions together in one piece and places the opening of the sixth day after it, so as to make the passage more accurate to and more in keeping with the biblical original.⁴⁹⁴ The addition of a description of the seventh day at the end of the *Hexaemeron* also fits into Eugenius’ efforts at making the texts more biblically accurate. The addition at the end of the text begins with six monostichs recapitulating the first six days, and then proceeds to describe the seventh in twenty-seven lines of hexameter, in keeping with the rest of the poem, followed by a final couplet addressing God. As part of this description, Eugenius outlines, at the end of the passage, an analogy between the six days of Creation and the six ages of man, with the final day, and age, being ‘rest’, that is, death. The added ending, overall, is a nice, succinct little homily on the allegory of Creation as well as the redeeming work

⁴⁹³ An opportunity which he uses heavily in the lines 255-269.

⁴⁹⁴ A number of other changes also come into this, some of which are dependent upon the additional lines, and some of which are not. It should be noted that it would be difficult to see the source of this change in a manuscript corruption, as the original line introducing the sixth day remains in the redaction in altered form, and the new introduction, which refers to the Sun as Phoebus, fits the new text well and has logical reasoning behind it, and could not possibly have existed in the original text (as it would have been absurdly redundant).

of Christ. On the surface it does not tell us much, other than the important fact that Eugenius clearly valued the didactic element of poetry over the others. When one considers the passage in more depth, however, it also shows us something else about both Eugenius and Dracontius. Eugenius added the passage because he felt that any versification of the story of Creation must contain all of the story, the seventh day, the day of rest, included. This shows Eugenius handling the biblical material quite literally, and striving for biblical accuracy. Yet, it also raises the question: why did Dracontius leave out the seventh day? The reason for this omission is actually very poetic. The seventh day, the Sabbath, was outlined by Genesis as the day of rest, as God undertook no new work that day. To show this, and to wholly grasp the idea of resting from one's labours as God so rested, Dracontius simply let his pen rest on the seventh day as well. His lack of inclusion of the seventh day, then, is wholly intentional, and bears witness to a bright, creative and rather playful mind. Eugenius, however, either did not understand Dracontius' sleight of hand here, or simply disapproved of it. What this shows us is, in effect, that Eugenius was a much more prosaic thinker than Dracontius. Eugenius' prosaic thought actually forms a vital element of his own poetry, which will be discussed in the following chapter.

iii.c. The Matter of Metre and Rhyme

There are other trends to be found in the redaction and many more differences which could be mentioned, but the examples discussed above and the trends which they illustrate give us a fairly comprehensive picture of the effort as a whole, and are the most important when investigating the text for insights into the cultural contexts within which it existed, both in its original form and as a redaction. There remains, however, one last important aspect of the redaction which we must now discuss: the

matter of metre and rhyme.⁴⁹⁵ In the *Satisfactio*, Dracontius' scansion is accurate with respect to the Classical norms practised by his sources.⁴⁹⁶ The same, however, is not entirely true of Eugenius.⁴⁹⁷ Now, as already stated above, the lines without differences in them, and even more so the lines without substantial ones, far outnumber those with differences. For the most part, therefore, Eugenius' scansion matches that of Dracontius. The metrical changes occur only when Eugenius makes substantial changes to the text in front of him. Such changes can indeed be seen in *Satisfactio*, 1, discussed above. Dracontius' line scans perfectly well. When Eugenius places *auctor* into the position originally held by *cunctorum*, however, the scansion fails, as the line reads: *rēx aēt|ērně Dē|ūs, aūct|ōr rēct|ōrquē sēr|ēnuš*, the problem here being that, in the original, the final syllable of *Deus* was made long by the initial 'c' of *cunctorum*, but with the removal of the second consonant, the spondee becomes an iamb. Although it violates the Classical rules of quantity, this lengthening of the final 'us' actually occurs quite frequently in Eugenius. Another example of this from the *Satisfactio* occurs at line 246/215, in which Eugenius turns

⁴⁹⁵ The present discussion differs from Reinwald. For his discussion of *res metricae*, see Reinwald, pp. 58-66.

⁴⁹⁶ For the Classical norms of quantity see Basil L. Gildersleeve and G. Lodge, *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar*, reprint of 3rd edn (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2000), pp. 445-452 and John Percival Postgate, *Prosodia latina: an introduction to classical Latin verse* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923) especially pp. 1-66. One of the only peculiarities of Dracontius' quantity is his treatment of final 'o' which he employs as both long and short as demanded by the metre, which is indeed a general facet of Late Latin prosody (Gildersleeve, p. 448). While it is prevalent in Dracontius, it is also seen to a lesser extent in his contemporary Luxorius (Morris Rosenblum, *Luxorius: a Latin Poet among the Vandals* [New York: Columbia University, 1961], pp. 92-93). Dracontius does possess a few other metrical ticks, but he is, in general, much more accurate than his contemporary Luxorius (for his errors, see Rosenblum, pp. 85-96). Luxorius' use of quantity rather more closely approaches that of Eugenius.

⁴⁹⁷ Eugenius certainly knew the Classical norms, however, as his successor Julian of Toledo wrote an *Ars Grammatica* which laid out the correct use of quantity in Latin verse. Julian frequently uses Eugenius as an example, and while his work likely points out the necessity of teaching quantity (instead of it being something inherently known by Latin speakers), it also shows us that learned knowledge of quantitative conventions was well established in mid-seventh-century Toledo. Eugenius must be viewed as being within this context. For Julian, see Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, pp. 97-98.

a pentameter line into a hexameter.⁴⁹⁸ Dracontius' original, which employs elision, scans perfectly well. Eugenius', on the other hand, contains two errors. His line reads: *dāmnā vēl| aūgmēt|ǎ rēb|ūs ēlēm|ēntǎ dēd|ērūnt*. Here again we see a final 'us' employed as though it were long in the fourth foot. We also see another recurring feature of Eugenius' scansion: non-ablative final 'a' treated as long, which again violates the Classical rules. This treatment of final 'a' also occurs at *Satisfactio*, 69/63, which reads, in the redaction: *mātērī|ǎ fērr|ī sīmpl|ēx ēt n|ōxīǎ c|ōnstāt*.⁴⁹⁹ At *Satisfactio*, 49/45 Eugenius likewise treats a final 'et' as long, even though it is not followed by a consonant. All three of these non-Classical lengthenings can be found throughout the *Hexaemeron*.⁵⁰⁰ In the *Hexaemeron* there are three examples each of the non-ablative long final 'a', the long final 'us', and the long final syllable ending in 't' followed by a vowel.⁵⁰¹ In the *Hexaemeron* one also finds final 'e' as long, again in contravention of Classical norms.⁵⁰² This error occurs only once in the Dracontian original.⁵⁰³ All of these errors found in both the *Satisfactio* and the *Hexaemeron* are pronounced in Eugenius' verse preface and in

⁴⁹⁸ The alteration of this line was necessitated by the placement of an additional line of pentameter at line 214 of the redaction, which in accordance with the 'domino effect' described above required this line to be converted into hexameter.

⁴⁹⁹ *Materia* here is nominative singular, and should thus be short. This difference also provides us with an example of the changes not making any actual difference: both texts mean the same thing, except that the Eugenic version *might* be conceived of as slightly clearer, because of the first-declension form.

⁵⁰⁰ Only the lengthening of final 'us' occurs in the Dracontian original, and that only twice in the whole text of Book I. The first is at line 293/177, and the second at 361/245, neither of which Eugenius changes. 293/177 lengthens the final 'us' on *Deus* as witnessed also in Eugenius, and line 361/245 has the metre fairly well mangled at the second and third feet. The *Dēūs* in line 293/177 could perhaps be seen as a model for Eugenius' use.

⁵⁰¹ For 'a' these are at lines 152/36, 162/46, and 490/372; for 'us' lines 357/241, 402/286, and 436/318. For final 't' followed by a vowel the three lines are 357/241, 386/270, and 719/600.

⁵⁰² These examples of long final 'e' occur at 430/312, 568/450, 735/616 and 737/618.

⁵⁰³ Line 737/618; it is shared with the redaction.

his additional summation of the seventh day of Creation.⁵⁰⁴ All of this tells us immediately two things. Firstly, Eugenius has a tendency to elongate syllables which were considered short in Classical Latin and, while this can be seen as just beginning in Dracontius, its development is much more advanced in his redactor. Secondly, when considered in light of the redaction as a whole, these trends, while they do exist, are not by any stretch the norm. That there are only eighteen lines that do not scan out of the many that are changed show us that Eugenius, like Dracontius, was well able to create verse that scanned correctly. Eugenius' occasional tendency to elongate short vowels certainly could bear witness to a decreased awareness of quantity, and the general breakdown of that poetic system. While there is doubtless some truth to this, the fact that he gets it right more often than not when he changes the text before him suggests another explanation might be better. It is not that Eugenius does not know metre and quantity, but rather that it is more fluid in his time, or that he feels himself less bound to its strictures. What the scansion of the redaction shows us for certain, however, is that Eugenius both knew the rules of Latin quantity and versification and also that he sometimes broke them.⁵⁰⁵ For

⁵⁰⁴ The addition at the end contains three such errors as have already been discussed, and the verse preface is indeed riddled with them (one quarter of its lines do not scan correctly). While Eugenius himself describes the seventh-day addition as being in 'pedestri sermone', which would usually indicate prose, it does nevertheless appear to be in dactylic hexameters. In truth, dactylic hexameters are really only fairly slightly removed from the rhythms of prose; bad ones even less so.

⁵⁰⁵ It is worth quoting here, and discussing, Wright's comments on quantitative poetry: 'The production of metric Latin poetry on the original quantitative basis is a *recherché* pursuit of the learned, an esoteric accomplishment of antiquarians, and has been so ever since the quantitative distinctions ceased to have any counterpart in ordinary speech. The existence of a few early medieval quantitative verses cannot be taken as evidence that phonemic length persisted in the speech of their composers any more than it is evidence of phonemic length in the speech of nineteenth-century scholars who also dabbled in the same pastime; it has to be seen now, as then, as the symptom of a sophisticated education system.' *Late Latin and Early Romance*, p. 67. This is indeed true, and is an important factor to consider in any discussion of Eugenius' use (or misuse) of quantity. What we must consider in the present discussion, however, is not whether this reflected actual speech patterns (which, if modern

anything else, we must look for confirmation in his independent works which will be discussed in the following chapter.

The last aspect of how Eugenius redacted the texts which we must concern ourselves with here involves changes in poetic style, especially as regards the use of rhyme, assonance and alliteration. Yet, while these are vital aspects of the Late Antique poetic enterprise, they all possess one shared and fairly significant difficulty in that they all ultimately depend upon pronunciation.⁵⁰⁶ There are certain aspects of pronunciation which we can be relatively certain of, as outlined by Roger Wright and Dag Norberg, but it is ultimately very difficult to know any of them for certain, and even more difficult to know how closely Eugenius and Dracontius were adhering to them.⁵⁰⁷ Rhythmic poetry has historically served as a source of information to determine pronunciation, and Norberg even used the quantitative poetry of Eugenius himself to support his arguments.⁵⁰⁸ This, of course, makes investigating pronunciation in poetry very difficult, as one runs the risk of entering into a circular argument quite quickly. As the full discussion of pronunciation and its correlative implications is beyond the scope of the present thesis, it is perhaps best if

poetry and musical lyrics are anything to judge by, they most certainly did not) but rather the cultural relevance of not only utilizing an archaic system of prosody, but also of not following its conventions strictly. It is this last factor, and not his pronunciation, that tells us the most about Eugenius' perception of the art of poetry and of the culture which he participated in.

⁵⁰⁶ While many in the past have regarded the quantitative verse of Late Antiquity as a fully elite and intellectual activity with no connection to the common Latin of its given contexts, Wright convincingly argues against this perception testifying rather to a shared common pronunciation between quantitative poetry, rhythmic poetry, hagiography, documentary texts, and even Isidore of Seville himself. *Late Latin and Early Romance*, pp. 71-72. The same is also argued by Dag Norberg, *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale*, *Studia Latina Stockholmiensia* 5 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958), pp. 46-48. Another problem exists in the difficulty of assessing any Late Latin verse in this way, and Norberg is entirely correct when he writes: 'Il est évidemment impossible de formuler des règles de prosodie qui seraient généralement valables pour la poésie quantitative au Moyen Age.' Norberg, p. 7.

⁵⁰⁷ See Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, pp. 71-78 for discussion of the pronunciation of vowels and syllables in Visigothic Spain.

⁵⁰⁸ Norberg, p. 48.

the investigation of these poetic tools be confined to cases in which the techniques are most clearly seen.⁵⁰⁹ Before embarking on this discussion, however, we must first look briefly at the use of these three literary techniques (rhyme, assonance and alliteration) in the Classical canon. Both assonance and alliteration were relatively common in Classical verse.⁵¹⁰ Early Latin verse employed alliteration quite heavily, and, as L. P. Wilkinson states, it was only Vergil who began 'to use alliteration with artistic restraint'.⁵¹¹ Assonance also represents a consistent feature of Classical verse. Yet, the Classical aesthetic strongly favoured moderation, and excessive uses of both alliteration and assonance were condemned.⁵¹² Rhyme too was a normal feature of Classical verse, but again, only in moderation.⁵¹³ In fact, rhyme occurs with approximately a thirty-percent frequency in the corpus of Classical poetry.⁵¹⁴ While many scholars have historically argued that intentional rhyme was rare in Classical verse, there actually exist perceivable patterns which point strongly towards its thoroughly intentional use.⁵¹⁵ Principal among these patterns was the rhyming of syntactically related words, with the relationships, in order of frequency, being

⁵⁰⁹ This is to say that, rather than arguing for the similar pronunciation of, for example, 'as' and 'es', this investigation will focus only on rhyme and assonance which involved orthographically identical phonemes, as this strikes the present author as being the most secure footing for the current analysis.

⁵¹⁰ *Aeneid*, 1.8 provides us with a fairly good example of both: 'Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso'.

⁵¹¹ L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 26.

⁵¹² Such an example of excess can be found in the famously unfortunate verse of Cicero: 'O fortunatam natam me consule Romam' found at Juvenal, 10.122. Despite this condemnation, the tolerance for assonance and alliteration in a single line of Latin could actually be quite high by modern standards. Norberg, representing the traditional view of Classical poetry, disagrees with Wilkinson's take on assonance in Classical verse, and places the beginning of its acceptance rather with Sedulius: 'L'assonance qui, chez les poètes antérieurs, était une exception, devient chez Sedulius une tendance consciente et tangible et se retrouve dans un grand nombre de ses vers.' Norberg, p. 38.

⁵¹³ Wilkinson, p. 32-34.

⁵¹⁴ W. M. Clarke, 'Intentional Rhyme in Vergil and Ovid', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 103 (1972), 49-77 (p. 66).

⁵¹⁵ Clarke, p. 50 and throughout.

attribute-noun, noun-attribute, and between agreeing verbs.⁵¹⁶ Yet, there are a number of examples to be found where such internal rhymes are avoided.⁵¹⁷ Keeping these factors in mind, then, we can now investigate our own texts.

Rhyme, principally internal rhyme, occurs occasionally throughout the verse of Dracontius. In the original *Satisfactio*, there are only twenty-two lines which include internal rhyme and twenty-two with consecutive rhyme.⁵¹⁸ The overall percentage, then, is actually significantly lower than the Classical norm, with only fourteen percent of the lines having rhyme. In the redaction, thirty-one lines have internal rhyme and only fourteen consecutive, which together total only about twenty-one percent of the text and place the text well below the Classical norm. If one were to count rhyme represented by the pronunciation systems suggested by Wright and Norberg, Dracontius' figures would still be well below the Classical norm, but Eugenius' fairly well match it. When internal rhyme does occur, however, it tends to be fairly prominent. The poem's second line provides the first example (found in both): 'quem tremit omne solum, qui regis igne polum'. *Satisfactio*, 60/54, which is the same in both versions, furnishes us with another example: 'humida cum siccis, ignea cum gelidis'. The dual internal rhyme in this line, coupled with the repetition of *cum*, serves to rhetorically parallel the conflicting ideas of the line. In neither line, however, are the words in grammatical agreement, and these lines do not fit the typical Classical practice. *Satisfactio*, 70/64 provides another example: 'impious inde nocet, rusticus inde placet'. While otherwise identical in form to the

⁵¹⁶ Clarke, p. 62-64. Nevertheless, in twenty percent of internal-rhyme instances, the words are not syntactically related. Clarke, p. 64.

⁵¹⁷ Wilkinson, p. 33-34.

⁵¹⁸ This number is limited to orthographically identical word-endings; if the number were expanded to include all probable rhyme with consideration to the pronunciation set down by Wright and Norberg, the number would be considerably higher. This applies to Dracontius as well as Eugenius.

first, this example fits better, although not perfectly, with the Classical norm by rhyming the verbs. *Satisfactio*, 79/73 provides us an hexameter example: ‘nubibus aggestis pluviae nix grando pruinae’. The only syntactical relationship between these words is that they are both subjects of the verb in the next line. This too does not fit the Classical norm. These lines do, however, give us Dracontius’ general practice as regards rhyme: general avoidance, but when it is employed, it trends away from the traditional Classical norms. What we see in Eugenius’ redaction is only slightly different. On several occasions, Eugenius introduces internal rhyme. *Satisfactio*, 1, already discussed above, provides one example: ‘Rex aeternae Deus, auctor rectorque serenus’. This line nearly accords with the noun-attribute rhyme common to Classical verse, but does not quite. Eugenius also introduces rhyme at line 8/6: ‘noster semper eris, qui es modo vel fueris’. This does keep within the Classical norms. Such also is the change at 12/10: ‘effingisque bonis candida corda viris’. This rhyme fits the attribute-noun pattern. This closer adherence to Classical norms is, in fact, Eugenius’ standard practice throughout this text, at least as regards rhyme. Eugenius even produces a line which would fit in nicely with the excessive verses sometimes found in the older Latin poets: ‘econtra adversa probrosa maligna inhonesta’.⁵¹⁹ Eugenius actually has a much stronger penchant for internal rhyme as many of the lines which he changes substantially are indeed changed so as to contain it. In terms of assonance and alliteration, however, both authors keep well within the Classical poetic norms and they employ it much the same as their predecessors.

Taking into consideration the caveat of dealing with this kind of evidence, this difference in usage still has one particularly important implication. As discussed in the previous chapter, Dracontius, while working within the continuous Classical

⁵¹⁹ Line 15 in the redaction.

tradition, felt free to violate Classical rules when he saw fit. This, as argued above, was the result of his perception of himself as a participant in one and the same culture as Vergil and Ovid themselves participated in. Just as they were allowed to innovate and write to their time, so Dracontius felt himself able to innovate and write to his. Eugenius, however, created rhyme by the book, and generally followed the normal patterns he saw in the Classical canon. This, of course, would at first seem to contradict the evidence of the metre. In terms of quantity Dracontius favoured conformity with the Classical canon and Eugenius comparative licence; in terms of rhyme, it is exactly the opposite. What this most likely shows is a difference in priorities between the two authors. Dracontius, attempting to keep his verse elevated in a period when non-Classical rhythmic verse was becoming ever more popular, avoided the rhyme associated with that genre and focused his attention on quantity. Eugenius, not feeling such constraints and himself imbued with both quantitative and rhythmic verse, favoured the memorable cadence of internal rhyme over quantitative concerns as syllable length had long since ceased to be a prominent feature of spoken Latin. This concern on Dracontius' part again shows him as part of the Classical tradition, but it also shows us that Dracontius felt that tradition to be under threat. Eugenius, on the other hand, shows us a scholarly approach to poetry: not worried about the influence of rhythmic verse, he brought Classical rhyme back into the piece. Yet, by putting errors into the quantity, it also shows us both that those rules had been eroded by his time, and that he did not consider syllable length to be as crucial a part of the poetic enterprise as his predecessors had. The presence of these two factors in the redaction suggests that Eugenius possessed a different perception of the poetic art than did Dracontius: this, however, must be confirmed in his original works.

iii.d. How?: In Conclusion

All of the examples discussed above serve to give us a solid impression of Eugenius' method in redacting Dracontius' texts. The general effect of all the changes was, indeed, to update Dracontius' originals to Eugenius' own Visigothic context. The four categories of differences discussed, orthographic changes, lexical and morphological changes, deletions, and additions, effectively account for all the alterations found in the redaction. The metrical implications of the changes serve alongside the differences themselves to give us a fuller picture of the work of the redaction. Looking solely at the textual evidence from a cultural viewpoint, we see the work of Eugenius' redaction, for redaction it is, moving down several different avenues. Firstly, Eugenius updated Dracontius' Latin to that of his own time and place. For the most part, these alterations were not terribly great, and focused primarily on partially updating the texts' original orthography to seventh-century Visigothic norms, but also involved a perceived clarification of Dracontius' Latin itself. Secondly, there were literary concerns which closely shadow those of Dracontius' original enterprise. This particularly involved the use of *loci similes* which both authors use in essentially the same way. Thirdly, Eugenius corrected any material which could be viewed as biblically inaccurate. This attempt at increasing biblical accuracy involved lexical changes, and both textual deletions and additions. The end result of this trend, while producing sometimes a more prosaic text, was to bring the overall poem more strictly into keeping with its biblical sources. This shows a shift in priorities and indeed mindset between the two authors. Fourthly, and related to the previous point, Eugenius corrected any material which might be suggestive of heterodox theological positions. He was not generally correcting material for its perceived 'Arianism' as none existed in the original due to

Dracontius' own striving for Trinitarian orthodoxy. He was, however, eliminating any material which could possibly speak to the theological concerns of seventh-century Visigothic Hispania, especially as regarded conflict with Jewish thought. This attests the presence of a strong cultural sensitivity to heresy in Eugenius' Visigothic society. Fifthly, and again connected with the previous point, we see Eugenius bringing the text more closely into line with his own cultural context. This required not only eliminating peculiarly Vandalic material, but also updating the ideology and thought underlying the originals to their new Visigothic context. As we have seen, this particularly involved sensitivities regarding kingship and the perception of that institution itself. In addition to these rather more theoretical trends we see also a very practical one: the desire to eliminate redundancy. This desire seems to have been specifically aimed at redundant passages, rather than redundant word choice. Interconnected to all of these avenues of change, we find the domino effect: changes beget other changes. Taken together, these different trends or avenues show us fairly comprehensively 'how' Eugenius actually redacted the work. In reading the text, he held certain areas of concern in his mind, and when he found words, phrases, or indeed passages, which ran counter to his thought, he changed them. The trends we have here seen bear witness to several of the areas of concern Eugenius had when he redacted the texts. That there are inconsistencies tell us both that he did indeed wish to change only what he felt absolutely necessary, and also that he did not apply these avenues as rubrics, but rather looked at each line and contemplated the material within it independently. That there are trends at all shows us that he was indeed redacting, and not merely editing, and that there were several particular cultural concerns which weighed on his mind, and that, when he saw them in the text, he felt they needed to be expunged. It is in this way that the differences in

the redaction provide us with a mirror on mid-seventh-century Visigothic Hispania, and indeed also on late-fifth-century Vandal North Africa.

iv. How and Why: the Implications of the Redaction

When studying the redaction closely, it becomes apparent that the descriptions of the work by Eugenius and Ildefonsus are both accurate and inaccurate. Firstly, it must always be remembered that the differences are far outweighed by that which remains the same. In the grand scheme of things, the texts match up quite closely. This has led some scholars to view Eugenius' work as a mere edition rather than a redaction.⁵²⁰ Yet, the changes are indeed significant, and the fact that there are observable trends within them, shows not the work of a mere editor, but rather that of a true redactor. This closeness between the two versions strongly argues against the view that the text from which Eugenius worked was badly mutilated. His manuscript may well have been missing the final lines of the *Satisfactio* and the initial ones of the *De Laudibus Dei*, as this is difficult to disprove and remains indeed the most likely explanation for their absence from the redaction.

Nevertheless, excluding these possible omissions, the text of Dracontius which Eugenius was working from must actually have been fairly good. Otherwise, the similarities could only be explained by sheer coincidence, or an uncanny ability on Eugenius' part to predict the original readings. This tells us that the baseness of the original manuscript as spoken of by our primary sources was rather overstated. Considering the nature of prefaces, this is not in the least surprising.

What then of Eugenius' other three stated reasons for the redaction? The first of these, one will recall, was the correction of mistakes. This correction included

⁵²⁰ Langlois, p. 808.

both the elimination of redundancy and the expunging of perceived errors. As we have seen, the removal of redundancy, principally in terms of statements rather than of word choice, was a conspicuous trend in the redaction. This, then, matches perfectly. The removal of perceived errors was rather more complex. Partly, this involved the correction of Dracontius' Latin into Eugenius' own. As we have seen, the results here varied, and not all changes were improvements. This correction of errors also involved the alteration of passages seen as being biblically inaccurate. In the text, we do indeed see Eugenius making changes which attempt to rectify both of these aspects of 'perceived errors'. Eugenius' second line of approach in redacting the texts was to correct 'poor' or 'weak' lines and lines which had no entertainment or didactic function. In essence, Eugenius bore out this theoretical approach in several ways. Firstly, he adapted the text to his own context, the specifically Vandalic lines being 'of no value'. Secondly, he added more internal rhyme to the text, to make the verse 'stronger', leastwise to the values of his own literary culture. Thirdly, this included the further introduction of *loci similes* into the text. Yet, in terms of actual stylistically 'weak' lines, Eugenius does little to fix the problems, and indeed frequently adds his own 'weak' and obscure lines. In the correction of 'weak' and 'poor' lines, then, Eugenius was either only partially successful, or rather meant to indicate something else by this phrase. A likely candidate for what this euphemism indicated is the third line of emendation: theological corrections. This line was clearly of great importance to Eugenius, and he made great efforts to bring it to fruition. In this we see again the emphasis on biblical accuracy, but also we see the removal of any material which could, in any way, be considered heterodox. In this avenue, Eugenius was highly successful. It should also be noted that, allowing

for some exaggeration as to the original task, all of these facets of the redaction fit perfectly with Ildefonsus' summation.⁵²¹

Taken together, these trends have several important implications for the culture of mid-seventh-century Visigothic Hispania. Firstly we see, as was the case with Avitus of Vienne at the time of Dracontius, that Eugenius feels the most important aspect of poetry is its ability to teach, and more especially to teach the orthodox Christian faith. Secondly, we see that there were palpable cultural differences between Eugenius' Hispania and Dracontius' North Africa. One of these, interestingly, was a greater sensitivity on Eugenius' part to possible heterodox material. One would normally expect heresy, especially Arianism, to have been a major concern for the cultural elites of Vandal North Africa, who were largely drawn from the orthodox Roman population subject to the Arian Vandals. Certainly, Dracontius included no Arian material and always strived to be solidly Trinitarian, but not with any great intensity. Eugenius, on the other hand, was very concerned with heresy, and excluded a number of perfectly acceptable words, phrases, and even a *locus similis*, on the grounds of the mere possible suggestion of heresy. This really shows us two things. Firstly, when literature became ever more the preserve of clerics, it became ever more concerned with theological matters. Dracontius was indeed one of the last great secular writers of Antiquity, and even he is very much concerned with theological matters. Once literature became the sole preserve of clerics, the final shift away from secular concerns was complete. This theologically driven and fully Christianized verse became the norm for the rest of the early-

⁵²¹ That is, of course, to exclude the initial motivation for the project, which Ildefonsus places solely on Eugenius.

medieval period, until the rebirth of 'secular' verse in the high middle ages.⁵²²

Secondly, this does indeed show a heightened sensitivity to heterodoxy in Visigothic Hispania. One would expect a certain level of unease due to that polity's Arian past, but this sensitivity seems mostly to be directed not at Arianism, but at the influence of Jewish thought. This concern over Jewish theology displays in literature what was shown in the proceedings of the Visigothic Church Councils and in many of the royal law codes. Another difference to which the redaction bears witness is the perception of kingship. Dracontius, imbued with *Romanitas* and possessing the traditional Roman mindset, did not have any particular qualms about degrading the monarchy by depicting a king being placed under the yoke. Even when writing directly to his own monarch, Dracontius still felt no qualms about the image of a king forcibly humbled. This nonchalance about standing in the face of one's ruler was, in actual fact, quite Roman.⁵²³ Eugenius, on the other hand, cut any reference to the base treatment of kings, and indeed places them on a higher plane than their subjects. Despite this difference, Eugenius was perfectly content with Dracontius' emphasis on royal mercy, and both authors agreed fully on this matter. Yet, Eugenius again differs from his predecessor in asserting that kings should not only bow to Christian teaching and the Church, as Dracontius does, but be subject to it. This is not particularly surprising considering Eugenius' role as the Archbishop of Toledo.

⁵²² There are, of course, some exceptions to this, such as the Waltharius poem. That notwithstanding, the poetic enterprise did, in general, take on a much more 'staunchly' Christian tone, and this is certainly true of the poems written in the high Latin tradition. These less-Christianised poems frequently came from either the 'low' tradition, such as represented by the later *Carmina burana*, or stemmed from the Germanic tradition, such as *Waltharius*. Yet, one should also note the strong Christian elements present, for example, in *Beowulf*.

⁵²³ Albeit rather extreme; the *Historia Augusta*, for example, bears witness to this mindset.

Yet, these differences are also complemented by similarities. While there are differences in the poetic style of the two pieces, both are generally in keeping with the Classical tradition. Eugenius follows it more closely, and, as seen above, this is suggestive. The overall style of both versions matches the other works of Late Antiquity and those indeed of the Classical canon. One must also remember that there are strong similarities between the texts, and that Eugenius, on the whole, felt that most of the text was still relevant. The most important similarity, from a cultural point of view, is Eugenius' continuity in the use of *loci similes*. In many ways, Eugenius continues to reference other works in the same method employed by Dracontius. In fact, Eugenius adds many of his own *loci similes* on top of those already found in the original. Yet, he sometimes also deletes them. This shows, at least to some extent, that Dracontius and Eugenius employed the same literary methods. The picture the redaction gives, then, is not one of complete and total cultural change and discontinuity. Nevertheless, the evidence here remains somewhat limited, and we must now seek confirmation in Eugenius' own independent, original works.

3: Eugenius and his Original Poetry: Between Originality and Classical Tradition

As we have seen, then, the image of seventh-century Visigothic culture given by Eugenius' redaction of Dracontius is an interesting picture of a culture undergoing, and having undergone, significant changes from its fifth-century North African predecessor. Yet, it is also an image of continuity and preservation. It is an image, nevertheless, that is incomplete. The nature of the redaction itself meant that much of Dracontius' culture and mindset was preserved in the new texts: the works, after all, are still mostly the same. To attain a fuller picture of Eugenius' own culture and mindset, and to more fully compare and contrast them with Dracontius', and thus better understand the cultural shifts which took place between the two, we must look at Eugenius' own independent works.⁵²⁴ Ultimately, it is in the interplay between tradition and originality within those works that these answers lie.

To study the independent works of Eugenius, we can employ the same techniques used in the analysis of the works of Dracontius undertaken previously. This must involve, as it did before, looking at both the methods, and methodology, involved in the composition of the poems and also at the nature of the poems themselves. As with Dracontius, the analysis of Eugenius' poetic method and compositional methodology will centre principally upon his use of *loci similes*. In order to discern the nature of Eugenius' verse, however, we must take a step back.

⁵²⁴ The present investigation will discuss all of the poetry passed down which can be reliably attributed to Eugenius himself. This approach would exclude only the poems which Vollmer considered *dubia et spuria* and which can be found edited, as the work of an anonymous Visigothic noble, by Nicolò Messina in his *Speculum per un nobile visigoto*. Carmen Codoñer (in her 'The Poetry of Eugenius of Toledo') limited herself to what she saw as Eugenius' 'important poetic works', which excluded all poems perceived of as 'scholastic poems or school exercises' as well as 'simply exercises in versification' (p. 325). While Codoñer considered this approach as being the fairest to Eugenius, the present author sees value in the shorter scholastic/school-room exercises and believes that these poems must be considered alongside the loftier ones, as both groups form a corpus that appears, for all intents and purposes, to be an intentional collection of poetry.

We must look for the general trends and ideas within the works in conjunction with the close details. This will allow us not only to shed some light on the mind that conceived these poems, but will also show us how that mind, Eugenius' mind, perceived the art of poetry. To conclude this chapter, as well as the rest of this Part, we must look at the implications of Eugenius' original poems, in light of the redaction, both in terms of practical method and cultural mindset.

Before embarking on this investigation, however, we must first briefly address the modern historiography of Eugenius' poetry. Generally speaking, relatively little ink has been spent on Eugenius. Historically, Eugenius' poetic corpus has been viewed in one of two ways. The first of these, and the more traditional, was to see the poems essentially as debased, deficient and decadent medieval scribbling utterly broken from the Classical past. Such was the opinion of Raby, who felt that Eugenius' 'verses, with their metrical faults, their barbarism of phrase, their poverty of content, their characteristics of acrostic, telestich, and epanalepsis, illustrate the declining culture of the seventh century' and who considered his 'sense of the antique tradition' to be 'inferior to that of the Carolingians'.⁵²⁵ Vollmer also appears to have shared this view, as his paltry list of *loci similes* makes Eugenius' verse appear almost entirely disjointed from that which came before it. The other traditional view, which was in a way connected to the first, was that Eugenius was essentially a slave to the older traditions, and confined himself to a sad imitation of the *Anthologia Latina*.⁵²⁶ Certainly, Raby saw Eugenius as travelling along well-worn paths.⁵²⁷ These overtly negative traditional views of Eugenius stem, in large part, from the Classical bias of those who historically studied Late Antique literature.

⁵²⁵ Raby, *Christian Latin Poetry*, p. 127 (with note 6).

⁵²⁶ Codoñer, 'The Poetry of Eugenius of Toledo', pp. 324-325 with references.

⁵²⁷ Raby, *Secular Latin Poetry*, I, 150.

Yet, even after his blanket condemnation of Eugenius, Raby thought that he saw something else, something new in his verses: a ‘new note’, a ‘new feeling’.⁵²⁸

Over the last forty years, Eugenic scholarship has tended to focus on this ‘new note’ and ‘new feeling’. The most important scholars on Eugenius have been Carmen Codoñer Merino and Paulo Farmhouse Alberto. Both of these scholars have emphasised Eugenius’ originality. In her 1981 article ‘The Poetry of Eugenius of Toledo’, Codoñer argued convincingly not only for Eugenius’ original thought and expression, but for his desire to break through the traditional stereotypes even while preserving the traditional rhetorical forms. Alberto has argued for Eugenius’ originality in a similar vein. In his study on *carmen* 101, Alberto shows Eugenius both working in the received Classical and Late Antique tradition and breaking forth from it.⁵²⁹ These scholars have rightly called into question the traditional assessments of Eugenius, and have, in turn, given him a place at the beginning of the Medieval poetic tradition. Yet, while ground-breaking, their work focused principally upon the ‘important’, or, as they are termed here, the ‘longer’ poems of Eugenius. The shorter poems, or epigrammata, remain relatively neglected. The present chapter seeks to elucidate in greater detail this struggle between tradition and originality in the works of Eugenius, pointed out by both Codoñer and Alberto, not only in light of the epigrammata, but in light of the Dracontian redaction as well.

⁵²⁸ Raby, *Secular Latin Poetry*, I, p.151.

⁵²⁹ Paulo Farmhouse Alberto, ‘Originality and Poetic Tradition in Visigothic Spain: the Summer according to Eugenius of Toledo’, *Euphrosyne: revista de filologia clàssica*, 31 (2003), pp. 349-356. It should also be noted that the most recent, and best, edition of Eugenius is the work of Alberto.

i. Eugenius' Poetic Method: the Evidence of the *Loci Similes*

One of the most intriguing facets of Eugenius' poetry, and one which has often been either missed or misrepresented by scholars, is the sheer variety and richness of the poet's source material.⁵³⁰ As we have already witnessed in the works of Dracontius, Eugenius employs a wide range of sources pulled from both the Classical and Late Antique past, both pagan and Christian, and from the Bible and Christian exegesis. Eugenius employs these sources with the full spectrum of *loci similes*, ranging from the quotation of exact phrases to vague reminiscences. This would, of course, be what one would generally expect of Eugenius, especially as regards the use of secular works, considering that he is generally placed in the Late Antique tradition exemplified principally by the *Anthologia Latina*.⁵³¹ Yet, when one looks more closely at the actual make-up of the *loci similes* in Eugenius' original poetry, one sees a very different picture. In Dracontius' poetry the overall weight of the *loci similes* was strongly in favour of the Classical canon first, and the Bible second. Late Antique literature, while it nevertheless featured prominently in Dracontius' works, was a distant third. Eugenius is very different.

The first aspect which one notices when looking at Eugenius' *loci similes* is the sheer volume of them. For Eugenius' whole corpus, excluding his preface to the redaction, there are approximately 660 *loci similes* of varying strengths and types. This number approaches near to the total number of *loci similes* found in all three books of the *De Laudibus Dei* put together. The *De Laudibus Dei*, however, is a significantly larger body of verse than the relatively small corpus of Eugenius'

⁵³⁰ While Codoñer and Alberto do recognize the extent of the *loci similes*, neither discusses them in full detail. Alberto does, however, provide an excellent *index fontium* for Eugenius' works at the end of his edition of the texts (pp. 413-438). It is to this list that the present author would direct the reader for reference.

⁵³¹ Codoñer, p. 324 with references.

poetry. This shows Eugenius using far more references and resonances than his Late Antique African predecessor. The second aspect which one notices is that already alluded to: the distribution of Eugenius' sources. In Eugenius, the weight of the *loci similes* is heavily, indeed prodigiously, in favour of the works of Late Antiquity. Amongst the 661 total *loci similes*, 535 are with Late Antique literary works.⁵³² There are only 126 parallels with the Classical canon. There are a mere forty-one with the Bible. These figures are almost the complete opposite of those for Dracontius. The question, therefore, is what do these figures tell us?

Before answering this, however, we must first look briefly at Eugenius' employment of the different groups of sources individually, starting with the Classical canon. While the percentage of Classical parallels in Eugenius is wildly different from that found in Dracontius' works, the absolute number in each of the two authors is fairly similar. This consistency with Dracontius applies to the texts used by Eugenius as well. His favourite Classical source, as one would expect, is Vergil's *Aeneid*, which he employs twenty-seven times. The *Aeneid* is followed by two other Classical works which were very popular sources for the Late Antique poets: Lucretius' *De rerum natura* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, each with nine resonances. Following these there are eight parallels with Vergil's *Georgics* and six with the works of Juvenal. The remaining Classical texts range from one to five resonances each, with two to three being about average. Overall, Eugenius makes reference to thirty-three different Classical texts coming from twenty different authors. All of the authors one would expect occur: Cicero, Horace, Martial, Statius, Lucan, Silius Italicus, Propertius, and even Catullus and Tibullus. Outside of the preponderance of Vergil and Ovid, however, the pattern of Classical *loci similes* is

⁵³² This number excludes exegetical works, which are counted separately.

quite different from that found in Dracontius.⁵³³ Catullus and Tibullus feature more prominently than Statius and Lucan. Horace is only referenced five times, his *Odes* only twice. The answer to this reversal must lie partly in the differences in the nature of Dracontius' and Eugenius' verse. The short poems of Eugenius would be expected to find more inspiration in the shorter poems of Catullus and Tibullus than the lengthier epics of Statius and Lucan, and so they do. Eugenius, therefore, is employing the Classical canon in much the same way as Dracontius: picking and choosing only those passages and texts which are deemed relevant. Leaving aside proportions, then, Eugenius' use of Classical *loci similes* matches that of Dracontius.

Eugenius' use of Late Antique sources provides a somewhat different picture. Firstly, the sheer volume of parallels with Late Antique sources is enormous. Not only are there some seventy-nine different works from forty-six different authors, but there are, as already stated, over 500 individual *loci similes*. These figures bear witness to a literary endeavour completely and totally imbued with the literary and intellectual culture of its age on a scale not really seen before. Certainly, Dracontius' use of Late Antique sources pales in comparison. Part of this, of course, must stem from the fact that Eugenius' cultural inheritance included the century and a half of literary achievements which separated him from Dracontius. Indeed, many of Eugenius' most-favoured Late Antique sources come from this period. His most-used source, from all genres and periods, is the poetry of Venantius Fortunatus, with which there are ninety-six *loci similes*. Isidore of Seville is his second most-used author with fifty-four parallels, thirty-one of which are with the *Etymologiae*. Eugenius' third most-favoured author is Dracontius himself. Forty-five Dracontian parallels, coming from all of Dracontius' texts, can be found in Eugenius' verse;

⁵³³ For Dracontius' use of Classics see especially pp. 33-36 above.

twenty-eight of these are from the three books of the *De Laudibus Dei*. Corippus and Braulio of Zaragoza also feature prominently in Eugenius' verse, as does the *Anthologia Latina*.⁵³⁴ Authors who preceded Dracontius, however, also feature prominently. There are thirty-six *loci similes* with Prudentius and thirty-four with Ausonius. These are followed by seventeen parallels with Paulinus Petricordiae, sixteen with Paulinus of Nola and eleven with Sedulius. Claudius Marius Victorius, however, only has two resonances. While the emphases on individual texts are different between our two authors, this again is due to the differences in subject matter and poetic form. This factor, at least, shows Eugenius once more working in the same vein as Dracontius and his Classical and Late Antique predecessors: selecting and employing the most relevant texts. This is especially true of his use of Venantius Fortunatus, whose epigrammatic poetry really forms the foundation for Eugenius' verse not only in terms of *loci similes*, but also in terms of form and style. It is also especially noticeable in his *De basilica sancti Aemiliani* (*carmen* 11), which pulls heavily from sources concerning St Aemilianus (San Millán de la Cogolla), especially Braulio. Thus we see Eugenius working, as before, within the tradition of Classical poetic culture and composition. Yet, there is something else going on here as well, as the sheer quantity of parallels suggests.

The state of Eugenius' biblical parallels, however, shows a significantly different picture from that witnessed in Dracontius. In the entire corpus of Eugenius' poetry, there are only forty biblical *loci similes*.⁵³⁵ Dracontius' *Satisfactio*, which is

⁵³⁴ There are twenty-two parallels with Corippus, and fifteen with Braulio. There are twenty-two with the *Anthologia Latina*, a compilation that was roughly contemporary with Dracontius.

⁵³⁵ In addition to these biblical references, there is also a handful of liturgical and exegetical *loci similes*, especially with the commentaries of Jerome.

shorter than Eugenius' corpus, has eighty-two.⁵³⁶ Part of this discrepancy must stem from the subject matter of many of Eugenius' poems, but this explanation is not fully sufficient. Eugenius simply employed less biblical material in his poetry, favouring instead Late Antique Christian literature as his principal source for Christian cultural material. What parallels he does use, however, show a solid knowledge of both testaments. They also show another shift from Dracontius. Whereas the earlier author favoured the Psalms, Eugenius favours especially the Book of Job, with which there are eight *loci similes*. Following Job is Matthew, with seven, and Genesis and Wisdom, each with four. The highest concentration of biblical resonances occurs in *carmen 2, Commonitio mortalitatis humanae*, where they serve an essentially didactic purpose.⁵³⁷ The high intensity of biblical parallels in this poem suggests that Eugenius specifically constructed it from biblical source material, and that the opposite was generally the case for the rest of his verse. This is in sharp contrast to the heavy use of the Scriptures in Dracontius. Again, though, we see Eugenius using the Bible when relevant, if only sparingly. This avoidance raises interesting questions, which can really only be answered when looking at the whole range of *loci similes* together.

Before concluding, however, it is best to investigate the dynamics of Eugenius' *loci similes* in closer detail, in order to get a better understanding than the numbers alone can give. A good poem to look at for this is *carmen 14b*, or the 'Lamentum de adventu propriae senectutis in sapphico'. This text is really part of a larger poem which combines elegiac couplets, Archilochian iambics (which are used

⁵³⁶ The numbers are again higher for the *De Laudibus Dei*, but, as that work is largely a biblical epic, this would be expected.

⁵³⁷ Eleven out of the forty total biblical parallels are found within this poem. There are also ten resonances with Late Antique authors, but there are none with the Classical canon.

for poems of abuse), and finally these Sapphic strophes. The use of Sapphic strophes in Latin was strongly associated with Horace especially, and also Catullus, who imitated this Greek form heavily. This connection with Catullus is strengthened further by the fact that this Sapphic section follows after several stanzas of Archilochian metre, the metre most strongly associated with insult and abuse and, as such, favoured by Catullus; except that where Catullus abused his fellow Romans, Eugenius was abusing that eventual enemy of all mankind, old age. This Catullan resonance is general, however, and there are some specific references worth mentioning here. Line seven of the poem reads ‘dumque me pigra peteret senectus’. This line contains resonances with a decent number of works. The first we shall look at is the one closest to Eugenius in time: Dracontius’ *Satisfactio*. Line 224 of the *Satisfactio* reads ‘vindicat aut fremitus pigra senectus habet’: the parallel of the phrase *pigra senectus*, ‘slow old age’, is obvious, and the reader’s mind is meant to be drawn to the passage in Dracontius. This particular passage of the *Satisfactio* describes in brief the six ages of man, and the passage within which our parallel is found laments the ‘shouting’ of slow old age as well as the din and cacophony suffered during adulthood in general. There is also here a reference to a poem of the Classical author Tibullus. Tibullus, 1.10.39-40, reads: ‘quin potius laudandus hic est quem prole parata/ occupat in parva pigra senecta casa!’⁵³⁸ Here again the verbal parallel between *pigra senectus* and *pigra senecta* is quite clear. The associations this line would bring up are also interesting. The lines, taken in the context of a discussion about dying in battle, read, when translated: ‘Indeed, he is more worthy of being praised whom, with children having been produced, slow old age overtakes in

⁵³⁸ Tibullus, *Elegies: Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes*, ed. and trans. by Guy Lee, 3rd edn, rev. by Guy Lee and Robert Maltby (Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1990).

his little house.' The lines which follow after these outline a nice vision of old age, where one tends the flock with one's sons, is fed by one's wife, and tells stories which the young people must listen to. A fine idealized portrait of old age, which Eugenius, in his seventy-sixth year, finds rather unsatisfactory. The strongest verbal parallel for this line, however, is with Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, 10.396. This line reads, 'me sine ferre tibi: non est mea pigra senectus,' and thus gives us the closest reading to Eugenius, although the context is not particularly useful. This line, then, shows us quite well the way in which Eugenius' *loci similes* work. Firstly, there are resonances that depend on more general aspects of the work, such as the link with Horace and Catullus in the inclusion in this poem of Sapphic strophes and Archilochian verses. Secondly, and more regularly and more easy to track, you have verbal parallels of varying degrees of solidity. The three quotations, likewise, give us a good sampling of how poets wove *loci similes* into their texts. Firstly, we have the basic verbal parallel, used solely because the expression is good, the thought is good, or the poet liked the language: whichever. Oftentimes they are more obvious than what we have here, but the Ovidian reference does serve as an example. We then get the higher levels of interaction which we see with the references to Dracontius and to Tibullus. The Dracontian reference brings to the reader's mind not only that old age is bad, but that the time before it is pretty bad too; the full Dracontian passage informs us that the only good time is infancy. This fits with what Eugenius is saying elsewhere in the stanzas, and serves not only to reinforce Eugenius' idea, but to express another range and depth of lamentation that his own little stanza does not allow: the quotation allows him to say more, as it directs the reader's attention back to this passage in Dracontius. The Tibullus passage shows us the same level of interaction, but in the opposite direction: the link with Tibullus serves to call to mind

the idealized portrayals of old age which Eugenius obviously dislikes, and then dispels them; the resonance serves to call to mind that whole positive picture and negate it.⁵³⁹ This is how *loci similes* had always worked; sometimes it was imitation of a text, other times it was interaction, whether to affirm or to deny, and this shows us that, at least in terms of *loci similes*, Eugenius was interacting with his models just as poets always had. This suggests that Eugenius was, at least in this regard, still part of a living tradition.

Having looked at Eugenius' use of *loci similes* in both the macro and the micro, we must now move back to the original question asked of the *loci similes*: what do the figures tell us? Firstly, works of North African origin feature very prominently. Not only does Eugenius possess a deep knowledge of Dracontius, as well as Corippus and the *Anthologia Latina*, but also of more minor authors such as Nemesianus and Verecundus of Junca.⁵⁴⁰ This prevalence of North African works, alongside the known popularity of Dracontius at the royal court, suggests a strong cultural and intellectual link between North Africa and Visigothic Spain.⁵⁴¹ Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, the *loci similes* show us how Eugenius viewed, and interacted with, his own cultural inheritance. Eugenius' use of *loci similes* does serve to place him firmly within the traditional framework of poetic

⁵³⁹ As Alberto points out, Eugenius does the same thing in *carmen* 101. 'Originality and Poetic Tradition in Visigothic Spain', pp. 355-356.

⁵⁴⁰ Nemesianus was a Carthaginian poet of the late-third century. Verecundus of Junca was involved in the Three Chapters dispute. The work of his which Eugenius used was his hexameter poem *De satisfactione poenitentiae*.

⁵⁴¹ This poetic evidence supports the conclusions of Collins, *Visigothic Spain*, pp. 147-161, where he argues convincingly that the cultural and intellectual foundation of the the 'Isidorian Renaissance' lay in the African migrants to Spain who arrived in the sixth century. These migrants, mostly clerics fleeing difficulties arising from the Three Chapters controversy brought with them a great deal of books, covering liturgy, literature and all things in between and these books, in turn, providing the source material for the cultural flourishing of Visigothic Spain. Collins' discussion, with its references, remains the best summation of the profound African influence on Visigothic Iberia.

composition. He is well read in the Classics, and continues to feel that these texts are relevant and important in his own day. Additionally, he continues to use the traditional compositional methods which he had inherited. He also possesses an impressive knowledge of and appreciation for the works of Late Antiquity: the preponderance of Venantius Fortunatus shows this clearly enough, but the sheer volume of Late Antique material pumped into the veins of Eugenius' poetry does so even more. This in turn shows us not only that the works of Late Antiquity were more preferred by our author, but that they spoke to him much more than did the Classics. Most importantly, however, Eugenius' favouring of Late Antique texts in his works demonstrates that he was not overly attached to the Classics, he was not clinging on to them for dear life or trying to rescue them from obscurity or revive them; he was merely using them when they were appropriate, and since the literature of Late Antiquity spoke to him more clearly, the Classics took a back seat. Indeed, in his own mind there was likely no dichotomy between Late Antique and Classical works, as witnessed especially in *carmen* 14b. For Eugenius, all works whether old or new were part of the literary canon, and while he almost certainly saw a distinction between Christian and secular works, he nevertheless saw both as part of his usable cultural inheritance. This preference does not bear witness to the behaviour of someone clinging desperately to a dead past, yet neither does it show someone intent on breaking wholly with tradition. The *loci similes*, then, show the same old interplay between tradition and originality, but not unchanged. Eugenius' use of parallels shows a picture, if incomplete, of a move away from tradition. For confirmation of this, however, we must cast a wider net.

ii. Eugenius' *Ars Poetica*: the Nature of the Original Poems

While vital to the understanding of Eugenius' poetry, the compositional method witnessed in the *loci similes* is really only half of the picture. Poetry cannot be simply boiled down to its constituent parts; it is not merely a technical art, and hence the study of technical composition can only give us one side of the story. To fully understand Eugenius' cultural mindset we must look to the poetry itself to find the true motivations, the true culture, and the true balance between tradition and originality which it holds. This involves looking not only at the mechanics of a poem, but at what it says, how it says it, and why. An investigation of this sort requires looking at the texts in several different ways. Firstly, we must look at what Eugenius himself wrote on the nature and purpose of poetry. Secondly, we must look for confirmation of this theory in the body of poetry itself. Thirdly, we must study Eugenius' use of metre, which, while itself technical, shows more than mere mechanics. Finally, we must look at the inner dynamics of Eugenius' verse by means of an in-depth study of one representative poem.

While not explicitly stated, Eugenius' own ideas about what poetry should be can be gleaned from his discussion of the problems in Dracontius' works found in his prose preface to the redaction. When Eugenius writes the following of his corrections, he is actually saying quite a good deal about his own perceptions of poetry:

Certainly, I have thought there to be in this work verses needing to be removed which are shown to be weak in sense, inelegant in expression and founded upon no rational principle; nor in these lines [to be removed] is anything found by which the learned mind of a reader would be soothed/delighted or the unlearned mind be taught.⁵⁴²

⁵⁴² 'Versiculos sane quos huic operi detrahendos esse putavi, et sensu tepidi et verbis inlepidi et nulla probantur ratione subnixi; nec in eis aliquod reperitur quo lectoris animus aut mulceatur doctus aut doceatur indoctus.' Prose preface, 2 (Alberto, p. 325).

In essence, Eugenius here outlines several principles. Firstly, Eugenius sees a stylistic push behind poetry: it should be elegant in its expression. This appears obvious; of course poetry should be elegant, but what is important is that Eugenius feels the need to mention it; for Eugenius elegance, or aesthetics, is a vital part of poetry. Yet, the other initial comments bring poetry back firmly to the ground: poetry should be aesthetically pleasing, but not at the expense of sense and reason.⁵⁴³ For Eugenius poetry should be founded upon *ratio*, ‘reasoning’ or a ‘rational principle’. Strongly tied both to this grounding in sense and reason and this emphasis on aesthetics are what Eugenius sees as the purposes of poetry, alluded to at the end of his statement. For Eugenius, poetry serves two functions: to the learned, who have already been taught, poetry should be entertaining or soothing, for those who have yet to learn, poetry should be didactic. The general picture of the poetic art which Eugenius gives, then, is one with two distinct facets. Poetry should be both aesthetically motivated and didactic. Eugenius’ syntactical placement of reason and his emphasis on the didactic at the end of each clause respectively, serves to point clearly at which elements Eugenius felt most important. For Eugenius, poetry existed first to teach and secondly to please; poetry was first and foremost a ‘serious’ art, meant to both teach and edify.

When one takes a step back and looks at Eugenius’ verse, one finds that the poet followed his own theory quite well. What Eugenius said, he largely did. When one looks at the corpus as a whole, Eugenius’ emphasis on didactic poetry is obvious. Many of Eugenius’ shorter poems are perhaps best viewed as versified

⁵⁴³ *Sensus* here has been taken as ‘sense’, but the word can also be taken as ‘feeling’: considering the proximity to *ratio* in the text, and also the difficulty of pinning down the meaning of ‘feeling’ in such a context, the present author has taken the first meaning.

natural history. These poems draw heavily on Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*, and cover topics ranging from the halcyon and the peacock to ice and adamant.⁵⁴⁴ While many of them are what would now be seen as pseudo-science, such as the softening of adamant with goat blood found in *carmen* 62 which is itself from Isidore's *Etymologiae* 16.13.2, many of them are also based on observation, such as *carmen* 57 on ice. While these poems have been construed in the past as mere school exercises, they are in fact striking little poems which even today serve not only to educate (*carmen* 66 reminds the reader that salt is both mined in the mountains and harvested from the sea) but also to put a smile on the face of the learned. In other words, they do exactly what Eugenius himself thought poetry should do. Eugenius' didactic efforts, however, are not confined to natural history. A number of his poems, of varying lengths, deal with various historical and/or Christian topics in a didactic fashion. These poems range from *carmen* 71, which is a distych on the items one finds upon an altar, to *carmen* 38, a versification of the Ten Plagues of Egypt, and *carmina* 39 and 40 on the invention of writing. These poems are also often seen as school exercises, but the simple and readily memorized format in which they are placed, along with their strong rhyme, might suggest rather that they are educational pieces, composed for the purpose of teaching.⁵⁴⁵ Eugenius also penned a selection of proverbs and little versified morals, which would also qualify as didactic. The picture gleaned from the shorter poems, then, is a strong emphasis on the moral and didactic element of poetry.

⁵⁴⁴ Eugenius was especially fond of birds, as the eleven poems about various birds and their sounds attest. Other natural topics of interest for Eugenius were the sounds humans make (*carmen* 41), the hybridisation of animals (*carmen* 42), and prognostications (55 and 56).

⁵⁴⁵ The same is true for some of the natural history poems as well: *carmen* 42 on the hybrids produced by various combinations of animals would not only serve to teach children the different combinations of animals and what they produce, but also the rarer and more classical names for the creatures, such as *Arcadicus* for *asinus* 'donkey'.

The same observation holds true for Eugenius' longer pieces. The longer poems tend to be between twelve and forty lines long, with some longer and some shorter.⁵⁴⁶ These poems cover a range of topics, and have been seen as the most representative of Eugenius' poetic talent.⁵⁴⁷ Some of the longer pieces are obvious examples of didactic *moralia*, such as *carmen* 6, *Contra ebrietatem*, and *carmen* 7, *Contra crapulam*. Some of these pieces are rather more than mere didactic *moralia*, and read as one would expect the advice of a seasoned monastic to read; such are *carmen* 2, *Commonitio mortalitatis humanae*, and *carmen* 5, *De brevitae huius vitae*, to name just two. Even *carmen* 8, which is a list of the books held in the monastic library at Zaragoza, contains advice on which books one should read. The rest of his longer pieces which are not explicitly didactic are mostly occasional poems. These tend to be either poems designed to be read in churches on the feast day of their patron saint or epitaphs for prominent figures, such as King Chindaswinth and Queen Reccibergera. Even these poems, however, usually have a little ascetic or otherwise didactic lesson hidden within them.

This emphasis on didactic poetry represents something of a conclusion to a debate which had raged in the literary world throughout Late Antiquity. As witnessed above with the works of Dracontius, different authors emphasised different aspects of the poetic art. For Dracontius, the aesthetic element of poetry was the most important, and while the didactic was important for him, the end goal of poetry was nevertheless artistic. For Avitus of Vienne, the didactic element of poetry was the principal reason for its existence, and while aesthetics was important,

⁵⁴⁶ The longest fully extant poem is *carmen* 14, *Lamentum de adventu propriae senectutis*, with either eighty or one hundred lines, depending on whether 14b, the poem discussed in detail above, is counted or not.

⁵⁴⁷ Codoñer, pp. 325-326.

it could be sacrificed in the pursuit of the didactic. Yet, on the whole, this debate was largely confined to letters and prefaces which discussed the art of poetry, and its presence in the verse itself was only ever very subtle. The great poets had always striven to combine the two: the debate only concerned the admixture. While this inner debate can be witnessed in Venantius Fortunatus, in Eugenius it disappears. Eugenius is concerned with the aesthetic, but everywhere it is sacrificed for the didactic. This choice is clearly observed in his poetry: everything teaches, and Eugenius, while he clearly prefers quantitative poetry, heavily employs rhyme, partly as a didactic tool. The fact that nearly every poem contains either some lesson, some piece of advice, or some piece of knowledge, shows that for Eugenius, poetry was didactic. Many were meant for public performances, not simply in the parlours of the wealthy but in the openness of the church on a feast day; not only did Eugenius intend to teach, but to teach a wide audience. This in turn shows something of a change from the poetic culture which Eugenius inherited. For him the debate was well and truly over. That he did not say so directly only serves to affirm this, as the protests of Avitus and the Gallic poets rather suggest something of a smoke-screen to cover up their own love of the aesthetic.

Yet, Eugenius' poems cannot simply be summed up as didactic. There were other elements to Eugenius' poetic art, other things which the poems themselves can tell us. Many of Eugenius' poems are very personal, and in his verse we learn that Eugenius was often unwell, and that, among other things, he did not enjoy the heat of a Spanish summer.⁵⁴⁸ Indeed, Eugenius' poems show us a great deal of the man

⁵⁴⁸ Alberto, 'Originality and Poetic Tradition', deals to some extent with the personal nature of Eugenius' poetry, as does Codoñer's 'Poetry of Eugenius of Toledo'. The complaints regarding summer are found especially in *carmen* 101, discussed in both the articles just named.

himself. They show us not only how he felt and how he saw the world, but how he saw himself, both in relation to that world, and in relation to God.

Another one of the key elements of Eugenius' poetic endeavour, and the one which is most central to the present investigation, is an interplay which he inherited from his Late Antique and Classical predecessors: the interplay between tradition and originality. The final investigation into the relationship between these two cultural forces lies in the two remaining lines of inquiry.

The first of these is Eugenius' use of metre. The quantitative poetry which so heavily marked Classical and Late Antique culture worked on a very strict set of rules: the violation of these metrical rules could only be undertaken occasionally, and served only to place extreme emphasis on a particular word or phrase. The violation of metre was so jarring to the poet and his audience, that it was a rare tool used only sparingly by skilled poets, and was enough to condemn a bad poet's verse to the grave. Late Antiquity, as it is widely known, saw the rebirth of the very non-Classical genre of rhythmic poetry, but this is not what most of the major poets of Late Latin wrote. Both Dracontius and Eugenius, while they employed rhythmic elements more freely than their Classical antecedents, nevertheless wrote solely quantitative verse rooted in the traditional metres of the Classical canon. Fitting the tastes of the sixth and seventh centuries, Eugenius employed a wide range of metres and verse constructions, with poems in dactylic hexameter, elegiac couplet, and even the ancient Sapphic strophes which had once again come into fashion, as well as a number of others. Eugenius attempted all of these metres within a number of poetic forms, from distichs, and even monostichs, through to a variety of shorter epigrams, epitaphs, elegies, hymns, and longer pieces with other purposes. In all actuality, Eugenius possessed a firm grasp of the traditional Latin metres, and was fully

capable of using them correctly and intelligently: Eugenius knew how metre worked, was able to create new works conforming to the old norms, and was able to exploit metrical constructions to make his verse more lively and powerful. Much of Eugenius' verse is accurate as regards the metre, but much of it is not. Some of his errors could be attributed to the old and customary reason: Late Latin authors spoke a more 'Vulgar' Latin and no longer knew the correct length of syllables.⁵⁴⁹

Certainly, some examples of his errors do look like this. The first line of *carmen* 48, which is written in elegiac couplet, provides such an example. The line, in hexameter, reads: Fūlgidā p|īnnā fāc|īt īnl|ūstrēm t|ēgmīnē p|āvūm. The third foot should be a spondee, but it is instead an iamb. Eugenius frequently makes this mistake, and it is fairly prominent in his verse in general.⁵⁵⁰ Yet, he still gets it right more often than not. The remainder of this poem, for instance, is perfectly correct. A rather more prodigious example of this can be found in the second line of *carmen* 54. The first line of the distich is perfectly fine dactylic hexameter, if rather over-full of spondees, but the second line is a different story. The line reads: aūtūmn|ūs ūv|ās, brūm|ā sūcc|īdīt ōl|īvās. Following the traditional, Classical, rules of quantity, then, this line scans spondee, iamb, spondee, iamb, and then the normal hexameter ending of dactyl and spondee. The problem is that this is not a recognized Classical metre. The only way it would work as a hexameter, which it would appear to purport to be, is if one took the final 'us' on *autumnus* and the final 'a' in *bruma* as long, which would violate the Classical rules of quantity, but make the hexameter work. Again, the lengthening of the final 'us' is a fairly common aspect of Eugenius' verse, which

⁵⁴⁹ See, for example, Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, p.67, where this is summarized and argued against; see also the discussion in Norberg, pp. 7-28. See the discussion above, pp. 218-221

⁵⁵⁰ This is noticeable in his redactions: examples can be found in *Hexaameron*, 357 and 386, for example.

could perhaps be seen as interference from the endings of the fourth declension, which do feature a long final ‘us’ in the nominative and accusative plural, or indeed the forgetting of the normal rules of prosody.⁵⁵¹ Yet, in the previous line, Eugenius scanned *messibus* correctly, and made the ‘us’ short.⁵⁵² The ‘a’ is even more anomalous: while it could easily be explained as an ablative, which carries the long ‘a’ in final position, the ablative would make no sense in this poem. All the other seasons listed in it are in the nominative, and the verb *succidit* demands a subject; the only other nominative singular without a verb in the poem is *autumnus*; but why would autumn bring down the grapes in winter- surely *bruma*, winter, is meant to be the agent here. And if *bruma* is the agent, then it is in the nominative, with a short ‘a’.⁵⁵³ That Eugenius knew that the nominative possesses a short ‘a’ is made very clear in *carmen* 48, for example, in which he scanned it correctly several times. The only way the line in *carmen* 54 works, from a metrical standpoint, is to violate the quantities of these two syllables, and make the line match the first. So, why does Eugenius do this? For those who would argue that Eugenius lived in an anachronistic world and strove to emulate the patterns of traditional versification without the requisite ability or understanding, this is a fine piece of evidence: Classical ideas of quantity were dead, and this was all that could be mustered in a dark and decrepit age. For those who see Eugenius as a great innovator, he is here breaking away from the Classical past, and forging his own new conventions of quantity.

⁵⁵¹ Several examples of this can be found in the redactions as well, such as *Satisfactio*, 1 and *Hexaemeron*, 357, 402, and 436.

⁵⁵² The first line of the poem reads: Ver gignit flores, pinguescit messibus aestas.

⁵⁵³ There are several other examples of this as well, such as lines 128 and 152 in the *Hexaemeron*. Eugenius also often treated final ‘e’ in a non-classical way. A further discussion of Eugenius’ use of quantity can be found in Norberg, pp. 9-11.

How should these errors really be viewed? The first aspect of these poems that should be noticed is that they make sense. Both *carmina* 48 and 54 are nice, discrete little thoughts and it is quite easy to discern their meaning. This is something which is very important, and is actually frequently overlooked. Of course, these errors could probably be explained by the erosion of the traditional rules of quantitative verse. This is the old standard explanation, and hinges upon the fact that all of these final letter combinations, while they are generally short, and must be short here, can, in certain circumstances, be counted as long: a final ‘it’ is short in the present, but long in the perfect, final ‘us’, as already stated, can be long in certain cases of the fourth declension, and the final ‘a’ is long when it represents the ablative. Errors of this sort have traditionally been taken to signify that the old distinctions between long and short syllables, which were not native to Latin, simply disappeared: and this is certainly true of spoken vernacular Latin.⁵⁵⁴ But poetry is written on a different register, and this has led scholars to condemn the work of Eugenius (and other Late Latin authors who commit the same ‘sin’) as ‘vulgar’ and unrefined, as uneducated, as allowing vernacular to creep into the ‘higher’ levels of the language.⁵⁵⁵ Yet, as the *loci similes* have shown, Eugenius was steeped in the Classics, he had read Vergil and Horace, and their quantitative consistency would surely have come to Eugenius’ attention. The man was able to write poetry that still charms and entertains over a thousand years after he wrote it: Eugenius was not a simpleton; he knew what he was doing. If he is not letting the errors into his work by

⁵⁵⁴ The changing quantity of syllables (especially in terms of shortening) is visible especially in the vernacular Latin of Visigothic Iberia, and in general there was no longer an expectation for Latin speakers to inherently know syllable quantities; see Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, p. 97 and elsewhere. The fact that Eugenius is often correct in terms of quantity is not evidence for the continued use of quantity; see Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, p. 67.

⁵⁵⁵ Raby, *Christian Latin Poetry*, p. 127.

ignorance, then why is he? This, of course, is a difficult question, but poetry is a highly practised and conscious art, and poets rarely do anything by accident.

Eugenius' apparent carelessness when it comes to quantity, and when he is clearly able to do it correctly, tells us something when we remember that these poems make sense. Eugenius, it appears, was willing to sacrifice the strict traditional metrical rules for sense. For Eugenius, the old quantitative rules of verse could be, if required, sacrificed for greater sense; that same sense which he emphasised in his preface to the redaction. Nevertheless, if it could be made to fit, then it should be made to fit. The strength of this emphasis of sense over form is important: sense had always obviously been key, but it had always, oftentimes laboriously, been fitted to the demands of metre. For Eugenius, the effort simply was not worth it. This, then, would seem to be strong evidence for Eugenius' originality, and so it is, but we must also remember that Eugenius chose normally to adhere to the old rules, chose to adhere to the traditions of quantitative verse. Yet he did not cleave pathetically to them as if to a dead but beloved past: he was happy to modify them when it suited him to do so, the old metres were handy tools of expression, but nothing more. This tells us something: Eugenius did not consider poetic tradition a hard and fast thing that represented a better time when 'poetry was poetry' and something that needed bringing back with proper strict usage restored. Quantitative verse was merely how one wrote poetry; the metres were useful and pleasant, but strict metre was to be adhered to only when convenient. Quantitative metre was no longer an end in and of itself, as it had been for so long.

The struggle between tradition and originality is witnessed even more fully when one examines the last aspect of this investigation, what Eugenius' poems are actually saying and doing. As discussed above, Eugenius' poems range in form,

theme, and subject. Scholars have already paid deserved attention to several of the longer pieces. Yet, some of the shorter pieces are not only very illuminating, but also very representative of Eugenius' poetic efforts. A good example of this is *carmen* 48, *De pavone*, or 'On the Peacock', discussed above. This is an interesting and curious little poem, and is worth quoting in full, both in Latin and English:

Fulgida pinna facit inlustrem tegmine pauum;
aurea pluma nitet, sed caro dura manet.

Which runs in English: 'The gleaming feather makes the peacock brilliant, when it comes to his clothes;/ the plumage shines, gleaming like gold, but the meat is still tough.'

The first thing that one notices when reading this poem, besides that surprise ending, is the internal rhyme in the second line, which occurs at the end of each half-line (the line is pentameter, and the caesura, which breaks the line into two, occurs just between *nitet* and *sed*). This is a relatively common feature, and rhyme of this sort would become the driving force behind Medieval verse, but it was generally considered to be distasteful by Classical authors. It does, however, serve to make the verse flow nicely, and shows that Eugenius was very much in touch with the tastes of his day.⁵⁵⁶ The poem starts by describing the beauty of the peacock, and the language which Eugenius uses is strongly reminiscent of Dracontius' description of the birds brought forth on the fifth day of Creation.⁵⁵⁷ While Eugenius' account is much shorter, and refers only to the peacock, he uses many of the same expressions employed by Dracontius, and his distich sums up the latter's description pretty well. In both versions we see *aurea pluma*, both use a word derived from the verb *fulgere*, and both depict the birds in that florid Late Antique style, which reminds one of the

⁵⁵⁶ This same internal rhyme can be found in *carmen* 54 as well.

⁵⁵⁷ The resonance is with *De Laudibus Dei*, 1, 234-254.

colourful mosaics contemporary with these pieces.⁵⁵⁸ This description evokes the most beautiful language the Late Antique poetic tradition had to offer, but instead of using it like Dracontius for aesthetic purposes, or Avitus for didactic, Eugenius turns it on its head: the bird may be beautiful, but eating it is not.⁵⁵⁹ Yet that last little surprise half-line, ‘sed caro dura manet’, has more to it. This half-line is actually a fairly clever reference to Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologies*, where, in his discussion of birds, he describes the peacock thus: ‘the peacock has its name from the sound of its voice; its meat is so tough that it scarcely goes off and is not easy to cook.’⁵⁶⁰ As his authority for this, Isidore quotes a poem of Martial, which, while it marvels at the bird’s *gemmantis alas*, its ‘bejewelled wings’, laments the toughness of the meat.⁵⁶¹ Eugenius effectively sums up Isidore’s description of both the toughness and the lasting power of the meat really quite smartly with his use of the verb *manere*, ‘to remain’: not only is the meat tough when it comes out of the kitchen, but it is still tough, and still unspoiled, days later when it has to be eaten as a left-over. Both parts of this poem, then, fit into a tradition: the first fits into the luxurious Late Antique aesthetic which actually found its roots in phrases like the *gemmantis alas* from the Martial quote; the second is the encyclopaedic tradition exemplified by Isidore and strongly associated with the birth of the Middle Ages, but the roots of which go back really all the way to Herodotus and his tangents. We once again see Eugenius working in established traditions, whether ancient or recent, but this poem does not really fit either of these traditions when one actually looks at it. It turns the aesthetic

⁵⁵⁸ This, of course, is Michael Roberts’ ‘jewelled style’ and also an example of the old idea of *décadence* found in Marrou.

⁵⁵⁹ Of course, one could say that there is a didactic element in Eugenius as well.

⁵⁶⁰ Isid. *Etym.* 12, 7, 48. The Latin reads ‘pauo nomen de sono vocis habet; cuius caro tam dura est ut putredinem vix sentiat, nec facile coquatur’.

⁵⁶¹ Martial, 13.70. His distich reads: ‘Miraris, quotiens gemmantis explicat alas, / et potes hunc saevo tradere, dure, coco?’ Martial, *Epigrammata*, ed. by D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1990).

tradition so valued by the Late Antique poets on its head, and yet it is also too florid, too funny, to really fit with the tradition of Isidore; it does not possess the 'feel' of Isidore. What Eugenius values in this poem, it would seem, is the joke: and Eugenius' joke is both more subtle and more barbed than Martial's. If the poem only said how beautiful the bird was, the reader, or listener, would not really remember it; it would just be two lines on how pretty peacocks are, and if it was only a description of how tough the meat was one would not really remark on it either; but that combination, that beautiful joining of the lofty and aesthetic world of the poetic with such a prosaic everyday complaint, is something one remembers. It is also something new.⁵⁶² In a way, this ability to lift the prosaic up in skilful verse and bring the poetic down to the prosaic is Eugenius' genius, and is where Eugenius really shines as an original thinker, and where he really breaks the bonds of tradition.⁵⁶³

⁵⁶² The humour is different from Martial's in that Eugenius' builds up the aesthetic more completely, and makes the ending much more of a surprise, whereas, in the Martial epigram, one can, to some extent, see it coming. Nevertheless, Martial was known for his biting humour and surprise endings, and, throughout his epigrammata, Eugenius does have a certain debt to Martial.

⁵⁶³ This raising of the prosaic and lowering of the poetic complements the conclusions of Codoñer and Alberto, who see Eugenius' ability to break through stereotypes as central to his originality. Codoñer, 'Poetry of Eugenius of Toledo', pp. 340-341; Alberto, 'Originality and Poetic Tradition', pp. 355-356.

4. Conclusion: Between Tradition and Originality in the Redaction and the Independent Works

The image of Eugenius' culture taken from his redactions of the works of Dracontius, it will be recalled, was one of both change and continuity. The same, we have also seen, is true of his independent works. In many ways, Eugenius had not abandoned the Classical world altogether, but rather continued the Classical poetic traditions which he had inherited from Late Antiquity.⁵⁶⁴ In terms of his use of *loci similes*, we see Eugenius working fully in the inherited Classical poetic tradition. His verse weaves parallels and resonances with various Classical and Late Antique sources together into a coherent, working fabric, just as poets had always done. His clear favouring of Late Antique works tells us two things: firstly, Eugenius felt that the works of Late Antiquity were more relevant to his own works, and his own world, and secondly, that he was not overly or sentimentally attached to the Classical past – the most certain mark of this mindset being the renunciation of later texts in favour of the Classics such as one sees in the Italian Renaissance. Eugenius was perfectly happy to favour the works of Late Latin, as, for Eugenius, and indeed for Dracontius before him, there was only one Latin poetic tradition, and Venantius Fortunatus was as much a part of it as Ovid or Horace, or even Vergil. He still employed the Classical metres, and did so with a seemingly solid understanding of what each metre was meant to express. Eugenius was able to fit his thoughts to the old rhetorical forms, but, nevertheless, often with difficulty, and his scansion does contain many an error; metrical perfection was clearly not a concern of his. He saw metre as a necessary and important part of the poetic art, as we can see from the sheer volume of different metres he used – if metre was no concern to him at all, and

⁵⁶⁴ This conclusion, then, serves to confirm that reached by both Codoñer and Alberto.

if he was not interested in the traditional forms, then why did he not just pick a simple iambic metre and stick with it, why experiment? Yet, on the other hand, when a particular word he wanted did not scan, he would use it anyway. For Eugenius it was better to say what one wanted than to have it fit the form. But the study of *carmen* 48 is perhaps the most telling. Eugenius valued the prosaic, and when he wrote poetry he wrote to express his own life, his own misfortunes, he wrote, sometimes at least, to turn the whole poetic world, with all its aesthetic values, on its head, and sometimes, he wrote simply to entertain his audience in a fun and simple way, or to teach them a little piece of knowledge. In other poems Eugenius laments the human condition, and his poems read something like the Blues, and in them we see the author himself. It is this prosaic humanity that really marks Eugenius' poetry, and also what really marks them as being original. And so we find Eugenius somewhere between tradition and originality: he does adhere to the Classical traditions, he does use the Classical methods of poetic composition, and not in an anachronistic way either; but by the same token he does break forth from that world. It is not a clean break, but it is a break in terms of mindset: in his poetry birds newly created by God do not perch aesthetically on trees, nor do heroes flee the ruins of Troy to settle piously in Italy. No, in Eugenius, you soften adamant with the blood of a goat as Isidore says, you look in dread as a roast peacock thigh is set in front of you at dinner, and you pray to God that your suffering will soon be over. The world of Eugenius, then, is a very different one from that inhabited by Dracontius. Dracontius' world was one of Roman baths, togas, and the continuation of a lofty and unbroken poetic, literary, and above all cultural tradition. Eugenius' world is much more practical, much more prosaic, and, in many ways much less plastic. For Dracontius the purpose of poetry was the pursuit of beauty. For Eugenius, the

purpose of poetry was prayer, lamentation, enjoyment, and, ultimately, to teach.

Dracontius' poetry was a public and artistic exercise, meant for the luxurious world

of the Late Roman Empire: Eugenius' was a private endeavour, a personal and

individual outpouring meant to teach and to encourage those who would read it.

Eugenius' world was medieval.

Conclusion: Dracontius and the Transformation of the Roman World

1. Dracontius' Poetry in its Vandalic and Visigothic Contexts: the Conclusion of the Case-Study

The case-study upon which this thesis is centred serves as a microcosm through which we can view the culture and society of the Latin West as it developed in the final centuries of Late Antiquity. As this thesis has striven to show, the poems of Dracontius can tell us a great deal not only about their Vandalic and Visigothic contexts, but about the transformations undergone in the Late Antique world in which they existed. The present inquiry, of course, has been limited to the high culture of the intelligentsia, as almost any such literary study of the ancient world needs to be. Nevertheless, it remains a valuable lens through which we can view the cultural developments of the period: Classical culture, upon which we have principally been focused, was, after all, largely the possession of the intellectual elite. The presence of our key texts, the *Satisfactio* and Book I of the *De Laudibus Dei*, in both the context of late-fifth-century Vandal North Africa and mid-seventh-century Visigothic Hispania allows us to examine these two different times and places with exactly the same evidence: a rare opportunity in the study of history.

Over the course of this study the poems have borne witness to a number of things. Firstly, antique learning, especially as exemplified by the Classical literary canon, was not only alive and well in late-fifth-century Vandal North Africa, but was still alive in the seventh-century Visigothic kingdom of Spain.⁵⁶⁵ Eugenius is as familiar with the Classics as Dracontius: both poets are fully imbued with the

⁵⁶⁵ This Classical tradition, therefore, lasted longer in Spain than it did elsewhere. For a discussion of the end of antique education see Riché, pp. 137-304. For fifth-century Vandal North Africa as a centre of learning see, among others, Riché, p. 39.

knowledge and literature of Classical Antiquity. Yet they have also shown that the culture of Classical Antiquity, both high and low, was far more alive and well in Vandal North Africa than in seventh-century Visigothic Spain, as one would expect.⁵⁶⁶ Secondly, and perhaps a little less to be expected, the works of Dracontius have shown us that Vandal North Africa was fully connected to the rest of the Mediterranean world: it was not an isolated kingdom, but rather a central part of the Late Antique world, culturally and intellectually connected to developments in Europe.⁵⁶⁷ This is seen not only in Dracontius' heavily Late Antique style, but in his knowledge of the works of Sidonius Apollinaris and also in Avitus of Vienne's knowledge of Dracontius himself. This level of cultural interaction and connectivity, not to mention Dracontius' mere existence, serves to undermine the strongly pessimistic views of the Vandal kingdom and its monarchs that Victor of Vita, among others, would have had us believe. Thirdly, we have seen that, while Dracontius possessed a close intimacy with the 'pagan' works of Classical Antiquity, he was thoroughly imbued with Christianity.⁵⁶⁸ While Dracontius in many ways treated the Bible as a literary work, he nevertheless saw in it the ultimate authority. The presence of his Christian mindset in all of his works shows that Dracontius was a Christian throughout his life. It also shows that, in his mind, there was no strict

⁵⁶⁶ Yet, this does contradict the dismal image of late-fifth- and early-sixth-century culture painted by Riché, p. 87: 'at the end of the fifth and during the sixth century, as a result of the decline of studies, only a warped version of classical culture remained'. While this may possibly be true of others, it is not true of Dracontius.

⁵⁶⁷ This conclusion, reached solely via literary evidence, is fully affirmed by the work of Conant published too late to in factor here. Conant's discussion, which applies a wide range of evidence, is found from pp. 67-129 in his *Staying Roman*.

⁵⁶⁸ As was, in many ways, Sidonius Apollinaris.

dichotomy between the pagan and the Christian: both formed legitimate parts of his cultural heritage, both could, and should, be used side-by-side.⁵⁶⁹

The most important conclusions from this case-study, however, concern the cultural mindsets of both of our authors. As we have seen, Dracontius was part of a living Classical culture, by which is meant here really the persistence of Classical modes of thinking and of perceiving the world. Not only was Dracontius intimate with the Classical canon, not only did he perceive himself as part of this living Classical tradition, but he still perceived the world and his art in the same way as his Classical forebears had done. Yes, Dracontius was a Christian and as such held different priorities and different things as truths, and thus judged the characters in his works differently from his pagan predecessors. Yet, he placed the Bible as an authority *alongside* the Classics, not as a replacement for them. For him, Caesar and King David are equally strong examples of royal mercy. Certainly, Dracontius was Late Antique and possessed the sensibilities and aesthetics of his age, but this Late Antique culture, while distinct, was nevertheless still a part of a living Classical culture.

Yet, as we have also seen, the opposite was true of Eugenius. While Eugenius was highly educated and learned in Classical literature and possessed a close knowledge and understanding of that culture he was, nevertheless, not himself a part of it. He was able to quote the Classics, and even sometimes to emend Dracontius' text so as to *better* quote them, but his priorities, and indeed the way he

⁵⁶⁹ For Dracontius and his contemporaries there was no contradiction in this. See R. A. Markus, 'From Caesarius to Boniface: Christianity and Paganism in Gaul', in Fontaine and Hillgarth, *The Seventh Century*, pp. 154-168 (p. 157); and especially Riché, p. 88, who summarizes the situation well: 'Aristocrats at the beginning of the sixth century were well aware that the ancient gods were dead. Myths had become artistic and literary themes whose symbolism alone was retained by aristocrats'; along with the caveat 'The rigorists, however, were not of the same mind'.

viewed himself and the world, were different. Where Dracontius had emphasized traditional forms and aesthetics, Eugenius emphasized a more simple didactic purpose, expressed in whichever way seemed to work at the time. While Eugenius' poetic art in many ways still functioned like the poetic art of his Classical predecessors, his emphases, his topics and indeed his own personal stamp on his poetry make it something new, and, in a small way, something revolutionary.⁵⁷⁰

The ultimate conclusion of the case-study undertaken in this thesis, then, is this: the poetry of Dracontius in its Vandalic and Visigothic contexts shows us that a shift occurred in the way in which intellectuals perceived themselves and their world in the century and a half between the two versions of our text. Dracontius, fully imbued with the secular Christian intellectual culture of the Late Antique West complete with all its elaborate trappings and forms, still viewed the world as his Classical predecessors had done. Eugenius, on other hand, while he still possessed the knowledge of the Classical world, no longer held this viewpoint. The way in which Eugenius perceived himself, his art, and indeed his world is in stark contrast to Dracontius. Eugenius' poetry is less rooted in the Classical tradition, as witnessed in his departure from the strict rules of traditional metre. Eugenius' world is also a much more personal world. Certainly, there had always been something of a personal element to Classical poetry: this, indeed, was one of the marked features of the Alexandrian school. This too is seen in Dracontius' *Satisfactio*, where the author confesses his panegyric misdeed. Yet, the *Satisfactio* expresses Dracontius' personal guilt and apology largely in impersonal terms: when he first expresses his

⁵⁷⁰ Avitus too focused more on the didactic elements of poetry, but his poetry remained, like Dracontius', rooted in the Classical world. Nevertheless, Avitus' poetry shows the initial phases of the developments which had reached full maturity in the verse of Eugenius.

wrongdoing, he likens it to Pharaoh's hardening-of-heart in Exodus.⁵⁷¹ Eugenius' complaints about his health, on the other hand, come from a very personal outpouring of emotion, executed in way quite distinct from that of his forebears.⁵⁷² As we have seen, then, while Dracontius' Late Antique world was still, at least in terms of cultural mindset, Classical, the world of Eugenius was no longer; in Eugenius we see the new world of Medieval Europe.

By looking at the poetry of Dracontius in its Vandalic and Visigothic contexts, then, we witness the cultural and intellectual transformation which marked the end of the ancient world and the birth of the medieval. While Dracontius' cultural mindset was ancient, Eugenius' was not; he represented something new. Eugenius knew and used the Classical past but he did not belong to it as Dracontius had done. This, then, is the conclusion of the particular case-study which has formed the centre of this thesis. While it uses very different evidence, it fits well with Brown's assertion that 'the seventh century, and not the inconclusive political crisis that we call the "Barbarian Invasions" of the fifth century, witnessed the true break between the ancient world and what followed'.⁵⁷³ What remains for us to do now, is both to place these conclusions in the greater context of Late Antiquity and also to ask: why, and how, did this happen?

⁵⁷¹ *Satisfactio*, 15-20.

⁵⁷² See especially *carmen* 101 and also its discussion in Alberto, 'Originality and Poetic Tradition'.

⁵⁷³ Brown, *Rise of Western Christendom*, p. 219.

2. The Triumph of the Monastic Ideal and the Transformation of the Roman World

The living Classical culture witnessed in the poetry of Dracontius was passed on through the traditional antique education system.⁵⁷⁴ By teaching Vergil and the Classics, rhetoricians passed down not only the knowledge of secular learning but, through school exercises and the like, they passed down the cultural mindset contained in these very works. While nearly all students would have been Christians by the end of the fifth century, the Classical worldview was not incompatible with traditional, secular, Late Antique Christianity. Christianity was, and is, able to accommodate a number of different philosophical viewpoints, as witnessed in the existence of neo-Platonic Christians, Aristotelian Christians and, more recently, Christian existentialists. As we have already seen, for Dracontius there was no contradiction between his secular Christian faith and the pagan myths and legends of the Classics. Others, including Saint Augustine of Hippo and even more Sidonius Apollinaris, also saw no contradiction in this, or at least no insurmountable contradiction, and continued to view the world as their ancestors had done.⁵⁷⁵ Thus it was not only Dracontius who viewed himself and the world in the same way as his Classical antecedents, but all those who received, and embraced, secular rhetorical education.⁵⁷⁶

There is, in fact, another piece of evidence which confirms the more general persistence of the Classical cultural mindset. This evidence lies in the fear of the

⁵⁷⁴ For the antique education system, there is Henri-Irénée Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. by George Lamb (London: Sheed and Ward, 1956). For education in Late Antiquity see especially the first five chapters of Riché.

⁵⁷⁵ See again Riché, p. 88 for this same accommodation in others.

⁵⁷⁶ For the survival of the Classical educational system into the sixth century see Riché, especially pp. 17-51 and 79-95.

Classics witnessed in the writings of the Gallic cultural and ecclesiastical elite as they came more and more to embrace monastic and pastoral forms of Christianity. This fear and distrust of the Classics is seen in the warnings of Avitus of Vienne, the rejections of Gregory of Tours, and the numerous condemnations of the secular arts as regards their use by bishops.⁵⁷⁷ But the *Vita* of that great monastic, Caesarius of Arles, bears even more vivid witness to this fear and distrust.⁵⁷⁸ This work recounts a vision from the saint's youth: Caesarius, having fallen asleep upon a book of Classical learning given to him by a rhetorician, awoke in a dream to see, in place of the book, a serpent (*draco*) winding around him and biting him.⁵⁷⁹ Having experienced this terrible, and 'divinely inspired' vision, Caesarius renounced 'the foolish wisdom of the world', that is to say, the Classics, and began to walk the path of the ascetic life.⁵⁸⁰ The intensity of the distrust of the Classics, seen especially in Caesarius' vision, shows that, for those laying down the foundations of the new

⁵⁷⁷ A fine example of this condemnation is that against Desiderius of Vienne, which will be discussed briefly below. In general see Riché, p. 95-99. Avitus' distrust of the Classics can be seen in the dedicatory letter to his *De spiritalis historiae gestis*. For Gregory of Tours, see for example the strong condemnation of the Classics (which itself references Jerome's) found at the beginning of his *Gloria martyrum*. It is worth noting that many of the figures whom Gregory here says it is improper to write about are written about by Dracontius in his *Carmina profana*. For the original text of the *Gloria martyrum* see *Liber in Gloria martyrum*, ed. by Bruno Krusch, in *Gregorii episcopi Turonensis: Miracula et opera minora*, ed. by Bruno Krusch, Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores rerum merovingicarum, 1.2 (Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1885), pp. 34-111. For the English translation see *Gregory of Tours: Glory of the Martyrs*, trans. by Raymond Van Dam, Translated Texts for Historians 4, 2nd edn (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004).

⁵⁷⁸ Caesarius lived from 469/70 until 542 and was bishop of Arles for about forty years. His *Vita* was written in the seven years following his death. See William E. Klingshirn, 'The Life of Caesarius: Introduction', in *Caesarius of Arles: Life, Testament, Letters*, ed. and trans. by William E. Klingshirn, Translated Texts for Historians, 19 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1994), pp. 1-8 (p. 1, with notes). Caesarius also spoke against the Classics in his sermons. Riché, p. 86.

⁵⁷⁹ *Vita Caesarii*, 1.9. There is a similar dream recounted by Jerome in his letters (*Epistle* 22.30). Unlike Caesarius, however, Jerome did not let the dream stop his use of the Classics in later life. See Megan Hale Williams, *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), pp. 25-26.

⁵⁸⁰ *Vita Caesarii*, 1.9. The translations are from Klingshirn, 'Life of Caesarius', p. 14.

ascetic and pastoral Christianity, the Classical cultural mindset was seen as a real, and universal, threat to their monastic or pastoral work. From an ascetic or pastoral perspective, the aesthetic culture of Christian intellectuals such as Dracontius, rooted firmly in the forms and thought processes of the 'pagan' Classical past, was a very real, and very strong, stumbling-block in the development of either their new monasticism or of their episcopal/pastoral duties. And, of course, the only reason this Classically oriented mindset could have been seen as a threat which needed to be countered, was the fact that people still held it.⁵⁸¹ This fear of the Classics, and especially of the worldview and cultural mindset which they contained, was still alive and prevalent in the West at the beginning of the sixth century.

This renunciation of secular learning, of the Classics, was a strong element of the growing ascetic and pastoral Christian spirituality of the fifth and sixth centuries.⁵⁸² This was especially true of those Gallic thinkers associated in any way with either monasticism or pastoral care. In Gaul, this reaction against Classical culture, or really against secular culture, led to its full-scale overthrow: and not only for monastics. Thus we find Gregory of Tours who, while educated, emphasises his use of *sermo humilis* and his rejection of classical mythology.⁵⁸³ Gregory's rejection,

⁵⁸¹ An example here can again be found in Desiderius of Vienne.

⁵⁸² This rejection stems from the fact that antique education conveyed to its students the Classical cultural mindset. Paul F. Gehl states regarding the antique educational system: 'practices, not school texts, were ethically normative. In the course of Christianizing the ancient grammatical and rhetorical tradition, writers from Tertullian to Isidore struggled with the ethical power of formal language study. They were concerned, of course, about the pagan myths and non-Christian philosophy embedded in many school texts. But the normative force of classical literary practice worried them even more.' Gehl, 'Latin orthopraxes', in *Latin Grammar and Rhetoric: from Classical Theory to Medieval Practice*, ed. by Carol Dana Lanham (London: Continuum, 2002), pp. 1-21 (p. 5; see also pp. 2-3). The fact that the practices rather than the texts were the normative part of the system is what allows the continued use of the same educational texts, such as Quintilian, throughout the Middle Ages.

⁵⁸³ See again, for example, Gregory's remarks at the beginning of the *Gloria martyrum*. The comprehensive study of Gregory's Latin remains Max Bonnet, *Le Latin de Grégoire de*

indeed, sums up much of how both pastoral/episcopal and ascetic Christianity viewed the Classics: 'it is not proper either to recall deceitful myths or to follow the wisdom of philosophers that is hostile to God, lest we slip into the penalty of eternal death when the Lord passes judgement. I am afraid of this result'.⁵⁸⁴ As this passage from Gregory shows us, the new ascetically or pastorally inclined Christian culture growing in Gaul increasingly saw the Classics, and the cultural mindset and worldview found within their pages, as a threat to salvation.⁵⁸⁵

The new Christian culture being preached from the pulpits of monastic and pastoral clerics had one goal: the salvation of souls. This, of course, had always been a feature of Christian thought and purpose as laid down in the Gospels. In the late-fourth and early-fifth centuries, this salvific intention had led Christians, like Saint Augustine, to combine Christianity with the Classics: in order to convert pagan intellectuals, Christianity needed to take on a more polished and intellectual form. This more polished form of Christianity, which freely employed the Classics, is witnessed not only in the works of Saint Jerome and Saint Augustine, but also, even more clearly, in the genre of biblical epic so popular in Late Antiquity.

Tours (Paris: Hachette, 1890). While Gregory composed in simple Latin, he nevertheless was able to show his rhetorical skill: as shown by Martin Heinzelmann, Gregory's *Histories* are carefully and thoughtfully constructed. Martin Heinzelmann, *Gregory of Tours: History and Society in the Sixth Century*, trans. by Christopher Carroll (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 146-152.

⁵⁸⁴ Gregory of Tours, *Gloria martyrum*, preface. The Latin reads: 'Non enim oportet fallaces commemorare fabulas neque philosophorum inimicam Deo sapientiam sequi, ne in iudicium aeternae mortis, Domino discernente, cadamus. Quod ego metuens [...].' Translation from Van Dam, p. 2.

⁵⁸⁵ While Gregory himself was notoriously anti-monastic, he was nevertheless influenced by the monastic traditions of St Martin. What is perhaps even more important for Gregory, however, is his emphasis on pastoral care. While this emphasis came mostly from his episcopal position, the motivations behind it were much the same as those behind the new monastic culture. For more detailed and general discussions of this growing monastic/ascetic culture and its effects on Christianity see principally Brown, *Rise of Western Christendom* (especially pp. 143-266), Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* and Marilyn Dunn, *The Emergence of Monasticism: from the Desert Fathers to the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).

By the sixth century, however, the intellectual battle with paganism was long in the past and Christian culture began to face in a different direction. The fifth-century Church, especially in Vandal North Africa, was still largely rooted in the martyr-based Christianity of the earlier centuries of Late Antiquity.⁵⁸⁶ This martyr-based Church had much more room for 'secular' Christians. Believers could show their faith by personal devotion, often, but not exclusively involving the martyr cults, alongside simple adherence to the Christian faith. The Church of the fourth and fifth centuries still produced great Christian thinkers who were not members of the clergy. Such was Dracontius, whose poetry contained a great deal of exegesis. By the beginning of the sixth century, Christianity had been the official religion of the Roman world for over one hundred years, and legal for two hundred. During this period, Christian devotion became increasingly centred upon confessor saints, as martyrdom was no longer easily available.⁵⁸⁷ Along with this move towards a confessor-based Christianity came an increased emphasis on personal asceticism.⁵⁸⁸ These developments were fuelled by the growth of monasticism first in Egypt, and then in Gaul and Italy. The Christianity of Saint Anthony of the Desert rejected the secular world entirely; it rejected not only wealth, property and the company of secular society, but all the values, perceptions and ideologies possessed by that secular society.

With the introduction of monastic Christianity to the Latin West came the rejection of the Classics witnessed above in the works of Caesarius of Arles. That

⁵⁸⁶The importance of martyrs was a key facet of the Christian cult of saints, especially in the early period. The standard work on Late Antique saints' cults remains Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

⁵⁸⁷ Brown, *Rise of Western Christendom*, pp. 219-231.

⁵⁸⁸ Asceticism, it should be noted, had a strong presence in Classical thought as well. The new Christian asceticism, however, was very different from the old Stoic-influenced *askesis* of Ancient Rome. See the discussion by Megan Williams, pp. 10-12.

this rejection is also witnessed in Gregory of Tours, who came from the pastoral tradition and not the monastic, shows the strength of these new ideas: they were not simply confined to monasticism, but eventually influenced the full spectrum of Christian thinkers. As the main thrust of the new confessor-based Christianity was a full-scale rejection of the world, it necessarily involved the rejection of the Classics and the secular culture which they so embodied. Combined with this new thrust was an increasing emphasis, for both the monastic and non-monastic Church, on evangelization; this increased push for evangelization also necessarily involved a rejection of the Classics, as the 'urban and rural masses' could only be reached by a more simple language, a 'language adapted to their usage.'⁵⁸⁹ With this growth in monastic and pastoral thought came the growth of a new worldview, of a new cultural mindset. This new mindset, thoroughly Christian in nature, emphasised personal holiness, a personal rejection of the world and all of its trappings and, indeed, the ascetic removal from the secular world as a whole. As these priorities shifted and the new ascetic, monastic and pastoral worldviews were ever more widely adopted, the old Classical perceptions and modes of thinking became ever more marginal and ever more a target for attack. As Christian intellectuals came increasingly to adopt this new way of thinking, either in the form of monasticism or increased pastoral emphasis, the old Classical cultural mindset simply ceased to exist. In its place grew a new cultural mindset, centred on personal holiness, personal faith, and devotion to the cult of saints.

Yet, these new modes of thought and perception encompassed a great deal more than simply new Christian devotions. This new mindset led to the creation of a

⁵⁸⁹ Riché, p. 93.

great many literary and cultural works.⁵⁹⁰ The thinkers of the sixth century produced not only a variety of monastic rules, sermons, and hagiographies but also the various historical and encyclopaedic works which passed the knowledge of Classical and Late Antiquity on to future generations. These monastically and pastorally influenced perceptions and priorities were indeed highly innovative, but were not completely new. While it fully blossomed in the sixth century, elements of this mindset existed already in the fourth. In many ways, it started with Saint Anthony of the Desert and the promulgation of his life and cult by Saint Athanasius and subsequently John Cassian in the West. There is evidence of this new way of thinking in Jerome as well, although he was unable to sunder himself fully from Classical culture.⁵⁹¹ It was in the sixth century, however, that this new cultural mindset really triumphed in the West.⁵⁹² It was this century that produced the first great monastic, and essentially medieval, thinkers; thus we have, to name just a few, Caesarius of Arles, Cassiodorus, Benedict of Nursia and Gregory the Great. It also produced non-monastic intellectuals who were nevertheless imbued with the central aspects of these new perceptions, priorities and ways of thinking: such were Gregory of Tours and Isidore of Seville, who were themselves figures of the episcopal and pastoral, and not the monastic, Church. The sixth century also produced the first great poet who did not belong to the Classically centred Late Antique tradition:

⁵⁹⁰ It also affected traditional literary practices within the Christian community through which many of these works were created. As Mary Carruthers states: 'monasticism irrevocably affected the medieval teaching and practice of rhetoric, especially in regard to the nature of invention and memory.' Carruthers, 'Late antique rhetoric, early monasticism, and the revival of school rhetoric', in *Latin Grammar and Rhetoric*, pp. 239-257 (p. 240).

⁵⁹¹ Unable, and perhaps a little unwilling. For a discussion see Megan Williams, pp. 25-29.

⁵⁹² Robert Markus also saw the break with the ancient world at this time. Markus' conclusion, p. 222, is worth stating here: 'In Western Europe the late sixth century marks a real break with the world of antiquity, closed off access to much of its intellectual culture, and even more drastically, to its ways of looking at, understanding and speaking about that world.'

Venantius Fortunatus. The *epigrammata* of Venantius differed, in many ways, quite markedly from what had come before and, as we have already seen in Eugenius' own verse, became one of the foundation stones for Early Medieval poetry.

One of the reasons for the triumph of the ascetic cultural mindset in the sixth century was the gradual, but final, replacement of the antique educational system with that of the ecclesiastical.⁵⁹³ Much as the traditional antique schools had imbued students with the knowledge and culture of Classical antiquity, so too the new ecclesiastical schools imbued their students with the new cultural mindset upon which they were founded. Although the antique tradition did continue well into the sixth century, as the examples of Boethius and Desiderius of Vienne testify, it was nevertheless beginning to disappear.⁵⁹⁴ The disappearance of these antique schools was facilitated by the rejection of Classical culture discussed above. Many of these great monastic thinkers were themselves the product of the secular Roman educational system; yet, their rejection of the old system, and everything it stood for, continually eroded its foundations. But, while they rejected secular, Classical education, the new Christian thinkers nevertheless tended to value education highly. Thus they established the new monastic, parochial and episcopal schools, and centres of Christian worship very quickly became centres of knowledge, of learning and, ever increasingly, of culture. By the time of the seventh century, churches, and especially monasteries, were responsible for a considerable portion of the Latin West's cultural output. Monasteries and cathedrals became ever more increasingly

⁵⁹³ The new ecclesiastical educational system encompassed not only monastic schools, but also parish and cathedral schools. For this replacement see especially Riché, pp. 100-136 and pp. 266-304. Initially, the monastic schools were less common than the other forms of ecclesiastical schools. Monastic schools did, however, become more prevalent in the seventh century (Riché partly attributes this to Irish influence, pp. 324-336).

⁵⁹⁴ While Desiderius himself was a teacher of Classics, we must not forget that Boethius felt the need to travel to Athens for his Classical education.

the principal fonts of scholarly and literary activity. The cultural mindset of the seventh century was that of the new Christian ascetic and pastoral thinkers: the old Classical culture had finally ceased to exist.

With the seventh century, we must turn once more to Visigothic Iberia. Visigothic Iberia never experienced the full-scale rejection of the Classics which so marked the intellectual culture of late-fifth- and sixth-century Gaul. In fact, despite the increase in ecclesiastical education and influence, Classical literature continued to be an important part of the literary and intellectual culture of sixth- and seventh-century Iberia. Thus we have both Isidore of Seville and Eugenius II of Toledo who possess not only an intimate knowledge of the Classical canon, but a certain and marked affinity for it.⁵⁹⁵ In Visigothic Iberia, then, the study of the Classics and all that came along with them never died out, and was never consciously rejected.⁵⁹⁶ Throughout the sixth and seventh centuries secular learning and the Classics continued to be highly regarded.⁵⁹⁷ This can be seen not only in the writings of Isidore and Eugenius, but, intriguingly, in the corpus of Iberian hagiography. The *Vita Desiderii* written by the learned Visigothic king Sisebut mentions the great secular learning of its subject, Desiderius of Vienne.⁵⁹⁸ Desiderius, it should be noted, was a prodigious supporter of secular, Classical, learning; so much so that he

⁵⁹⁵ As Gehl, p. 9, states: 'For Isidore, and for most Christian thinkers ever since, there is no danger in studying the pagan classics as long as that study is properly, spiritually contextualized.'

⁵⁹⁶ Nor was there a slavish attachment to them, as Riché, pp. 355-356, suggests.

⁵⁹⁷ See for example Riché, pp. 352-355.

⁵⁹⁸ *Vita Desiderii*, 2. For the Latin text see, Sisebut, *Vitae Desiderii episcopi Viennensis*, ed. by Bruno Krusch, in *Passiones vitaeque sacnctorum aevi merovingici et antiquiorum aliquot*, ed. by Bruno Krusch, Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores rerum merovingicarum, 3 (Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1896), pp. 630-637. For an English translation see Sisebut, *Life and Martyrdom of Saint Desiderius*, trans. by A. T. Fear, in Fear, *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, pp. 1-14.

earned a warning from Pope Gregory the Great, as mentioned above.⁵⁹⁹ The *Vita Desiderii* itself quotes not only the poetry of Dracontius, but Vergil's *Aeneid*. The late-seventh-century *Vita Fructuosi* begins partly by praising the learning and oratorical skill of Isidore of Seville.⁶⁰⁰

Yet, in the Visigothic hagiography we also see the triumph of both ecclesiastical education and the new ascetic and pastoral modes of thinking. The narratives of the *Vitas Patrum Emeritensium* begin with an account of a young boy attending school at the *domus ecclesiae* of Saint Eulalia in Merida.⁶⁰¹ Here, then, we see evidence for the growth of the new ecclesiastical (in this case episcopal) education in Iberia. The work in which the new monastic cultural mindset is witnessed most clearly in Visigothic Hispania, however, is the *Vita Sancti Aemiliani* written by Braulio of Zaragoza.⁶⁰² Braulio was not only highly educated himself, but presided as abbot over the important centre of learning that was his monastery in Zaragoza. Braulio and his monastery, after all, produced, among others, Eugenius II of Toledo. Yet, his *Vita Aemiliani* is marked for its praise of the very opposite of Braulio's own learning: it praises Aemilian, who started life as a shepherd, especially for his rustic, untutored and simple faith. Aemilian, Braulio writes, 'so plucked flowers of knowledge from the meadows of the ineffable Godhead that he who had scarcely committed the eighth psalm to memory, far surpassed without

⁵⁹⁹ See note 2 on p. 1 of Fear's translation for the details of this.

⁶⁰⁰ *Vita Fructuosi*, 1. For the Latin text see Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz, ed. *La Vida de San Fructuoso de Braga* (Braga: Diário do Minho, 1974). For an English translation see Anonymous, *The Life of Saint Fructuosus of Braga*, trans. by A. T. Fear in Fear, *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, pp. 123-144.

⁶⁰¹ *Vitas Patrum Emeritensium*, 1.1. For a very brief discussion of the *domus ecclesiae* see Fear, *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, p. 46 note 4.

⁶⁰² For the Latin text see L. Vázquez de Parga, ed., *Vita S. Emiliani: edición crítica* (Madrid: Instituto Jerónimo Zurita, 1943). For an English translation see Braulio of Zaragoza, *The Life of Saint Aemilian the Confessor, Called the Hooded*, trans. by A. T. Fear in Fear, *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, pp. 15-44.

compare the ancient philosophers of the world in practical knowledge, wisdom and sharpness of perception'.⁶⁰³ This emphasis on knowledge and wisdom earned not through reading and traditional learning but through the practice and experience of the monastic life (along with the divine revelation that this life earned) is an important element of these new modes of thinking, and a sharp break with the Classical world. This new cultural mindset is also evident in Braulio's preface to the *Vita Aemiliani*. Braulio's words here are worth quoting:

In order to reply briefly to those who struggle to display their eloquence, let them know that the abuse of detractors has but little weight, as the law of the Church does not set empty verbosity as something for humble and lowly Christians to pursue nor the superficiality of human complaints, nor yet the bombastic ostentation, but the sober, modest, and weighty profundity of the truth. It is indeed better to tell the truth in a less than educated fashion than eloquent fictions, as can easily be learnt from the Gospels of the Saviour which preach to the people in simple language. I do not because of my ineptitude revile the eloquence of wise men, but will not at all condone the fleeting frivolity of bickerers. [...] Wherefore although I have in part cleaved to the study of the things of this world, here I have altogether spurned them, lest I should make my account difficult to understand for the less educated and throw the camp of Israel into confusion with the language of Jericho.⁶⁰⁴

Braulio's words here echo, of course, the standard sentiments expressed in the prefaces of most hagiographical works, such as those of Gregory of Tours. Yet, there is also something else going on here. Braulio is a learned and eloquent man himself, as his own letters show: whereas Gregory of Tours uniformly rejected the ostentatious educated style, Braulio only does so here, as he himself tells us. Braulio felt that, while there was nothing in and of itself necessarily wrong with the learned and Classically influenced Late Antique style, its goals and priorities paled in comparison to the importance of the simple, unlearned and devout faith of his subject. Thus what we see here is the full embracing of the idea expressed by Avitus

⁶⁰³ *Vita Aemiliani*, 5.12. Translation from Fear, p. 25.

⁶⁰⁴ *Vita Aemiliani*, Preface, 5. Translation from Fear, p. 19.

in his own preface to the *De spiritalis historiae gestis*: truth matters more than anything else.⁶⁰⁵ Yet, where Avitus was not yet ready to fully cast off the trappings of the ornate Late Antique style, Braulio was. Braulio's priorities had changed: while he was fully able to produce the ornate, educated Latin of Late Antiquity, he chose here not to, because the plain and simple truth was more vital. This change in emphasis and priorities underlies the change from the Classical to the monastic cultural mindset. Braulio, in turn, passed this mindset on to his most illustrious student and disciple, Eugenius.

What was different about Visigothic Hispania, then, was that the adoption of the new monastic and pastoral modes of thinking and perceptions did not involve the full-scale rejection of Classical culture witnessed in some of the Gallic thinkers. The learned elite of the Visigothic kingdom never stopped regarding both the Classics and secular learning very highly. As Isidore, Eugenius and the lives of the Visigothic fathers show, Classical knowledge and learning never disappeared in Iberia. Yet, as these works also show, Classical culture, and the cultural mindset which came along with it, did. With the growth of monasticism and the triumph of the ascetic ideal in Hispania, the old Classical values, perceptions, and modes of thinking were replaced. When this new cultural mindset triumphed in Iberia, however, it no longer included the rejection of Classics as it had done in Gaul: the triumph of the new monastic and pastoral Christian mindset was so powerful, that the study of the Classics never needed rejection, because the new came in so strong that the old ways were never perceived as a threat. Thus, in the middle of the seventh century we find Eugenius: a learned poet, imbued with the Classics, who chooses to follow Venantius Fortunatus rather than Vergil, and chooses also to put his own, simple, ascetic faith into his

⁶⁰⁵ See above, pp. 151-153.

verse. While he knows and uses the Classics, he is not of them: he, a monastic himself, belongs to the world of the Middle Ages.

We must now take one last step back, and view the final conclusion of the case-study in the global setting of the transformation of the Roman world. The principal intent of this study was, in effect, to examine this transformation through the lens of Dracontius' poetry and its redaction by Eugenius. What we have seen in them is this: Dracontius, in his cultural mindset, his perceptions, his priorities, his worldview, was part of a living Classical culture. Dracontius shows us continuity with the world of Classical Antiquity. The end of the Classical world did not come with the thought of Augustine or the swords of the barbarians. No, for Dracontius, at the heart of the 'barbarian' kingdom of the Vandals, still held up the banner of antiquity, still practised the poetic arts as he had inherited them. Surely, the slow transformation of the Roman world had begun by Dracontius' day, as the works of Saint Augustine do attest, but that transformation was not yet complete. But, while the works of Dracontius attest cultural continuity, those of Eugenius show change. Eugenius' world was Medieval: he was a part of the new ascetic Christian culture which grew to prevalence over the course of the sixth and seventh centuries and which came to dominate the culture of the Latin West for nearly one thousand years. By Eugenius' time the culture of the Classical world, which was the life-blood of ancient Rome, had ceased to exist: in Eugenius' day the Classics were a scholarly reserve, and no longer part of a living culture. By Eugenius' time, then, the transformation of the Roman world was complete. As outlined above, this final transformation was a transformation of cultural mindset, of perceptions and modes of thinking, and it came with the triumph of the pastoral Church, monasticism and the ascetic ideal. The final word of this case-study then is that the end of the

Classical Roman world did not come about with the introduction of Christianity, or the devastation of the barbarians, but with the changes in Christianity itself, and the final triumph of the ascetic, monastic and pastoral ideal. The end of antiquity did not come with the torches of the Vandals and Goths, for they sought only power and accommodation, not change; rather, the end of antiquity started with the spiritual fire of Anthony of the Desert, for that fire, that ascetic drive founded in the Egyptian heat, sought change, and found it.

Appendix: The *Loci Similes*

The following lists have been compiled from the various modern editions (principally Vollmer's MGH and the *Belles Lettres*) along with original contributions by the present author. These lists cover only the *Satisfactio* and the three books of the *De Laudibus Dei*, as those are the works most central to the argument of the present thesis. These lists cover only the Dracontian version of the texts, as Alberto has provided in his recent edition a thorough list of the *loci similes* found in the Eugenic *opera*. For the *loci similes* found in further Dracontian texts, see the *apparati* of the modern editions listed in the bibliography.

1. References to Classical and Late Antique Texts

Satisfactio

- 1: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.60-61
Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* 5.1.1
- 2: Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.296
Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina* 4.14.6
- 5: Prudentius, *Contra Symmachum* 2.95
Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 2.250
Ausonius, 1.16.4
Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina* 5.3
- 11: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.565
Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.888
- 15: Juvenal 1.85
Prudentius, *Hamartigenia* 763
- 27: Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.11
Cyprianus Gallus, *Leuiticus* 72
- 28: Arator 1.1052
- 31-7: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.206ff.
- 33: Horace, *Satirae*, 1.5.60-61
- 37: Vergil, *Aeneid* 2.471
- 38: Ovid, *Heroides*, 14.86
Ovid, *Fasti*, 5.620
- 39: Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carmina* 16.37
- 40: Aulus Gellius 5.9.1
Livy 10.19.7
Tacitus, *Dialogus de oratoribus* 36.8
- 42: Prudentius, *Apotheosis* 216
- 46: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.741-42
- 47: Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina* 4.16.7
- 47-8: Statius, *Thebaid* 5.613-14
- 54: *Disticha Catonis* 1.5.2
- 55: Prudentius, *Hamartigenia* 338
- 57ff: Augustine, *Enchiridion* 3.11
- 60: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.19
Apuleius, *De Mundo* 21
- 62: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.588-89
- 63: Lucretius 4.531
- 67: Lucan 6.673

- 69ff: Lucretius 5.1293-95
72: Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 45-46
75: Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.387-88
 Lucretius 3.577
 Merobaudes, *Carmina* 4.3
78: Ovid, *Amores*, 2.6.56
 Martial 8.32.2
 Martial 11.104.9
81: Martianus Capella 2.186-87
84: Horace, *Epodes* 2.41
 Statius, *Silvae* 4.3.126
 Lucan 8.830
 Propertius 4.9.46
86: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.122
 Tibullus 2.6.46
 Martial 6.10.8
 Statius, *Thebaid* 1.102
 Lucretius 3.526-27
89-92: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.45-51
 Vergil, *Georgics* 1.231-39
91: Claudius Marius Victor, *Aletheia* 2.469
96: Commodian, *Carmen Apologeticum* 819
 Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 4.8
 Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.242
115: Ovid, *Tristia* 2.22
116: Prosper, *Epigrammata* 21.5-6
117: Ovid, *Tristia* 1.1.84
118: Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina* 23.2
119: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.370
137: Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.296
139: Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.313
 Valerius Flaccus 3.100
141: Ovid, *Tristiae* 3.5.33-34
145: Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 8.48
 Seneca, *De Clementia* 1.5.5
148: Phaedrus, *Fabulae* 3.22
149: Ovid, *Tristiae* 2.40
 Seneca, *De Clementia* 1.5.7
152: Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina* 16.121
 Commodian, *Carmen Apologeticum* 577
157: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 5.77
170: Juvenal 8.25
177: Suetonius, *Divus Iulius* 41.1ff
183: Suetonius, *Titus* 8.1
 Eutropius 7.21.3
 Ausonius 419.72
187: Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 105
188: *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* 4.18.2-3
199: Cicero, *Pro Marcello* 6
 Cicero, *Pro Marcello* 11
 Fronto, *Ad Verum*, 2.3
204: Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae* 2.40
 Ovid, *Tristiae* 2.177

- 207: Vergil, *Eclogues* 10.45
Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.266
- 218: Statius, *Achilleid* 1.848
- 220: Ovid, *Amores* 1.6.24
- 221: Augustine, *De diuersis quaestionibus* 58.2,
Augustine, *De diuersis quaestionibus* 64.2
- 224: Tibullus 1.10.40
Maximian, *Elegiae* 1.246
- 226: Seneca, *Troades* 775
- 227: Statius, *Thebaid* 1.21
Ausonius 12.6.2
- 228: Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.160
- 229: Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina* 4.6.1
- 243: Catullus 63.39
Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 4.228
- 244: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.122
- 247: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 15.409
Claudius Marius Victoius, *Aletheia* 3.30
- 251: Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 187-88
- 253: *Laus Pisonis* 149ff.
- 255: *Elegiae in Maecenatem* 1.113-14
Ovid, *Fasti* 6.771
- 258: Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.6.10
Laus Pisonis 140
- 260: Juvenal 6.571
- 261: Horace, *Carmina* 2.9.1
Laus Pisonis 147ff.
- 271: Vergil, *Georgics* 4.538
- 275: Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae* 2.213
- 277: Horace, *Carmina* 2.10.11-12
Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 369ff.
Statius, *Siluae* 2.7.90
- 279-80: Horace, *Carmina* 2.10.11-12
Seneca, *Agamemnon* 96
- 280: Silius Italicus 4.2
- 296: Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina* 7.12.44
- 297: Ovid, *Tristiae* 2.32
Seneca, *De Clementia* 1.17.3
- 300: Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.6.5-8
- 312: Damasus, *Carmina* 2.19
- 313-4: Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.596
Lucan 6.83

De Laudibus Dei, I

- 4: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 5.431
- 6-7: Lucretius 5.1189-1193
- 25: cf. Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 1.63ff.
- 39: cf. Vergil, *Georgics* 1.351ff.
- 41: Manilius 1.874-5
- 45: Lucan 1.589-591
- 46: *Anthologia Latina* 224.7
- 46-7: Lucan 1.562-3
Claudian, *In Eutropium* 1.1

- 58: cf. Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 8.161
63: cf. Cicero, *De divinatione* 1.98
65-6: Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.645
69: Seneca, *Hercules furens* 609
70: Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae* 2.198
72: Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae* 2.221
76: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.256
cf. Lucan 3.418
79: Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae* 2.298
83: Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 1.462-3
89: cf. Prosper, *Epigrammata* 4
cf. Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 1.465ff.
90: Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 1.465-7
Prosper, *Epigrammata* 75.9
138: Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 1.49
146: Claudian, *Panegyricus dictus Probino et Olybrio consulibus* 17
151: Lucretius 1.2-4
158-163: Lucretius 5.492-4
Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.43-4
169: Vergil, *Eclogues* 3.56
170: Horace, *Carmina* 4.2.8-9
177: Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 1.246
180: Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.163
191: Claudian, *Panegyricus de Tertio Consulatu Honorii Augusti* 98
192: Vergil, *Eclogues* 10.49
193: Horace, *Carmina* 1.4.4
199: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.107
Prudentius, *Cathemerinon* 3.103
Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 1.228
Sidonius, *Carmina* 2.409
202: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.111-12
Vergil, *Eclogues* 4.29-30
217: Vergil, *Georgics* 1.137
230: Prudentius, *Libri contra Symmachum* 1.334-5
250: Claudian, *Phoenix* 19
257: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.475
259: cf. Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 5,558
275: Vergil, *Georgics* 3.539
Ovid, *Tristiae* 3.11.11
276: Statius, *Thebaid* 7.66
280: Statius, *Thebaid* 11.532-3
Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae* 2.243
Juvenal 5.116
282: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.418-419
284: Vergil, *Georgics* 3.480
cf. Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto* 10.1
289: Lucan 9.724-26
292: cf. Vergil, *Georgics* 1.60
cf. pseudo-Ovid, *Halieutica* 92
295: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.6
Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.686
cf. Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*. 11.87
301: Horace, *Carmina* 1.9.10-1

- 308: Petronius, *Fragmenta* 31.3
311-2: Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae* 3.265-6
314: cf. Solinus, 30.14
319: Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.686
325: cf. Pliny, *Naturalis Historiae* 12.116/118
cf. Statius, *Silvae* 5.2.138
329: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.76
332: cf. Prudentius, *Apotheosis* 1031ff.
340: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.66
341: Vergil, *Aeneid* 10.452
342: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 7.78
348: Vergil, *Aeneid* 2.570
350: cf. Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 3.173
365: Vergil, *Aeneid* 4.172
367: Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 20.4
377-8: Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 1.374-5
379-380: Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 1.379-380
381: Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 1.363
388: Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.150
393: Ovid, *Amores* 1.5.17
399: Ovid, *Fasti* 4.97
400: Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 1.381-2
408: Lucan 1.89-90
417: cf. Manilius 1.69
420: Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.515
Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.518
430: Claudian, *Carmina minora* 32.1
pseudo-Prosper, *De providentia* 466
439: Lucretius 5.931-932
Statius, *Thebaid* 8.71
449: Vergil, *Aeneid* 9.608
Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.101-2
460: Prudentius, *Hamartigenia* 208
Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 2.58
471: Cyprian, *Genesis* 76
472: Vergil, *Aeneid* 4.308
473: Arator 1.610
484: Horace, *Epistulae* 1.2.3
Horace, *Satirae* 1.6.63
488: Prudentius, *Peristephanon* 10.891
502: Persius 5.10
504: Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.446
508: Statius, *Thebaid* 7.720
525: Prudentius, *Apotheosis* 309
527: cf. Vergil, *Georgics* 1.373ff.
529: Vergil, *Georgics* 1.391-2
Pliny. *Naturalis Historia* 18.357
Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 2.11
535: Cicero, *Pro Roberio Postumo* 11
537: Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 1.413-4
542: Horace, *Satirae* 1.2.62
Arator 1.447
555: Prudentius, *Peristephanon* 5.527-8

- 559: Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.393
- 563: Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina* 19.134
cf. Prudentius, *Apotheosis*, preface, 1
cf. Merobaudes, *De Christo*, 28
- 574: Vergil, *Eclogues* 3.56
- 585: Vergil, *Georgics* 1.462
Vergil, *Aeneid* 5.20
Cicero, *Natura deorum* 2.101
- 588: Ovid, *Amores* 1.7.54
- 591: Statius, *Thebaid* 6.848
Statius, *Thebaid* 5.668
cf. Prudentius, *Apotheosis* 836ff.
- 592: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.122
- 593: Lucan 1.622-3
- 596: Prudentius, *Apotheosis* 837-842
- 600-1: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.726-7
- 602: Ovid, *Fasti* 6.132
Ovid, *Fasti* 6.802
- 603-4: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.7
- 607: Claudian, *In Eutropium* 2.259
- 611: cf. Horace, *Satirae* 1.3.1
- 612: cf. Ennius, *Tragoediae* 366ff.
- 614: Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.176
- 625: cf. pseudo-Cyprian, *De resurrectione mortuorum* 121-136
- 628: Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.47
- 636: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 5.461
- 638: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.421
- 639: Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.190
- 644: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 15.70
- 648: Prudentius, *Apotheosis* 756
Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 4.288
- 654: Claudian, *Phoenix* 60
- 655: Claudian, *Phoenix* 62
- 657: Vergil, *Aeneid* 2.758
- 660: Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.574;
Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 10.279
- 662: Vergil, *Aeneid* 7.362
- 664: Vergil, *Georgics* 1.427
- 668: Statius, *Thebaid* 6.238
cf. Ovid, *Fasti* 2.314
cf. Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 15.189
- 670: Statius, *Thebaid* 6.240
- 671: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.77
- 674: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 4.228
- 681: Lucan 2.71-73
- 707: cf. Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.52
cf. Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 14.224
- 710: Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.199
- 716: Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.742
Vergil, *Georgics* 2.478
- 717: Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae* 2.130
- 725: Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 10.15
cf. Ovid, *Fasti* 6.196

- 738: Lucan 1.52
 740: Prudence, *Cathemerinon* 6.93-4
 752: Seneca, *Thyestes* 1045

De Laudibus Dei, II

- 1: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.60
 8: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.5
 9: Horace, *Carmina* 3.21.24
 11: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.255
 18: cf. Martianus Capella 2.187-189
 Fulgentius the Mythographer 1.12
 24: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 2.66
 Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.279
 33: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.722
 Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.726
 55: Lucretius 5.96
 61: Prudentius, *Cathemerinon* 11.17 ff.
 62: Prudentius, *Hamartigenia* 931-932
 72: Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina* 27.58
 85: Lucretius 1.866
 87: Arator 1.748
 89-90: Merobaudes, *De Christo* 4-5
 Arator 2. 73
 93: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 2.39
 94: Merobaudes, *De Christo* 10
 100: Prudentius, *Cathemerinon* 10.82
 108: Merobaudes, *De Christo* 11-12
 110: Claudian, *De Salvatore*, 5
 128: Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.390
 141: Vergil, *Georgics* 3.529
 146: Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina* 19.9
 152: Lucan 9.443
 178: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.284
 179-80: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.148
 187: Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.646
 188: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 3.339
 190: Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.224
 195: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.25
 203: Prudentius, *Peristephanon* 10.539-540
 210: Vergil, *Aeneid* 9.403
 222: Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.47
 239: Vergil, *Aeneid* 11.754
 251: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 5.156
 277: Vergil, *Eclogues* 3.93
 278: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.356
 279: Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.8
 280: Vergil, *Eclogues* 3.75
 289: Juvenal 1.79
 290: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.227
 305: Catullus 64.399
 308: Juvenal 10.22
 317ff.: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.609

- 319: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.427
 322: Juvenal 6.596
 331: cf. Juvenal 2.45
 cf. Juvenal 14.57
 cf. Juvenal 6.134
 352: Vergil, *Georgics* 4.444
 354: Vergil, *Eclogues* 9.43
 362: Vergil, *Georgics* 4.206
 373: cf. Cladius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 2.364
 379: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.292
 383: Vergil, *Georgics* 3.243
 Horace, *Carmina* 1.2.7ff.
 Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.304ff.
 386: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.304
 387: Vergil, *Eclogues* 4.22
 389: Statius, *Thebaid* 1.109
 399: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.138
 403: Lucan 4.240
 405: Claudian, *In Rufinum* 2.141
 418: Vergil, *Aeneid* 7.517
 Vergil, *Georgics* 3.451
 419: Vergil, *Aeneid* 2.587
 421: Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 3.778
 423: Claudius Marius Victorius, *Aletheia* 3.776-777
 437: Vergil, *Aeneid* 11.258
 438: Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.367
 441: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.89-112
 cf. Prudentius, *Psychomachia* 619ff.
 444: Juvenal 12.57
 453: Vergil, *Eclogues* 4.43
 454: Vergil, *Eclogues* 4.44-45
 456: Statius, *Thebaid* 2.281
 459: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.128
 462: Vergil, *Eclogues* 4.39
 Lucan 8.446
 470: Orientius, *Commonitorium* 1.45
 478: Lucan 5.290
 495: Valerius Flaccus 4.345
 497: Claudian, *De Consulatu Stilichonis* 3.167
 509: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 2.274
 520: Juvencus 4.634
 525: Vergil, *Georgics* 2.336
 526: Merobaudes, *De Christo* 23
 537ff.: Arator 1.181
 544-5: Lucan 6.721-722
 547-8: Vergil, *Georgics* 2.292
 554: Vergil, *Aeneid* 2.40
 Vergil, *Aeneid* 2.370
 Vergil, *Aeneid* 5.76
 571: Propertius 4.5.41
 577: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.148
 579: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.341
 597: Cyprianus Gallus, *Judicium* 156

- 599: Claudian, *Carmina minora* 32.14
 Merobaudes, *De Christo* 7
 Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 2.59ff.
- 610: Lucan 2.113
- 613: Prudentius, *Cathemerinon* 12.82
- 633: Ovid, *Amores* 3.7.65
- 636: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.108-109
- 637: Lucan 2.342
- 642: Vergil, *Aeneid* 4.66
- 645: Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.293
- 646: Claudian, *Carmina minora* 32.8
- 650: Ovid, *Fasti* 3.690
- 651: Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.4.21
 Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 14.840
- 662: Ovid, *Amores* 1.8.16
- 674: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 6.203
- 690: Vergil, *Aeneid* 11.241
- 703: Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina* 32.224
- 728ff.: Lucan 15.10
- 733: Vergil, *Georgics* 4.412
- 734: Prudentius, *Psychomachia*, preface 32
 Prudentius, *Peristephanon* 1.72
- 737: Juvenecus 1.102
- 754: Vergil, *Aeneid* 2.118
- 757: Commodian, *Instructiones* 2.38.3
- 766: Arator 1.801ff.
- 770: Arator 1.806
- 772: Arator 1.803
- 798: Vergil, *Aeneid* 7.588
- 799: cf. Valerius Flaccus 5.120
- 803: Lucretius 2.618
- 811: Claudian, *De Bello Gothico* 49

De Laudibus Dei, III

- 4: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 66-67
 Lucretius 2.1054
 cf. Lucretius 3.779
- 19: Statius, *Thebiad* 5.387
- 20: Prosper, *Epigrammata* 101.1
- 33: Lucan 1.181
- 43: Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina* 18.255
- 44: Horace, *Epistulae* 1.2.56
- 45: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 13.703
- 51: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.163
- 58: Propertius 4.4.58
- 60: Juvenal 1.28
- 63: Juvenal 1.29
- 65: Vergil, *Aeneid* 11.841
- 71: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 11.127
- 72: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 5.51
- 75: Claudian, *Fescennina de Nuptiis Honorii Augusti* 2.16
- 87: Juvenal 8.83
- 93: Statius, *Thebiad* 8.385

- Statius, *Thebaid* 10.768
 108: Vergil, *Aeneid* 11.86
 110: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.76
 118: Commodian, *Instructiones* 1.4
 cf. Prudentius, *Contra Symmachum* 2.296ff.
 151: Ovid, *Remedia amoris* 20
 152: Lucan 4.278
 cf. Lucan 2.158
 cf. Lucan 2.439
 cf. Commodian, *Carmen apologeticum* 176
 171ff.: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 197ff.
 175: Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.421
 Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 205
 176-7: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.791
 Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.837
 193: Vergil, *Aeneid* 5.377
 196: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 7.191
 cf. Valerius Flaccus 6.245
 cf. Horace, *Satirae* 2.7.97
 203: cf. Ausonius 408.11
 205: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.429
 221: Ovid, *Tristia* 4.4.63-4
 225: Vergil, *Georgics* 4.234
 237ff.: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.585
 cf. Manilius 5.91ff.
 248: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 5.436
 260: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.624
 Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.42
 262: Statius, *Thebaid* 10.756ff.
 263: cf. Statius, *Thebaid* 10.708
 264: Statius, *Thebaid* 10.777
 277: Vergil, *Eclogues* 5.11
 278: Lucan 8.241
 279: Diodorus 11.9ff.
 280: Vergil, *Aeneid* 9.315
 293: pseudo-Tertullian, *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* 1.20
 296: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 4.617
 296ff.: Sallust, *Bellum Iugurthinum* 19.3
 Sallust, *Bellum Iugurthinum* 79.5ff.
 Valerius Maximus 5.6
 303: Vergil, *Aeneid* 7.341
 306: Horace, *Carmina* 4.7.3
 311: Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.430
 312: Vergil, *Georgics* 1.67
 Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.531
 320: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.898
 328: Livy 1.59.1 & 3
 329: Ovid, *Ars amatoria* 1.125
 339: Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto* 7.134
 Ovid, *Heroides* 7.136
 349: Paulinus of Perigueux, *Vita Martini* 3.229
 351: Statius, *Thebaid* 7.569
 354: Paulinus of Perigueux, *Vita Martini* 4.631

- 355: Lucan 10.76
357: Lucan 6.595
361: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 4.118
Stattius, *Thebaid* 4.607
376: Ovid, *Fasti* 6.463
387: Juvenal 3.213
388: Vergil, *Aeneid* 11.86
390: Stattius, *Thebaid* 6.625
397: Valerius Maximus 3.3.1
Martial 1.21.7
407: Silius Italicus 9.540
Stattius, *Thebaid* 8.19
409: Stattius, *Thebaid* 7.821
Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 3.89
410: Stattius, *Thebaid* 8.3
414: Stattius, *Thebaid* 8.4-20
420: Lucan 6.789
421: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 4.93
423: Vergil, *Georgics* 2.491
424: Lucan 2.148
426: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1, 283
433: Claudian, *De bello Gildonico* 1.78-9
450: Stattius, *Thebaid* 12.781
457: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.853
cf. Cicero, *De Officiis* 1.35
466: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.341
473: Juvenal 6.284
484: Stattius, *Thebaid* 4.321
488: Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina* 26.165
497: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.623
500: Claudian, *In Eutropium* 1.340
501: cf. Herodotus 1.214
Valerius Maximus, 9.10 ext. 1
505: Vergil, *Aeneid* 2.407
507: Stattius, *Thebaid* 12.545
510: Vergil, *Aeneid* 4.646
511: Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae* 2.361
515: Vergil, *Aeneid* 4.646
517: Vergil, *Aeneid* 4.196ff.
cf. Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 5.17.5
525: Vergil, *Aeneid* 7.496
546: Prosper, *Epigrammata*, preface 9
Stattius, *Achilleid* 1.105
549: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.240-1
cf. Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.220ff.
554: Lucan 10.238
556: cf. Lucretius 6.652
568: Vergil, *Georgics* 2.43
Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.625
cf. Arator 1.459ff.
569: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.36
571: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.545
591: Ovid, *Tristia* 2.102

- 626: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.365
 627: Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae* 2.271
 647: Ovid, *Ars amatoria* 3.376
 652: Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.367
 653: Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 5.135
 673: Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.203
 680: Aulus Gellius 1.15.3
 692: Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.389
 707: cf. Cicero, *De natura deorum* 2.149
 cf. Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 7.70
 708-9: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 14.304-5
 709-10: Prudentius, *Apotheosis* 859-860
 711-2: cf. Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.804-6
 718: cf. Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.206-211
 722-3: Ausonius, 153.71
 732: Vergil, *Aeneid* 11.796
 736: Ovid, *Fasti* 2.658
 736-8: cf. Ausonius 153.4-5
 745: Juvenal 10.356
 cf. Ausonius 153.59ff.
 cf. Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina* 4.8ff.
 752: Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.638
 cf. Prudentius, *Cathemerinon* 3.101
 cf. Prudentius, *Hamartigenia* 795
 cf. Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.53
 cf. Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina* 31.605

2. Biblical *loci similes*

Satisfactio

- 3: cf. Daniel 3. 2ff.
 7: Daniel 2. 21
 Malachi 3. 6
 10: Ecclesiastes 3. 1
 11: Jeremiah 2. 17
 12: cf. Psalms 7. 10
 Proverbs 16. 9
 16: Mark 5. 37
 17: cf. Exodus 4. 21
 cf. Exodus 7. 13
 cf. Exodus 8. 19
 Romans 10. 17
 18: Exodus 4. 21
 Exodus 7. 13
 cf. Exodus 9. 12
 cf. Exodus 10. 1-27
 cf. Exodus 11. 10
 cf. Exodus 14. 4
 26ff.: Psalms 20. 10
 Psalms 89. 11
 Nahum 1. 6
 27ff.: Psalms 20. 10
 29: cf. Deuteronomy 28. 28

- 29-38: Daniel 4. 22ff.
Daniel 4. 30ff.
- 39ff.: Luke 1. 7ff.
cf. Psalms 38. 2
Luke 1. 3-20
- 44: Sirach 22. 33
- 54: I John 1. 8-10
III Kings 8. 46
Proverbs 20. 9
- 70: Joel 3. 10
Micah 4. 3
- 98: Exodus 32. 1ff.
cf. Numbers 11. 4
cf. Numbers 11. 10
- 101: Luke 6. 35
Romans 13. 1ff.
- 103: Proverbs 21. 1
- 114: Romans 13. 4
- 137: Proverbs 19. 12
- 147: Proverbs 15. 1
- 148: Proverbs 28. 13
- 151: Matthew 18. 23
Luke 19. 12ff.
cf. Matthew 25. 14ff.
- 154: Matthew 27. 57 *Vetus Latina*
- 155ff.: Ephesians 4. 26
- 157: I Kings 24. 11ff.
I Kings 26. 9ff.
cf. I Kings 25. 33ff.
- 158: II Kings 11. 2ff.
- 163: II Kings 14. 24ff.
II Kings 15. 1ff.
II Kings 18. 1ff.
- 165: I Kings 25. 28
- 167-8: III Kings 3. 11-12
cf. II Chronicles 1. 11-12
Wisdom 9. 1ff.
Wisdom 9. 4
- 171: Acts 6. 8ff.
Acts 7. 59
- 182: cf. Matthew 2. 1ff.
cf. Matthew 7. 9ff.
- 210: cf. Proverbs 16. 32
- 219ff.: Ecclesiastes 3. 1ff.
- 233: Ecclesiastes 1. 5ff.
- 238-40: III Kings 17. 4 *Vetus Latina*
- 288ff.: Ecclesiastes 3. 2-8
- 255: cf. Wisdom 2. 5
- 257: Ecclesiastes 3. 8
- 259: Ecclesiastes 3. 4
- 260: Ecclesiastes 3. 6
- 264: John 7. 30
John 12. 23

- John 12. 27
 John 13. 1
 John 17. 1
 cf. John 8. 20
 285ff: cf. II Peter 2. 5-8
 291: Matthew 5. 43
 Matthew 18. 15
 Luke 17. 3
 293: Matthew 5. 45
 296: Matthew 9. 12
 303: cf. Job 35 6
 305-6: Matthew 6. 12
 Luke 11. 4
 cf. Matthew 6. 14-15
 cf. Mark 11. 25
 307: Matthew 18. 21
 Luke 17. 4
 310: Wisdom 15. 2
 Psalms 118. 94

De Laudibus Dei, I

- 3-11: Psalms 148
 19: James 1. 17
 20: II Chronicles 30. 9
 Judith 7. 20
 Sirach 2. 13
 I John 1. 5
 John 4. 24
 I John 4. 8
 29: Ezekiel 18. 23
 Ezekiel 33. 11
 II Peter 3. 9
 cf. Psalms 37. 11
 29-34: Wisdom 11. 24-26
 Wisdom 12. 10
 Wisdom 12. 20
 Wisdom 16. 11
 34: cf. Psalms 31. 5
 cf. I John 1. 9
 99-100: cf. Psalms 6. 2
 cf. Psalms 37. 2
 101: cf. Wisdom 11. 14 *Septuaginta* (or perhaps *Vetus Latina*)
 101-8: cf. Psalms 72. 11
 cf. Psalms 72. 19
 cf. Psalms 93. 7
 cf. Isaiah 47. 11,
 cf. I Thessalonians 5. 2-4.
 116: cf. Jonah 4. 10-11
 cf. Wisdom 11. 24-26
 118: Genesis 1. 5
 129-131: cf. I John 1. 5
 183: Isaiah 51. 3
 217: cf. Genesis 1. 14-15

- 218: cf. Genesis 1. 16
 221: cf. Deuteronomy 17. 3
 361-370: cf. I Corinthians 7. 10-11
 cf. Ephesians 5. 28-29
 cf. Ephesians 5. 22
 521: Matthew 12. 34
 522: Matthew 16. 2-4
 542-3: cf. Ecclesiastes 25. 33
 557-8: John 5. 29
 571: Genesis 1. 28
 Wisdom 10. 1-2
 585: Job 37. 21
 693-4: Psalms 50. 18-19
 697: Isaiah 64. 3
 Psalms 96. 5
 699: Psalms 103. 32
 cf. Psalms 17. 8
 cf. Psalms 76. 19
 701: Job 9. 6
 702-3: Joshua 3. 16
 704: Psalms 76. 17
 707: Psalms 134. 7
 708-710: cf. Psalms 134. 7
 cf. Sirach 43. 14-20
 cf. Job 37. 3-11
 cf. Job 38. 22-28
 712-3: Job 38. 29
 721-3: Job 39. 27-30
 721: Psalms 146. 9
 Job 38. 41
 Luke 12. 24
 722: Matthew 24. 28
 Luke 17. 37
 724: Psalms 102. 5
 726: cf. Psalms 135. 25
 cf. Psalms 103. 27-28
 cf. Psalms 144. 15-16
 738-742: Luke 1. 52-53

De Laudibus Dei, II

- 2: cf. Wisdom 11. 25
 13: Genesis 1. 2
 25: Jeremiah 19. 13
 Zephaniah 1. 5
 45: Psalms 103. 4
 47: cf. Romans 10. 148
 57: Wisdom 12. 12
 Job 11. 10
 87: Luke 1. 35
 Matthew 1. 18
 117: cf. Matthew 17. 14ff.

- cf. Mark 9. 14ff.
 cf. Matthew 8. 28ff.
 cf. Mark 5. 1ff.
 119-120: Matthew 8. 1ff.
 Mark 1. 40ff.
 Luke 5. 12ff.
 Luke 17. 11ff.
 123-5: John 9. 1ff.
 126: cf. Mark 2. 3ff.
 cf. Luke 5. 18ff.
 127-8: cf. Matthew 9. 1ff.
 cf. Mark 2. 3ff.
 130: cf. Luke 7. 11ff.
 131: Matthew 9. 18ff.
 Luke 8. 40ff.
 Mark 5. 22ff.
 132: John 11
 134: cf. Matthew 9. 20
 cf. Luke 8. 43ff.
 cf. Mark 5. 25ff.
 136: Luke 4. 39
 Mark 4. 39
 137: cf. Matthew 14. 22ff.
 140: cf. John 2
 142: Matthew 14. 13ff.
 Matthew 15. 32ff.
 Mark 6. 30
 Mark 8
 John 6. 5ff.
 147: cf. Acts 2. 2ff.
 151-2: Mark 16. 17ff.
 165: Exodus 14. 15ff.
 168: Exod. 14. 27-28
 176: cf. Numbers 11. 31
 cf. Psalms 77. 26-27a
 179: Exodus 16. 4
 Psalms 77. 24-26ff.
 Wisdom 16. 20
 John 6. 31
 I Corinthians 10. 3
 Exodus 16. 13
 Numbers 11. 31ff.
 181: Exodus 17. 6
 Numbers 20. 11
 I Corinthians 10. 4
 182/3: Job 41. 2
 cf. Romans 11. 35-36
 186: Wisdom 12. 13
 cf. I Peter 5. 7
 211ff.: Psalms 148
 Daniel 3. 64-70
 245: Genesis 1. 26
 Genesis 9. 6

- 336: cf. I Kings 28. 7-25
352: Job 38. 11
Proverbs 8. 29
369: Genesis 6. 4ff.
400: cf. Genesis 7. 11
417: Genesis 9. 11
420: Wisdom 10. 6
420ff.: Genesis 19
441: cf. Matthew 6. 26
449: Isaiah 57. 9
464: Job 4. 18-19
cf. Job 15. 15-16
470: Job 4. 19
481: Apocalypse 12. 3-4
515ff.: Matthew 26. 14-16
Mark 14. 10-11
Luke 22. 5-6
521: cf. Hebrews 9. 14
cf. I John 1. 7
528: Matthew 27. 45ff.
532: Isaiah 24. 23
Joel 2. 31
Acts 2. 20 (citing Joel 2. 31)
Apocalypse 6. 12
538-551: cf. Acts 2. 31
cf. Romans 10. 7
cf. Ephesians 4. 9
544-5: I Peter 3. 19
Luke 13. 28
552: Matthew 27. 52-53
557ff.: Mark 16. 19
Acts 10. 42
II Corinthians 5. 10
567-576: Matthew 27. 3ff.
Matthew 27. 51-53
Acts 1. 18
577-9: Luke 23. 34
Luke 23. 43
580ff.: Acts 9. 1ff.
Acts 8. 58
583: II Timothy 4. 8
cf. I Corinthians 9. 25
cf. I Peter 5. 4
585: Leviticus 24. 19
611: Hebrews 9. 12ff.
612: cf. John 1. 29
cf. I Peter 2. 24
cf. Isaiah 53. 4
cf. I John 3. 5
613: Hebrews 1. 2
614: I Thessalonians 1. 9
625: Genesis 15. 6
Romans 4. 3 (citing Genesis 15. 6)

- 635-9: Genesis 17. 16
Genesis 18. 10
- 638: cf. Romans 4. 18-21
- 653-6: Genesis 15. 5
Genesis 22. 7
- 659: Tobit 6. 11ff.
Tobit 3. 16ff.
Tobit 11. 1-15
- 664: II Kings 11. 4ff.
- 672: cf. IV Kings 18. 1ff.
cf. IV Kings 20
- 674: cf. I Kings 1. 10-13
- 686: Luke 1. 7ff.
- 696: Psalms 144. 14
Psalms 145. 8
- 697: Psalms 145. 7
- 697ff.: Wisdom 12. 2
- 706: Habakkuk 3. 2
- 713: I Kings 2. 6
Wisdom 16. 13
cf. Deuteronomy 32. 39
cf. Tobit 13. 2
- 715: cf. Ecclesiastes 8. 11
- 728-9: Luke 15. 10
- 732: Luke 1. 52
I Kings 2. 7-8
Psalms 145. 7
- 745: Matthew 5. 45
- 752: Isaiah 30. 18-19
- 753: Psalms 50. 18
- 755: Psalms 146. 3
Isaiah 61. 1
- 757-765: Matthew 25. 35
- 763: Tobit 4. 11
- 765: Proverbs 19. 17
Proverbs 28. 27
- 766: Acts 9. 36-41
- 786: Psalms 103. 4
- 788: Exodus 3. 2ff.
- 789-793: Exodus 3. 7-8
- 793ff.: Exodus 14 & 15
- 794: Psalms 144. 13
- 796ff.: Wisdom 10. 17-20
- 797ff.: Exodus 15. 1-21
- 801: Exodus 14
Wisdom 10. 20
- 803: Exodus 15. 20

De Laudibus Dei, III

- 48: Sirach 14. 4
cf. Sirach 11. 28-20
Ecclesiastes 2. 18
cf. Ecclesiastes 6. 2

- Luke 12. 20
 68: Luke 16. 26
 83: John 12. 25
 cf. Matthew 10. 39
 cf. Luke 9. 24
 116: Genesis 22. 13
 131: James 1. 13
 171ff.: Daniel 3. 23ff.
 178: Daniel 3. 49
 180: Daniel 3. 92
 229: Acts 3. 6ff.
 229ff.: Acts 5. 15
 Acts 9. 32
 230: Matthew 10. 8
 231: Acts 3. 12
 236: Acts 8. 10
 570: Psalms 39. 13
 576: Jeremiah 29. 23
 578: I John 1. 8
 589: Psalms 17. 5
 590: Psalms 68. 3
 Jonah 2. 4
 591: Psalms 68. 2
 Jonah 2. 6
 602: Psalms 87. 9
 Psalms 37. 12
 Job 19. 14
 Psalms 37. 12
 605: Job 19. 15ff.
 615: Ephesians 4. 26
 Matthew 5. 25
 617: cf. Luke 17. 4
 cf. Matthew 18. 21ff.
 641: Luke 23. 40-43
 685: Proverbs 18. 21
 Sirach 37. 21
 James 3. 2-10
 689: Ezekiel 37. 4
 690: Ezekiel 37. 7ff.
 694: Ezekiel 37. 8
 695: Ezech. 37. 7
 717: John 5. 25
 718: cf. Daniel 4. 30

Bibliography:

Editions of Dracontius' Works:

Díaz de Bustamente, J. M., ed., *Draconcio y sus Carmina Profana: Estudio*

biográfico, introducción y edición crítica, Monografías de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 44 (Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 1978)

Moussy, Claude and Colette Camus, eds, *Dracontius Œuvres*, 4 vols, 2nd edn (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002)

Rapisarda, Emanuele, ed., *Draconzio. La Tragedia di Oreste* (Catania: University of Catania, 1964)

Speranza, Felicianus, ed., *Blossi Aemili Draconti Satisfactio una cum Eugeni*

recensione, Biblioteca di Helikon: Revista di Tradizione e Cultura Classica dell'Università di Messina, Testi e Studi, 9 (Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1978)

Vollmer, Friedrich, ed. *Blossii Aemilii Dracontii*, in *Fl. Merobaudis Reliquiae, Blossii*

Aemilii Dracontii Carmina, Eugenii Toletani Episcopi Carmina et Epistulae, ed. by Frederick Vollmer, MGH, Auctores Antiquissimi, 14 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1905), pp. 20-228.

Vollmer, Friedrich, ed. *Dracontii*, in *Poetae Latini Minores*, vol. 5, ed. by Emil

Baehrens and Frederick Vollmer (Leipzig: Teubner, 1914)

Editions of Eugenius' Works:

Alberto, Paulo Farmhouse, ed., *Eugenii Toletani Opera Omnia*, Corpus

Christianorum Series Latina CXIV (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005)

Speranza, Felicianus, ed., *Blossi Aemili Draconti Satisfactio una cum Eugeni*

recensione, Biblioteca di Helikon: Revista di Tradizione e Cultura Classica

dell'Università di Messina, *Testi e Studi*, 9 (Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1978) [the redaction is printed as an intertextual gloss within Dracontius' original version]

Vollmer, Friedrich, ed., *Eugenii Dracontiana*, in *Fl. Merobaudis Reliquiae, Blossii Aemilii Dracontii Carmina, Eugenii Toletani Episcopi Carmina et Epistulae*, ed. by Frederick Vollmer, MGH, *Auctores Antiquissimi*, 14 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1905), pp. 27-69 and 115-129

Vollmer, Friedrich, ed., *Eugenii Toletani Episcopi: Carmina*, in *Fl. Merobaudis Reliquiae, Blossii Aemilii Dracontii Carmina, Eugenii Toletani Episcopi Carmina et Epistulae*, ed. by Frederick Vollmer, MGH, *Auctores Antiquissimi*, 14 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1905), pp. pp. 231-270

Primary Sources:

Anonymous, *The Life of Saint Fructuosus of Braga*, trans. by A. T. Fear in *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, ed. and trans. by A. T. Fear, *Translated Texts for Historians*, 26 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997), pp. 123-144

Anonymous, *La Vida de San Fructuoso de Braga*, ed. by Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz (Braga: Diário do Minho, 1974)

Anthologia Latina: sive poesis latinae supplementum, ed. by Francis Buecheler and Alexander Riese 2 vols, 5 parts (Leipzig: Teubner, 1894-1926)

Augustine of Hippo, *Confessiones. Books I-IV*, ed. by Gillian Clark (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Avitus of Vienne, *De spiritalis historiae gestis*, in *Alcimi Ecdicii Aviti Viennensis episcopi opera quae supersunt*, ed. by Rudolph Peiper, MGH *Auctorum antiquissimorum* 6.2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1883), pp. 201-296

- Braulio of Zaragoza (Braulio of Saragossa), *The Life of Saint Aemilian the Confessor, Called the Hooded*, trans. by A. T. Fear in *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, ed. and trans. by A. T. Fear, *Translated Texts for Historians*, 26 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997), pp. 15-44
- , *Vita S. Emiliani: edición crítica*, ed. by L. Vázquez de Parga (Madrid: Instituto Jerónimo Zurita, 1943)
- Breviarium gothicum*, ed. by Antonius Lorenzana, in *Liturgia mozarabica secundum regulam beati Isidori*, ed. by J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 86, 2 vols (Paris: Migne, 1862), II
- Caesarius of Arles: Life, Testament, Letters*, trans. by William E. Klingshirn, *Translated Texts for Historians*, 19 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1994)
- Caesarius of Arles (Césaire D'Arles), *Sermons au peuple*, ed. by Marie-José Delage, 3 vols (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1971-1986)
- Cicero, *De Re Publica*, in Cicero, *De Re Publica, De Legibus*, ed. and trans. by Clinton Walker Keyes, *Loeb Classical Library*, 28 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1970), XVI, 12-285
- Cicero: Laelius, On Friendship (Laelius de Amicitia) and The Dream of Scipio (Somnium Scipionis)*, J. G. F. Powell, ed. and trans., *Aris & Phillips Classical Texts* (Oxford: Oxbow, 1990)
- Claudius Marius Victor, *Alethia*, in *Poetae Christiani Minores*, ed. by Michael Petschenig, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, 16 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1888), I, 364-436
- Cyprianus et al., *Vita Caesarii episcopi Arelatensis libri duo*, in *Passiones vitaeque sanctorum aevi merovingici et antiquorum aliquot*, ed. by Bruno Krusch,

MGH Scriptorum rerum merovingicarum, 3 (Hannover: Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1896), pp.433-501

Gregory of Tours: Glory of the Martyrs, trans. by Raymond Van Dam, Translated Texts for Historians, 4, 2nd edn (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004)

Gregory of Tours (Gregorius Turonensis), *Liber in Gloria martyrum*, ed. by Bruno Krusch, in *Gregorii episcopi Turonensis: Miracula et opera minora*, ed. by Bruno Krusch, Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptorum rerum merovingicarum, 1.2 (Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1885), pp. 34-111

Hymnodia Gotica. Die Mozarabischen Hymnen des alt-spanischen Ritus. ed. by Clemens Blume, Analecta Hymnica medii aevi, 27 (Leipzig: O.R. Reisland, 1897)

Ildefonsus of Toledo (Ildefonsus Toletanus), *De viris illustribus*, ed. by Carmen Codoñer Merino, in *De virginitate Sanctae Mariae, De cognitione baptismi, De itinere deserti, De viris illustribus*, ed. by Carmen Codoñer and V. Yarza Urquiola, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 114A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 597-616

---, *On the Lives of Famous Men*, trans. by A. T. Fear, in A. T. Fear, *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, Translated Texts for Historians, 26 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997), pp. 107-122

Isidore of Seville, *De viris illustribus*, in *El 'De viris illustribus' de Isidoro de Sevilla: Estudio y edición crítica*, ed. by Carmen Codoñer Merino, *Theses et studia philologia Salmanticensia*, 12 (Salamanca: Consejo Superior de

- Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto 'Antonio de Nebrija', Colegio Trilingüe de la Universidad, 1964)
- , *Isidori Hispalensis Chronica*, ed. by José Carlos Martín, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 112 (Turnhout : Brepols, 2003)
- , *History of the Kings of the Goths, Vandals and Suevi*, trans. by Guido Donini and Gordon B. Ford, Jr (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966)
- Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, trans. by George Norlin, in *Isocrates*, ed. and trans. by George Norlin, Loeb Classical Library, 3 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1928), I, pp. 116-243
- Jerome, *Select Letters of St Jerome*, trans. by F. A. Wright (London: Heinemann, 1933)
- Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, trans. and ed. by A. T. Fear, Translated Texts for Historians, 26 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997)
- Livy (Titus Livius), *Histoire Romaine*, ed. by Jean Bayet et al., 34 vols (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1947-1984)
- Macrobius (Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius), *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*, ed. by Jacob Willis (Liepzig: Teubner, 1963)
- Marius Victorinus, *Opera theologica*, ed. by Albrecht Locher (Leipzig: Teubner, 1976)
- , *Theological Treatises on the Trinity*, trans. by Mary T. Clark, The Fathers of the Church vol. 69 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1981)
- Martial, *Epigrammata*, ed. by D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1990)
- Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, ed. and trans. by Frank Justus Miller, Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1925)

Procopius, *History of the Wars*, trans. by H. B. Dewing, Loeb Classical Library, 6 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1916), II

Sedulius, *Opera omnia: una cum excerptis ex Remigii exposition in Sedulii Paschale carmen*, ed. by Johannes Huemer and Victoria Panagl, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 10 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007)

Sidonius Apollinaris, *Sidoine Apollinaire: Poèmes*, ed. by André Loyen, in *Sidoine Apollinaire*, ed. by André Loyen, 3 vols (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1960-1970), I (1960)

Sisebut, *Life and Martyrdom of Saint Desiderius*, trans. by A. T. Fear, in *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, ed. and trans. by A. T. Fear, Translated Texts for Historians, 26 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997), pp. 1-14

--- (Sisebutus rex Wisigothorum), *Vitae Desiderii episcopi Viennensis*, ed. by Bruno Krusch, in *Passiones vitaeque sacnctorum aevi merovingici et antiquiorum aliquot*, ed. by Bruno Krusch, Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores rerum merovingicarum, 3 (Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1896), pp. 630-637

Tibullus, *Elegies: Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes*, ed. and trans. by Guy Lee, 3rd edn, rev. by Guy Lee and Robert Maltby (Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1990)

Venantius Fortunatus (Venance Fortunat), *Poèmes*, ed. by Marc Reydellet, 3 vols (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1994-2004)

Vergil, *Georgics*, in Virgil, *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I-VI*, ed. and trans. by H. Rushton Fairclough, Loeb Classical Library, rev. edn, 2 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1965), I, pp. 80-237

Victor of Vita, *History of the Vandal Persecution*, trans. by John Moorhead,
Translated Texts for Historians, 10 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press,
1992)

--- (Victor Episcopus Vitensis), *Historia persecutionis Africae Provinciae*, ed. by
Michael Petschenig, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 7
(Vienna: C. Gerold, 1881)

Vitas sanctorum patrum Emeretensium, ed. by A. Maya Sánchez, *Corpus
Christianorum Series Latina* 116 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1992)

Editions of the Bible:

Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem, ed. by Robert Weber et al., 4th edn
(Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994)

Novum Testamentum Graece, ed. by Eberhard Nestle & al., rev. by Kurt Aland and
Barbara Aland, rev. edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979)

The New Testament in the Original Greek, rev. by Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D.
Fenton John Anthony Hort, D.D. (New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin
Square, 1885)

Secondary Sources:

Aaron, David H., 'Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim:
Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam', *The Harvard Theological
Review*, 90.3 (1997), 299-314

Abellán, Salvador Iranzo, 'Eugenio II de Toledo', in *La Hispania visigótica y
mozárabe: dos épocas en su literatura*, ed. by Carmen Codoñer (Salamanca:
Universidad Salamanca/Universidad de Extremadura, 2010), pp. 110-118

- Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: an introduction to the critical editions and to the theory and practice of modern textual criticism*, trans. by Erroll F. Rhodes, 2nd edn rev. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1995)
- Alberto, Paulo Farmhouse, *Eugenii Toletani Opera Omnia*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina CXIV (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005)
- , 'Notes on Eugenius of Toledo', *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, 49.1 (1999), 304-314
- , 'Originality and Poetic Tradition in Visigothic Spain: the Summer according to Eugenius of Toledo', *Euphrosyne: revista de filologia clàssica*, 31 (2003), pp. 349-356
- Albrecht, Michael von, *A History of Roman Literature: From Livius Andronicus to Boethius: With Special Regard to its Influence on World Literature*, trans. by Michel von Albrecht, et al., rev. by Gareth Schmeling and Michael von Albrecht, 2 vols (New York: E. J. Brill, 1996)
- Arianism after Arius: essays on the development of the fourth century Trinitarian conflicts*, ed. by Michael R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams (Edinburgh: Clark, 1993)
- Arweiler, A., 'Interpreting Cultural Change: Semiotics and Exegesis in Dracontius' *De Laudibus Dei*', in *Poetry and Exegesis in Premodern Latin Christianity: The Encounter between Classical and Christian Strategies of Interpretation*, ed. by Willemien Otten and Karla Pollmann (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 147-72
- Bartholomew, Philip, 'Fifth-Century Facts', *Britannia*, 13 (1982), 261-70

- Bartlett, R., 'Aristocracy and Asceticism: The Letters of Ennodius and the Gallic and Italian Churches', in *Culture and Society in Late Antique Gaul*, ed. by Danuta Shanzer and Ralph Mathisen (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 201-16
- Beard, Mary, *The Roman Triumph* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007)
- Bodelón García, Serafin, 'Draconcio y el reino vándalo,' *EPOS: Revista de filología*, 17 (2001), 29-53
- , 'Épica y lírica vándala: Draconcio,' *Entemu*, 12 (2000), 163-202
- Bonnet, Max, *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours* (Paris: Hachette, 1890)
- Bourgery, A., 'Introduction', in *Lucain. La guerre civile (la Pharsale)*, ed. by A. Bourgery, 2 vols (Paris: Les Belles-Lettres, 1926), I, v-xx
- Bright, David F., 'The Chronology of the Poems of Dracontius', *Classica et Mediaevalia: Revue danoise de philology et d'histoire*, 50 (1999), 193-206
- , *The Miniature Epic in Vandal Africa* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987)
- Brown, Peter, *The Cult of the Saints: its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981)
- , *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, ad 200-1000*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003)
- , *The World of Late Antiquity AD 150-750* (New York, London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1989)
- Bruce, F.F., 'Marius Victorinus and His Works', *The Evangelical Quarterly* 18 (1946), 132-153
- Burckhardt, Jacob, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. by S. G. C. Middlemore (New York: Harper and Row, 1958)

- Burton, Philip, *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language*
(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- Butrica, James L., *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984)
- Cairns, Francis, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1972)
- Cameron, Alan, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius*
(Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970)
- Cameron, Averil, *The Later Roman Empire* (London: Fontana Press, 1993)
- Carruthers, Mary, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)
- , 'Late antique rhetoric, early monasticism, and the revival of school rhetoric', in
Latin Grammar and Rhetoric: from Classical Theory to Medieval Practice,
ed. by Carol Dana Lanham (London: Continuum, 2002), pp. 239-257
- Chadwick, Henry, *Boethius: the Consolation of Music, Logic, Theology and
Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981)
- Clarke, W. M., 'Intentional Rhyme in Vergil and Ovid', *Transactions and
Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 103 (1972), 49-77
- Clover, Frank M., 'Carthage in the Age of Augustine', in *Excavations at Carthage
1976, Conducted by the University of Michigan IV*, ed. by J. H. Humphrey
(Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum, 1978), pp. 1-14
- , 'Carthage and the Vandals', in *Excavations at Carthage 1976, Conducted by the
University of Michigan VII*, ed. by J. H. Humphrey (Ann Arbor: Kelsey
Museum, 1982), pp. 1-22
- , 'Commodus the Poet', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 32 (1988), 19-33

- , 'Felix Karthago', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 40 (1986), 1-16
- , *The Late Roman West and the Vandals* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1993)
- , 'The Symbiosis of Romans and Vandals in Africa', in *Das Reich und die Barbaren*, ed. by Evangelos K. Chrysos and Andreas Schwarcz (Vienna, Köln: Böhlau, 1989), pp. 57-73
- Codoñer, Carmen, 'The Poetry of Eugenius of Toledo', in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, Third Volume 1981*, ed. by Francis Cairns (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1981), pp. 323-42
- Collins, Roger, *Early Medieval Spain: Unity in Diversity, 400-1000*, 2nd edn (New York: St Martin's Press, 1995)
- , *Visigothic Spain, 409-711* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004)
- Conant, Jonathan, *Staying Roman: conquest and identity in Africa and the Mediterranean, 439-700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)
- Courcelle, Pierre, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques*, 3rd edn (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1964)
- Courtois, Christian, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris: Arts et métiers graphiques, 1955)
- Curtius, Ernst Robert, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. by Willard R. Trask, Bollingen Series 36 (New York: Pantheon, 1953)
- Daly, William M., 'Christianitas Eclipses Romanitas in the Life of Sidonius Apollinaris', in *Religion, Culture, and Society in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. by Thomas F. X. Noble and John J. Contreni (Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1987), pp. 7-26

- Das Reich der Vandalen und seine (Vor-)Geschichten*, ed. by Guido M. Berndt and Roland Steinacher, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters* 13 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2008)
- Demandt, Alexander, 'The Osmosis of Late Roman and Germanic Aristocracies', in *Das Reich und die Barbaren*, ed. by Evangelos K. Chrysos and Andreas Schwarcz (Vienna, Köln: Böhlau, 1989), pp. 75-86
- Díaz, Pablo C., 'Monasticism and Liturgy in Visigothic Spain', in *The Visigoths: Studies in Culture and Society*, ed. by Alberto Ferreiro (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 169-99
- Díaz de Bustamente, J. M., *Draconcio y sus Carmina Profana: Estudio biográfico, introducción y edición crítica*, *Monografías de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela*, 44 (Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 1978)
- Díaz y Díaz, Manuel C., *Anecdota Wisigothica I: Estudios y ediciones de textos literarios menores de época visigoda*, *Filosofía y Letras* 12.2 (Salamanca: University of Salamanca, 1958)
- , *De Isidoro al siglo XI: ocho studios sobre la vida literaria peninsular* (Barcelona: Ediciones El Albir, 1976)
- , 'El Latín de España en el siglo VII: Lengua y escritura según los textos documentos', in *Le Septième Siècle: Changements et continuités: Actes du Colloque bilatéral franco-britannique tenu au Warburg Institute les 8-9 Juillet 1988/ The Seventh Century: Change and Continuity: Proceedings of a joint French and British Colloquium held at the Warburg Institute 8-9 July 1988*, ed. by Jacques Fontaine and J. N. Hillgarth (London: the Warburg Institute, University of London, 1992), pp. 25-40

- , 'El Latín de la liturgia hispánica', in *Estudio sobre la liturgia mozárabe*, ed. by J. Rivera Recio (Toledo: Diputación Provincial, 1965)
- Dix, Gregory, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, rev. edn (London: Continuum, 2005)
- Duckworth, George E., 'Five Centuries of Latin Hexameter Poetry: Silver Age and Late Empire', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 98 (1967), 77-150
- Dunn, Marilyn, *The Emergence of Monasticism: from the Desert Fathers to the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000)
- Edwards, Mark J., 'Dracontius the African and the Fate of Rome', *Latomus*, 63 (2004), 151-60
- Elsner, Jás, 'The Changing Nature of Roman Art and the Art-Historical Problem of Style', in *Late Antique and Medieval Art of the Mediterranean World*, ed. by Eva R. Hoffman (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007) pp. 11-18
- Fear, A. T., *Lives of the Visigothic Fathers*, Translated Texts for Historians, 26 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997)
- Ferreiro, Alberto, *The Visigoths in Gaul and Iberia: a supplemental bibliography* (Leiden: Brill, 2006)
- , *The Visigoths in Gaul and Spain, AD 418-711: a bibliography* (Leiden: Brill, 1988)
- Fontaine, Jacques, and Marie-Hélène Jullien, 'Introduction', in *Ambroise de Milan: Hymnes. Texte établi, traduit et annoté*, ed. by Jacques Fontaine (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992), pp. 11-123
- Fontaine, Jacques, *Études sur la poésie latine tardive d'Ausone à Prudence: recueil de travaux de Jacques Fontaine* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1980)

- , *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique*, 2nd edn, 3 vols (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1983)
- , *Isidore de Séville: Genèse et originalité de la culture hispanique au temps des Wisigoths* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000)
- , 'Les trois voies des formes poétiques au VII^e siècle latin', in *Le Septième Siècle: Changements et continuités: Actes du Colloque bilatéral franco-britannique tenu au Warburg Institute les 8-9 Juillet 1988/ The Seventh Century: Change and Continuity: Proceedings of a joint French and British Colloquium held at the Warburg Institute 8-9 July 1988*, ed. by Jacques Fontaine and J. N. Hillgarth (London: the Warburg Institute, University of London, 1992), pp. 1-24
- , *Naissance de la poésie dans l'occident chrétien: esquisse d'une histoire de la poésie latine chrétienne du III^e au VI^e siècle* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1981)
- Fossum, Andrew, 'Hapax Legomena in Plato', *The American Journal of Philology*, 52.3 (1931), 205-231
- Franco, Ruth Miguel, 'Braulio de Zaragoza, el rey Chindasvinto y Eugenio de Toledo: imagen y opinion en el *Epistularium* de Braulio de Zaragoza', *Emerita, Revista de Lingüística y Filología Clásica*, 79.1 (2011), 155-76
- Frend, W. H. C., *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952)
- Gehl, Paul F., 'Latin orthopraxes', in *Latin Grammar and Rhetoric: from Classical Theory to Medieval Practice*, ed. by Carol Dana Lanham (London: Continuum, 2002), pp. 1-21

- George, Judith W., 'Vandal Poets in their Context', in *Vandal, Romans and Berbers: New Perspectives on Late Antique North Africa*, ed. by A. H. Merrills (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 133-44
- , *Venantius Fortunatus: A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)
- , *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems*, Translated Texts for Historians 23 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1995)
- Gibson, Margaret, ed., *Boethius: his Life, Thought and Influence* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1981)
- Greenspahn, Frederick E., *Hapax Legomena in Biblical Hebrew: A Study of the Phenomenon and its Treatment since Antiquity with special reference to Verbal Forms* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984)
- , 'The Number and Distribution of hapax legomena in Biblical Hebrew', *Vetus Testamentum*, 30.1 (1980), 8-19
- Griffin, Carl W., and David L. Paulsen, 'Augustine and the Corporeality of God', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 95.1 (2002), 97-118
- Hall, J. B., 'Epyllia from Vandal Africa: review of *The Miniature Epic in Vandal Africa* by David F. Bright', *The Classical Review*, New Series, 40.1 (1990), 55-57
- Halsall, Guy, *Barbarian Migrations and the Roman West, 376-568* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)
- Harries, Jill, *Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome AD 407-485* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994)
- Hays, Gregory, 'Review of P.F. Alberto, ed. *Eugenii Toletani Opera Omnia*', *The Journal of Medieval Latin*, 19 (2009), 291-294

- , “*Romuleis Libicisque Litteris*”: Fulgentius and the “Vandal Renaissance”, in *Vandals, Romans and Berbers: New Perspectives on Late Antique North Africa*, ed. by A. H. Merrills (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 101-32
- Heather, Peter, *The Fall of the Roman Empire* (London: Macmillan, 2005)
- Heinzelmann, Martin, *Gregory of Tours: History and Society in the Sixth Century*, trans. by Christopher Carroll (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)
- Hen, Yitzhak, *Roman Barbarians: The Royal Court and Culture in the Early Medieval West* (Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)
- Hillgarth, J. N., ‘Visigothic Spain and Early Christian Ireland’, *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature*, 62 (1961-1963), 167-194
- Hoffmann, M., ‘Principles of Structure and Unity in Latin Biblical Epic’, in *Poetry and Exegesis in Premodern Latin Christianity: The Encounter between Classical and Christian Strategies of Interpretation*, ed. by Willemien Otten and Karla Pollmann (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 139-45
- Hudson-Williams, A., ‘Notes on the Christian Poems of Dracontius’, *The Classical Quarterly*, 41.3/4 (1947), 95-108
- Iranzo Abellán, Salvador, ‘Eugenio II de Toledo’, in *La Hispania visigótica y mozárabe: dos épocas en su literatura*, María Adelaida Andrés Sanz et al., ed. by Carmen Codoñer (Salamanca: Universidad Salamanca/Universidad de Extremadura, 2010), pp. 110-118
- Kay, N. M., *Epigrams from the Anthologia Latina: Text, Translation and Commentary* (London: Duckworth, 2006)

- Kenney, E. J., 'The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid's *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria*, and *Remedia Amoris*', *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, vol. 12.1 (1962), 1-31
- King, P. D., 'King Chindaswinth and the First Territorial Law-code of the Visigothic Kingdom', in *Visigothic Spain: New Approaches*, ed. by Edward James (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), pp. 131-157
- , *Law and Society in the Visigothic Kingdom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972)
- Klingshirn, William E., *Caesarius of Arles: the Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- , 'The Life of Caesarius: Introduction', in *Caesarius of Arles: Life, Testament, Letters*, ed. and trans. by William E. Klingshirn, *Translated Texts for Historians*, 19 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1994), pp. 1-8
- Koon, Sam, and Jamie Wood, 'The *Chronica Maiora* of Isidore of Seville', *e-Spania*, 6 (2008) <<http://e-spania.revues.org/15552> [accessed 12 June 2012]
- Kuijper, Dirk, 'Varia Dracontiana' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1958)
- La Hispania visigótica y mozárabe: dos épocas en su literatura*, ed. by Carmen Codoñer (Salamanca: University of Salamanca Press, 2010)
- Langlois, Pierre, 'Dracontius', in *Das Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 16 vols (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1950-1994), iv, 250-269
- , 'Notes critiques sur l'Hexameron de Dracontius et sa recension par Eugène de Tolède: A propos d'une édition récente du *De laudibus Dei*' in *Latomus*, 23 (1964), 807-817

- Lapidge, Michael, 'The Authorship of the Adonic Verses "ad Fidolium" Attributed to Columbanus', *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 18.2 (1977), 249-314
- , 'Epilogue: did Columbanus compose metrical verse?', in *Columbanus: Studies on the Latin Writings*, ed. by Michael Lapidge, Studies in Celtic History (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997), pp. 274-85
- Late Antique and Medieval Art of the Mediterranean World*, ed. by Eva R. Hoffman (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007)
- Lester, Mary. 'Ad nostram catholicam fidem: Remembering Religious Identity in Post-Conversion Visigothic Iberia', Paper presented at the *International Medieval Congress*, Leeds, 11 July 2012
- Löfstedt, Einar, *Late Latin*, Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning Serie A, 25 (Oslo: H. Aschehoug and Co., 1959)
- Loyen, André, *Sidoine et l'esprit précieux en Gaule aux derniers jours de l'empire* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1943)
- Mackail, J. W., *Latin Literature* (London: John Murray, 1909)
- MacCormack, Sabine G., *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1981)
- Markus, Robert A., *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)
- , 'From Caesarius to Boniface: Christianity and Paganism in Gaul', in *Le Septième Siècle: Changements et continuités: Actes du Colloque bilatéral franco-britannique tenu au Warburg Institute les 8-9 Juillet 1988/ The Seventh Century: Change and Continuity: Proceedings of a joint French and British Colloquium held at the Warburg Institute 8-9 July 1988*, ed. by Jacques

- Fontaine and J. N. Hillgarth (London: the Warburg Institute, University of London, 1992), pp. 154-168
- Marrou, Henri-Irénée, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. by George Lamb (London: Sheed and Ward, 1956)
- , *Décadence romaine ou antiquité tardive? III^e-IV^e siècle* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1977)
- , *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris: E. De Boccard, 1938)
- , *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique: Retractatio*, (Paris: E. De Boccard, 1949)
- Martindale, John Robert, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), ii (ad 395-527)
- McClure, Judith, 'The Biblical Epic and its Audience in Late Antiquity', in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, Third Volume 1981*, ed. by Francis Cairns (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1981), pp. 305-21
- McCormick, Michael, *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)
- Merrills, A. H., and Richard Miles, *The Vandals* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010)
- Merrills, A. H., 'The Perils of Panegyric: The Lost Poem of Dracontius and its Consequences', in *Vandals, Romans and Berbers: New Perspectives on Late Antique North Africa*, ed. by A. H. Merrills (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 145-62
- , 'The secret of my succession: dynasty and crisis in Vandal North Africa', *Early Medieval Europe*, 18.2 (2010), 135-159

- , 'Vandals, Romans and Berbers: Understanding Late Antique North Africa', in *Vandals, Romans and Berbers: New Perspectives on Late Antique North Africa*, ed. by A. H. Merrills (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 3-28
- Messenger, Ruth Ellis, 'The Mozarabic Hymnal', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 75 (1944), 103-126
- Messina, Nicolò, *Pseudo-Eugenio di Toledo. Speculum per un nobile visigoto. Introduzione, edizione critica e traduzione. Concordanza e Lista di frequenze* (Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 1983)
- Moussy, Claude, 'Introduction', in *Dracontius: Œuvres*, 4 vols (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002), I, 7-136
- Nodes, Daniel J., 'Benevolent Winds and the Spirit of God in *De Laudibus Dei* of Dracontius', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 43.3 (1989), 282-292
- , *Doctrine and Exegesis in Biblical Latin Poetry*, ARCA, 31 (Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1993)
- Nora, Pierre, 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire', *Representations*, 26 (1989), 7-24
- Norberg, Dag, *Introduction a l'étude de la versification latine médiévale*, Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 5 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958)
- Orchard, Andy, *The poetic art of Aldhelm*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 8 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Orlandis, José, *Historia de España: La España visigótica* (Madrid: Gredos, 1977)
- Ozanam, A. Frédéric, *History of Civilization in the Fifth Century*, trans. by Ashley C. Glyn, 2 vols (London: W. H. Allen and Co., 1868)
- Pirenne, Henri, *Mohammed and Charlemagne*, trans. by Bernard Miall (London: Allen and Unwin, 1939)

- Plater, W. E. and H. J. White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate: Being an introduction to the study of the Latinity of the Vulgate Bible* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926)
- Pohl, Walter, 'The Vandals: Fragments of a Narrative', in *Vandals, Romans and Berbers: New Perspectives on Late Antique North Africa*, ed. by A. H. Merrills (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 31-48
- Raby, F. J. E., *A History of Christian Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953)
- , *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957)
- Raven, Susan, *Rome in Africa* (London: Evans Brothers Ltd, 1969)
- Reinwald, Karl, *Die Ausgabe des ersten Buches der Laudes dei und der Satisfactio des Dracontius durch Eugenius von Toledo* (Speyer: Jäger, 1913)
- Reynolds, Suzanne, *Medieval Reading: grammar, rhetoric and the classical text*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 27 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)
- Riché, Pierre, *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West: Sixth through Eighth Centuries*, trans. by John J. Contreni (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1976)
- Roberts, Michael J., *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity* (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1985)
- , 'The "First Sighting" Theme in the Old Testament Poetry of Late Antiquity', *Illinois Classical Studies* 10.1 (1985), 139-55
- , *The Humblest Sparrow: the poetry of Venantius Fortunatus* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009)

- , *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989)
- , 'The Latin Literature of Late Antiquity' in *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, ed. by Frank A. Mantello and A.G. Rigg (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), pp. 537-46
- , 'The Prologue to Avitus' *De Spiritualis Historiae Gestis: Christian Poetry and Poetic License*, *Traditio* 36 (1980), 399-407
- Romano, Domenico, *Studi Draconziani* (Palermo: U. Manfredi Editore, 1959)
- Rosenblum, Morris, *Luxorius: a Latin Poet among the Vandals* (New York: Columbia University, 1961)
- Rousseau, Philip, 'In search of Sidonius the bishop', *Historia* 25 (1976), 356-77
- , 'Sidonius and Majorian: The Censure in "Carmen" V', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, vol. 49.2 (2000), pp. 251-57
- Schetter, Willy, 'Zur "Satisfactio" des Dracontius', *Hermes*, 118.1 (1990), 90-117
- Schwarz, Andreas, 'The Settlement of the Vandals in North Africa', in *Vandals, Romans and Berbers: New Perspectives on Late Antique North Africa*, ed. by A. H. Merrills (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 49-57
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R., *Towards a Text of the 'Anthologia Latina'* (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1979)
- Shanzer, Danuta, and Ian Wood, 'Introduction' in *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose*, trans. by Danuta Shanzer and Ian Wood, *Translated Texts for Historians*, 38 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2002), pp. 3-85
- Shaw, Brent D., *Rulers, Nomads and Christians in Roman North Africa* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1995)

- Smolak, Kurt, 'Die Stellung der Hexamerondichtung des Dracontius (laud. dei 1,118-426) innerhalb der lateinischen Genesispoesie', in *Antidosis: Festschrift für Walther Kraus zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. by Rudolf Hanslik et al. (Vienna: Hermann Böhlaus, 1972), pp. 381-397
- Stahl, William Harris, 'Introduction', in Macrobius, *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*, trans. by William Harris Stahl (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966), pp. 3-65
- Strecker, Karl, *Introduction to Medieval Latin*, trans. and rev. by Robert B. Palmer (Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1957)
- Stroumsa, Gedaliahu, 'The Incorporeality of God: contexts and implications of Origen's position', *Religion* (1983), 345-358
- Taft, Robert, *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West: the Origins of the Divine Office and its Meaning for Today* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1986)
- The Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the failed quest for unity in the sixth-century Mediterranean*, ed. by Celia Chazelle and Catherine Cubitt (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007)
- Thompson, E. A., *The Goths in Spain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969)
- Thomson, D. F. S., *Catullus: Edited with a Textual and Interpretive Commentary* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997)
- Tizzoni, Mark. 'Dracontius' Poetry and the Politics of Vandal North Africa', Paper presented at *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity*, State College, PA, 25 June 2011
- Todd, O. J., 'Sense and Sound in Classical Poetry', *The Classical Quarterly*, 36.1/2 (1942), 29-39

- Vandals, Romans and Berbers: new perspectives on late antique North Africa*, ed. by A. H. Merrills (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004)
- The Visigoths: Studies in Culture and Society*, ed. by Alberto Ferreiro (Leiden: Brill, 1999)
- Vollmer, Friedrich, 'Praefatio: De Draconti Carminibus Codicibus Editionibus', in *Fl. Merobaudis Reliquiae, Blossii Aemilii Dracontii Carmina, Eugenii Toletani Episcopi Carmina et Epistulae*, ed. by Frederick Vollmer, MGH, *Auctores Antiquissimi*, 14 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1905), pp. v-xxxvii
- Walker, G. S. M., 'Introduction', in *Sancti Columbani Opera*, ed. and trans. by G. S. M. Walker (Dublin: The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1957), pp. ix-lxxxii
- Wallace-Hadrill, J.M., *The Barbarian West: 400-1000*, 5th edn (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004)
- Wallis, Faith, 'The Ambiguities of Medieval "Memoria",' *Canadian Journal of History/Annales canadiennes d'histoire*, 30.1 (1995), 77
- Ward-Perkins, Bryan, *The Fall of Rome: and the End of Civilization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
- Warmington, B. H., *The North African Provinces from Diocletian to the Vandal Conquest* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954)
- Weber, Brigitte, *Der Hylas des Dracontius: Romulea 2*, *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde*, 47 (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1995)
- Wells, Colin M., 'The Maghrib and the Mediterranean in the Early Middle Ages', *Florilegium* 16 (1999), 17-29
- Weyman, Carl, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der christlichlateinischen Poesie* (Munich: Max Hueber, 1926)

- White, Carolinne, 'Introduction', in *Early Christian Latin Poets*, The Early Church Fathers (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 3-23
- Wilkinson, L. P., *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963)
- Williams, Gordon, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968)
- , *Change and Decline: Roman literature in the early Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978)
- Williams, Megan Hale, *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006)
- Williams, Rowan, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, 2nd edn (London: SCM Press, 2001)
- Witke, Charles, *Numen Litterarum: the old and the new in Latin poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great*, *Mittellateinische Studien und Texte*, 5, ed. by Karl Langosch (Leiden: Brill, 1971)
- Wolfson, Harry A., 'Maimonides on the Unity and Incorporeality of God', *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series, 56.2 (1965), 112-136
- Wood, Ian, 'Avitus of Vienne, The Augustinian Poet', in *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul: Revisiting the Sources*, ed. by Ralph W. Mathisen and Danuta Shanzer (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 263-277
- , 'Royal succession and legitimation in the Roman West, 419-536', in *Staat im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. by Stuart Airlie, Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, II (Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2006), pp. 59-72
- , 'The Construction of Frankish Catholicism, 507-8', Paper presented at the *International Medieval Congress*, Leeds, 13 July 2009

Wright, F. A. and T. A. Sinclair, *A History of Later Latin Literature: from the Middle of the Fourth to the End of the Seventeenth Century* (London: George Routledge & Sons Ltd, 1931)

Wright, Roger, *A Sociophilological Study of Late Latin*, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002)

---, 'Late Latin and Early Romance: Alcuin's *De Orthographia* and the Council of Tours (AD 813)', in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar: Third Volume 1981*, ed. by Francis Cairns, ARCA: Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 7 (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1981), pp. 343-361

---, *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France* (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1982)

---, 'Speaking, Reading and Writing Late Latin and Early Romance', *Neophilologus* 60.2 (1976), 178-189

Reference Works:

A Latin Dictionary, ed. and rev. by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)

Gildersleeve, Basil L. and G. Lodge, *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar*, reprint of 3rd edn (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2000)

Liddel and Scott's Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon, 7th edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, [n.d.]

Niermeyer, J. F., *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leiden: Brill, 1976)

Oxford Classical Dictionary (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968)

Postgate, John Percival, *Prosodia latina: an introduction to classical Latin verse* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923)

Souter, Alexander, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 AD* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949)

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, 10 vols (Leipzig, et al.: Tuebner, 1900-)