

## Citation style

Fascione, Sara: Rezension über: Anita Di Stefano / Marco Onorato (eds.), *Lo specchio del modello. Orizzonti intertestuali e Fortleben di Sidonio Apollinare*, Napoli: Paolo Loffredo, 2020, in: *Plekos. Elektronische Zeitschrift für Rezensionen und Berichte zur Erforschung der Spätantike*, 23 (2021), S. 261-269, heruntergeladen über Website



## copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

Anita Di Stefano/Marco Onorato (eds.): *Lo specchio del modello. Orizzonti intertestuali e Fortleben di Sidonio Apollinare*. Napoli: Paolo Loffredo Editore 2020 (Studi latini n. s. 94). 486 p. € 38.50. ISBN: 978-88-32193-33-6.

The volume contains the contributions of the International Conference “Lo specchio del modello. Orizzonti intertestuali e *Fortleben* di Sidonio Apollinare” (Messina, 4–5 October 2018). The papers address the topic of the relationship between Sidonius Apollinaris and intertextuality under two different perspectives. The first part of the volume (“Forme e funzioni del riuso sidoniano dei modelli”, 13–290) focuses on the presence and function of intertextual allusions in Sidonius’ works, while the second section (“Percorsi della ricezione di Sidonio”, 293–480) examines the reception of Sidonius in later authors and in the history of scholarship.

The very title of the book is the result of a stratification of references playing with the memory of the reader. The mentioned mirror, as clarified at pp. 30–33, alludes to two famous passages of Macrobius’ *Saturnalia* (5.2.13; 6.2.1), where Vergil is said to see himself in the works of his precedents Homer and Lucretius like in a mirror. The idea of the reflected image powerfully vehiculates the late antique conception of the problematic relationship between literary creation and past tradition, which implies at the same time similarity and diversity with the mirrored object. Moreover, the expression ‘specchio del modello’ echoes and varies the title of Alessandro Barchiesi’s influential study on intertextuality in Vergil’s poetry, “La traccia del modello. Effetti omerici nella narrazione virgiliana”<sup>1</sup>.

Sidonius is an author with a vast culture, addressing an equally learned audience in a period when cultural elitism takes on a crucial function in the creation of identity. For this reason, his writings turn out to be a mosaic of resemantized hypotexts. Due to the importance of intertextuality in the work of the bishop of Clermont-Ferrand, the volume aims at analyzing his writings as ‘case study’ and to provide a contribution on what intertextuality is, as explained by Marco Onorato in the introduction (“*Velut de quodam speculo formatum: l’intertestualità sidoniana tra teoria e prassi*”, 13–53).

1 A. Barchiesi: *La traccia del modello. Effetti omerici nella narrazione virgiliana*. Pisa 1984 (Biblioteca di materiali e discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici 1).

The intertextual relationship between Sidonius and his *fontes* has been a central topic in the studies on the author since the publication of the seminal works by Isabella Gualandri and Franca Ela Consolino<sup>2</sup> in the 1970s. However, the methodological purpose declared in the introduction is an original element, as the other miscellaneous volumes on Sidonius' work are not entirely devoted to the phenomenon of intertextuality. Furthermore, the idea of using Sidonius' text as a starting point for a broader evaluation on the meaning of intertextuality is new.

The articles collected in the first section of the volume investigate how Sidonius integrated the literary tradition into his work. The contributions highlight how the appropriation of the literary past shapes the authors' oeuvre, influencing his self-fashioning, vehiculating a political message or serving as a filter for the representation of his world.

The papers by Franca Ela Consolino, Maria Jennifer Falcone and Jesús Hernández Lobato take into account Sidonius' approach towards the mythical tradition and its retelling by earlier authors. Franca Ela Consolino ("A confronto con la tradizione: Sidonio, il mito e la struttura dei carmi", 55–93) examines the function of the myth in the poems as narrative framework. Reference to mythical characters and situations is used by the author to connect his work with those of his *fontes*, especially Statius and Claudian; the intertextual dialogue with the literary tradition enables our author to find room for innovation within the chosen genres. Maria Jennifer Falcone ("*Agnita virgo ... crimine*. Alcune considerazioni sulla presenza del mito di Medea in Sidonio", 95–118) considers the passages concerning Medea's myth. Also in this case, reference to different episodes of the story of the sorceress provides the poet with the opportunity to play with his models, to show off erudition or give greater effectiveness to the profile of the Arian Pelagia (carm. 5.126–147), who is presented as a new Medea. In "Phoenix and Aurora in Sidonius' *carm.* 2: A Self-Representational Metaphor?" (119–137), Jesús Hernández Lobato gives a meta-poetic reading of Sidon. *carm.* 2.407–435, where the kingdom of Aurora is described as a place dominated by a condition of constant rebirth, symbolized by the Phoenix. According to the scholar's reading, the passage constitutes a "metaliterary manifesto"

2 F. E. Consolino: Codice retorico e manierismo stilistico nella poetica di Sidonio Apollinare. In: ASNP 4, 1974, 423–460; I. Gualandri: *Furtiva lectio*. Studi su Sidonio Apollinare. Milano 1979 (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 62).

(126). By re-elaborating texts by Ovid, Lactantius and Claudian, Sidonius transforms the description of the eternal spring into a metaphor of his own poetics, full of *flosculi* and preciousities just like the eternally flowery meadow in Aurora's kingdom.

The studies by Rosa Santoro and Stefania Santelia investigate the relationship between intertextuality and the characterization of otherness. The first article ("Valenze letterarie e metaletterarie del cibo nell'opera di Sidonio Apollinare. Il 'pasto del mostro' e il mito", 139–172) analyses the occurrences of the *topos* of the 'eating monster' in the representation of the anthropophagous creatures of Ulixes' journeys (carm. 9.146–167), of Thyestes' bloody banquet (carm. 9.110–113) and of the monstrous whale in Jona's biblical episode (carm. 16.26–30). The late antique poet uses materials coming from different sources, narrating these episodes according to an 'aesthetics of ugliness' which is also present in the representation of the barbarians. Stefania Santelia ("Non solo Ovidio: giochi di intertestualità in Sidonio Apollinare *carm.* 12", 173–190) examines the intertextual strategy underlying Sidon. *carm.* 12. By developing the theme of the silence of the exiled poet, Sidonius echoes Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Furthermore, the metaphor of the poetic bridles in Prop. 3.9 is an influential model for Sidonius' self-fashioning as a poet exiled in his own homeland. This causes an ironical subversion: Maecenas holds the bridles of Propertius' poetry and directs him towards higher glories; Sidonius' Muses prevent him from writing poetry while the Burgundians are governing Lyon.

The readings of the bishop of Auvergne include a wide range of authors from the Republican age to the late fourth and early fifth century. The openness to recent writers is explicitly expressed by Sidonius in *epist.* 8.11, where the rhetor Lampridius is praised for approaching ancient authors with reverence without neglecting the most recent ones (Sidon. *epist.* 8.11.8: *legebat etiam incessanter auctores cum reverentia antiquos, sine invidia recentes*). The relationship with late antique texts is the topic of the contributions by Aaron Pelttari ("The rhetor Sapaudus and conflicting literary models in Sidonius Apollinaris and Claudianus Mamertus", 191–210) and Marco Onorato ("Il filosofo, la tessitrice e la cortigiana: echi neoplatonici e sperimentalismo di genere nell'epitalamio sidoniano per Polemio e Araneola", 211–278). Aaron Pelttari compares Claudianus Mamertus' letter 2 to Sapaudus and Sidon. *epist.* 5.10 to the same addressee, highlighting their different approach to-

wards authors who had written in the near past. Claudianus' letter is a reaction to that of Sidonius, as the clear similarities between the two texts let infer. This proves the existence in Sidonius' circle of a *querelle* between writers who prefer archaic readings and those who do not disdain more recent works. Moreover, the contrast between *novitas* and *vetustas* as expressed in Sidon. epist. 5.10 seems, in my opinion, to echo Symmachus' letter 3.11 to the archaizing writer Naucellius, where Symmachus describes himself as one of the last admirers of the ancient eloquence. If Sidonius praises Sapaudus for being the person *in quo solo vel maxume animum advertit veteris peritiae diligentiaeque resedissee vestigia* (Sidon. epist. 5.10.1), Symmachus writes *spectator [...] veteris monetae solus supersum* (Symm. epist. 3.11.2). Furthermore, the fourth century epistolographer admits that in his times the public prefers a more popular style, which is more easily applauded (Symm. epist. 3.11.1: *Trahit enim nos usus temporis in plausibilis sermonis argutias*); Sidonius depicts the scene of Pragmatius who overwhelms his audience *plausibili oratione* (Sidon. epist. 5.10.2).

Marco Onorato examines the use of intertextuality in Sidon. carm. 15, an epithalamium full of references to Neoplatonic philosophy. The scholar identifies a very large number of echoed authors, including not only Claudian and Ovid, but also Macrobius and Martianus Capella, whose works can be approximately dated to the fifth century. The definition of the relationship between Sidonius' poem and the *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, which has been variously dated to the first half of the fifth century or to the years around 470<sup>3</sup>, is particularly interesting. Establishing whether Sidonius read Martianus Capella would further improve our knowledge of the historical background of the *De nuptiis*. In particular, Onorato focuses on the analogies between the section dedicated to Minerva in Sidon. carm. 15.1–25 and the hymn to Pallas in *De nuptiis*, 6.567–574. In my opinion, the identification of a certain closeness between the two texts is consistent with the presence of

3 R. Schievenin: Marziano Capella e il *proconsulare culmen*. In: *Latomus* 45, 1986, 797–815, and L. Cristante (ed.): *Martiani Capellae De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii, Libri I–II*. Hildesheim 2011 (Bibliotheca Weidmanniana 15,1), LVIII–LIX, point out that the *De nuptiis* cannot have been written before 450; D. Shanzer (review of the book W. H. Stahl/R. Johnson/E. L. Burge: *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts*, Vol. I–II, New York 1971–1977. In: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 103, 1982, 110–117) has argued that Martianus' work dates back to the second half of the fifth century.

other textual similarities between the works of the two authors, like, for example, that existing between Sidon. *carm.* 6.5: *Dulcisonum quatitur fidibus dum pectine murmur* in reference to the sound of Orpheus' cithara, and Mart. *Cap.* 9.907.13–14: *Nam muros Thebis dulcisonis fidibus | praesidiumque dedit carminis arbitrio*, referring to another mythical musician, Amphion.

The term *dulcisonus* is rare and is present only in late antique texts; it is first attested in Optatianus Porfyrius (*Opt. Porf. carm.* 27.4). The occurrences of the word are, as said, very limited. Among them, the passages of Sidonius and Martianus stand out for the similarity of the context, in both cases concerning a mythical singer, as well as for the fact that the adjective is connected to *fidibus* (in Sidonius *dulcisonum [...] fidibus [...] murmur*; in Martianus *Capella dulcisonis fidibus*). However, it is difficult to determine whether Sidonius is alluding to Martianus, since *dulcisonus* is connected to the sound of the lyre (*Schol. Hor. carm.* 4.3.17: *lyrae pulchrae et dulcisonae*) or to the songs of the Muses (*Serv. gramm.* IV 463.12: *dulcisonae Pierides versifico favete*; *Ter. Maur.* 2644: *Carmen Pierides dulcisonum dabunt*) in texts related to the school context, which certainly had wide circulation. It seems rather more likely that both Sidonius and Martianus referred to the same text, which unfortunately is lost or, at least presently, impossible to identify.

Likewise, the similarity observed by Onorato between Mart. *Cap.* 6.576–577: *ad proprium dignata illabere munus | inspirans nobis Graias Latiariter artes* and Sidonius, prefatory letter to poem 15 (*carm.* 14.2): *quae si quispiam ut Graeca, sicut sunt, et peregrina verba contempserit, noverit sibi aut semper huiusmodi artis mentione supersedendum aut nihil omnino se aut certe non ad assem Latiari lingua hinc posse disserere*, does not necessarily imply an intertextual allusion to the *De nuptiis*, although the two passages are clearly close for language and context.

The term *Latiaris*, already identified by Varro<sup>4</sup> as an archaic epithet of Jupiter, is in fact used several times with reference to the language in Symmachus' correspondence<sup>5</sup>. In particular, the expression *Latiari lingua*, which is, according to Onorato (224), an original re-elaboration of the adverb *Latiariter* used

4 Varro *ling.* 5.52.5.

5 Compare *Symm. epist.* 1.3.2: *Unus aetate nostra monetam Latiaris eloquii Tulliana include finxisti*; 1.15.2: *Movit λόγος Athenaei hospitis Latiare concilium divisionis arte, inventionum copia, gravitate sensuum, luce verborum*; 8.69: *Ego autem, quoniam scire nostra desideras, in domicilio Latiaris facundiae otio et studio torpeo*; 9.88: *Gallicanae facundiae haustus requiro, non quod his septem montibus eloquentia Latiaris excessit, sed quia praecepta rhetoricae pectori meo senex olim Garumnae alumnus inmultit, est mihi cum scholis vestris per doctorem iusta cognatio*. On

by Martianus, is already present in Symm. epist. 8.22, where the theme of the relationship between Greek and Latin languages also occurs (*in tuo ore vernat Musa Cecropia, mihi lingua Latiaris est*). Thus, the analysis of the prefatory letter of Sidon. carm. 15 should also take into account the relevance of Symmachus' precedent, considering that the fourth-century letter writer was one of the epistolary models explicitly mentioned by Sidonius (epist. 1.1).

The first section of the volume is closed by Matthijs Zoeter's article "Death of the Poet: A Commentary on Sidon. epist. 8.11" (279–290), which proposes a reading of Sidon. epist. 8.11, on the death of the rhetor Lampridius, in the context of Letters book 8. In Sidonius' point of view, Lampridius' murder has been caused by his propension for astrology, which was not appropriate for a Christian. However, if we consider its position with respect to the other epistles, letter 8.11 takes on a specific function within Book 8, where the main themes are the defence of cultural heritage, the relationship between reality and illusion and unsteadiness of happiness. Sidon. epist. 8.11 should be read in close relation with 8.9, where Lampridius is presented at the height of his success thanks to his position at the Visigothic court. In this sense, the letter links the theme of the fragility of fortune to that of the problematic relationship between King Euric and the Gallo-Roman aristocracy.

Whereas the first section of the volume is dedicated to the relationship between Sidonius and his sources, in the second the author is taken into consideration as *fons* and reference for the history of literary criticism. The studies collected in this part also aim to open new perspectives in the studies on Sidonius by developing the theme of Sidonius' *Fortleben*, which has been so far only partially investigated<sup>6</sup> (as highlighted by Anita Di Stefano, "Per il *Fortleben* di Sidonio: alcune riflessioni", 293–310).

Symmachus' use of the term *Latiaris* see P. Bruggisser: *Clin d'œil latin. Latiaris* avant, chez et après Symmaque. In: J.-M. Carrié/R. Lizzi Testa (eds.): *Humana sapit. Études d'antiquité tardive offertes à Lellia Cracco Ruggini*. Turnhout 2002 (Bibliothèque de l'antiquité tardive 3), 97–110.

6 The themes of the reception of Sidonius from Late Antiquity to the present has been also addressed and widely investigated in sections 5 and 6 of G. Kelly/J. van Waarden (eds.): *The Edinburgh Companion to Sidonius Apollinaris*. Edinburgh 2020 (reviewed by S. Fascione: *Plekos* 22, 2020, 421–430, URL: [http://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2020/r-kelly\\_van-waarden.pdf](http://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2020/r-kelly_van-waarden.pdf)), which has been published shortly after the book under review.

The early fortune of Sidonius' writings in the sixth century AD is studied by Luciana Furbetta (*"Inter facundiae paternae delicias. Interferenze mnemoniche, testi e intertesti sidoniani nell'opera di Avito di Vienne: sulle orme del 'modello'?"*, 311–360) and Silvia Condorelli (*"Sidonio e Venanzio Fortunato"*, 361–406), who consider the reception of Sidonius respectively in the works of Avitus of Vienne and Venantius Fortunatus. The two articles should be read together, as they highlight in two different authors, living respectively in the Burgundian kingdom and in Merovingian Gaul, the same way of approaching Sidonius' precedent. Both Furbetta and Condorelli notice the substantial absence of proper textual references to the work of the bishop of Auvergne; his writings are rather used for shaping the self-representation of the two sixth-century authors, as well as treasure trove of *topoi* and suggestive images.

The presence of Sidonius is as constant as it is evanescent and mostly has the function of mediating textual references to earlier authors, which had become part of his code. This happens, for example, with the references to Pliny's letter 1.1, to the *ars poetica* or to a vaguely neoteric language in Avitus (319–323; 328), which reveal his intention of emulating Sidonius' idea of epistolary practice. In Venantius Fortunatus, *carm.* 21.13–14, the image of the death conquered by death, already present in Tertullian and Ambrose, is expressed through the locution *mortua mors est* of Sidon. *carm.* 16.60 (370).

This method of appropriation is consistent with what emerges from the letters of Ruricius, bishop of Limoges. Although Ruricius has been ironically accused by Sidonius of *furtiva lectio* from his own works (*epist.* 4.16), he nevertheless only rarely echoes the friend's texts through specific textual allusions. The similarity and at the same time the distance between Sidonius and Ruricius clearly emerges from the comparison between their letters addressed to the same correspondent, the teacher Hesperius; there are some common images recurring, such as that of linguistic rust (Sidon. *epist.* 2.10.1; Ruric. *epist.* 1.3.3), but Ruricius' prose appears substantially different from that of the bishop of Auvergne, dominated as it is from references to the Scriptures. One may conclude that while Sidonius transforms the artificial and evident interlacing of intertextual allusions into an aesthetics, intertextuality as a stylistic factor is a phenomenon far less present in the authors of the following generation.

Anita Di Stefano (*"Il commento a Sidonio di Giovan Battista Pio: il testo 'forzato'"*, 407–450) and Étienne Wolff [*"La notice de Pietro Crinito*

(1474–1507) sur Sidoine Apollinaire dans le *De poetis latinis*”, 451–459] investigate how two fifteenth-century scholars, Giovan Battista Pio and Pietro Crinito, read Sidonius. Pio is so careful in considering Sidonius’ references to the *auctores* and lexical choices that Di Stefano identifies in Pio’s commentary an intertextual reading *ante litteram* (442). His *annotamenta* offer a learned exegesis covering a wide range of topics, from the linguistic analysis to the antiquarian glosses, from the identification of *loci similes* to textual criticism. Pio’s commentary proves his profound appreciation for Sidonius’ prose. On the contrary, Crinito considers his style as flamboyant and clueless; in his point of view, Sidonius’ Latin is provincial and corrupted.

The volume closes with the article by Joop van Waarden (“Fifty years of Sidonius Scholarship in the Mirror”, 461–480) which offers an overview of the reading methodologies used in the last century for the exegesis of Latin literary texts and, in particular, of Sidonius’ works. The common element unifying the different scholarly approaches towards Sidonius’ texts is the importance given to the past for the interpretation of his reality. This aspect highlights how relevant the appropriation of the literary tradition and the connection with the past are in the writings of the fifth century bishop. Maybe, as van Waarden remarks, we should approach Sidonius’ texts just like he did with his *fontes*, that is by asking how they could help us understanding our reality and culture – as expressed in the conclusive thought-provoking question: “What is Sidonius, what is Late Antiquity to us?” (471).

In conclusion, the book offers an insight into the culture of Sidonius’ age, emphasizing the vastness of his readings and the culture of his intended audience. The different viewpoints used for examining the relationship between Sidonius and intertextuality show the complexity of this phenomenon in his works and to what extent it has influenced his strategy of self-representation. Being introduced to the many games of mirrors created by the author, the reader is led to meditate over and over on what intertextuality is and what awareness the late antique readers actually had of the multiple intertextual references identified by modern scholarship. In this respect, the volume offers an important contribution for the studies on Sidonius and on late antique literature.

---

Sara Fascione, Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II  
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici  
sara.fascione@unina.it

**www.plekos.de**

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Sara Fascione: Rezension zu: Anita Di Stefano/Marco Onorato (eds.): Lo specchio del modello. Orizzonti intertestuali e *Fortleben* di Sidonio Apollinare. Napoli: Paolo Loffredo Editore 2020 (Studi latini n. s. 94). In: Plekos 23, 2021, 261–269 (URL: [http://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2021/r-distefano\\_onorato.pdf](http://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2021/r-distefano_onorato.pdf)).

---