SCOTT MCGILL
JOSEPH PUCCI (Eds.)

Classics Renewed

Reception and Innovation
in the Latin Poetry
of Late Antiquity

LATIN LOVE ELEGY
CENTO RE-USE
LATIN PANEGYRIC
VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS
JUVENCUS
INTERTEXTUALITY
DRACONTIUS
PROBA
PRUDENTIUS
LATIN LYRIC
CLAUDIAN
AUSONIUS
ENDELECHIUS
LATIN EPIGRAM
MAXIMIANUS
SEDULIUS
HRABANUS MAURUS

The Library of the Other Antiquity

Over the past decades Late Antiquity has evolved into an independent and increasingly productive area of study. No longer seen merely as the continuation of "classical" antiquity, epigonal age or first phase of the medieval, late antiquity is understood as having its own characteristic traits, which have to be analyzed as such. Currently, a comprehensive re-engagement with Late Antiquity is taking place, promoting a shift in its evaluation as well as a variety of disciplinary approaches. The profile of Late Antiquity that is emerging is diverse, complex and problematic, as it combines cultural pluralism with a stubborn dedication to tradition.

It is at this moment in the history of late-antique studies that this series intervenes. Although for terminological reasons the term 'Late Antiquity' cannot currently be avoided, *The Other Antiquity* aims to contribute to a more independent conceptualization of the epoch. The series thus understands itself as provocation and stimulus for a discussion of Late Antiquity which will open up new approaches in the areas of Classical Philology and literary studies, and simultaneously put the fascination and charm of Late Antiquity on display for other disciplines as well. This series has three major focuses: (mainly Latin) late-antique textuality, its reception in later ages in Western culture (including visual and material aspects), and Late Antiquity as a paradigm for the construction of other Western "decadences".

The Other Antiquity will open up the field to a broader cultural discussion, not least with a view to postmodern reassessments, and will offer a basis for the interpretation of texts of widely varying origin and genre. It will serve as a forum for discussing these texts in an interdisciplinary fashion, for pursuing alternative paths in research and for departing from the traditional approaches of Classical Philology.

Marco Formisano, Ghent University

SCOTT MCGILL
JOSEPH PUCCI (Eds.)

Classics Renewed

Reception and Innovation in the
Latin Poetry of Late Antiquity

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

Cassiod.	Cassiodorus
Cath.	Prudentius, *Cathemerinon*
Catul.	Catullus
Cent.	Proba, *Cento*
Chron.	Jerome*, Chronica*
Cic.	Cicero
Civ. dei	Augustine, *De civitate dei*
Cont.	Seneca, *Controversiae*
Cons.	Boethius, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*
Cyneg.	Nemesianus, *Cynegetica*
D.	Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*
De cons. phil.	see *Cons.*
De fin.	Cicero, *De finibus*
De loc. aff.	Galen, *De locis affectis*
De Orat.	Cicero, *De Oratore*
Det.	Philo, *Quod deterius potiori insidiari solet*
Don.	Donatus
DRN	Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*
E. / Ecl.	Virgil, *Eclogues*
EB	*Epigrammata Bobiensia*
Endel.	Endelechius
Enn. / Ennod.	Ennodius
Epod.	Horace, *Epodes*
Epig. / Epigr.	*Epigrams* (various authors)
Ep. / Epist.	*Epistles* (various authors)
Eun.	Terence, *Eunuchus*
Evang.	Juvencus, *Evangeliorum libri IV*
Etym.	Isidore, *Etymologiae*
F.	Ovid, *Fasti*
G. / Geo.	Virgil, *Georgics*
Get.	Claudian, *De bello Getico*
Goth.	Procopius, *De Bello Gothico*
Her.	Ovid, *Heroides*
Herc. O.	[Seneca], *Herculeus Oetaeus*
Hist. Eccl.	Rufinus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*
Hor.	Horace
HN	Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*
Id.	*Idylls* (various authors)
Inst.	Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones*
Isid.	Isidore of Seville
Juv.	Juvenal

Lap.	Theophrastus, *De Lapidibus*
LD	Dracontius, *De Laudibus Dei*
Lith.	*Lithika*
Luc.	Lucan
Lucr.	Lucretius
Lk	Gospel of Luke
Mart.	Martial
Max.	Maximianus
Men. Rhet.	Menander Rhetor
Met.	Ovid, *Metamorphoses*
Mk	Gospel of Mark
Mt / Matt.	Gospel of Matthew
NA	Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*
Nat. hist.	see *HN*
Ol. Prob.	Claudian, *Panegyricus dictus Probino et Olybrio Consulibus*
Orig.	Isidore, *Origines*
Ov.	Ovid
Pan. Lat.	Pacatus, *Panegyrici Latini*
Paneg. Theod. (Opusc. 1)	Ennodius, *Panegyricus Theoderico regi dictus (Opuscula 1)*
Paul. Nol.	Paulinus of Nola
PC	Sedulius, *Paschale Carmen*
Pe / Perist. / Peristeph.	Prudentius, *Peristephanon*
Plut.	Plutarch
pr. / Praef.	*praefatio*
Prob.	see *Ol. Prob.*
Procop.	Procopius
Prog.	Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata* / Aphthonius, *Progymnasmata*
Prol. ad Carm.	Avitus, *Prologus ad Carmina*
Prop.	Propertius
Ps.	Psalm(s)
Psych.	Prudentius, *Psychomachia*
Pun.	Silius, *Punica*
QNat.	Seneca, *Quaestiones Naturales*
Quint.	Quintilian
Rapt.	Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae*
Rom. / Romul.	Dracontius, *Romulea*
Sat.	*Satires* (various authors; Petronius, *Satyricon*
Schol.	*Scholion / Scholia*

Sen.	Seneca
Sil. / *Silv.*	Statius, *Silvae*
Stil.	Claudian, *De consulatu Stilichonis*
Suas.	Seneca, *Suasoriae*
Suet. *Gramm.*	Suetonius, *De grammaticis*
Theb.	Statius, *Thebaid*
Theod.	Claudian, *Panegyricus dictus Mallio Theodoro Consuli*
Theophr.	Theophrastus
Thes.	Plutarch, *Vita Thesei*
Tib.	Tibullus
Trist.	Ovid, *Tristia*
Var.	Cassiodorus, *Variae*
Verr.	Cicero, *In Verrem*
Virg.	Virgil
Vulg.	Vulgate

b.   Journals, Series, and Editions

A&A	*Antike und Abendland: Beiträge zum Verständnis der Griechen und Römer und ihres Nachlebens*
AJP / *AJPh*	*American Journal of Philology*
Anecd. Par. Cramer	J. Cramer, ed., *Anecdota Graeca Paris*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1839–1841)
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*
AnTard.	*Antiquité Tardive*
A&R	*Atene & Roma*
BAGB	*Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*
C&M	*Classica et Mediaevalia: Revue Danoise de Philologie et d'Histoire*
CCSL	*Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*
Chron. min. I	*Chronica Minora saec. IV. V. VI. VII*, ed. Theodor Mommsen, vol. 1, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, vol. 9 (Berlin, 1892)
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
CJ	*Classical Journal*
CLE	*Carmina Latina Epigraphica,* vols. 1 and 2, ed. F. Buecheler, (Leipzig, 1895–97); vol. 3, ed. Buecheler and E. Lommatzsch (Leipzig, 1926)
CML	*Classical and Modern Literature*

CP	*Classical Philology*
CQ	*Classical Quarterly*
CSEL	*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*
DA	*Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*
EB, Speyer	W. Speyer, ed., *Epigrammata Bobiensia* (Leipzig, 1963)
EL	Études de lettres: Revue de la Faculté des lettres, Université de Lausanne
Ferrua	A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana* (Vatican City, 1942)
GIF	*Giornale Italiano di Filologia*
GL	*Grammatici Latini*
Gow-Page *HE*	A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1965)
Green	R. P. H. Green, ed. *The Works of Ausonius* (Oxford, 1991)
HSCP / HSPh	*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
ICS	*Illinois Classical Studies*
ICUR	*Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores, nova series*, 10 vols. (Vatican City, 1922–1992)
Ihm	M. Ihm., ed., *Damasi Epigrammata* (Leipzig, 1895)
IJCT	*International Journal of the Classical Tradition*
ILCV	*Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres,* vols. 1–3, ed. E. Diehl, (Berlin, 1925–31, rev. ed. 1961); vol. 4, Supplementum, ed. J. Moreau and H. I. Marrou (Berlin, 1967)
ILS	*Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*
InvLuc	*Invigilata Lucernis*
JbAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum Aschendorff*
JECS	*Journal of Early Christian Studies*
JHS	*The Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JÖByz	*Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*
Keil	H. Keil, ed., *Grammatici Latini*, 7 vols. (Leipzig, 1857–80)
LCM	*Liverpool Classical Monthly*
LS	E. A. Andrews, W. Freund, C. T. Lewis, and C. Short, eds., *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 2002)
MD	*Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*
MGH	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica*

MGH AA	*Monumenta Germaniae Historic, Auctores Antiquissimi*
MGH, Epist.	*Monumenta Germaniae Historic, Epistolae*
MLatJb	*Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*
MSLC	*Miscellanae di Studi di Letteratura Cristiana Antica*
NMS	*Nottingham Mediaeval Studies*
Nouv. Rev. Française	*La Nouvelle Revue Française*
OCD	*Oxford Classical Dictionary*
OLD	*Oxford Latin Dictionary*
PBSR	*Papers of the British School at Rome*
PCBE	*Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire, Part 2: Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313–604)*, ed. C. Pietri and L. Pietri, 2 vols. (Rome: 1999–2000)
PL	*Patrologia Cursus Completus, Series Latina*
PLAC	*Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*
PLRE	*The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 1 (260–395), eds. A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris (Cambridge, 1971); vol. 2 (395–527); ed. J. R. Martindale, (Cambridge, 1980); vol. 3 (527–641). ed. J. R. Martindale, (Cambridge, 1992)
RAC / RlAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*
RCCM	*Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale*
RE	*Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*
REL	*Revue des Études Latines*
RFIC	*Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*
RhM	*Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*
SVP	H. F. A. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* 4 vols. (Stuttgart, 1903–05)
TAPA / TAPhA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association*
TLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Leipzig: 1900–)
WS	*Wiener Studien: Zeitschrift für Klassische Philologie, Patristik und Lateinische Tradition*

Introduction

The essays that form this volume were originally presented at a bi-coastal conference devoted to the Latin poetry of late antiquity, organized by the editors and held at their home institutions, Rice University and Brown University, in March and October 2011. While the quality of the papers encouraged the move from lectern to print, the size of the conference – there were thirty-one participants in all – precluded a volume offering the full conference proceedings. What follows gathers those contributions specifically focused on the reception and reuse in Late Latin poetry of sources from the classical past. Particularly in the Anglophone world, poetry once lagged significantly behind political, military, social, and art history as an area of interest in late antique studies. This has begun to change in earnest, however, and we dedicate the volume, as we did the conference, to poetry in order to further that development.[1]

An animating assumption behind the book is that late antiquity was a distinct period in the history of poetry. The issues with periodization are well rehearsed: literary periods are retrospective and at times arbitrary abstractions, and the features ascribed to them cannot characterize all texts produced in the relevant age. But it is still useful to isolate late antiquity as a unique age of poetry. To do so is to give it a discrete historical identity, rather than viewing it as fallen classical literature or as an interstitial era, the time between classical antiquity and the Middle Ages. Late antiquity deserves to

---

[1] For examples of an increasing interest in Late Latin poetry, see the edited volumes of Henriette Harich-Schwarzbauer and Petra Schierl, eds., *Lateinische Poesie der Spätantike* (Basel: Schwabe, 2009); and Willemien Otten and Karla Pollmann, eds., *Poetry and Exegesis in Premodern Latin Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2007). Several monographs and translations also attest to the changing conditions. They include books from contributors to this volume: Marc Mastrangelo, *The Roman Self in Late Antiquity: Prudentius and the Poetics of the Soul* (Baltimore MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008); Michael Roberts, *The Humblest Sparrow: The Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009); Joseph Pucci, *Venantius Fortunatus: Poems To Friends*: Translation, Introduction, and Commentary (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2010); Gerard O'Daly, *Days Linked by Song: Prudentius'* Cathemerinon (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); and Catherine Ware, *Claudian and the Epic Roman Tradition* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2012).

have that separate identity. Salient features of the era distinguish it within
literary history: the geographical spread of its poetry well beyond Rome; the
prevalence of the "jeweled style";[2] the strong taste for ludic verse (e.g., pattern
poems, centos, and palindromic/reciprocal poems); the emergence of Chris-
tian poetry, and notably classicizing Christian verse; and the growth of poet-
ry, including new forms of poetry, connected to the imperial court and impe-
rial ceremonial. Poets also produced and circulated their work in literary
cultures that were in many ways unique to their time. The essays collected
here all identify and explore defining traits of this poetry. What is more, they
together enable readers to do what periodization itself does: to draw instruc-
tive connections between poems and poets and to observe wider literary and
cultural movements.[3]

The chapters that make up the volume are organized chronologically and
mainly treat material from the fourth through the sixth centuries CE. With re-
spect to Latin poetry, these are the appropriate termini for late antiquity. With
the revival of poetry and literary culture in the fourth century, distinguishing
features of late antique verse either arise or begin to appear widely.[4] After Ve-
nantius Fortunatus at the end of the sixth century, moreover, there is a distinct
break in the tradition: Latin poetry in classical forms and meters almost entire-

---

[2]   The term "jeweled style" comes from Michael Roberts, *The Jeweled Style: Poetry
      and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1989). It refers
      to the tendency in poetry toward episodic fragmentation, visual description and
      spectacle, juxtaposition and paradox, and enumeration. The jeweled style is a suc-
      cessor to the aesthetics of Hellenistic poetry and of first-century CE Latin verse.

[3]   On periodization and late antique literature, see Danuta Shanzer, "Literature, His-
      tory, Periodization, and the Pleasures of the Latin Literary History of Late Antiq-
      uity," *History Compass* 9 (2009) 1–38, which strongly influences our remarks.
      Also essential on the topic is Reinhart Herzog, ed., *Restauration und Erneuerung:
      Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr. = Handbuch der lateinischen
      Literatur der Antike*, ed. Reinhart Herzog and Peter Lebrecht, vol. 5 (Munich:
      Beck, 1989), 1–44. See also Mark Vessey, "Literary History: A Fourth-Century
      Roman Invention?," in *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD: Per-
      forming Paideia, Constructing the Present, Presenting the Self*, ed. Lieve Van
      Hoof and Peter Van Nuffelen (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 16–30.

[4]   On the fourth-century revival, see Alan Cameron, "Poetry and Literary Culture in
      Late Antiquity," in *Approaching Late Antiquity: The Transformation from Early to
      Late Empire*, ed. Simon Swain and Mark Edwards (Oxford: Oxford University
      Press, 2004), 327–54. With Latin poetry, the starting point for late antiquity can
      be placed more specifically in the age of Constantine, with Optatian and Juvencus;
      its peak is then from the 360s, when Proba and Ausonius were active, to the mid-
      dle of the fifth century. Disputes over the precise dates of a period are almost in-
      evitable; this does not mean that a period itself is an arbitrary construct.

ly disappears from the record in the seventh century.[5] This allows the end of Fortunatus' life to mark the end of late antiquity for Latin verse. Two concluding chapters also proceed beyond Fortunatus and treat both late antique authors and their Carolingian successors. In doing so they open up the scope of inquiry as the volume draws to a close, in that they examine the reception of late antique poets as well as continued developments in areas where they worked.

The contributors treat a diverse body of authors and texts, which reflects the intensely plural character of Late Latin poetry: it was Christian and secular, religious and profane, solemn and playful, political and personal. Significantly for the volume, so much of the poetry was also of the present but firmly rooted in the past. Latin poets of every era were keenly aware of the literary, historical, and philosophical traditions that preceded them, and they could not, and did not want to, leave those traditions behind. Late Latin authors of course had more cultural history with which to work. In their hands, too, the imitators of earlier eras became the imitated – notably Virgil and other writers of the first century BCE and CE, who were established in late antiquity as ancient and authoritative classics.[6] But what really sets late antique poets apart from earlier authors is what they did with the cultural past to which they were bound. Thus they reworked their source material to develop new ways of thinking about and talking about their poetry, to display a new Silver Age literary aesthetics, to update and alter inherited genres, to generate new patterns of thought and new content, to pursue new forms of imitation, and to respond to and reflect the changing historical and religious landscapes around them.

It is uncontroversial to assert that Latin poetry can be profitably read through the lenses of intertextuality and imitation/allusion. But profit comes only when we isolate the individual amid the communal – that is, when we examine the particular ways that specific authors used what preceded them. T. S. Eliot's observation that "not only the best, but the most individual parts of [a poet's] work may be those in which the dead poets, his ancestors, assert their immortality most vigorously" applies well to Late Latin poets.[7] The contributors to this volume seek to uncover the individuality of those authors and their texts by exploring within their poetry the "reflexes of, uses of, re-

---

[5]   The exception is the poetry of Eugenius II of Toledo (d. 647), a distinctly liminal figure between late antiquity and the Middle Ages.

[6]   See Aaron Pelttari, *The Space That Remains: Reading Latin Poetry in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 2014), 150.

[7]   T. S. Eliot, "Tradition and the Individual Talent," in *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism* (Gloucestershire: Dodo Press, 2009), 31.

constitutions of, or responses to" predecessors in the classical tradition.[8]
While several chapters focus on the treatment of Virgil in Late Latin verse,
others range over a number of sources, mainly Latin but also Greek.

What emerges from the chapters is a powerful sense of how Late Latin
poetry was both conservative and innovative. A poetry so grounded in the
past is inherently conservative; it upholds and perpetuates the tradition and
the canon as it defines them. Yet the attachment to the past was not constrain-
ing; on the contrary, the freedom to take classical models in new directions is
a marked feature of late antiquity. Late Latin poets demonstrate continuity
with the past while also creating distance from that past through how they
adapted and remade their inheritance.[9] Not least, the rise of Christianity ob-
truded in so profound a way as to ensure, and to energize, differences. On the
one hand, Christian poets could no sooner abandon the materials of their
culture than they could abandon their language if they wished to continue to
practice their art. On the other hand, they were no longer entirely settled in
that culture because of their connections and commitments to a different sys-
tem of belief, thought, and expression. This led to poetry of the excluded
middle: classicizing Christian verse belonged to and was an extension of the
literary tradition that stretched back centuries but, at the same time, was situ-
ated outside of that tradition.[10] It is also the case that poets transformed the
work of their classical forebears, often radically so, when applying it to their
Christian messages and purposes.

Relevant here is Marco Formisano's assertion that late antiquity cannot be
interpreted exclusively by applying the categories and hermeneutical tools of
traditional classical philology.[11] To be sure, the contributors to this volume
have all received traditional training. But as will become clear as the book
progresses, when classically trained readers disenthrall themselves from clas-

---

[8]   The quoted matter is from Michael Silk, Ingo Gildenhard, and Rosemary Barrow,
      The Classical Tradition: Art, Literature, Thought (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell
      2014), 4, where they define the classical tradition.
[9]   We echo Pelttari, *The Space That Remains*, 28. It is of course true that the combi-
      nation of conservatism and innovation marks Latin literature on the whole. But
      again, what distinguishes Late Latin poets is how they display that combination of
      elements.
[10] We are thus well rid of the Raby model of separating late antique secular verse
      from late antique Christian verse. Late antique poetic culture is a big tent that in-
      cludes both forms, which then subdivide into a very wide variety of texts.
[11] Marco Formisano, "Reading *Décadence:* Reception and the Subaltern Late Antiq-
      uity," in *Décadence: "Decline and Fall" or "Other Antiquity"?*, ed. Marco For-
      misano and Therese Fuhrer (Heidelberg: Winter, 2014), 8. See also his "Towards
      and Aesthetic Paradigm of Late Antiquity," *Antiquité Tardive* 15 (2007): 277–84.

sicizing interpretive assumptions, they are able to approach Late Latin poetry on its own terms and, consequently, to get at the texts more deeply. This is not to say that readers must unlearn well-established practices – and those practices reflect late antiquity itself, inasmuch as they derive from its school-rooms and commentaries. Yet it is crucial to take a cue from the late antique world and to combine tradition and innovation. Just as Late Latin poets updated the classical past, so critics of those poets must update their past – the interpretive techniques, models, and schools that belong to the history of scholarship – when dealing with those authors. Only by accepting the differences between Late Latin poets and their classical predecessors, and only by asking new questions and developing critical approaches that respond to those differences, can we arrive at a suitable understanding of the authors and their texts.

Thus our hope in presenting these essays to a wider audience is to show some ways in which readers can bring new voices to the new forms, content, and concerns that mark Late Latin poetry. The volume's opening chapter does precisely this, by exploring the distinctive character of late antique Latin verse and by showing how old interpretive models, when recalibrated, can respond to late innovations. In it, Marc Mastrangelo focuses on the development of a late antique poetics of reuse, a term that includes intertextuality, imitation, and allusion. Mastrangelo also investigates the ancient readership for those innovations, with a particular interest in interpretive communities and the ideological commitments that help to define them. As he argues, reuse in late antique poetry is unique in ancient cultural history because of the rise of a distinctive artistic mentality in the age, and because of the role played by the "muscular religious ideology" of Christianity. For Mastrangelo, that ideology had a determinative influence on how poets engaged with their models, while also shaping the horizon of expectations for readers of the Christian texts.

How a specific Christian poet reused his classical inheritance is the subject of Scott McGill's chapter. As he demonstrates, the early biblical epicist Juvencus responded to his great exemplar, Virgil, both programmatically and through imitation and allusion, thus keying in to practices inherited from the Latin tradition, not least from Virgil himself. In turning to Virgil to accomplish his Christian poetic project, Juvencus transforms his classical model. Not only does he forge a poetic identity that claims both continuities with and distance from Virgil, but he also remakes Virgilian language by applying it to Gospel content. The transformation of Virgil in Juvencus helps to bring about a transformation of epic. Christ's deeds and teachings become the stuff of a new epic idiom and a new epic heroism, distanced from what Juvencus identifies as the lies of ancient epic and ennobled by religious truth. This form of late antique modernization brings the shock of the new: both the Gospels and classical epic are reimagined and reinvented in striking ways. At times, too,

Juvencus' text can derive local meaning from its allusions to specific lines of Virgil. McGill examines instances when this might occur, while also exploring the roles played by the author, text, and reader in generating allusions.

The reading of allusion is also an important topic in Dennis Trout's study of a set of fourth-century verse inscriptions on monuments in Rome. Trout examines the inscriptions as social performances both for members of the elite and for non-elite poets, patrons, and readers. His concerns lie in how the inscriptions worked to construct identities for those they commemorated, as well as in how readers/viewers might have responded to the poetry. As Trout demonstrates, the inscribed texts provide a rich body of evidence for late literary sensibilities, for the representation of historical individuals and events, and for a dynamic writing and reading culture that spread well beyond the elite. To illustrate his claims, Trout focuses on intertextual echoes that link the inscriptions to other monuments in the city, even as the poems also respond to the classical legacy, and specifically Virgil, through shared diction. Often the real power of the texts seems to depend on a reader's ability to detect both the language that activates Rome's poetic heritage and the language that evokes other inscriptions in the cityscape. Allusions reach back to the past but also operate squarely in situ, among the monuments of late antique Rome.

While the Roman monuments and Juvencus recast Virgil's poetry, their engagement with it is no match in frequency and intensity to that of the centonist Proba. This poet takes discrete lines and segments of lines from the Virgilian corpus and recombines them to produce a new 694-line poem on Old and New Testament material. Sigrid Schottenius Cullhed examines how Proba weaves the isolated scraps of Virgilian verse into a textual unity, arguing that coherence is an important principle in the text. To illustrate her point, Cullhed demonstrates that the centonist modified the Genesis account of the Creation to make it more concise and logical; used allusions to her Virgilian source material to produce coherent messages about Adam and Eve; and linked herself to seers in Virgil in order to construct a consistently authoritative narrative persona. From the study, a fundamental paradox about the cento emerges, one that exaggerates a broader feature of Late Latin poetry that we identified earlier: it was at once a radical return to the past and a radical departure from it. Proba repeats Virgil and transforms him, thus giving new shape and new direction to the canon. In Proba's view, however, her changes to Virgil only brought out the Christian content that inhered in his texts; the cento technique released meaning rather than remade it. Just as Virgil's language is assimilated to Christianity, so, too, is his authorial identity.

The prolific Ausonius had many identities as an author, including that of a centonist who notoriously used Virgil to produce a vivid sex scene. A very

different erotic voice, and one that responds to other classical predecessors, emerges in the poet's *Bissula*. As Joseph Pucci argues, Ausonius aims in the poem to create a contemporary space for lyric. This he does by situating the *Bissula* against the backdrops provided by Horace and Catullus. The preserve of Horace's lyric is its privacy, while Catullus' words gesture toward the articulation of emotion. But as Ausonius sees it, neither classical poet achieved his goal. As a result, Ausonius finds himself championing the failure of lyric mimesis – a failure that is not quite complete enough to prevent the *Bissula* from communicating its own lyric messages.

A more optimistic vision of how, and of how much, poetry can communicate is evident in Claudian's epigrams. Working against the idea that Claudian's form dominates his content, especially where translation from Greek exemplars is concerned, Bret Mulligan reveals the extent to which close imitation and near-literal translation in the hands of a poet such as Claudian energize, rather than enervate, verbal artistry in ways unique to Late Latin antiquity. In Claudian's translations of Rufinus and in his collection of "crystal" epigrams written in Latin and Greek, we gain a clearer sense of late ancient aesthetics and authorial practices. Far from suffering from being late, Claudian benefits from his lateness because it requires of him a more determined examination of his poetic inheritance in order to be different. As Mulligan's study suggests, Claudian demands readers who register the subtle ways in which he embraces his poetic models and distances himself from them. His manipulation of slight topics in a minor genre is not a sign of cultural exhaustion, but is rather evidence for his late antique understanding of literary value and achievement.

Through her careful exploration of a complex web of imitation in the preface to the *De sexto consulatu*, Catherine Ware shows still more how Claudian converted the literary past to his own purposes. Her focus lies on how he imitated several classical models in order to lay out and champion his own literary program and to present himself as an epic successor to Virgil. Claudian's primary model is Lucretius, whose message about dreams in the fourth book of the *De rerum natura* he "corrects" as a way of celebrating his own act of writing. Yet Claudian also integrates into his preface debts to Petronius, Ovid, and, most conspicuously, Horace. Such imitation is more than ornamental tessellation: through it Claudian situates his poem within the literary tradition and defines it as an epic in relation to the multiple genres of his models. But Claudian is not yet done. Ware demonstrates that he reverses an elegiac *recusatio* of Propertius and the reference to the ivory gate of dreams in Virgil's *Aeneid* 6 to convey that his subject is a true modern-day Gigantomachy. This is to affirm further his identity as an epic poet who, as he relates with the gilded tongue of the panegyrist, sings about, and before, the gods and heroes of the imperial court.

The *De sexto consulatu* likewise concerns Stephen Wheeler, whose focus is not on Claudian's construction of his own authorial identity but rather on the ways in which he represents the emperor Honorius. Specifically, Wheeler examines how, and why, Claudian portrayed Honorius as a lover of Rome, even though the city was no longer the seat of imperial power, and even though Honorius had only been to Rome once, as a boy with his father Theodosius. One source for Claudian's approach is epideictic rhetoric; he adapts conventional topics for imperial orations and arrival orations, as laid out by Menander Rhetor, when trumpeting Honorius' regard for Rome. But in doing so, Claudian also turns to Virgil, imitating his poetry and setting up a dialogue with it in order to shape and deepen his own message. To add to the intricacy of the *De sexto*, Claudian pursues anagrammatic wordplay on *Roma* and *amor* to depict Honorius' love for the city, while also emphasizing the love that Rome, in turn, feels for the emperor. Wheeler's study highlights the density of Claudianic panegyric, as well as – to echo a metaphor he uses – the ways in which Claudian grafts his models, especially Virgil, into his own work to produce new literary growth.

Claudian's contemporary Prudentius continues to broaden the picture of how Late Latin poets updated the classical literary past. Gerard O'Daly examines different gestures through which the Christian Prudentius reflects on the nature and purposes of his poetry. The gestures show Prudentius recasting elements of the Latin poetic tradition to introduce into Latin poetry new modes of religious expression and thought. An important move is to imitate and allude to the lyric poetry of Horace. The older poet's work stands as a foil to Prudentius' narrative, pointing up what is to be rejected and making explicit the moral dimension of poetry. In addition, Prudentius draws on Horatian and broadly classical symbols of poetry, such as ivy and the garland, only to transform them into Christian symbols. Scripture provides the material for some of Prudentius' poetry, whereby David's words are sometimes linked to Virgil's (or other classical poets) in a way that situates Prudentius' work in both the classical Latin and Biblical traditions at once, making clear the poet's identity as a Latin Christian poet.

Prudentius' newly articulated identity is affirmed in the *Apotheosis*, in a passage where he uses various instruments commonly associated with Greek and Roman poetic production to encourage the world to celebrate Christ. Likewise, the poet fashions a specifically Christian identity at the moments in his large output when he deals with the voice, writing, or inscribing. The Christian must attempt to communicate through those media, and while his poetry, being of this ephemeral world, stands below heavenly glory, it can manifest something of that glory and bring both the author and his audience closer to it. The poet's task, like the poet himself, is humble, but his work –

Prudentius' work – may help him and the faithful reader in attaining heaven's repose.

Christian redemption is a major theme in Endelechius' *Carmen de mortibus boum*, a late antique experiment in bucolic poetry. In her essay on the poem, Petra Schierl takes a fresh look at the way in which Endelechius adapts both Virgil's *Eclogues* and the cattle plague in the third book of the *Georgics* to convey a message about the salvific power of Christianity. Previous scholarship has tended to regard Endelechius' work as an attempt to Christianize the bucolic genre, taking polemical statements of the church fathers as a cue. The critical rhetoric is notably martial: Endelechius' project, for example, is a "Christian invasion into literary Arcadia." As Schierl reveals, however, the rich and varied engagement with Virgil in Endelechius belies the notion of conflict. Rather than contesting the traditional bucolic genre and seeking to supplant it with a version that is legitimate from a Christian point of view, Endelechius uses Virgil's first *Eclogue* as a frame and resource through which to dramatize the changes that Christianity has brought. Endelechius turns to the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* because the Virgilian models – when changed and rewritten – allow him to articulate the Christian view of the world and to set it against Virgil's own description of the human condition before the coming of Christ.

Still another Christian poem that engages pervasively and creatively with Virgil is Sedulius' *Paschale carmen*. As Eric Hutchinson demonstrates, Sedulius consistently opposes the content of the gospels and of the *Aeneid* through *Kontrastimitation*: he respects the great poem sufficiently to use it as a dictional storehouse, but he recurrently does so in such a way as to contrast his own subject matter with Virgil's. In the process, he takes a polemical stance toward Virgil, and he revivifies Virgilian scenes and characters in transformed Christian terms. The reader of the *Paschale carmen* who is familiar with Virgil is reminded of Virgil's poetic prowess at the same time that Virgil is shown to possess a view of human experience that no longer obtains. Thus Sedulius is able to offer in his poem an alternate hero and God superior to the heroes and gods of the *Aeneid*. Virgil's Aeneas, and his divine machinery, interpreted *ad litteram*, ultimately belong to the world of pagan *mendacia* castigated in the poem in no uncertain terms, but they can be refigured to treat, as Sedulius puts it, of "the illustrious miracles of salvation-bringing Christ." In this way, the old culture sings and, in singing, strengthens the new.

While classical Latin poetry exercised a profound influence on late antique Latin verse, the next two chapters look beyond it to other sources and models. In one, Michael Herren examines how the African poet Dracontius dealt with pagan themes and responded to classical philosophy. Herren argues that philosophy, specifically Stoicism, and Christianity take parallel paths in

Dracontius' poetry. In fact, Stoicism looms large across the poet's entire output, although Herren focuses on Dracontius' secular poetry and how he interprets pagan myth through a Stoic lens. Its importance can be seen conceptually in the depictions of the cosmos and its bonds, a providential God, the causes of vice, the fate of the soul, the elemental nature of creation and destruction, and the relationships between error, delusion, and belief. Ultimately there emerges on a longer reading of Dracontius' oeuvre a Christianized Stoicism that offers a stable paradigm for making sense of the cosmos and, on a literary level, for a Christian interpretation of pagan myths.

From the cosmos and God, the poet Maximianus returns us bluntly to the body. In his elegiac poetry a first-person persona speaks as an old man, with a focus on his past erotic (mis)adventures. Ian Fielding examines Maximianus' account of his affair with a Greek girl in his fifth elegy, and he argues that the poet imitates both Ovid's *Amores* and the erotic epigrams in Greek that Ovid used as models. Maximianus' allusions to Greek poetry prove his familiarity with the language and are consistent with a journey the poet is supposed to have taken to the East with one of Justinian's embassies. On the assumption that Maximianus spent time in Constantinople during the late 530s, Fielding argues that he could have experienced for himself the resurgence of interest in Hellenistic epigram that gave rise to a host of Byzantine imitations, which were collected together in Agathias' *Cycle* a generation or so later. In particular, the epigrams of Philodemus provide a closer model than any of the Roman elegists for Maximianus' persona of an older lover, which suggests that the Latin poet took Philodemus as his principal source. Yet Maximianus' elegies are not at all straightforward imitations. In fact, the identification of his sources brings their originality into sharper focus. In these works the autobiographical presentation of earlier erotic cycles – both Greek and Roman, epigrammatic and elegiac – is given broader scope and new expression.

Other perspectives on elegy, and other uses of the elegiac meter, appear in the work of Venantius Fortunatus. As Michael Roberts suggests, Fortunatus considers elegiacs an all-purpose meter, although the poet also affiliates it, as did the ancients, with consolation, expressions of grief, and death. His three longest poems confirm that affiliation, while they also show the significant influence of Ovid's *Heroides*, those poems of epistolary lament over separation from a loved one. In addition, Fortunatus introduces his four-book hexameter *Life of St. Martin* with an elegiac preface that expresses his compositional aims. This was in keeping with general late antique practice; prefatory paratexts, and particularly those in elegiacs, were common in the period. Roberts proceeds to examine how Fortunatus' elegiac practices influenced Carolingian poets, as well as how those successors moved beyond Fortunatus

and other ancient elegists. In the process, Roberts shows that the formal regularization and structural innovations that Fortunatus brought to the elegiac couplet were not maintained in the Carolingian period and only sparingly revived in the hands of, among others, Theodulf.

By the time the Carolingian Alcuin's prized student Hrabanus Maurus was writing in the early ninth century, the poetic achievements of the Latin poets of late antiquity were already well in the past, and a new set of creative and cultural forces led to new literary developments. As David F. Bright reveals in an analysis of Hrabanus Maurus' *In honorem sanctae crucis*, the aims Hrabanus sets for his project are more properly medieval in conception and reveal a view of human experience that takes shape apart from the energies supplied by antiquity – classical or late.

To be sure, Hrabanus' poem on the holy cross, comprised of twenty-eight *carmina figurata*, draws on a tradition that goes back to the Hellenistic Age and extends into late antiquity, when the fourth-century Optatian Porfyry exploited the potential of figural verse to the utmost. Hrabanus is also tied to the classical past in that he responds in different ways to Lucretius' *De rerum natura*. But, as Bright points out, Hrabanus pursues a distinctive poetic project, and one that is striking in its solemnity and even monumentality. As Bright puts it, his is a panorama of the world as he understood it, from the smallest building blocks of language to the grandest patterns of eternity: it tests both the relations and the limits of text and image, and it affirms a tangible, discrete Christian order to all of creation in its manifold variety. Hrabanus' project is confident, rigorous in conception, and strikingly original. The classical tradition, including the late antique period on which this volume focuses, evolves in Hrabanus' hands into what Bright calls "a new modernism in a new Imperium." As with all the poetry treated in the volume, Hrabanus' work combines continuity and change, the old and the new, to show how the Latin poetic tradition continued to evolve and to live in the hands of authors who viewed the past as more a mine than a monument.

Marc Mastrangelo

Toward a Poetics of Late Latin Reuse

Historical Conditions of Late Latin Reuse

As Christian poets and readers grew among the Roman Empire's elite in the fourth century,[1] Christian and non-Christian poets faced three related challenges. The first was the enormous prestige of the literary history of Greco-Roman poetry and the centrality of the Bible. Lucretius, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Lucan, Juvenal, and Statius cast long shadows, just as Greek literary models had for those very authors in the Republican, Augustan, and post-Augustan periods.[2] As Alan Cameron has recently emphasized, "the Roman literary

[1]   While there were hard-line Christian intellectuals and poets like Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Prudentius, and Paulinus, whose ascetic views influenced their attitudes toward the classical inheritance, this cultural heritage was the common space where ideological purists and moderates met. Alan Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) coins the terms "center-Christians" and "center-pagans," nobles who moved with ease between the two literary and artistic worlds (see P. Brown, "Paganism: What We Owe to the Christians," in *New York Review of Books* [2011]: 68–72). These late antique readers of texts indeed had new money that allowed them to interact with the old pagan elite. Whether or not one was a Christian did not trump the condition of wealth. Moreover, Christian ideology was not an impediment to interaction among elites. In fact, these social developments permitted Christian poetry to make its way from localities where it honored martyrs and saints, or was sung in Church as hymns, to elite circles where tastes encompassed broader aesthetic and ideological concerns.

[2]   Calling attention to the weight of the literary tradition, Aaron Pelttari, *The Space That Remains:Reading Latin Poetry in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014), 5 and 151, cites Nemesianus, *Cyneg*. 46–47, *haec iam magnorum praecipit copia vatum, / omnis et antiqui vulgata est fabula saecli* (a multitude of great poets has already handled [myths], / and every myth of ancient times has been made common); and Ausonius, *Ep*. 8.23–24, *grande onus in Musis; tot saecula condita chartis, / quae sua vix tolerant tempora, nostra gravant* (there is a great burden in the Muses, so many ages committed to paper, / they're scarcely tolerable to their own times, heavy to ours). By contrast, Helen Kaufmann,

tradition played a vital and continuing role in shaping the thought world of Christians and pagans alike."[3] At the same time, the content and literary forms of the Bible stood together with the proliferating genres of patristic commentary as a separate tradition, for which Christian poets had to account in their work. For Prudentius or Paulinus of Nola, the Biblical texts of Jewish and Christian tradition, Roman Christian writings (Church Fathers, tributes to the martyrs), and the massive pagan inheritance could all be activated, separately or collectively, through allusion. On the secular side, Ausonius and Claudian barely, if at all, took part in the "new" content,[4] and this resulted, according to contemporaries like Paulinus, in trivial poetry.[5] So even non-Christian poets had to deal with Christian perspectives, if only as a possible source of hostile criticism.

"Intertextuality in Late Latin Poetry," in *The Poetics of Late Latin Literature*, ed. Jas Elsner and Jesus Hernández-Lobato (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming), quotes Seneca *Epist*. 79.6 in order to portray late antique poets as liberated by the extensive literary inheritance: *condicio optima est ultimi: parata verba invenit, quae aliter instructa novam faciem habent* (the situation of the last is the best: he finds the words ready and they take on a new shape once they are put together in a different way). The literary inheritance for Late Latin poets was a double-edged sword that required new approaches to poetics yet furnished a huge store of material to reuse.

[3]   Alan Cameron's compelling argument against a pagan revival in the late fourth century addresses the negotiation of ideological differences in late antique Rome. Both Pagan and Christian aristocrats shared and accepted the classical inheritance. Pagans were not hell-bent on defending Rome from the "barbarous" Christians, and Christians were not threatened by a pagan renaissance since the issue had been settled. This does not mean that clear differences did not exist between late antique and classical poets' aesthetic goals and use of their predecessors. For instance, Claudian infused the well-worn genre of epic with panegyric. In the case of Christian poetry, the stark ideological differences, such as the primacy of Christian salvation history, drove the content of poetry. (Cameron, *The Last Pagans*, quoted by Brown, "Paganism;" see also Cameron, *The Last Pagans*, 31–32).

[4]   Elaine Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013), 259–60, treats Ausonius as an inspired Christian, but his correspondence with Paulinus of Nola reveals him to be one of Cameron's "center-Christians."

[5]   Although the tone is personal, Ausonius' exchange with Paulinus on his new life (e.g. *Ep*. 21 and *Carm*.10 respectively) is also a subtle debate on the possibility of a Greco-Roman Christian poetics. Note that Paulinus' poetry is also disapproved of from the other side (a Christian rigorist) in the person of Jerome (*Ep*. 53 and 58). See Dennis Trout, *Paulinus of Nola: Life, Letters, and Poems* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 79–89 and 98–103. Michael von Albrecht, *A History of Roman Literature*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 1310, holds a similar

The second challenge was the relative newness of Christian doctrine and political culture. Poets confronted a world in which a thousand years of religious and political ideology and history were being overturned. In the fourth and early fifth centuries, the very idea of Rome was being remade, and a millennium's worth of rich poetic tradition lay there to be reworked, rejected, appropriated, and/or transformed for this purpose. For most of the fifth century and all of the sixth century, the response to this challenge had changed significantly. The idea of Rome as expressed in poetry receded into the background, and poets, for the most part, did not trumpet the triumph of Roman history nor attempt to harmonize Christianity with Roman civilization. Political themes remained, as seen for example in Dracontius' poetic pleas to the Vandal king, Gunthamund, but localized issues tended to dominate, as with Fortunatus, whose poems honor saints, bishops, aristocratic friends, and Churches in different towns and cities.[6] Ausonius, perhaps in order to maintain his literary and intellectual status, demurred when it came to politics, while Claudian was in the thick of it, activating the Greco-Roman tradition of encomium to carve out a position at the emperor's court.

The changed status of poetry in late antiquity contributed a third no less daunting challenge. After the second and third centuries, when there was a dearth of poetic production,[7] poetry reemerged as a viable art form under the post-Constantinian regime. By then, however, it had become distinctly subor-

---

position to Paulinus', namely, that Ausonius may have "towered above his contemporaries," but his poetry is incidental and ephemeral. Gian Biagio Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. Joseph B. Solodow (Baltimore MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 657, criticizes Ausonius' lack of political engagement. On the other hand, Alan Cameron, "Poetry and Literature in Late Antiquity," in *Approaching Late Antiquity*, ed. Simon Swain and Mark Edwards (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 351, asserts, "The most remarkable, and certainly the most influential, Latin poet of late antiquity is the bilingual Alexandrian Claudian." One reason for this, Cameron argues, is that Claudian had internalized Lucan, Statius, and Juvenal like no other Late Antique poet. Conte, *Latin Literature*, 660–61, has a mixed evaluation of Claudian. For a summary of modern views on Claudian, see Marc Mastrangelo, "The Decline of Poetry in the Fourth Century West," *IJCT* 16 (2009): 325–26.

6   The *Natalicia* of Paulinus of Nola is an early example of this localized focus. Kaufmann, "Intertextuality," argues that with Fortunatus' entrance into Merovingian Gaul in the mid-sixth century, "a clear endpoint to Late Latin intertextuality can be identified."

7   Conte, *Latin Literature*, 608–609; Von Albrecht, *A History of Roman Literature*, 1290–92.

dinate in literary and intellectual importance to patristic prose and the Bible.[8] The resulting trivialization and pigeonholing of poetry by Christian thinkers was determinative for much of secular poetry as well, helping to impel it toward the protected existence of the imperial court or toward a learned neo-Alexandrianism. Both patristic writers and Christian poets dismissed pagan poetry's claims to truth. It remained for poets to find a new role, a new set of purposes, even a new poetics. Poets, politicians, clerics, and a readership of educated and common parishioners took for granted a situation that Plato in the *Republic* could only dream about, where poetry was written with ideological considerations to the fore, and under the informal supervision of the Church and its authorities.[9]

These challenges grounded the art and originality of Latin poets of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries and set the terms for any discussion of late antique poetics in the Western Roman Empire. Reuse, that is, allusion and intertextuality, provides a crucial window onto poetic practices and mechanisms for creating meaning in this context. An understanding of shared allusive practices – of how, where, when, and why poets refer to Classical and religious texts and genres – will obviously be key to any fair appreciation of poets working in these circumstances. And here critics of late antique Latin poets have been given helpful assistance from scholars specializing in the poetry of the Republic, Augustan Age, and Early Principate – though, as will become evident, late antique critics have recently made distinguished contributions on the topic of reuse.

Reuse: Theory and Definitions

Over the last several decades, scholars of classical poetry have clarified the terms allusion and intertextuality.[10] Allusion, intertextuality, reference, and topos are the central terms of reuse. Of course, critics use many other terms

---

[8]   W. Evenepoel, "The Place of Poetry in Latin Christianity," in *Early Christian Poetry*, ed. J. Den Boeft and A. Hillhorst (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 52, and Mastrangelo, "The Decline of Poetry," 322–24.

[9]   While outlining the reasons early Christian poets write, Carolinne White, *Early Christian Latin Poets* (London: Routledge, 2000), 9–10, may underestimate the effects of ideological homogeneity and the Church's Platonist attitudes toward poetry.

[10] Gian Biagio Conte, *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and other Latin Poets*, ed. Charles Segal (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1986); Joseph Farrell, *Virgil's* Georgics *and the Traditions of Ancient Epic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991); Richard Thomas, "Virgil's Georgics and the Art of Reference," *HSCP* 90 (1986): 171–98; Richard Thomas, *Reading Vergil*

as well: imitation, echo, reminiscence, reworking, copy, parallel, emulation, parody, burlesque, model, inspiration, influence, source, and so forth.[11] But it is fair to say that a critical consensus has emerged that sees most of these terms as subcategories or aspects of allusion and intertextuality, or else as broader interpretive labels (e.g. burlesque). Moreover, intertextuality is distinct from allusion, since it is not author oriented nor is it an issue of one author reusing another. Rather intertextuality functions as a condition of all literature – in other words, at a more general level, at which language and ideas in texts can be decoupled from specified references.[12]

The term allusion can function as a larger category for the process of referring to other texts, and it crucially posits an active collaboration between a poet and a learned reader.[13] As Hinds initially frames it, allusion can take various forms: 1) citation (*fama est, ferunt, dicitur*) in which there is an appeal to tradition or a type of report; 2) memory, which is worked into the narrative context of the poem; 3) echo, or mannered repetition, in which a text echoes another text, which can, in turn, echo itself; and 4) recognition, which is an act of referring that is recognized by the reader.[14] Hinds' formulation of allusion is helpful because it presupposes authorial control *and* reader reconstruction, and it opens up a middle ground between positivistic philological fundamentalism, on the one hand, and reader-oriented subjectivity, on the other.[15] Further, it highlights an interpretative community, a communal con-

---

and his Texts: Studies in Intertextuality (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999); Barbara Weiden-Boyd, *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influences and Innovation in the* Amores (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997); Stephen Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Joseph Pucci, *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1998), who covers late antiquity as well; and Lowell Edmunds, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).

[11] Weiden Boyd, *Ovid's Literary Loves*, 19.

[12] For a more detailed treatment on the distinction between allusion, intertextuality, and other terms, see Pucci, *The Full-Knowing Reader*, 3–108.

[13] Thomas, *Reading Vergil*, 1–2. In the case of late antiquity, "the reader" can be defined more broadly, implying levels of intelligibility.

[14] Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext*, 1–8. Hinds categorizes all four cases as "allusive self annotation" (Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext*, 10).

[15] This middle ground can breed uncertainty. However, the concept of allusion is useful precisely because of the tension between revelation and concealment, a game that is played by both the poet and the audience (Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext*, 53 with Macrobius 5.18.1; Ellen Finkelpearl, "Pagan Traditions of Intertex-

struction of meaning, as a realm in which reuse happens.[16] For Late Latin poetry, especially on the Christian side, the interpretive community is interestingly more transparent and consistent in its ideological commitments than that of Golden or Silver Age poetries.[17]

Scholars of classical Latin poetry have also usefully discussed the terms reference and topos. Thomas sees reference as a general term of referring, an instance of significant verbal overlap between poet and predecessor in which it is clear that the poet is familiar with the model, and the overlap "is susceptible of interpretation."[18] Hinds calls a topos a self-conscious "intertextual gesture" that, although at first glance hackneyed from poetic overuse, nevertheless can be used creatively to produce new meanings.[19] A topos was originally a rhetorical term, "storehouses of arguments" for a Roman orator.[20] However, it penetrated into all genres of literature, becoming a set of tools for the use of the poet and appropriate to a genre. Generic allusions in the form of topoi and verbal references are frequent in Late Latin poetry and reflect the aesthetic project of developing a new poetry and poetics.

As a result of this scholarly activity, the questions one can ask of allusion and intertextual relationships (and their authors) have become more complex and interesting, allowing critics productively to negotiate the limits of interpretation. For critics of Late Latin poets in particular, there are questions to be asked: Does language, image, or idea mean something different in its reuse, e.g., contrastive reuse? Does a case of reuse signal a worldview that the poet is promoting, recalling, or dismissing? Does the mode of reuse put the poet/poem in a hostile, emulative, imitative, or noncommittal relationship to his/its antecedents or models? Multiple references, a common phenomenon in Late Latin poetry, present the reader and critic with further questions. For instance, do the references form a hierarchy or range for which he or she can

---

tuality in the Roman World," in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*, ed. Dennis R. MacDonald (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001), 83, with Elder Seneca *Suas*. 3.7 and Seneca *Ep*. 84.3.7). Pelttari, *The Space That Remains*, and Kaufmann, "Intertextuality" have proposed versions of "the middle ground" for Late Antique poetry.

[16] Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext*, 29, and 50, citing Roland Barthes, *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments*, trans. Richard Howard (London, 1979), 8–9.

[17] See Brian Stock, *Augustine the Reader* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 1, 16, and 168–69 for Augustine's conception of a community of readers, including a community that derives from a "spiritual community" and picks out a "specific group of readers." (169).

[18] Thomas, *Reading Vergil*, 117.

[19] Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext*, 36.

[20] Quintilian at 10.10.20 uses the phrase *argumentorum sedes*.

distinguish primary or secondary references? Given where Late Latin poetry falls at the end of Roman literary and political history, there are questions concerning its aesthetic and ideological commitments. To answer these questions, the critic must have a "more dynamic sense of contextual appropriateness."[21] Lack or surplus of linguistic overlap remains important, but context, ideas, and themes become central to recognizing and interpreting instances of reuse.

Late Antique Scholars' Views of Reuse

Allusion takes place in an interpretive community. But how can the critic recognize allusions, and how are we to evaluate or assess the meaning of reuse in late antique authors with their distinctive literary culture? Late antique scholars have gone about their own business in trying to answer these questions.

Pierre Courcelle's influential *Les lettres greques en occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore* reaffirmed tight philological criteria for proof that a Late Latin author read and knew a Greek author.[22] Although he was not averse to importing broader considerations of grammatical style, multiple sources, and doctrine, the message was clear to the critic of late antique literature seeking to establish sources and influences: uncommon philological matches are best for answering the question of whether one author had directly read a previous author.[23] This is fine as far as it goes. For Late Latin poetry this message would limit the questions critics can ask and the interpretations critics can generate.[24] But recent work on Late Latin poets has sought to revise and ex-

---

[21]   Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext*, 38. Although not usually understood as a technical term for the process of referring, nevertheless, "context" is vital for the interpretation of references. On the face of it, context is the surrounding words, images, and themes of an allusion in both the new and the source text. More importantly, for interpretation, context constitutes the possible worlds that the two or multiple texts in an allusive passage signify (Edmunds, *Intertextuality*, 32, quoting Samuel R. Levin, *The Semantics of Metaphor* (Baltimore MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977). The term "context" is broad, laden with historical, political, literary, and intellectual information. However, it is a point of entry for the critic who must exercise judgment about similarity and difference regarding a case of referring.

[22]   Pierre Courcelle, *Les lettres greques en occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore*, 2nd ed., trans. H. E. Wedeck as *Late Latin Writers and Their Greek Sources* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1969).

[23]   Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext*, 25–6 with references.

[24]   For good examples of Courcelle's approach to Greek sources for Late Latin writ-

pand source criticism into the areas of allusion and intertextuality, allowing for richer interpretations of the works.[25]

In the second half of the twentieth century, Thraede's "contrast imitation," Herzog's exegetical turn, and Gnilka's concept of *chrêsis* ("use") established the special character of Late Latin reuse.[26] All three ideas flow from the principle that early Christian reception of non-Christian texts was a manipulation of those texts in service to Christianity. Gnilka nuances this position by arguing that the tradition and techniques of classical imitation (*chrêsis*), including *aemulatio*, furnished a basis for early Christian poets to use the classical in-

    ers, see on Ausonius, Roger P. H. Green, "Greek in Late Roman Gaul: The Evidence of Ausonius," in *Owls to Athens: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, ed. E. M. Craik (Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1990), 311–320; and on Ammianus, see Charles Fornara, "Studies in Ammianus II," *Historia* 41 (1992): 424–37.

[25] E.g., J. H. D. Scourfield, ed., *Texts and Culture in Late Antiquity*: *Inheritance, Authority, and Change* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2007); Willemien Otten and Karla Pollmann, ed., *Poetry and Exegesis in Premodern Latin Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2007); Roger Rees, ed., *Romane Memento: Vergil in the Fourth Century* (London: Duckworth Press, 2004).

[26] Contrast imitation occurs when a passage highlights its own aesthetic or ideological position against that of an antecedent passage (Klaus Thraede, "Epos," *RAC* 5 (1962): 983–1042). Reinhart Herzog, "Exegese-Erbauung-*Delectatio*: Beiträge zu einer christlichen Poetik der Spätantike," in *Formen und Funktionen der Allegorie* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche, 1979), 52–69, sees a clear oppositional relationship between biblical epic and pagan genres; see Jean-Louis Charlet, "Aesthetic Trends in Late Latin Poetry (325–410)," *Philologus* 132 (1988): 82–4; but his notion of an "exegetical turn" as fundamental to the development of Christian poetry has resulted in rich scholarship on exegesis and early Christian poetry (e.g. Roger P. H. Green, *Latin Epics of the New Testament: Juvencus, Sedulius, Arator* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Roger P. H. Green, "The *Evangeliorum Libri* of Juvencus: Exegesis by Stealth?" in Otten and Pollmann, *Poetry and Exegesis*, 65; and Marc Mastrangelo, *The Roman Self in Late Antiquity: Prudentius and the Poetics of the Soul* (Baltimore MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008). The more generalizing notion of E. R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety: Some Aspects of Religious Experience from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965) of late antiquity as an "age of interpretation" is a forerunner of Herzog. Christian Gnilka, "Interpretation frühchristlicher Literatur. Dargestellt am Beispiel des Prudentius." *Prudentiana II: Exegetica* (München: K.G. Saur, 2001), 52, sees "use" of Classical texts flowing from a strong inner core of belief centered on Christianity. The *vates Dei* (Paulinus of Nola *Ep*. 16.6) chooses and uses according to the belief he is serving; hence its potential transformative power on form and content.

heritance. From this he concludes that there is a fundamental difference between classical and early Christian reuse: whereas the classical poets use, imitate, or allude, according to their personal preferences, the requirements of the particular poem, or the laws of a genre, Christian poets allude in order to advance the ideology of Christianity.[27] On Gnilka's view, early Christian poetry is a complete transformation, a total reorientation, of classical models. In essence, there is a complete break.[28] More recently scholars have deemphasized a break or an overly reductive view of Late Latin reuse preferring, instead, to highlight the use of the classical inheritance in terms of "negotiation, accommodation, adaptation, transformation."[29] There is broad scholarly agreement that Late Latin Christian reuse does not revolve around a "conflict model," in which early Christian poets sought to destroy or silence their classical (pagan) antecedents.

This move toward a less oppositional view of reuse and a non-systemic approach to allusion, i.e., on a case-by-case basis, has permitted critics to deepen their understanding of individual poets. It has also revealed commonalities (and differences) between "secular" poets like Ausonius and Claudian and early Christian poets. For example, both employ *aemulatio* and contrast imitation, but where secular poets engaged in a constructive modification of classical models, their Christian counterparts necessarily went further because of their singular ideological commitment to Christian salvation history and doctrine. Because poets of the period from the fourth to the sixth century are a diverse group geographically, ethnically, and aesthetically, their poetry exhibits a "multiplicity of ways in which attempts are made to integrate the past, particularly as represented by texts which possessed special authority, into the present."[30]

While the late antique reuse of the literary authority of Virgil, Horace, Lucretius, and others plays a significant role (particularly Virgil and the Bible) in interpreting of both the new and antecedent texts, it should not be overvalued. After all, there is a tension between appropriation of and distinction from classical poetic authority harbored by poets of the period, since they were establishing their own authority. For early Christian poets, this tension

---

[27] Gnilka, *Prudentiana II*, 53.

[28] Robert Kirstein, *Paulinus Nolanus* Carmen 17. *Die Methode der Kirchenväter in Umgang mit der Antiken Kultur VIII* (Basel: Scwabe & Co, 2000), 14–15, has a summary of the term *chrêsis* with further references.

[29] Gerard O'Daly, *Days Linked by Song: Prudentius'* Cathemerinon (Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2011), 23, n.52, and the quote is from Scourfield, "Introduction," 3–4, in Scourfield, *Texts and Culture*.

[30] Scourfield, "Introduction," 4.

often bursts through the surface of the text. Furthermore, Late Latin authors reused many other classical texts, sometimes conflating several with other concerns besides poetic authority.

More recently Aaron Pelttari and Helen Kaufmann have described the break between classical and late antique poetry in terms of each period's differing approach to intertextuality and reuse. Pelttari argues that while both periods share certain techniques of reuse, late antique authors, both Christian and secular,[31] often allude to their imperial predecessors in an open-ended fashion, inviting the reader to take a more active role in interpretation. One way to characterize the rise of the reader is a shift away from classical *aemulatio*, the competitive element between poets that drives their expressions of authority and originality. For late antique poets, "poetic quotations [are] read through their reader rather than through the competitive systems of author and text." Late antiquity sees a rise in nonreferential allusions, or allusions that "leave their referentiality undefined … the link between the context of their text and its hypotext [intertext] is undetermined." Thus the individual late antique poet is not locked in a competitive struggle with Virgil, Horace, Statius, or any other Roman poet, but rather, through his allusions, the late antique poet "[emphasizes] the difference [and distance] between these prior words and their present use … [to create] out of the text a strong reader, charged with navigating the meaning of the difference."[32]

Pelttari's observation about *aemulatio* resonates but can be further clarified. Rather than think of a late antique poet's *aemulatio* of his prestigious predecessor as part of a competition that either vanquishes the predecessor or produces a recognition of the poet's qualities (nearly) equal to the predecessor, *aemulatio* in late antique poetry reorients its emulative impulses away from the originality or status of the poet himself and toward the development of newly invigorated genres or even the construction of a new kind of literature. This is particularly the case with Christian poetry. As authors engage the pagan, biblical, and patristic literary inheritance, they develop the genres of the hymn, the letter, and epic, as well as a poetics that calls for a new canon designed according to ideological criteria. Paulinus' disapproval of the lying

---

[31]   Though Pelttari, *The Space That Remains*, 10, excludes biblical poetry from his data set because the texts "are not technically different from the translations and secondary poetry that was always part and parcel of Latin literature," which means that "they are not the best evidence for the turn towards the reader in the fourth century." However, the biblical poem composed at the end of the fifth century, Dracontius' *De laudibus dei*, may be more germane to Pelttari's arguments.

[32]   Pelttari, *The Space That Remains*, 131, 154, and 159.

of pagan poetry and his assertion of the truth of a new Christian poetry[33] illustrate how the ideological commitment of Christianity made individual poetic rivalries moot.

We know, as does Pelttari, that poets such as Prudentius, Ausonius, and Paulinus operate on a variety of different levels regarding allusion. They engage in the whole range of allusion from quotation and nonreferential allusions to integrative allusions in which the intertext has a major role in determining the meaning of a particular passage. Part of these poets' response, according to Pelttari, was to incorporate into their works allusions that are juxtapositions or "appositions" of the old and the new, leaving it to the reader to fill in the space of interpretation. Moreover, Pelttari does not characterize his imagined reader except to observe that readers in the fourth century read less of republican authors and more of the imperial authors beginning with Virgil. This resulted in a "thick" history of Latin literature for which Virgil was the source. It also produced a mentality that distanced itself from these authors.[34] We might simply say that the frequency of explicit allusions (this is a period where quotations, the centonic allusion, and generic markers are omnipresent) significantly increased. Coupled with the fact that these poets engage in allusive practices established by their classical predecessors, there is a need for a taxonomy of allusions in late antique poetry.

Helen Kaufmann has provided just that: a schematic that purports to take into account the range and particular character of Late Latin reuse. She isolates a sliding scale or "continuum" of allusions made up of two poles with a middle point: on one side are allusions essential to the content meaning; on the opposite end are allusions that are "formal features" of the poetry[35] that express the (classical) tradition and are irrelevant to the content meaning of the new poem; and between these two poles are allusions that are an optional part of the content meaning, perhaps adding an "extra layer of meaning if taken into account."[36] Similar to Pelttari, Kaufmann understands the difference between Late Latin and Classical intertextuality as lying in the use of allusions as formal features, which are "particularly suitable to communicate

---

[33] Paulinus of Nola, *Carm*. 20. 28–32.

[34] Pelttari, *The Space That Remains*, 150: "Ausonius and his contemporaries imagined themselves as separate from their classical models."

[35] What Pelttari calls "nonreferential" allusions, a term that Kaufmann, "Intertextuality" finds too strong because her more reader-centered approach allows the reader to remain in control of assigning a meaning to a formal feature – though Pelttari is aware of this as well (Pelttari, *The Space That Remains*, 131)

[36] Kaufmann, "Intertextuality," goes on to argue for her view through an interesting analysis of late antique criticism and metapoetics on "modes of intertextuality," and on colonial and post-colonial "modes of reception."

new content to audiences of various education levels as [they draw] attention away from the model texts to the new text."[37]

Thraede, Herzog, Gnilka, Pelttari, and Kaufmann provide a nuanced picture of the unprecedented variety of Late Latin reuse, and they are part of a scholarly direction that, over the last fifty years, has advanced to new frontiers the discussion of allusion, intertextuality, and reuse. However, what stands out is that the best of Late Latin poets achieve a dialogue, or even a form of dialectic, with the classical, biblical, and/or patristic traditions that reflects the cultural revolution taking place in the Roman Empire from the fourth to the sixth centuries. Juvencus' epilogue to his biblical epic (4.804–12) recalls Virgil's representation of Augustus's peace making (*G.* 4.559–62) in order to pay tribute to Constantine's extraordinary achievements. A new Virgil praises the emperor by alluding to Virgil's praise of an emperor, which leads to considerations of Constantine's role in the creation of Latin Christian poetry.[38] Prudentius – another new Virgil and a new Horace, but also a neo-Psalmist – recalls in *Cath*. 9 the various genres of lyric, epic (biblical and classical), and the hymn through allusions to Horace, Virgil, Hilary of Poitiers, and the Hebrew Bible to create a universal poetry that represents the whole of reality.[39] Boethius, an exceptional poet and critic, alludes to Plato, Parmenides, the Book of Wisdom, and the Orpheus myth in a successive prose/poetry pair in order to give a Christian and Greek philosophical definition of God and to assert poetry's connection to divine truth.[40] These three poets, in these instances of reuse, express the radical nature of the changes the Roman Empire was undergoing.

Finally, no discussion of Late Latin reuse would be complete without considering, albeit briefly, how late antique material culture has contributed to our understanding of the period's reuse of its classical and biblical inheritance. Michael Roberts explication of the "jeweled style" was at the forefront of an approach in which late antique poetry reflects in concrete ways its art, architecture, and monuments.[41] During the period of the construction of the Arch of Constantine, thirty-six intact arches already occupied the cityscape of Rome. The reuse of objects and images from the imperial period, that is *spolia*, from the principates of Trajan, Hadrian, and Aurelius, has led to a

---

[37]   Kaufmann, "Intertextuality."

[38]   Roger P. H. Green, "Constantine as Patron of Christian Latin Poetry," *Studia Patristica* 46 (2010): 76. See also McGill in this volume (pp. 59–60).

[39]   See O'Daly in this volume.

[40]   For Plato, *Cons.* 3. Pr.12. 1 and 111; For Parmenides, *Cons*. 3. Pr.12. 105–106; For *The Book of Wisdom*, *Cons*. 3. Pr.12. 63–64; For Orpheus, *Cons*. 3. M.12.

[41]   Michael Roberts, *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1989).

vigorous debate on the mélange of old and new imagery and materials on the Arch of Constantine. For instance, scholars have argued for a deliberate artistic strategy that transforms the historical narratives of the reused imperial reliefs into symbols of imperial virtues.[42] The placement of the reused material is deliberate and revises its "original" meanings, bestowing a glorious past on the dynamic, Constantinian present.[43]

The reuse of *spolia* parallels the reuse of phrases and half lines of Virgilian centos and the frequent quotations of past verse in Late Latin poetry that exhibit the full range of allusive meaning, including non-referential, complementary, and contrastive.[44] Another example of this aesthetic crossover is the proliferation of finely crafted small objects (ivory diptychs, silverware, cameos) that reflect an enthusiasm for smaller genres (e.g., epitaphs, erotic poems, sermons, church dedications, *acta martyrum*, prefatory epistles).[45] The delight in fragments, the focus on detail, and the telescoping of visual and intellectual attention cumulatively portray an artistic mentality in which the rich textual and material patrimony of Rome could be used and reused to produce new meanings and forms.[46] This mentalité suggests the model of a dialogue as a way to conceive of late antique intertextuality; a dialogue reflective of the intellectual, artistic, and spiritual upheaval of the period. An innovative feature of early Christian poetry, for instance, is that a dialogue of allusive sourc-

---

[42] E.g., M. Schlitt, "Past as Present: Art History and Power in the Arch of Constantine," in a paper presented in March 2015 at the conference of the Renaissance Society of America, Humboldt University, Berlin.

[43] See *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*, ed. Richard Brilliant and Dale Kinney (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011). Roman elites as well as non-elites were the audience of Constantine's arch and would have recognized much, including the allusions to Roman political ideals and their own place within the Roman state – and perhaps even the replacement of the heads of certain imperial reliefs with the head of Constantine. On non-elites as audience for Constantine's arch, see John R. Clarke, *Art in the Lives of Ordinary Romans: Visual Representation and Non-elite Viewers in Italy, 100 B.C.–A.D. 315* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006) chapter 2; also Schlitt, "Past as Present."

[44] Jas Elsner, "Late Narcissus: Classicism and Culture in a Late Roman *Cento*," in Elsner and Hernández-Lobato, *Poetics*. For bibliography on *spolia* see Brilliant and Kinney, *Reuse Value*.

[45] Jas Elsner and Jesus Hernández-Lobato, "Introduction," in Elsner and Hernández-Lobato, *Poetics*.

[46] See Trout in this volume, who uncovers examples of Late Antique use of the classical inheritance in monuments that reuse classical verse in order to take part in a dialogue with other monuments in the landscape of Rome.

es evolves into a dialectic of beliefs that the poet directs and the reader is encouraged to recognize. The reuse of biblical and classical typology in Prudentius' *Psychomachia*, which compels the reader to think through and choose between morally distinct ways of living, and the reuse of classical philosophical and literary exempla in Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*, which requires the reader to rethink the history of intellectual and spiritual ideas, are examples of the ambition of Late Latin reuse. This intertextual dialectic is not indeterminate or aporetic but propels the reader toward monumental ideological commitments and choices.

This discussion of reuse has yielded several observations that are complementary. First, literary allusion becomes a kind of literary criticism, exploring meanings available in the source text beyond the obvious. It allows us to respond to serious questions of meaning: "does the new text altogether discard the values of the old, or does it sometimes reshape and redefine those values and events in a non-oppositional way?"[47] Allusion as literary criticism is a productive approach for understanding the full scope of reuse in Late Latin poetry. Both poets and audience of this period understood the process of referring to other texts as central to the production and reconstruction of meaning in a text – not to mention how the text positions itself in the new and developing genres of hymns (Ambrose, Hilary, Prudentius), epic (Juvencus, Claudian, Prudentius), letters (Ausonius, Paulinus, Sidonius), and elegiac genres (Prudentius, Paulinus, Fortunatus).[48]

Second, critics need to situate poet, reader, and critic in a more transparent allusive relationship. Thus we can imagine a triangular relationship between author, reader, and critic.[49] What the author does, what the reader perceives, and what the critic discovers converge at various points: at one time, more in line with the response of the reader; at another time, nearer to the intentions of the author; or, at another time, more dependent on the judgment of the critic. Where the point of convergence is located depends on how successful a historicist the critic is, how purposeful an alluder the poet was, and how knowledgeable readers were. Philological fundamentalism and its overcorrection, the "death of the author," represent extremes that are situated at the author (i.e., with clear inten-

---

[47] Finkelpearl, "Pagan Traditions," 82.

[48] This is not to say that allusion-as-literary-criticism is simply an updated form of source criticism, an approach that dominated the approach to classical and Late Latin texts for a good portion of the twentieth century and still has its uses. Rather, literary criticism in all its forms, whether ancient, medieval, Romantic, Modernist, or Postmodernist methods, becomes richer when classical and Late Latin poets' allusive techniques are considered.

[49] Christopher Francese first suggested to me the scheme of a triangular relationship.

tions) and the reader (whose response is all) respectively. In order to do justice to Late Latin poetry, the critic must weigh the claims of both (i.e., according to each author and literary historical context), between the poles of philological fundamentalism and reader-oriented subjectivity.[50]

The allusive methods developed by late antique specialists reflect these principles of allusion as interpretation and the convergence of poet/reader/critic. We have already mentioned contrast imitation, which often is manifest in early Christian poetry from the ideological use of the classical inheritance. Exegesis, which is tied (but not exclusively) to the reuse of the Bible, patristic treatises, and Virgil, originates in the intellectual historical context of the period. The stories and characters of scripture and the *Aeneid* furnish ready-made intertextual examples. In addition, the interpretations of these stories provide further intertextual connections. Although they are paraphrasing scripture, Juvencus and Sedulius engage to various degrees in exegetical commentary.[51] Often narrative choices include or exclude parts of a Biblical or Virgilian story and, consequently, indicate ideas that are expressed by the poets and recognized by the reader.[52] Related to exegesis is typology, in which an allusion to a person, event, or idea connects the poem historically and figuratively to the Bible text and chronology and to pagan texts and history.[53] This connection results in a comparison between figures or events that, like the case of exegesis, expresses poetic, spiritual, or intellectual meaning. Both concepts of exegesis and typology can function simultaneously as the content

---

50 Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext*, 19 and 50. Philip Hardie, "Metamorphosis, Metaphor, and Allegory in Latin Epic," in *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World*, ed. Margaret Beissinger, Jane Tylus, and Susanne Wofford (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1999), 89, asserts that here is a tension between "the allegorical drive to fix categories on the author's side and the resistance to interpretative fixation."

51 Green, "Exegesis by Stealth," 158–59, sees Sedulius' exegeses as more complex and theological than those of Juvencus. M. Roberts, "Vergil and the Gospels: The *Evangeliorum Libri IV* of Juvencus," in Rees, *Romane Memento*, 49 says: "Juvencus' reuse of Vergilian phraseology in a Christian context is inherently exegetical, constituting an *interpretatio Christiana* of epic, but also potentially … an *interpretatio epica* of the Bible." Similarly, see Scourfield, "Introduction," 16.

52 Scourfield, "Introduction," 19, comments that Pagan (Platonist) philosophical texts also were subject to exegetical commentary that ventured far beyond the ideas of the object texts.

53 On typology and figural reading see Northrop Frye, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich) 1982; David Dawson, *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); and Mastrangelo, *The Roman Self*.

of an allusion (i.e., the person or event) and as the interpretation of them (e.g., Jesus as the second Adam or Honorius as Jupiter).

Poetical texts of the fourth through sixth centuries allude often, both referentially and nonreferentially. With regard to meaning, these texts stipulate a variable combination of the knowing reader and the intending poet. In the cases of multiple allusions, both referential and nonreferential, as well in cases of singular nonreferential allusions, each case demands that the critic judge the appropriate relationship between authorial intentions, reader reception, and the critic's own assumptions. Late antique critics of the last half-century have made significant progress in negotiating these categories, having been further aided by the parallels which exist between late antique literary and material cultures.

The Poetic Self, Ideology, and Reuse

Reuse in the form of allusion and intertextuality goes to the core of late antique poetic composition. The tools of reuse (i.e., essential and integrative allusions), including generic references, contrast imitation, exegesis, and typology, are driven by ideological commitments. In the case of Christian poets, the commitment is all-consuming. In the case of Claudian, ideological commitment takes the form of propaganda at worst, nationalistic panegyric at best; and political or spiritual commitments do not significantly register in the poetry of Ausonius – though, as Joseph Pucci shows in this volume, aesthetic commitments certainly do. These two poets would seem, then, to occupy the center of the audience bandwidth, what Cameron labels "center-pagans" and "center-Christians." These terms denote the point of reception at which Christian and pagan readers of all stripes could gather. However, doctrinally focused Christian poets define the Christian poetic self according to the ideology of Salvation. That is, early Christian ideas of poetic originality situate the poetic self within Salvation History as part of a group seeking eternal life. The merging of the poetic self with the group has significant effects for the interpretation of cases of reuse. The ideological intersection of poet and audience implies an interpretive community in which allusion and intertextuality are more determinate. Poets and readers understand each other. By contrast, for Claudian and Ausonius, whose audience comprises center-pagan and center-Christians, the calculus of allusive interpretation depends less on ideological commitments and more on the manipulation of forms and genres of Roman pagan poetic tradition.[54]

---

[54]   On the effect of Claudian's propagandistic poetry on his western audience, see Alan Cameron *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Ox-

Furthermore, Endelechius, Juvencus, Prudentius, Paulinus, Proba, Sedulius, Dracontius, and Fortunatus do not trumpet their personal achievements as poets, whereas the challenge of traditional Roman pagan notions of poetic originality was activated for Claudian and Ausonius – a difficult task considering how the established genres had been worked and reworked over the centuries. For these two, classical poets were to be emulated through content and form, whereas for their Christian counterparts, content as a function of ideological commitment characterized at first glance a rivalry with classical poetic tradition. Moreover, poetic form did not necessarily function as a source of emulation or rivalry. For Late Latin Christian poets the question of originality could simply be answered by the inclusion of the new Christian content – not to mention the complementary suggestion that their originality consisted in the Christian life they led.[55] Yet Prudentius, Paulinus, Juvencus, Sedulius, Dracontius, and other Christian "rigorists" experimented radically and allusively with poetic forms. To approach an allusion in Late Latin poetry, then, one must consider these poets' assumptions concerning poetic originality.

Unlike Virgil, Horace, Propertius, and Ovid, most Christian poets do not explicitly emphasize their mastery, originality, and position within the tradition of a certain genre.[56] Golden Age Latin poets see their poetry as not attracting the *vulgus*, "the crowd." Their poetry is poets' poetry, which, for the most part, defines the audience to whom they asserted a muscular originality by means of generic, conceptual, and verbal reuse, as well as of explicit assertions.[57] For Christian poets, direct conversation of this kind with antecedent pagan poets is avoided. Moreover, Christian poets at times give the impression that they are after a bigger crowd – though ideological purity would seem to restrict the audience. As Catherine Ware and Joseph Pucci in this volume show, Claudian and Ausonius express their claims to originality indirectly by their reuse of Virgil and Horace respectively. Ausonius, for example, uses

---

ford: Clarendon, 1970), 242–52. One could argue that works such as Claudian's *De Raptu Proserpinae* had a targeted reading community, characterized as learned enough to appreciate Alexandrian scale and allusive practice.

[55] O'Daly, *Days Linked by Song*, Preface.

[56] However, see in this volume Part Two of McGill's essay for Juvencus as one of the exceptions where a Christian poet explicitly trumpets his own poetic achievement. McGill shows how Juvencus, with his contrastive approach to reuse, "sets the conditions for readers to remember the concluding statements of classical authors on lasting poetic fame and to register how he, like Constantine, was after something bigger."

[57] See Pucci in this volume on Horace *Ep*. 2.1, which mentions "the dire consequences of attempting to attract the *vulgus*."

Horace to express "a self-effacing quality grounded in humility, but also in the conviction that what the poet has to say is, indeed, worth saying."[58]

To a certain extent, on this issue of the place of the poet in Christian poetry, a literary dialogue does take place with the Bible – for instance, with David, the ur-psalmist and "founder" of the hymnal tradition. Early Christian poets modestly positioned themselves as they tried to develop a new poetic tradition. As Gerard O'Daly points out in this volume, Prudentius refers to himself as a *poeta rusticus* (*Pe*. 2.574) and an *obsoletum vasculum* (a worn out container) in the corner (*Epil*. 26–28). Thus, for Prudentius and others, if we interpret un-ironically, the poetic self is submerged under the priority of praising god, explicating doctrine (rooting out heresy), and achieving salvation. Poetic authority is achieved through the expression of a triumphant, shared Christian worldview that transforms a classically based genre. This feature of the Christian poetic self helps to determine the process of reuse.[59] For instance, Prudentius and Paulinus replace Apollo with Christ, as the source of poetic inspiration. *Psych*. 1 and *Carm*. 10.21–22 are focused allusive references grounded in the position the poet takes regarding his aesthetic role, which is subordinate to the representation of salvation history and the texts that Christ represents.[60]

Salvation history is a totalizing vision of reality that held first place in early Christian poetics. It consists of five points on the universal historical timeline: the creation, the fall, the incarnation, the resurrection, and the last judgment. Where the poetic self falls in the process of explicating this vision is beside the point. Therefore, this positioning of the Christian poetic self as well as the assumption of salvation history circumscribes a poet's approach to reuse, the reader's recognition of reuse, and the critic's recovery of that reuse. A good example of this convergence occurs when Christian poets allude to both the Exodus and the *katabasis* of *Aeneid* 6 in order to authorize the story of Christian salvation (Prudentius, *Psych*. 606–64; cf. *Cath*. 531–137 and Paulinus of Nola, *Carm*. 26.43–44, and Sedulius *Carm Pasch*. 1.136–59; cf. Ausonius *Mosella*).

---

58   Pucci, in this volume.
59   On Prudentius' *Cathemerinon* see O'Daly in this volume: "The self-definition of his [Prudentius'] poetic aims" is achieved through allusiveness regarding the Psalms, Virgil, Horace, and Ambrose.
60   *Psych*. 1: *Christe, graves hominum semper miserate labores* (oh Christ! You have always pitied the harsh agonies of human kind); *negant Camenis nec patent Apollini / dicata Christo pectora* (hearts dedicated to Christ deny the Muses and reject Apollo). Note that Prudentius is reusing Virgil *A*. 7.46; shortly after *Carm*. 10.21–22, Paulinus reuses Terence, *Andria* 189.

This argument suggests the broader point that early Christian, "rigorist," authors and their readers composed and interpreted under the ideologically vigilant regime of the Church, for an ideologically committed audience, according to how they understood Church doctrine.[61] They were part of an ecclesiastical interpretive community (clerics, laity, and government officials) whose ideological agenda was prioritized to the extent that it was the basis for all literature, including poetry. Under this scheme, poets and readers appear to have had a mutual interpretive understanding. Indeed, patristic thought appears to have set the standards, especially of content, for Christian poetry. The patristic critique of pagan poetic tradition developed a loose set of patristic conventions of poetic practice for Christian poetry. The following list of eight criteria reflects both patristic ideas and the adaptation of those ideas by the poets: 1) the truth vs. lies of pagan poetry (Juvencus, *Praef.* 16; Paulinus, *Carm.* 20.28–32; Dracontius, *De laud. dei* 3.527), 2) Christ or the Holy Spirit as divine inspiration (Juvencus, *Praef.* 25–6; Prudentius, *Psych.* 1), 3) the act of poetry as bringing salvation of the poet (Juvencus, *Praef.* 22; Prudentius, *Praef.* and *Epil.*), 4) the salvation of the reader, 5) poetry as an offering to God (Prudentius, *Cath.* 3.31–35; Paulinus, *Carm.* 10.29–32; Ennodius, *Carm.* 1.9, *Praef.* 4), 6) David as the ur-biblical poet (Hilary, *Liber Hymnorum*; Paulinus, *Carm.* 6.13–26; Ps.-Paulinus *Carm.* 32.5–8), 7) the epic genre as an exalted way to praise God,[62] and 8) the promotion of Church doctrine and rooting out of heresy (Sedulius, *Ad Macedonium*; Prudentius, *Praef.*).

While poets' intentions and readers' reactions varied, Christian doctrine was generated by the texts of salvation history: the New and Old Testaments and patristic commentary. Roman pagan literature of the past, meanwhile, embraced and incorporated different modes of interpretation of history, nature, and humanity's role in the world. Consequently, soothsayers, priests, poets, historiographers, and grammarians were separate interpretative communities with their own interpretive traditions and specific methods of decoding signs to express meaning.[63] Early Christian poetry was produced according to an outlook that was deeply shaped by Christian doctrine: "divine revelation … required a universally valid explanation of all human experience as part of salvation history."[64]

---

[61] Mastrangelo, "The Decline of Poetry," 327.

[62] Alexander Arweiler, "Interpeting Cultural Change: Semiotics and Exegesis in Dracontius' *De laudibus Dei*," in Otten and Pollmann, *Poetry and Exegesis*, 147–72.

[63] Arweiler, "Semiotics and Exegesis," 155.

[64] Arweiler, "Semiotics and Exegesis," 155.