

Richard Flower (ed.): *Imperial Invectives against Constantius II*. Translated with Introduction and Commentary. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2016 (Translated Texts for Historians 67). 272 p., 1 map. £ 85.00 (hb). ISBN: 978-1-78138-327-8. £ 19.99 (pb). ISBN: 978-1-78138-328-5.

In a worthy successor to his 2013 monograph, Flower provides in this book the translations of three texts composed by bishops who opposed the search for Christian unity as it was patronised by Constantius II in the mid-fourth century.¹ A complete table of contents (VII) is followed by a brief preface that situates this book within the work of Flower (IX–X) and a list of abbreviations for essential instruments and series (XI). There follows an introduction (1–38) that sets the stage – in historical, theological, and literary terms – for the three texts to be presented. Arranged in chronological order, these texts offered in English translation are: Athanasius of Alexandria's *History of the Arians* (39–114), Hilary of Poitiers' *Against Constantius* (115–140), and Lucifer of Cagliari's *The Necessity of Dying for the Son of God* (141–186). Concluding this book is the usual scholarly apparatus: a list of editions and translations of ancient texts (187–199); a bibliography of modern works cited (200–206); a glossary of imperial ranks and titles as well as theological terms (207–210); a map of the Roman world of the mid-fourth century (211); a general index (212–223); and an index of the non-biblical texts cited by Lucifer of Cagliari (224–225). Overall, the quality of scholarship, translations, and printing makes for an aesthetically appealing and extremely useful volume that merits a place on scholarly bookshelves as well as in the classroom and university library. This volume is a welcome addition to the growing body of scholarship that invites non-specialists to go beyond the narrow confines of the Constantinian question and to explore the vast horizons of the fourth century at greater length.

* * *

The introduction (1–38) to this volume is workmanlike, offering an immense amount of useful information within the brief compass of a few pages so as

1 See R. Flower: *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective*. Cambridge 2013; for review and critical questions (only partially answered here), see U. Lambrecht: *Review of Flower 2013: H-Soz-u-Kult*, 23. 9. 2013, URL: <http://www.hsozkult.de/publicationreview/id/rezbuecher-20611>.

to orient readers before they tackle the texts themselves. Carefully constructed and clearly signposted, the introduction takes readers from historical context (2–20: “Ecclesiastical and theological politics, 318–361”) to authorial biographies and the texts of the invectives (21–35: “Authors and texts”, subdivided into three appropriate parts) to the literary construction of this genre as practised by these fourth-century authors (35–38: “Invective, imperial criticism and self-presentation”). It concludes with a concise indication of the critical editions upon which the following translations are based (38: “Notes on the translations”). It is difficult to recall a more superb instance of the concise presentation of authors and their texts in recent decades.

The first of the three works of this anthology of invective against Constantius II is Athanasius of Alexandria’s *History of the Arians* (39–114). Apparently composed early in the third exile of Athanasius, late in AD 357 to be precise (for references, see 25 n. 119; 42 n. 19), this historical work is of exceptional importance because it offers a detailed, contemporary account of ecclesiastical disputes during the reign of Constantius II. Commencing *in medias res* with the aftermath of the Council of Tyre (AD 335), this historical narrative extends to the expulsion of Athanasius from his see early in AD 356. The “evil reputation” of this tendentious representation of contemporary Christological controversy is well merited, as can be seen upon a critical reading, and Flower appropriately introduces it by observing the various forms of invective to be found within the *History of the Arians* (25).² Unfortunately, for all its faults, the work of Athanasius is often the sole source that we possess for many episodes in this tumultuous, foundational period (e. g. the imperial chamberlain Eusebius’ leaving gifts at the *martyrium* of St Peter after an interview with pope Liberius). To borrow a metaphor from the language of the courts, if the historian treats Athanasius as a hostile witness, then it may just be possible to use his testimony to create a more balanced vision of the events of the period AD 335–356. Interpretation, of course, is also rendered problematic by uncertainty as regards the commencement of the text. Flower elegantly provides readers with information that will enable them to decide for themselves whether the beginning of the *History of the Arians* has

2 For the memorable description of the *History of the Arians*, see T.D. Barnes: Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire. Cambridge, Mass./London 1993, 126, where analysis draws attention to the numerous features that it shares with the other works of Athanasius.

been lost or whether this work was a direct continuation of the earlier *Defence against the Arians* (39 n. 1).

The second work presented here is that of the *Against Constantius* of bishop Hilary of Poitiers. Although – at twenty-six pages of printed text and notes – it is the shortest of the three pieces in this anthology, its careful rhetorical organisation and the author’s clear grasp of Greek as well as his native Latin make it a forceful and valuable historical document for the ecclesiastical history of the reign of Constantius II. Composed subsequent to the Council of Constantinople (January-February AD 360), this work is – as Flower aptly comments (28) – the antithesis of Hilary’s conciliatory *To Constantius* earlier in the same year. The expression “more than four years ago” (Hilar. Pict. c. Const. 2: *quinto anno abhinc*) points to composition in the spring or later in AD 360. Extremely suggestive, it may be worth observing, is the closing clausula of the entire work: *et paternae pietatis rebellem* (Hilar. Pict. c. Const. 27). This forceful manner of declaring Constantius II an illegitimate emperor and therefore a tyrant because an apostate and a persecutor of Christians seems influenced by the recent rebellion of the Caesar Julian against Constantius II. If so, it is worth adding, then Hilary was labouring under the misunderstanding that Julian was a devoted Christian. Be that as it may, the invective of Hilary is best approached by the modern student through analysis of generic features and without worry over whether this polemical work or the previous, eulogistic work addressed to Constantius II sincerely represents his thought (29 n. 137). Hilary is concerned not only to offer a coherent and cogent explanation of his own stance *vis-à-vis* the emperor, but also to make the case that, by supporting the Homoiousian bishops, Constantius II is the Antichrist. Hilary repeatedly remarks the favours that Constantius II showered upon those willing to adopt the Homoiousian definition of Christ’s person, just as he repeatedly observes that Constantius II is by far the most perilous of persecutors by virtue of his kindly treatment of those whom he wishes to persuade and corrupt. It is unfortunate that Hilary did not offer any particular instance of the euergetism (125 n. 59) that he affirms did take place. “We see your sheep’s clothing, rapacious wolf. You burden God’s sanctuary with the empire’s gold and you heap up for God property that has been stripped from temples, confiscated with edicts or exacted through punishments.” (Hilar. Pict. c. Const. 10; translation that of Flower 125). It is difficult not to think here of items such as the construction of St Peter in

the Vatican and the list of properties transmitted by the *Liber Pontificalis*.³ In any case, Hilary does show more concern for theological argumentation and abusive address than for citing instances that might have been viewed as well-known to contemporaries. Indeed, since this work was addressed to Constantius II, there was no reason to speak of what the emperor well knew. From the perspective of intertextuality, it is intriguing to see just how complex a web of Biblical citations is woven by Hilary. All three authors in this volume (Athanasius, Hilary, Lucifer) make use of Biblical citations, but Hilary does so to such a degree that one is almost tempted to define the *Against Constantius* a prose *cento*.⁴ On the other hand, it is worth noting that Hilary's reference to the story of the violent death of the prophet Isaiah (Hilar. Pict. c. Const. 4) is in all likelihood to be attributed not to direct knowledge of the story via an apocryphal text in Greek (*pace* 119 n. 25)⁵, but rather to its re-telling in a text that had been written by bishop Potamius of Olisipo apparently just a brief time before Hilary wrote *Against Constantius*. The text of Potamius does survive, having been fortuitously rediscovered in the late twentieth century.⁶ In view of the role that Potamius played in the ecclesiastical politics of the 350s, Hilary is likely to have been well acquainted with all of the works of this peer whom he viewed as a traitor to orthodox faith.

The third work to constitute this anthology of fourth-century bishops' invectives against imperial authority is Lucifer of Cagliari's *The Necessity of Dying for the Son of God* (141–186). Flower (33) quite rightly observes that the reference to Eudoxius (punningly named Adoxius by Lucifer) situates the date of this work subsequent to the Council of Constantinople held in January–February AD 360 (Lucif. moriend. 11). Composed during Lucifer's exile and therefore prior to the death of Constantius II in November AD 361, this

3 R. Westall: Constantius II and the Basilica of St. Peter in the Vatican. In: *Historia* 64, 2015, 205–242.

4 Indeed, it may well be wondered whether it was not this theological culture of citation that gave rise to the late antique genre of the *cento*.

5 Cf. A. Rocher (ed.): *Hilaire de Poitiers, Contre Constance*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et index. Paris 1987 (*Sources chrétiennes* 334), 231.

6 M. Conti: *The Life and Works of Potamius of Lisbon. A Biographical and Literary Study with English Translation and a Complete Commentary on the Extant Works of Potamius, Epistula ad Athanasium, De Lazaro, De martyrio Isaiae prophetae, Epistula de substantia, Epistula Potami*. Turnhout 1998 (*Instrumenta patristica* 32); M. Conti (ed.): *Potamii Episcopi Oliponensis opera omnia*. Turnhout 1999 (*Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina* 69A).

invective clearly came at the very end of the reign and is probably the latest of the three pieces in terms of date. It is tempting to push matters as regards the milieu of composition, on the other hand. As Flower well observes, the evidence indicates that Lucifer spent his exile at Germanicia in Syria, in Palestine, and in the Thebaid successively (32). The transferral from Germanicia to Palestine is in all likelihood to be dated to AD 357, in the wake of the transferral of Eudoxius from the see of Germanicia to Antioch. In view of the claim made by Lucifer that he had entrusted a copy of *The Necessity of Dying for the Son of God* to the *magister officiorum* Florentius (35, with references), it is tempting to think that it was this work that was the cause for Lucifer's further removal from the centre by transferral from Palestine to the Thebaid. Identifying the place of composition is not merely an inane, antiquarian undertaking. Composition in Palestine would nicely help to explain how Lucifer came to have texts of Cyprian of Carthage that served him as a model for this invective. Be that as it may, it should be added as an afterthought (which is not expressly stated by Flower) that the fact that Lucifer spent his exile initially at Germanicia is relevant to his attitude towards Eudoxius, for the latter was bishop of that city until his transferral to Antioch in AD 357. It is probably not too bold to imagine that Eudoxius used acquaintances in Antioch (e. g. the *comes Orientis*) to secure the transferral of Lucifer to Palestine and thereby free himself of a troublesome duty. Lucifer's *animus* towards Eudoxius must have been rooted as much in the fact of his exile as in theological differences. Despite claims that Eudoxius had angered Constantius II by a subdolous act that enabled him to become the bishop of Antioch, both his later installation at Constantinople and the especial venom reserved for him by Lucifer point to a close, enduring relationship between bishop and emperor. Lucifer himself, on the other hand, had refused to enter into such a relationship, and his exile was a consequence. In the forty-six pages of printed text of translation (and notes), readers are treated to a resounding instance of verbal abuse addressed at the master of the Roman world. Describing the treatment of homoousian bishops by Constantius II as persecution on the model of past, pagan emperors, Lucifer has little time for theological niceties or historical detail, but concentrates instead on repetitive and often lengthy litanies of abuse of the emperor.⁷ Lucifer claims that he desires

7 In the memorable and lapidary formulation of M. Simonetti regarding the work of Lucifer in this period: *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*. Roma 1975 (Studia Ephemeridis

martyrdom. While one may doubt this on the basis of arguments from readership, as does Flower (35), it does seem that this may well have been the case. Constantius II was bound to hear of the work if it circulated, and Lucifer's sentiments are such that as an ordinary civilian he would have been turned over to Paul "the Chain" or a similar inquisitor for unpleasant interrogation and eventual destruction (cf. Amm. 19.12.3–6). If nothing else, to assert that Constantius II was a tyrant was to make a politically loaded comment that implied that he ought to be destroyed.

The paratextual materials (bibliographies, glossary, map, and indices) that follow and supplement these texts are overall thoughtfully executed and will be of assistance to readers. Consequently, this is a volume that is well suited for use in the classroom.

* * *

To commend a work for its excellence does not entail avoiding an observation or two on where corrections might usefully be made. As was observed by admirers in Antiquity, even Homer occasionally nodded. In the present case, there are some instances where a change in expression or an altogether different conclusion are probably necessary. For instance, Flower surveys the modern views on the integrity of the commencement of the *History of the Arians* of Athanasius (39 n. 1). The citation of differing views is quite appropriate, but reflection shows that the thesis that the beginning is intact as transmitted is untenable. The situation is comparable to that of the opening of *De bello civili* of Julius Caesar: narrative immediately and without the benefit of any introduction or apostrophe of the readership. Although not classically educated, Athanasius never shows such a lack of art in the other surviving works. Moreover, the thesis that the *History of the Arians* constituted a continuation of the *Defence against the Arians* reveals itself impossible to sustain.

It is unfortunate that Flower decided not to provide the whole of the text in its ideal state. To wit, he has omitted letters that also appear in the *Defence against the Arians*, emulating an ancient editor: Athan. hist. Arian. 8.2 (p. 46: letter of Constantine II to the people of Alexandria), 23.1–2 (p. 58: letter of Constantius II to the Orientals), 23.3 (p. 58: letter of Constantius II to the

Augustinianum 11), 248: "I vari libri da lui composti durante gli anni d'esilio [...] rivelano grande coraggio ma anche grande angustia intellettuale."

people of Alexandria); 26.3 (p. 61: letter of Ursacius and Valens to Julius), and 26.4 (p. 61: letter of Ursacius and Valens to Athanasius). In a textbook aimed at undergraduates, the omission is particularly unfortunate in that it gives students the wrong impression of what modern scholars think of contemporary documents as opposed to later narrative re-elaborations. Indeed, a comparison of the Greek versions of Athanasius with the original Latin versions – even in translation – could have formed a worthwhile appendix illustrating the transmission of documents in the chain that led from bureaucratic publication to literary re-working.⁸

Amongst the occasional problems that are inevitable in such an undertaking, one in particular is of especial note and needs to be mentioned at the outset. The translation of the text in which Athanasius refers to the votive offering that the imperial chamberlain Eusebius deposited at the Vatican (Athan. hist. Arian. 37.1) is infelicitous, as it will prove misleading for those interested in the topography of early Christian Rome. Whatever one thinks about the chronology of the construction of basilica of St. Peter in the Vatican, the translation is demonstrably wrong on a fundamental point of lexicography and can be impugned on yet another. Flower (70) translates the single masculine nominative aorist participle (ἀπελθών) of the verb ἀπέρχομαι as “entered”, whereas such a translation would require that the Greek text have the appropriate participle deriving from the verb εἰσέρχομαι. The verb used by Athanasius clearly means “going off to”, i. e. Eusebius abandoned his attempt to persuade Liberius and left him for the Vatican so as to deposit a votive offering. It is to be added that the decision to leave μαρτύριον untranslated is regrettable, especially since the accompanying note informs readers that “[a] *martyrion* is a shrine to a martyr”. Why offer an explanatory note that will probably be highly ambiguous for most readers? This holds true for neophyte native speakers as well as non-native users of English. Moreover, what is the lexical aid¹⁰ that Flower used to arrive at this? Although methodologically misguided, Paolo Liverani’s discussion of the text is better, in that he

8 Cf. A. E. Cooley: *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. Text, Translation, and Commentary. Cambridge 2009, for an elegant comparison of the Latin original and Greek translation of the R. Gest. div. Aug.

9 Cf. Liddell/Scott, Lex. (9. Aufl.) 187 s. v.

10 Cf. Liddell/Scott, Lex. (9. Aufl.) 1082 s. v. μαρτύριον III.

does cite one of the appropriate instruments.¹¹ However, the word μαρτύριον can be shown to have evolved in meaning over the course of the fourth century as the architectural traditions of Christianity benefited from the new influx of wealth and the need for social ostentation. The “monument” or “memorial” for a martyr evolved from a simple (or perhaps visibly indicated) grave into a full-blown category of church.¹² The “victory monument” (τρόπαιον) mentioned by Gaius in the early third century (Eus. hist. eccl. 2.25.6–7) seems more than sufficient to explain Athanasius’ language, and, in any case, Athanasius cannot be construed as saying that the imperial chamberlain entered this “shrine”.

The translations of the three texts in question are overall highly readable and faithful to the originals. Flower demonstrates an enviable capacity for the appropriate turn of phrase, and the volume can be readily recommended. Which is not to say that it is altogether free from infelicitous moments. But most of these are rather minor. For instance, the adverb ἄθρόως at Athan. hist. Arian. 10.1 (Opitz 188.24) is far better rendered as “en masse”¹³ rather than “all at once” (47). Or, to cite another example, the conjunction *dum* at Hilar. Pict. c. Const. 2.27 is rendered as “until” (117) whereas “as long as” would have been preferable in this instance: Hilary had tried to reason with his colleagues and failed, and it is for that reason he now writes the present work of polemic. Slips such as the rendering of καταράομαι (Athan. hist. Arian. 62.1 [Opitz 217.31], 62.2 [Opitz 218.2]) as “to denounce” (93) rather than “to curse”¹⁴ are, fortunately, quite rare.¹⁵ Again, the translations are of quite high quality, even if there are moments when the original could have

- 11 P. Liverani: Old Saint Peter’s and the Emperor Constans? A Debate with G. W. Bowersock. In: JRA 28, 2015, 485–504, here 501, citing G. W. H. Lampe: A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford 1961–1968; cf. Westall (above, n. 3), 211 n. 26, for other aids and discussions.
- 12 C. Mohrmann: Les dénominations de l’église en tant qu’édifice en grec et en latin au cours des premiers siècles chrétiens. In: RSR 36, 1962, 155–174, here 167–168.
- 13 Cf. G. Müller, SJ: Lexicon Athanasianum. Berlin 1952, col. 28 s. v. ἄθρόως 1: catervatim.
- 14 Cf. Liddell/Scott, Lex. (9. Aufl.) 908; F. Montanari: Vocabolario della lingua greca. Con la collaborazione di I. Garofalo e D. Manetti. Torino 1995, 1037 s. v.
- 15 In this particular instance, one suspects that the error is to be attributed to the false sense of ecumenism that has consistently claimed “misunderstandings” as a vehicle to achieving Christian unity over the past half-century. The ecclesiastics of Antiquity – and today – were some of the most virulent of haters.

been rendered with greater vivacity and the translation almost requires juxtaposition with the original to make sense, as in the case of the wonderful antithesis inherent in the phrase *deserens apostolicam fidem conversus ad fabulas* (Lucif. moriend. 11.1 Diercks), where something such as “Apostate from the faith of the Apostles and a convert to myths” would have been preferable to “Abandoning the apostolic faith and having been turned unto fables”, which translation sounds oddly archaic in English and indubitably muffles the religious point of this expression that was arguably inspired by a reading of Athanasius’ work (cf. Athan. hist. Arian. 77.2 [Opitz 226.15]).¹⁶

Another example, taken at random, concerns the possessive adjective ἡμέτεροι at Athan. hist. Arian. 24.4 (Opitz 196.12), where “our” rather than “your” correctly renders this word and thereby entails a natural and far better rendering of the overall sentence:

For it is fixed in our soul that,
in accordance with your resolution,
you will continue to be
bishop in your own place. (59)

For it is fixed in our soul that
you always, in accordance with
our decision, wish to be bishop
in your place. (modified)

As is typical of administrators compelled to deal with a *fait accompli*, Constantius II puts a good face upon matters by asserting that it was *his own* desire that Athanasius resume activity undisturbed as bishop of Alexandria (cf. Athan. apol. Const. 23 [Opitz 291], for another, somewhat different version of this same document).

More serious is the failure to take into account the numerous, persuasive emendations that were set forth in a fundamental publication nearly forty years ago.¹⁷ The oversight is unfortunate, since good readings and potentially useful historical information are likely to be missed by future users of Flower’s fine volume. So, for instance, textual criticism makes as probable as can be the emendation of a corrupt passage at Athan. hist. Arian. 5.2, adding the figure of Cymatius of Gabala.¹⁸ Even something as simple punctuation can benefit from the critical reflections of Cesana, as can be seen

16 For the meaning of *fabulae*, cf. Quint. inst. 2.4.2.

17 F. Cesana: Annotazioni al testo di H. G. Opitz dell’«Historia Arianorum ad monachos» di Sant’Atanasio. In: VetChr 19, 1982, 257–274.

18 Cesana (above, n. 13), 258–259; E. Honigmann: Cymatius of Gabala (358, 362 A.D.). In: idem: Patristic Studies. Vatican 1953 (Studi e testi 173), 36–38. Flower (43 n. 22) is aware of the emendation, but inexplicably fails to act.

from comparing Flower's translation and that based upon the new punctuation proposed by Cesana:

If anyone anywhere is pious and loves Christ (and in every place there are many people who resemble the prophets and the great Elijah), they go into hiding if they can find a trustworthy man like Obadiah and either head off into a cave or cracks in the earth, or else spend their time wandering around the deserts. (85–86)

If anyone anywhere is pious and loves Christ (and in every place there are many people of this sort), like the prophets and the great Elijah they go into hiding if they can find a trustworthy man like Obadiah and either head off into a cave or cracks in the earth, or else spend their time wandering around the deserts. (modified according to Cesena 1982, 264)

It is to be hoped that a future, revised edition of this work will take into account these valid and helpful points.

The decision to limit the bibliography in languages other than English is comprehensible in terms of the primary audience (undergraduates) at which this volume presumably aims. However, in view of its seeking to address a scholarly audience as well, more items in German, French, and Italian would have been in order. Amongst those authors of especial note and use are: Bruno Bleckmann, Alberto Camplani, Felice Cesena, and Heinrich Chantraine. One suspects that the omission reflects experience as well as editorial theory.¹⁹ Had Flower, for instance, been aware of the vital contributions of Chantraine 1993/1994 and Bleckmann 1999, then surely he would have provided readers with useful commentary regarding the apocalypticism that so frequently colours the vision of Constantius II that is offered by Athanasius, Hilary, and Lucifer.²⁰ Their shrill tones of denunciation at the close of the

19 Indeed, it is worth adding that better use might have been made of the fundamental work of Annick Martin, whose 1996 tome (below, n. 24) is little cited.

20 B. Bleckmann: *Die Schlacht von Mursa und die zeitgenössische Deutung eines spätantiken Bürgerkrieges*. In: H. Brandt (ed.): *Gedeutete Realität. Krisen, Wirklichkeiten, Interpretationen* (3.–6. Jh. n. Chr.). Stuttgart 1999 (*Historia-Einzelschriften* 134), 47–101; H. Chantraine: *Die Kreuzesvision von 351 – Fakten und Probleme*. In: *ByzZ* 86/87, 1993/1994, 430–441. To these may now also be added the useful contribution of S. Diefenbach: *A Vain Quest for Unity: Creeds and Political (Dis)Integration in the Reign of Constantius II*. In: J. Wienand (ed.): *Contested Monarchy. Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*. Oxford 2015, 353–378.

350s must surely stand in strident contrast with the triumphalist rhetoric that greeted the victory of Constantius II over Magnentius in a hard-fought civil war.²¹ Items such as the use of the *chi-rho* with the legend IN HOC SIGNO VICTOR ERIS on coins minted by Vetranio (and then Constantius II) in Illyricum and the report of the appearance of the Cross over the skies of Jerusalem on 7 May AD 351 provided Constantius II and his partisans with the confidence to undertake once again to support bishops in their attempt to resolve in definitive fashion the theological dispute that had raged over the nature of Christ for more than a generation.

The map (211) is executed upon an appropriate scale, and the locations and names of the cities that have been identified are well done (e. g. Nike in Thrace, Ariminum in Italy, and Seleucia in Asia Minor).²² However, one must protest at the unseemly decision to sacrifice most of Egypt and virtually all of the prefecture of the Gauls. Egypt was far more than a port of call on the Mediterranean²³, and cities such as Poitiers, Trier, and Olisipo were associated with some of the leading figures of the period covered in this book (viz. Hilary, Paulinus, and Potamius). To maintain this scale of coverage, which is just right for legibility, the map could have been appropriately presented over two facing pages. Moreover, given the numerous references to provinces as well as regions and cities, maps with the provinces of the eastern portion (viz. the dioceses of *Oriens* and *Aegyptus*) of the Empire at the very least and of Egypt with its plethora of cities (cf. Athan. hist. Arian. 72.2,4) would have been in order.²⁴

- 21 Cf. Amm. 16.10, on the *adventus* of Constantius II in Rome late in April AD 357. To be associated with that event is the so-called Arch of Janus Quadrifrons: P. Mateos Cruz/A. Pizzo/Á. Ventura: Arcus Divi Constantini: An Architectural Analysis and Chronological Proposal for the Arch of Janus in the Forum Boarium in Rome. In: JRS 107, 2017, 237–274.
- 22 In view of the fact that Lucifer of Cagliari spent a significant amount of time there in exile between Germanicia in Syria and the Thebaid, the city of Eleutheropolis in Palestina ought to have also been indicated clearly (*Libellus precum* 109 [CSEL 35.1.39]).
- 23 Extraordinary, lengthy lists of bishops and their communities in Egypt are transmitted in a recently published document that is now also available in English as well as Italian translation: A. Bausi/A. Camplani: The History of the Episcopate of Alexandria (HEpA): *Editio minor* of the fragments preserved in the *Aksumite Collection* and in the *Codex Veronensis* LX (58). In: Adamantius 22, 2016, 249–302.
- 24 Cf. A. Martin: Athanase d’Alexandrie et l’église d’Égypte au IVe siècle (328–373). Rome 1996 (Collection de l’École française de Rome 216), 121 fig. 7; P. Maraval:

The index of non-Biblical texts utilised by Lucifer of Cagliari in his text (224–225) is well executed and extremely useful, even as an analytical tool in its own right. The reviewer only wishes that Flower – who has given consistent evidence of being thorough – had also offered an index of the Biblical texts cited or alluded to by all three authors of the texts collected in this volume. The omission seems to have its origin in the view of these works as “Christian literature” rather than “Patristics”. From a literary perspective, the Biblical citations are perhaps of less interest. But from a Patristic perspective, these are the citations that particularly matter. That, the reviewer suspects, is precisely what Athanasius, Hilary, and Lucifer would also have asserted. Indeed, as Christological debate evolved over the fourth century, a key issue was that of whether or not the language being used was Biblical (cf. Hilar. Pict. c. Const. 16).

On a final note, there is the issue of two letters of Athanasius to Lucifer that were composed *ca.* 360 and which survive in Latin translation (CCL 8, 1978, pp. 306–310; CSEL 14, pp. 323–327; PL 13, coll. 1037–1042). Although they have been declared spurious by their latest editor (Diercks)²⁵, a strong case has been made for their authenticity²⁶, and the reviewer sees no reason to doubt the authenticity of two documents that are made all the more plausible by the circumstances of Lucifer’s exile and movements in the late 350s and early 360s. Consequently, it would have been useful for Flower at least to inform readers of their existence and perhaps to add an appendix in which these two brief letters were provided in translation. Time and time again we are reminded by such material that there was constant communication across the linguistic divide of Greek and Latin in the fourth century.

* * *

Drawing together the various threads of the foregoing discussion, the reviewer would observe that Flower has made an excellent choice of the three

Lieux saints et pèlerinages d’Orient. Histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe. Paris 1985, 314, 331; A. H. M. Jones: *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602. A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey*. 3 vols. Oxford 1964, Maps I–II. Readers will now also wish to consult the PAThs digital atlas for late antique Egypt (URL: <http://paths.uniroma1.it/>).

25 G. F. Diercks (ed.): *Luciferi Calaritani opera quae supersunt*. Turnhout 1978 (*Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina* 8), XVIII, XXVI, and 303 n. 14; Flower (above, n. 1) 124; for further bibliography, see Martin (above, n. 24).

26 Martin (above, n. 24), 528 n. 282.

texts to present and that the presentation of these texts will make it all the more attractive to teach late Roman history in the future. The reign of Constantius II was far more formative for the future than has been generally recognised, and these texts afford insight into the debates and thought of the 350s. Through a detailed, perceptive introduction and by means of translations that are overall fluent and sometimes enviably felicitous in terms of phrasing, Flower imparts to these texts an immediacy that allows them to shed light upon the period, its protagonists, and their thought. Once again the theological polemic of the mid-fourth century makes sense and possesses a certain urgency. That is no mean achievement.

Richard Westall, Rom
richard.westall@gmail.com

www.plekos.de

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Richard Westall: Rezension zu: Richard Flower (ed.): *Imperial Invectives against Constantius II*. Translated with Introduction and Commentary. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2016 (Translated Texts for Historians 67). In: Plekos 21, 2019, 139–151 (URL: <http://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2019/r-flower.pdf>).
