

dello stesso Ennodio, cui offre supporto il sorriso bonario del barcaiolo (vv. 41-46), e la chiusa nel segno di una salvezza raggiunta *Christo duce* (vv. 47-52).

Letto in chiave simbolica il carme si fa dunque sintesi della polare tensione che anima Ennodio, spinto da istanze retoriche e classiche e animato da sentimenti e valori cristiani che assicurano un approdo certo e garantito dalla fede cristiana. Da semplice esercizio di stile, attraverso una lettura accorta, il carme acquista una valenza e una funzione comunicativa ben più importanti, veicolate soprattutto dall'elemento fortemente simbolico dell'acqua che da fonte di ispirazione pagana (a questo valgono la menzione delle sorgenti Castalia e Ippocrene nei versi iniziali) diviene *medium* dell'azione salvifica della fede, luogo emblematico del viaggio estremo (non a caso evocato da diversi riferimenti all'esperienza oltremondana dell'Enea virgiliano e all'episodio biblico di Giona).

Una bibliografia, selettiva ma estremamente puntuale (51-58), precede il testo del componimento, che è accompagnato da una pregevole traduzione italiana (60-65): nella precisione con cui rende la densa *elocutio* ennodiana, Gasti mostra un'attenzione notevole alla stilizzazione retorica della *dictio* poetica, cimentandosi, sulla scorta di un'attenta interpretazione, in un'impresa non semplice vista l'intricata lingua di Ennodio.

Anticipata, nelle sue linee portanti, dalle pagine introduttive, l'esegesi del carme trova nel commento (67-114) uno strumento di lettura agile e al tempo stesso puntuale, nella misura in cui illumina accuratamente, sul piano contenutistico, stilistico e letterario, il carme ennodiano, che, grazie alla sapiente operazione di Gasti, nella forma dell'edizione isolata, trova la preziosa occasione di emergere dalle carte degli specialisti e degli 'iniziati' per godere di un più ampio pubblico di lettori.

Silvia CONDORELLI

Maria Luisa FELE, *Le fonti dei Romana di Iordanes*. I. Dalle origini del mondo ad Augusto (*Rom.* 1-257), (Nuova Biblioteca di Cultura Romanobarbarica, I). Firenze, SISMEL · Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2020, pp. XXXV-313.

This highly detailed analysis of the first half of the *Romana* by Jordanes (writing in 551) will be an indispensable tool for scholars working on this often neglected text. An excellent Latinist and specialist of Florus and Festus, two main sources of Jordanes, Fele provides a running commentary on the first 257 chapters of the work, with a focus on the sources and the language of the *Romana*. Her study replaces the unsatisfactory work by Beatrice GIROTTI, *Ricerche sui Romana di Iordanes*, Bologna, 2009, which is often corrected by Fele in her discussion and notes. Given the nature of the exposition, the work is unlikely to be read from front to back, except by the most dedicated Jordanes scholars, but it should be within reach of anyone consulting the *Romana*. Indeed, Fele lists all the changes made by Jordanes to his sources, thus providing a good sense of how he both stayed close to the source and adapted it to his own language and intent. Her knowledge of scholarship on Jordanes is encyclopedic and she notes rightly that many of the issues still discussed today were first brought to attention by nineteenth-century scholars. Her work is to be welcomed as an addition to a body of scholarship revisiting the sources of Jordanes, for which the edition of Theodore Mommsen from 1882 still provides the main point of reference (but see now L. VAN HOOF and P. VAN NUFFELEN, *The Latin Fragmentary Historians of Late Antiquity (300-650 A.D.): Edition, Translation, and Commentary*, Cambridge 2020; P. VAN NUFFELEN and L. VAN HOOF, *Jordanes, Getica and Romana: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Liverpool, 2020, both of which appeared while Fele's book was in press.) The points of disagreement signaled in this review should not distract from the quality of this excellent work.

The introduction sketches the life of Jordanes as far as we can reconstruct it from his works and studies the make-up of the *Romana*, with a focus on the first part, which is the subject of the book. It is a sober and careful discussion, rightly rejecting the untenable identification of the

dedicatee of the *Romana*, Vigilius, with the bishop of Rome of that name, as well as the identification of Symmachus the Younger's lost *Roman history* as the main source of the *Romana*.

The first chapter discusses the section until Abraham (*Romana* 6-11). If still reliable, it is the weakest part of the work. What Jordanes offers here is a traditional account of the biblical patriarchs, in a mode of exposition that can be paralleled easily in the chronicle tradition (already in the *Synagoge chronon* of Hippolytus, early 3rd c.): patriarch A lived so many years and then his son B was born. It is hence not remarkable that Jordanes does not mention Cain and Abel as sons of Adam, but only Seth (p. 7), or only Shem of the sons of Noah (p. 10), for Seth and Shem provide the continuity of the succession of the patriarchs. Jordanes simply does what chroniclers did before him. There is no merit in Mommsen's idea that Jordanes relied on a chronographic compendium from the Jewish community of Alexandria (p. 8): Jordanes follows the Septuagint chronology, possibly mediated through Annianus, the early fifth-century chronicler (VAN NUFFELEN and VAN HOOFF, *Jordanes*, 111). Most interestingly, Jordanes consciously does not follow the chronology of Jerome in this section, who is otherwise his major source. I am not sure Jordanes used the *Vetus Latina* tradition of the Bible (p. 7 n. 21): traces of the Vulgate are clear and use of the Septuagint is also likely (VAN NUFFELEN and VAN HOOFF, *Jordanes*, 68). The issue may bear further scrutiny.

The second chapter analyses sources until *Romana* 86, the beginning of Roman rule. The main source is Jerome's chronicle, to which Jordanes adds some material, mostly drawn from the Bible. For *Romana* 12, Fele suggests the use of Augustine, *City of God* 18.2 – which is possible (but not certain), as that work is also used in *Romana* 51. She notes correctly that Jordanes adds events of biblical history to his Hieronymian framework from *Romana* 16 onwards, but seems shy to accept that Jordanes indeed used the Bible directly and rather prefers Mommsen's source on Jewish history (see also p. 266). I do not see any reason not to embrace that conclusion. Indeed, the selection of events is influenced by Hebrew history as told by Stephen in *Acts* 7, rendering a Jewish source implausible. Fele argue plausibly for use of Augustine's *City of God* in *Romana* 38-9, 49, 51. In *Romana* 57 I would argue for a direct use of the Bible rather than Mommsen's unknown source.

The third chapter gets us to Fele's home turf, as in *Romana* 87-257 Jordanes uses mostly Florus and Festus, historians on which she has worked extensively. She demonstrates that many of the errors of Jordanes are due to the manuscripts he used of those two authors. Fele also provides a wealth of detail on how Jordanes transcribes his sources. For *Romana* 111, Mommsen's identification of Festus §2 as source is rejected and Eutropius 1.9.2 proposed instead. The only substantial criticism one can make here is that Fele tends to prefer the hypothesis of a lost source to explain minor differences with Festus or Florus, whereas I would argue that Jordanes adds sentences himself, extrapolating from the context in his source. She usually considers that possibility (e.g. p. 188) and sometimes even prefers it (p. 216). I would argue that her own discussion provides ample evidence for Jordanes being capable of rephrasing and reordering his sources to accept that he did add sentences of his own here and there. On p. 211 the hypothesis for an unknown source for *Romana* 229 is surely unnecessary (cf. VAN NUFFELEN/VAN HOOFF, *Jordanes*, 169).

The conclusion usefully summarises the results. It opens with an important affirmation of how Jordanes shaped his material himself, which anticipates a discussion of the additions by Jordanes to his sources (p. 282-5). It then provides a summary of the main and supplementary sources used by Jordanes and how they are tailored to fit the narrative. Fele further clarifies what the linguistic features of these adaptations are (thus supplementing the fundamental work of G. GALDI, *Syntaktische Untersuchungen zu Jordanes. Beiträge zu den Romana*, Hildesheim, 2013.) Any reader of Jordanes will profit immensely from Fele's painstaking comparisons and numerous accurate observations.