

Anders CULLHED, *The Shadow of Creusa: Negotiating Fictionality in Late Antique Latin Literature*. Translated by Michael KNIGHT. Berlin – Boston, De Gruyter, 2015. 1 vol. 15,5 x 23 cm, XXI-703 p. (BEITRÄGE ZUR ALTERTUMSKUNDE, 339). Prix : 129,95 €. ISBN 978-3-11-031086-3.

This English translation is to be welcomed as making available to a wide scholarly audience the content of the Swedish original *Kreousas skugga: Fiktionsteoretiska nedslag i senantikens latinska litteratur* (Stockholm/Stehag, 2006). In his rich and impressive study, A. Cullhed explores Late Antique conceptions of, and attitudes towards literary fiction and fictionality, designated in the source texts by terms such as *fabulae*, *ficta* or *figmenta* (p. 18). The theme of this study directly relates to the variety of strategies adopted in the Christian reuse of the pagan legacy (*chrèsis*, cf. the volumes authored and/or edited by C. Gnifka), including rejection, appropriation, compromise and juxtaposition. At the outset, Cullhed tries to come to grips with the concept of fiction, stressing that it is not a static but rather a dynamic one, evolving over time. Therefore, it cannot be taken for granted that Late Antique intellectuals conceived of “fiction” exactly the way we do, in spite of several evident continuities. Without formulating an actual definition, Cullhed suggests that the “as if” element – fiction as counterfactual or hypothetical “make-believe” – is an important distinctive criterion of fiction in ancient literature: “fictional literary works like to operate *as if* the persons or the events referred to actually existed” (p. 12). Whereas the study’s philological foundation could have been stronger, and whereas the interaction with scholarly literature is not very dense (the latter fact is acknowledged to some extent, p. VIII), the author demonstrates a firm grasp of literary history and theory, and of the different sociocultural and religious backgrounds to the topic of his investigation. Examples of this sound contextualization are Cullhed’s helpful outline of Late Antiquity by means of a number of historical landmarks, and his discussion of the various precedents that influenced Late Antique approaches to fictionality. In the latter discussion, Cullhed – following the lead of modern scholars like K. Pollmann – roughly discerns between two concepts of fictionality, viz. (1) a Platonic-Aristotelian, mimetic model, based on the criteria of truth and probability, and (2) a Stoic, referential or substitutive, “sign-based” model. Other important influences are (a) Xenophanes’ and Plato’s criticisms of the poetic licence and licentiousness of Homeric-Hesiodic myth, (b) conceptions of imagination (*phantasia/imaginatio*) in the Neoplatonist tradition, esp. Proclus, (c) Cicero’s and Quintilian’s discussions of rhetorical *inuentio* (in an Aristotelian vein), and (d) ancient categorizations of figurative language, as proposed by teachers of grammar and rhetoric. Cullhed’s study covers a wide range of authors from Late Antiquity, including (a) Christian apologists such as Minucius Felix and Lactantius, (b) “Church Fathers” in the strict sense such as Jerome and Augustine, (c) Biblical epic poets (or authors of Biblical poetry, among other works) such as Paulinus of Nola, Proba, Prudentius, Juvencus, Sedulius, Avitus, and Arator, (d) authors often considered “nominal Christians” such as Ausonius and Boethius, (e) encyclopaedic authors with either (preponderantly) pagan or Christian profiles, such as Macrobius, Martianus Capella, Fulgentius the Mythographer, and Isidore of Seville, and (f) the pagan Vergil commentator Servius, who according to Cullhed has a remarkably open-minded, non-exclusive approach to literary fiction.

The main advantage of Cullhed's choice to discuss both pagan and Christian authors is that it clearly brings to the fore the basic incompatibility perceived by many Christian intellectuals between, on the one hand, the necessary and exclusive truth of the Christian message and the Biblical account and, on the other, the *uanitas* or *error* of Classical literary fiction. Nevertheless, Christian authors polemically criticizing the fictional contents of pagan literature at least occasionally had to recognize the "cognitive value and theoretical legitimacy" (p. 177) of fiction, as well as its pedagogical value, in that it managed to teach general truths more easily by stimulating the reader's pleasure. In addition, Christian authors were bound to use the very language and discursive strategies of the literary works they were criticizing. As a consequence, they continued to struggle with the fictional contents of Classical literature and to reflect extensively upon them in their writings. Among the authors enumerated above, pride of place is rightly given to St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430), who held a nuanced and innovative attitude towards literary fiction (in particular Vergil's literary "lies"), and for whom, according to Cullhed, fiction remained "an unsolved problem" (p. 292). It is telling that for the main title of his study, Cullhed harks back to Augustine's reflections in his *Confessiones*, where at 1.13 he echoes Vergil's *ipsius umbra Creusae* (*Aen.* 2.771), presenting it as a paramount pagan fiction opposed to the reality of Christian faith and its God. It is also in Augustine's works that issues of linguistics, semiotics, and Biblical hermeneutics are integrated into the "truth-fiction" opposition most elaborately. Important themes are the superiority of "inner speech" (the *uerbum cordis*) over exteriorized language and, relatedly, the inadequacy of human language to express the reality of God's greatness. Augustine also elaborates upon the precise relation between fiction and lie (to which he devotes his *De mendacio* and *Contra mendacium*), and tries to tackle the phenomenon of "lying" characters in the Old Testament by interpreting these apparent *mendacia* as *mysteria* standing for (future) true events. In order to do so, he has recourse to a wide range of interpretive strategies going back to the Classical tradition and "baptized" in the context of Christian hermeneutics (figures of speech, allegory, the relation of prefiguration or typology between the Old and the New Testament). Cullhed pays due attention to this double influence on Augustine and on Christian authors in general, viz. (a) the Classical school tradition of grammar, rhetoric, and literary commentary, and (b) the Biblical tradition, with its Pauline and Johannine theology and with prominent Jewish-Hellenistic elements. Throughout the study, a number of further general tendencies can be singled out. Cullhed repeatedly draws attention to a gendered presentation of the "truth-fiction" opposition, which associates truth with male adults and fiction with "children, girls and old women" (p. 65). In Cullhed's words, fiction is often presented as "an outcome of female fantasies in contrast to a male, sound and solid principle of reality" (*ibid.*). Similarly, fiction is often associated, by way of imagination and fantasy (and talkativeness), to the "sinful" temptations of sexuality. Another recurrent opposition, related with the previous ones to some extent, is that between "Roman truth" and "Greek lies" (p. 428). The negative moral evaluation of fiction is evident in the associations with dreams, madness, drunkenness and raving, to the extent that Classical myths are often presented as "drunken writings" (p. 420-421). Fiction is also associated with heresy as opposed to the truth of orthodox faith, and with an overly sophisticated, rhetorical style, while the poetic inspiration

emanating from the Holy Spirit (*uera mens*, p. 507) is opposed to that issuing from the pagan Muses. Incidentally, Cullhed formulates interesting comments on the persistence of Classical education, based on the *Bildung*-oriented cycle of liberal arts and characterized by its esoteric nature, its specific reading practices, and its focus on Vergil's *œuvre*. As regards the formal presentation of the study, it should first be emphasized that the translator has done a very good job in providing a correct and enjoyable English text. The number of typographical errors is low for a work of this size, but there are a couple of awkward editorial choices, such as the (inconsistent) use of ligatures in Latin quotations. A more important inconvenience, in my opinion, is Cullhed's tendency towards prolixity. On a general level, the study's broad scope sometimes results in a lack of focus, which makes it difficult at times to follow the global thread. Moreover, the chapter titles are vague and thus make it hard to find out what exactly a particular chapter is going to deal with. This, however, is certainly made up for to a good extent by the index with which the volume concludes. Another useful component at the end of the volume is the appendix with the full Latin text of important source passages. All in all, Cullhed's study can be called an innovative, engaging, and highly readable investigation of a complicated topic in a still under-researched historical period.

Tim DENECKER

Charles Edwin Vandervord NIXON & Barbara Saylor RODGERS, *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini*. Introduction, Translation and Historical Commentary with the Latin Text of Roger Aubrey BASKERVILLE MYNORS. Berkeley, University of California Press, 2015. 1 vol. 16 x 24 cm, XII-736 p., 1 carte (THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE CLASSICAL HERITAGE, 21). Prix : 44,95 \$. ISBN 978-0-520-28625-2.

Dieser Band bietet den Text, eine englische Übersetzung und einen in Form von Anmerkungen eingearbeiteten historischen Kommentar zu den *Panegyrici latini* (unter Ausschluss des Plinius). Wenngleich es sich bei dieser neuen Paperbackausgabe um einen unveränderten Nachdruck der Erstauflage von 1994 handelt, erscheint es angesichts der Bedeutung dieses Buches sinnvoll, mehr als nur einige wenige Worte darüber zu äußern. Beginnen wir mit seiner direkten Aufnahme durch die Forschung in Form der vorhandenen Rezensionen. Fünfzehn ließen sich ermitteln, die angesichts der diesbezüglichen Fehlstellen der *Année Philologique* (die nur zwölf davon kennt; besonders ärgerlich ist die Auslassung der ausführlichen Kritik Whitbys) hier vollständig zusammengestellt sind: T. D. Barnes, *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 9 (1996), S. 532-552 (Sammelrezension, davon S. 534-535 zu der Ausgabe und S. 539-542 zum Spezialproblem der Datierung der *Panegyrici*); M. Clauss, *Klio* 80/1 (1998), S. 277-278; S. Corcoran, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* Oktober 1999, Nr. 13 (<http://bmc.brynmaur.edu/1999/1999-10-13.html>); J.-M. Demarolle, *L'Antiquité Classique* 66 (1997), S. 464; J. Gruber, *Gymnasium* 105 (1998), S. 153-160 (Sammelrezension, davon S. 157-158); A. P. Keaveney, *Greece & Rome* 2.S. 43 (1996), S. 240 mit S. 242, Anm. 3; C. Kelly, *Times Literary Supplement* 4873 (23. August 1996), S. 26-27; R. Klein, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 108/4.F. 46 (1997), S. 254-255; J. Kramer, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 113 (1997), S. 283-285; F. Paschoud,