E. Heck-A.Wlosok, *L. Caelius Firmianus Lactantius. Divinarum institutionum libri septem. Fasc. 1: Libri I et II. Ediderunt Eberhard Heck et Antonie Wlosok* (Bibliotheca Teubneriana), München-Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2005, LXI + 200 pp., ISBN 3-598-71265-0.

Following upon their 1994 Teubner publication of a definitive edition of Lactantius' own *Epitome* of his *Divinae Institutiones,* Heck and Wlosok have now issued the first of four intended fascicles of the work itself; their hope is that the rest will appear at two year intervals. Students of Lactantius have been looking forward with great eagerness to this endeavor, and the first fascicle is already extremely useful and rewarding.

Until now the standard edition of Lactantius has been that of Samuel Brandt and Georg Laubmann, volumes 19 (1890) and 27 (1893 and 1897) in the series *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* of the Vienna Academy. After Brandt, Thomas Stangl[1] did valuable work on the text; Eberhard Heck throughout his career has made the most important subsequent contributions of all[2]. There are some more recent editions not of the whole corpus but of individual works. Of Lactantius' shorter works, *De Opificio Dei* has been edited by

---

[1] "Lactantiana", *RhM* 70, 1915, 224-52.

[2] Especially in *Die dualistischen Zusätze und die Kaiseranreden bei Lactantius*, Heidelberg 1972 (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften); reviews of new editions in *Gnomon* 49, 1977, 366-70, 64, 1992, 592-600, 72, 2000, 599-602; "Wer baute die Mauer für Laomedon?" in vol. 2 of Roger Gryson (ed.), *Philologia Sacra: biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele*, Freiburg 1993, 397-415; with Antonie Wlosok, "Zum Text der *Epitome diuinarum institutionum* des Laktanz", *WS* 109, 1996, 145-70; "Lactantius, *De falsa religione.* Textkritisches zum 1. Buch der *Diuinae institutiones*", in Yves Lehmann *et al.,* (edd.)*, Antiquité tardive et humanisme: Mélanges offerts à François Heim*, Turnhout 2005, 55-67.

Giorgio Rialdi and Franco Lanzone (Montecatini Terme 1964), and with French translation by Michel Perrin (Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1974). *De Ira Dei* has been edited with German translation by H. Krafft and Antonie Wlosok (Darmstadt 1957), and with French translation by Christiane Ingremeau (Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1982). *De Mortibus Persecutorum* has been edited with Italian translation by Francesco Scivittaro (Rome 1923), with French translation by Jacques Moreau (Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1954), with English translation by J. L. Creed (Oxford-New York 1984), and with German translation by Alfons Städele (Brepols 2003). Pierre Monat has edited individual books of *Divinae Institutiones* in the Paris Éditions du Cerf series *Sources Chrétiennes*: Book I (1986), Book II (1987), Book IV (1992), Book V (1974, revised 2000). Although these editions have made valuable contributions to Lactantius studies, none has achieved the full, fresh and systematic view of the widest range of manuscripts that Heck and Wlosok now offer by collating anew the twelve extant older mss. either directly or from microfilm or microfiche; these range in date from the 5th to the 13th centuries. Of the more than 200 more recent codices, none has been shown to belong to a tradition independent of the earlier, nor does any represent a complete copy of an older tradition which is fragmentary; therefore Heck and Wlosok have not used them to establish the text[3].

The detailed and most useful *Praefatio* to this edition offers in five sections a survey of the text history, a description of the codices, a full discussion of the *ms.* transmission of the *inscriptiones* and *subscriptiones* to the work as a whole and to individual books, an exposition of the problem of the two versions of the work found in the textual tradition, and finally the principles and features of the present edition. There follow indices of editions and commentaries, abbreviations and *sigla,* and finally a list of *sigla* of codices and critical editions. The *apparatus criticus* is like that of Heck and Wlosok's edition of Lactantius' *Epitome* of *Inst.*, providing up to six levels of information after Brandt's practice; rarely on a given page are six levels required, but one can see them all on pp. 27 and 151.

---

[3] On the *codd. recc.*, see their *Praef.* XLIII.

The first, marked Epit. in bold face, provides cross references to *Epit.* Second comes an untitled level with citations of other passages from *Inst.* to which Lactantius himself makes reference. The third level, entitled Auct., provides references to the many ancient works that Lactantius uses in paraphrase or quotation. The fourth, Test., provides references to later authors who employ the current passage. The fifth, Codd., lists the *codd.* presently in use from a given point forward; finally at the bottom comes the conventional *app.* giving variant readings.

I. Principal features of the new edition. To the eyes of one accustomed to Brandt's *CSEL* edition, four aspects of this new one jump out. Heck and Wlosok consistently write Roman names like Gaius, Lucius, Marcus, and Publius in full rather than abbreviated, where Brandt preferred abbreviations; in this respect the tradition varies in an inconsistent manner. Certain passages, transmitted by some manuscripts which represent a longer version of the work, are now placed in the text in italics rather than relegated to the *apparatus criticus.* What I may dare to call a peculiar orthography adopted by Brandt has been abandoned for more standard Latin. Finally, Brandt's tendency to alter the tradition to what he regarded as a more consistent, more explicit, or more classical state has been corrected. Let us take up the last three of these matters in turn.

1) Displaying the two extant versions of the text. Besides smaller additions and alterations, the longer version of *Inst.* contains two addresses to the Emperor Constantine at 1.1.13-6 and 7.16.11-7, plus further passages characterized by dualistic theology, the major ones at 2.8.6 and 7.5.27; another such appears at *Opif.* 19.8. Brandt investigated the problem of the two versions in 1889[4] and in 1972 Heck published a major work on the *Kaiseranreden* and *dualistischen Zusätze*[5], demonstrating

[4]*Über die dualistischen Zusätze und die Kaiseranreden bei Lactantius*, in three parts in *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaft, Wien* 118, 1889 (Abhandlung 8, "Die dualistischen Zusätze"), 1-66; 119, 1889 (Abh. 1, "Die Kaiseranreden"), 1-70; and 120, 1889 (Abh. 5, "Über das Leben des Lactantius"), 1-42.

[5] *Die dualistischen* mentioned above, summarized in 'Die dualistischen Zusätze und die Kaiseranreden bei Laktanz,' 185-8 in E. A. Livingstone

that Lactantius himself and no interpolator[6] was responsible
for the longer version, having begun a *retractatio* of his own
work which was however left unfinished. BGDVP transmit the
shorter version, and RKS the longer; HMW transmit the shorter
version but with some contamination from the longer. And yet,
despite these clear indications of two versions, errors common
to the entire tradition show that all the manuscripts descend
from a single archetype. Heck's ingenious explanation of how
this came about is necessarily conjectural, yet to me convincing:
Lactantius made later additions and corrections not upon his
original autograph, but upon a copy of it which already contained
the errors that were then transmitted to the entire tradition
as we have it[7]. As the additional passages are with little doubt
authentic, it is useful and right to have them in the main text.
The so-called dualistic passages are in fact no more dualistic than
many passages transmitted in the shorter version, and are coherent
with Lactantius' theology[8]; the addresses to Constantine entirely
suit Lactantius' political connections and outlook[9]. In Heck and
Wlosok's edition, the major additions from the longer version
appear in italics; and where text from the longer version replaces
that from the shorter, the former, in italics, appears on the right
side of the page opposite the latter, on the left side in normal
type. In some passages this presentation is somewhat awkward
until a reader becomes accustomed to it, but it seems the most

---

(ed.), *Studia Patristica* 13, part 2 of the Proceedings of the International
Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford 1971 (Berlin 1975, Texte und
Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 116).

[6] Brandt himself changed his earlier opinion; see his review of René
Pichon's *Lactance* in *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 23, 1903,
col. 1225.

[7] See XXXII-XXXIV for a brief explanation of what he set out in full
in *Dualistischen*, 171-202.

[8] See Anthony Bowen-Peter Garnsey*, Lactantius Divine Institutes*,
Liverpool 2003, 27-8, n. 106.

[9] Elizabeth DePalma Digeser, "Lactantius and Constantine's Letter to
Arles: Dating the Divine Institutes", *JECS* 2, 1994, 33-52; *The Making
of a Christian Empire: Lactantius and Rome*, Ithaca and London 2000,
134-5.

efficient method to display a complex situation, certainly much more direct than if a reader must laboriously work out the text of the longer version from the *apparatus criticus* as was the case from previous editions.

2) Orthography. Brandt's text regularly offers *illut* for *illud*, *aliut* for *aliud*, *aput* for *apud*, *set* for *sed* and *istut* for *istud*. Forms of *neglego* are spelled *neclego* at 2.7.21 and 16.17; forms of *loquor* have *c* for *qu* in most instances, though not at 1.1.19, and *antiquum* appears as *anticum* at 1.21.6; instead of the more usual forms, Brandt prints *formonsum* at 1.10.3 and 2.16.16, *nanctus* at 1.10.9, and *thensauro* at 2.7.18; he omits the *p* from *consumsit* at 1.10.10 and *adsumtiones* at 2.5.31 but keeps *p* in *adsumpsit* and *adsumptum* at 2.8.46. In very many instances, Brandt avoids normal assimilation of prefixes in compound words; to my eye the most striking and frequent of these are as follows:

adt- for *att–* in forms of *attingo, attribuo*, and *attuli* (1.18.22, 2.1.17, and many more), though *attigisse* appears at 1.5.28 and *attulisse* at 1.6.10.

conp- for *comp-* in verbs like *compono* and *comprehendo* in a great many instances, though forms of *componere* appear with *–m–* not infrequently.

inbeciliores and *inbecillitatis* at 1.16.16 twice and 1.17.2, and *inberbis* at 2.4.18, but *imbuerunt* and *imbuere* at 1.15.7 and 1.23.7.

inm- for *imm-* in words like *immortalis* in the vast majority of instances, but not at 1.11.43, 1.15.12, 1.20.2, 1.20.3, 2.4.7.

inp- for *imp–* in words like *impresso* and *impleo* in a great many instances, but not *impleat* at 2.3.3, *implicatos* at 1.17.3, and *implorauerunt* at 2.1.12.

The cumulative effect of these readings is to make Lactantius' Latin sound really rather odd, as if he were perhaps a grammatical purist, or a dabbler in archaisms. Most of them result from Brandt's principle of following codex B—and where it is lacking, P—believing them witnesses to Lactantius' authentic orthography[10]. It may be possible that Lactantius tended to use quaint forms; clearly he had the mentality of a Roman

---

[10] *CSEL* 19 XIX (N.B. "antiquiorem rationem, qua sine dubio Lactantius

traditionalist. However, as is the case with most authors, he lived in a time of linguistic transition. It is a very dubious proposition to expect a later codex, written at a different stage of linguistic transition, to reveal a much earlier author's personal orthography. Therefore Heck and Wlosok rightly follow the example of Monat in using what will appear to current readers like normal spelling, as with *aliud*, *apud*, *illud*, *loquor*, and *neglego*. They practice consistency in the matter of assimilation, for example uniformly printing *att-* rather than *adt-*, *comp-* rather than *conp-*, *imm-* rather than *inm-*, *imp-* rather than *inp-*, and so on. But where the codices tend generally not to assimilate, as for example with *adf-*, *ads-*, and *inl-*, they conservatively follow the codices rather than adopting modern lexicons' usage of *aff-*, *ass-*, and *ill-*, while acknowledging that not everyone would agree with this procedure. The fourth fascicle of this edition will provide an index of forms cataloguing all these variants[11].

3) A return to the tradition from Brandt's alterations to achieve consistency, to fill in ellipses, or to provide a more classical expression. Heck and Wlosok's text is more faithful to the manuscript tradition than Brandt's in these respects.

a. Consistency. Sometimes Brandt emends to achieve uniformity with other passages. At 1.1.10, *[causa ueritatis] claritate ac nitore sermonis inlustranda et quodammodo disserenda est*, Brandt follows Petrus Francius in writing *adserenda* rather than *disserenda* of the tradition, evidently to make this passage conform to 1.1.20, *cognitio ueritatis cui adserendae atque inlustrandae septem uolumina destinavimus*, and 6.1.1, *[veritas] cuius adserendae atque inlustrandae causam*[12]. Similarly at 1.17.13 where Vulcan attempts to ravish Minerva: *in illa colluctatione Uulcanum in terram profudisse aiunt.* DVP have *profundisse*; Brandt, for conformity with *Epitome*

---

usus est"), CVII. At 1.16.3 where B is lacking Brandt follows P with *quia* where all other *codd.* have *qui nihil ueri adferebat.*

[11] *Praef.* XLVI with note 150; also Heck-Wlosok, *Lactantius Epitome*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1994, XXXIX.

[12] Further remarks on this passage under prose rhythm below.

9.2 and Augustine *CD* 18.12 alters it to *effudisse*, which is hardly necessary[13].

At 1.22.28, Brandt gives *matrem <Opem> et aviam Tellurem*, citing 1.11.38, 13.2f, & 14.2-4 where Lactantius names *Ops* as the mother of Jupiter; but in contrast to those passages, here there is no particular focus upon the story of *Ops* and therefore no reason to think that Lactantius must have named her.

Out of a similar insistence upon consistency, Brandt places a lacuna at 1.23.2: *nam et Agamemnon, qui gessit Troicum bellum, Iouis abnepos fuit et Achilles Aiaxque pronepotes, et Vlixes eodem gradu proximus, Priamus quidem longa serie. … sed auctores quidam tradunt Dardanum et Iasium Corythi filios fuisse, non Iouis.* He claims *ad loc.* that information about Priam's genealogy must have been included, something like *nam pater eius Laomedon abnepos fuit Dardani, qui erat filius Iovis.* But this *longa series* of six generations would hardly fit Lactantius' claim that Agamemnon was Jupiter's great great grandson. I agree with Heck that Lactantius, himself no genealogist, is here simply concerned to show that Saturn, the ancestor of all the gods, lived within the scope of human history[14]; thus a lacuna need not be surmised.

At 2.8.4, BGDVPR read *tanto enim haec ab illis superioribus distant, quantum mala bonis et uitia uirtutibus*; Brandt follows H *mala a bonis* and RH *et uitia a virtutibus*, and Bünemann changes *tanto* to *tantum*, all evidently for the sake of perfect parallelism where Lactantius had chosen variation instead[15].

At 2.8.10, preserving a fragment of Cicero's *De Natura Deorum* 3.65, Lactantius quotes "Primum igitur non est probabile eam materiam rerum unde omnia orta sunt esse diuina prouidentia

---

[13] Stangl, "*Lactantiana*", 234; Monat, *Div. Inst. I*, 253; nor is it necessary to add an object like *<semen>* to avoid absolute use of the verb.

[14] Heck, "*Lactantius, De falsa religione*", 66-7. Oliver Nicholson has demonstrated how Lactantius, in his attempts to establish chronology of Biblical and mythological events, has difficulty with dates and shows sloppiness in arithmetic: "The source of the dates in Lactantius' *Divine Institutes*", *JThS* 36, 1985, 291-310.

[15] Heck, *Dualistischen*, 182 n. 68.

effectam, set et habere et habuisse uim et naturam suam." At
2.8.20 he quotes again slightly differently, "Sed probabile est,"
inquit "materiam rerum habere et habuisse uim et naturam suam."
Here, too, Brandt wants "<et> habere et habuisse," but given that
Lactantius now repeats Cicero's argument in a slightly varied
manner there is no warrant for changing the tradition.

At 2.17.5 *sed seponatur interim nobis hic locus de ira
disserendi*, Brandt thought that B reads *de ira dei*, which he
prints, followed by Monat; Heck and Wlosok point out that *dei* is
not read in B or any of the older mss., so they print *de <ira> dei*[16];
but it seems to me that <ira> is hardly necessary. The *recc.* likely
added *ira* on the basis of Jerome *De Viris Illustribus* 80.2, or in
conformity with the title of Lactantius' monograph *de Ira dei*.
In fact *Ira* 22.1 offers an interesting comparison: *haec habui quae
de ira dicerem, Donate carissime, ut scires quemadmodum
refelleres eos qui deum faciunt inmobilem.* There *recc.* offer
ira Dei, and Brandt prints *ira <dei>*, but Christiane Ingremeau
resists the addition, observing that this work discusses human
wrath as well as divine[17]. Stangl, who like Brandt thought that
B reads *de ira dei*, also observes that it is hardly necessary in the
Inst. passage to add *dei* in order to exclude a discussion of wrath
in people or animals[18], and that is my opinion also; *disserendi*
can easily depend upon *locus*, and one might translate "But let
us put aside for the time being this opportunity for a discussion
about wrath."

b. Filling in ellipses. A larger group of Brandt's emendations
involves various forms of ellipsis which he is inclined to fill
in more explicitly by augmenting the text. At 1.1.4, within
a long period stretching from §3 to §6, the parenthesis at §4
consists according to the tradition of two independent clauses
in asyndeton. Later codices and editors add *–que* to *tantum*
in the middle of §4, and Brandt emends to *<et> tantum*[19]; but
the structure is good without it, and perhaps more interesting.

[16] Heck reviewing Monat, *Gnomon* 64, 1992, 595.
[17] *Lactance, La Colère de Dieu*, Paris 1982, 361.
[18] "*Lactantiana*", 236.
[19] See also Stangl, "*Lactantiana*", 227.

Another asyndeton that should be left alone is at 1.16.4, where Lactantius begins his argument against female deities: *Illi ergo, qui poetas finxisse de diis fabulas opinantur, deas feminas et esse credunt et colunt; reuoluntur imprudentes ad id quod negauerant, coire illos ac parere*. To add *<et tamen>* after *opinantur* as does Brandt on the analogy of other passages spoils a carefully crafted effect whereby a reader is unobtrusively led into the very contradiction that the apologist hopes to deride. Earlier editors' *<et>* seems even more useless, at odds with the *et* after *feminas*.

At 1.3.13 there is an argument for the universe being governed by one god. One who thinks this impossible is the subject: *At si concipiat animo, quanta sit diuini huius operis immensitas, cum antea nihil esset, tamen uirtute atque consilio dei ex nihilo esse conflatam…* Brandt emends to *<eamque> immensitas*, evidently to provide a subject accusative for *esse conflatam*; but it is perfectly natural to understand *magnam immensitatem* as Bünemann argued *ad loc*[20].

At 1.9.5 in Lactantius' spirited diatribe against the all too human qualities of Hercules, the tradition offers an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ[21], *non enim fortior putandus est…qui fimum stabulo quam qui uitia de corde suo egerit*, which Brandt represses by adding a second *<de>* before *stabulo*; there is no need for it, and the text is to my ear more arresting as transmitted.

Sentence structure and punctuation are involved at 1.15.32f. HMKS offer a relative clause at §32, *qui subornatus est a patribus*, while VPR give no *est*; later codices and editors have *qui subornatus a patribus est*, followed by Brandt and Monat who end this sentence at the end of §32. However, if the sentence is allowed to continue beyond to §33, then no *est* is needed since §33 *persuasit* and *liberavit* then become the main verbs of the *qui* relative clause, leaving *subornatus a patribus* as a participial

---

[20] *Lactantii Opera Omnia*, Halle-Leipzig 1739; Halle 1764.

[21] Stangl, "*Lactantiana*", 226; Monat *ad loc.*, *Institutions Divines Livre I*, 251.

phrase modifying *qui*[22]. Besides a fine period, better prose rhythm results as well, with the dicretic clausula –◡– –◡–[23].

At 1.16.14 Lactantius offers a rather contrived chain argument against the concept of female divinities, based on the idea that though people need women, gods, whom one cannot imagine requiring domestic comforts, do not: *si enim agros non habent, ne urbes quidem, si urbes non, ne domos quidem, si domibus carent, ergo et concubitu, si concubitus ab iis abest, et sexus igitur femininus.* Editors including Brandt add *<habent>* after *si urbes non*, expressing what is easily understood and spoiling what appears to me to be a series of *si* clauses constructed with variety in mind: *si agros non habent, si urbes non, si domibus carent, si concubitus ab iis abest*[24].

At 1.18.17, Lactantius refers to those of a violent way of life, who will commit any crime *ut habere hostem possint, quem sceleratius deleant quam lacessierint.* Brandt adopted Georg Thilo's[25] emendation of *<non>* after *deleant* lest Lactantius appear to declare the obvious, that it is worse to kill than injure. "But Thilo's *non* is quite unnecessary," as Shackleton Bailey observes. "What Lactantius means is that the lovers of military glory will commit all sorts of crimes in order to provoke an enemy so that they may add the still greater crime of destroying him"[26].

At 2.2.16 Lactantius argues against worshipping statues: *Quisquamne igitur tam ineptus est, ut putet aliquid esse in simulacro dei, in quo ne hominis quidem quidquam est praeter umbram? sed haec nemo considerat; infecti sunt enim persuasione ac mentes eorum penitus fucum stultitiae*

---

[22] "Das Romuluselogium des Ennius bei Laktanz: ein Testimonium zu Ciceros Schrift *de Gloria*?", *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 125, 1981, 305 n.2.

[23] Further textual decisions involving prose rhythm will be examined at the end of this review.

[24] Heck, "*Lactantius, De falsa religione*", 63f.

[25] Brandt, *CSEL* 19, CIX.

[26] Brandt, *CSEL* 19, CXII; Monat *Inst. Div. I*, 235; Bailey "*Lactantiana*", *VChr* 14, 1960, 165.

perbiberunt. Brandt adds *uana* after the model of 1.11.39 *uana igitur persuasio est*; something has fallen out, he thinks, comparing 5.1.8 *inepta persuasione*, 2.1.1 *stulta persuasione*. But *persuasio* stands alone quite effectively here[27]. Editors, including Brandt but not Monat, have made another change from the tradition in this passage, substituting *sucum* for *fucum*; but Lactantius' arresting metaphor is most effective[28].

At 2.3.20 Lactantius argues that those who have wisely rejected pagan religions as false should acknowledge the possibility of a true one: *Facerent enim prudentius, si et intellegerent esse aliquem ueram et falsis impugnatis aperte pronuntiarent eam quae uera esset ab hominibus non teneri.* Against the tradition Brandt adds *<religionem>* after *aliquem ueram*, but quite unnecessarily since for some pages the discussion has concerned true and false religion; *falsam religionem* appears eight lines above in §17. At 2.14.13, on the subject of worshipping demons, most *mss*. read *Hos in suis penetralibus consecrant, his cottidie profundunt et scientes daemonas uenerantur quasi terrestres deos…* R. reads *profundunt preces*, which Heck and Wlosok do not print in the main text but regard as possibly correct[29]. Brandt added *<vina>* before *profundunt* following the example of 6.2.1; *<merum>* is found in editions as well, and Stangl[30] gives a humorous list of other possible conjectures (*preces*, *lacrimas*, *sanguinem*, *animas*, "oder Gott weiss was") to make the point that it is perfectly natural in a ritual context to use such verbs as *profundere*, *facere*, and *celebrare* absolutely.

c. Classical usage. Some of Brandt's additions were motivated by his conviction that Lactantius must have conformed to some ideal of the best classical usage. For example, in many places even where all the *codd*. present *his* Brandt prints *iis*, believing that Lactantius, along with the best writers, uses *hic* to indicate

----

[27] Stangl, "*Lactantiana*", 230; Monat, *ad loc. Inst. Div. Liv. II*, 217, translating 'croyance.'

[28] For the literally minded, Monat points out *ad loc*. that the dye of the orchilla weed would be liquid, in fact.

[29] See also his *Dualistischen Zusätze*, 1972, 188.

[30] Stangl, "*Lactantiana*", 233.

matters with a present significance[31]. But fundamentally *hic* is the demonstrative of the first person; for this reason at 1.2.3 and 1.5.24, where Lactantius refers to books of Cicero which he seems to have at hand, *his* seems entirely appropriate, in fact. In other instances (1.9.9, 11.58, 16.1, 20.42; 2.5.28) it appears that Lactantius refers to entities quite present to the discussion, again making *his* perfectly suitable. At 1.8.8, 2.3.18 and 2.17.10 *his* is useful to Lactantius in making a contrast. In these instances Brandt appears to adhere to an abstract principle which does not in fact describe classical Latin[32].

Against the idea of subordinate gods, Lactantius argues thus at 1.3.22: *iam ergo ceteri non dii erunt, sed satellites ac ministri, quos ille unus maximus ac potens omnium iis officiis praefecerit, et ipsi eius imperio ac nutibus seruient.* As DVPMR have *seruiant*, editors have changed *et* to *ut*; Heck and Wlosok retain *et* and read *servient* along with B; if this is right, all the verbs are in the future indicative, which is both logical and rhetorically effective.

1.11.63 *in eo loco suspexit [Iuppiter] in caelum quod nunc nos nominamus, idque quod supra mundum erat, quod aether uocabatur, de sui aui nomine caelum nomen indidit.* Against the tradition Brandt emends *idque* to *eique*, evidently to provide a dative for *nomen indidit*; Monat follows him. Vahlen *ad loc.*, regarding this change as unnecessary, compares Terence's *eunuchum quem dedisti quas turbas dedit* (*Eun.* 653)[33]; *idque* is an example of *attractio inversa*[34].

2.3.7f *ut intellegat nihil colendum esse quod oculis mortalibus cernitur, quia mortale sit necesse est, nec mirandum esse si deum non uideat, cum ipsi ne hominem*

---

[31] *CSEL* 19, CVII.

[32] J. B. Hofmann-A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, München 1965, 181 notes *id est* becoming more usual than *hoc est* already in later works of Cicero.

[33] *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*[2], Leipzig 1903, 226; Marcus Winiarczyk (ed.), *Euhemeri Messenii Reliquiae*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1991, 38 also retains *idque*.

[34] Heck, "*Lactantius, De falsa religione*", 58-9 citing Hofmann-Szantyr, 567-8.

quidem uideant quem uidere se credant. With a period after *necesse est*, editors follow *recc.* and change *mirandum esse* to *mirandum est*; Heck and Wlosok, following Monat, preserve the tradition simply by placing a comma after *necesse est*; now *mirandum esse* is a second accusative and infinitive, dependent upon *intellegat* and parallel to *colendum esse*[35]. With this arrangement there is that much less need to read *credunt* rather than *credant* as does Brandt following DV.

II. Further Details about the new edition which may strike readers as noteworthy follow here.

1) Use of Greek typeface. The approximately 130 passages of *Inst.* which contain Greek text (mostly of the Sybilline Oracles or the Hermetic corpus), or simply individual words, vary among the manuscripts in using Roman or Greek letters. Heck & Wlosok use Greek letters in quotations of Greek texts, and have worked out a logical system for choosing which alphabet is more authentic for individual words, described fully in Heck's 'Lactantius, *De falsa religione*', 60-3.

2) Correcting plain errors. Heck and Wlosok have corrected the following errors of Brandt and other editors.

1.8.8 quotes Verg *georg.* 4.200f *e foliis natos, e suauibus herbis*: Brandt erroneously following R2 against all other *mss.* prints *et suauibus*.[36]

1.ll.63 *idque Iuppiter quod aether uocatur precans primus caelum nominauit*: evidently by mistake Brandt printed *placans*, found in late *codd.* and editors, for *precans* in the tradition; Monat followed him[37].

1.15.15, in the second line of a Sibylline oracle, πρὸς τί δὲ δῶρα μάταια καταφθιμένοισι πορίζεις: Heck & Wlosok follow the *codd.* of Lactantius for δὲ rather than those of *Orac Sib.* which Brandt and Monat followed, printing τὲ[38].

[35] Monat *ad loc., Inst. Div.* II, 217.

[36] *Et* is in fact found in 9th century codices of *georg.*; see Heck, "*Lactantius, De falsa religione*", 57-8.

[37] Heck, "*Lactantius, De Falsa Religione*", 59.

[38] Heck, "*Lactantius, De Falsa Religione*", 59.

1.19.3 *fulmine esse detrusum:* Brandt, followed by Monat, omitted *esse* by mistake[39].

2.3.14 *quia summum hominis officium* Brandt has *qui* against the *codd.* & *edd.* "*miro errore*" as Heck & Wlosok put it.

3) Restoring excluded text. Heck and Wlosok have restored excluded text as follows:

1.10.3 *et muros Laomedonti extruxit Neptunus mercede conductus.* Brandt and Monat omit Neptunus following DVP[1]; Heck and Wlosok rightly follow BHMKSR. In fact, the variant version of the myth, in which Neptune himself builds the walls, appears in other church writers[40].

At 1.21, following earlier editors, Brandt bracketed text in two places, evidently suspicious of glosses creeping in. But I agree with Heck and Wlosok's retaining the words, since at 1.21.7, *id est hominem* following the last word of the oracular quotation φῶτα provides an appropriate rhetorical emphasis upon the horror of human sacrifice; and at 1.21.22, *hic est Osiris, quem Serapim uel Serapidem uulgus appellat*, Lactantius helpfully provides the alternative form of the name in common use.

2.4.21 *ac si humilis quispiam quid tale commiserit.* Brandt following BGHPV omits *quispiam*, though it occurs in RS., on the grounds that it is unnecessary[41]; but as Heck points out, one ought to be able to account for the source of an alleged interpolation. Heck plausibly argues rather that BGHPV omitted *quispiam* through haplography[42].

4) Some textual dilemmas.

1.5.26 quoting Seneca (frg. 26 Haase): '*non intellegis' inquit 'auctoritatem ac maiestatem iudicis tui, rectorem orbis*

---

[39] Heck, "*Lactantius, De Falsa Religione*", 59-60.

[40] Heck, "Wer baute die Mauer für Laomedon?: Autorversehen in den *Diuinae institutiones* des Lactanz", in Roger Gryson (ed.), *Philologia Sacra: biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele zu ihrem siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Freiburg 1993 (Vetus Latina 24), vol. 2, 397-415.

[41] Brandt, *Über die dualistischen*, 1889, Abh. 8, 28.

[42] Heck, *Dualistischen*, 175 n. 27; Monat believes it to be the addition of a copyist with a purist agenda, *Inst. Div. II*, 218.

*terrarum caelique et deorum omnium deum, a quo ista
numina quae singula adoramus et colimus suspensa sunt?'*
The tradition offers two readings with grammatical coherence,
M with *rector* and *deus*, and WKR with *rectorem* and *deum*;
Brandt and other editors accepted *rectoris* from S and emended
deus to *dei*. Heck and Wlosok follow WKR with Monat[43] and
print two accusatives.

At 1.6.11 *[libri Sybillarum] quorum postea numerus sit
auctus, Capitolio refecto, quod ex omnibus ciuitatibus et
Italicis et Graecis praecipue Erythris coacti adlatique sunt
Romam.* Editors and Brandt have read *Erythraeis* out of the
jumble offered by the mss (*erytris* H, *eritris* W, *erythriis* DVPR
followed by Monat, *erytriis* K, *eritriis* S, *eritreis* M); this reading
has Lactantius referring to three groups of cities, Italian, Greek,
and especially those of the Red Sea. But surely he must have
meant a single city, Erythrae, the seat of the Erythraean Sibyl,
named a bit later in §13.

At 1.11.63, one of the passages where Lactantius quotes from
the *Historia Sacra*, Ennius' translation of Euhemerus, *Deinde
Pan eum [Iovem] deducit in montem, qui uocatur Caeli
sella.* The mss. have *stella*, as does Monat; Petrus Ciacconius
suggested *stela*[44] which Brandt followed among others. Diodorus
5.44.5 mentions a mountain called Οὐρανοῦ δίφρος; this offers
the solution *sella*, first proposed by L. Krahner[45]; editors of
Euhemerus agree[46].

From 1.20.14 Lactantius develops a contrast between external
rituals and inward spiritual disposition; this theme culminates
in an interesting dilemma for establishing the text at 1.20.26.
Heck & Wlosok, like Monat, follow the tradition in printing *nec*

[43] *Ad loc., Inst. Div.* I, 249.

[44] Reported by Isaeus in *Lactantius Opera Omnia*, Cesena 1646; see
Migne, *PL* 6, 899.

[45] *Programm Hauptschule Halle* 1837, 39 n. 2.

[46] Geyza Némethy, *Euhemeri Reliquiae*, Budapest 1889, 59; Giovanna
Vallauri, *Evemero di Messene*, Torino 1956, 40 and 57; Felix Jacoby, *Die
Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Leiden 1957, vol. 1, 311, F 21;
Marcus Winiarczyk, *Euhemeri Messenii Reliquiae*, Stuttart-Leipzig
1991, 38.

tamen desinunt ea colere quae fugiunt et oderunt. colunt enim ture ac summis digitis, quae sensibus intimis colere / horrere debuerunt. Recc. and editors, including Brandt, have emended the second *colere* to *horrere* (some *recc.* offer *horrescere*), to provide a verb contrasting with *colere* as the immediate context seems to demand; the error could be ascribed to repeating once more the verb *colere* which is used so often in the preceding passages, twelve times in the three pages from §15. However, the wider context, a contrast between performing exterior rituals vs. inwardly cultivating true virtue, makes it clear that *ea* means virtues as personified in religious cult, which Lactantius claims Romans, despite pretending to worship them, despise in daily practice: §20 *uirtus enim colenda est, non imago virtutis*; §25 *itaque nulla in quoquam uirtus est, uitiis ubique dominantibus.* Heck & Wlosok, though tempted to obelize the second *colere*, with some hesitation rightly decided to keep it in the main text despite what seemed to them an unusually far ranging backward reference to §20[47].

At 1.20.30-1 is a passage with a similar scribal error in repetition, where Heck & Wlosok do not print the solution which Heck seems to prefer[48]: *Cognitis aurem dolis hostium Lacedaemonii sequebantur. his armatae mulieres obuiam longius exierunt. quae cum uiros suos cernerent parare se ad pugnam, quod putarent Messenios esse, corpora sua nudauerunt.* (31) *at illi uxoribus cognitis et aspectu in libidinem concitati, sicuti erant armatae / i / e permixti sunt, utique promisce—nec enim uacabat discernere…*The *codd.* give *armatae* in §31, evidently a repetition error from *armatae mulieres,* however improbable with *permixti sunt.* Only the second hand of P in an erasure offers *armati.* Heck ingeniously prefers to read *armate,* since *e* is often an orthographical variant for *ae.* Though *armate* is not otherwise attested, there are analogs in *ordinate* and *disposite,* and it provides an attractive parallel to *permisce.*

2.8.13 *sua illi dictata recitanda sunt:* The tradition gives *dicta* except for *dictata* in SR, two of the *codd.* which represent

---

[47] Heck "Lactantius, *De falsa religione*", 64-5.
[48] Heck "Lactantius, *De falsa religione*", 65-6.

the longer version of *Inst.* (along with K which is not extant here). Heck (*Dualistischen* 176) argues that *dictata* in the sense of 'widerholte Aussagen' is appropriate because the preceding passage at §12 emphasizes Cicero's regularly stated belief in divine providence. Monat had objected to *dictata* as otherwise not found in Lactantius, and rather uncommon in general[49]; but Heck and Wlosok cite Cicero's use of the word at *de nat. deor.* 1.72, where Pease, translating it as 'lessons,' gives further examples: *Fin.* 2.95, 4.10; *TD* 2.26; *ad Q Fr* 3.1.11; Hor *Ep* 1.1.55, 18.13-4, 2.1.70f & more. Could not *dictata* be an example of a small change that Lactantius made when producing his revision?

At **2.8.24** Lactantius gives point to a criticism of Cicero's cosmology by quoting Terence *Phormio* 780f: *Cum igitur ortum rerum tribuis naturae ac detrahis deo, 'in eodem luto haesitans uersuram soluis, Geta'*. The quotation is not exact: Lactantius changes Terence's *haesitas* to *haesitans* and *solues* to *soluis*. One *ms.*, V, reads *uersura*, which Bünemann and Brandt follow "quod postulat nexus sententiarum Lactantii" as Brandt says. Unable to fathom what he was thinking of, I am happy to agree with Heck & Wlosok; *uersuram* in the other *mss.* (following *uorsuram* in *mss.* of Terence) seems to make perfect sense).

Finally, at **2.8.43** Lactantius concludes an argument about the eternity of matter: *Si ergo ex commutatione ac fine materiae colligitur habuisse principium, a quo alio fieri nisi a deo potuit?* DVPR have *materiae*, which requires the reader to supply *eam (materiam)* as subject accusative of *habuisse*. BHM's reading *materia*, followed by Brandt and other editors, gives a nominative with infinitive subject for *colligitur* and thus requires one to understand *materiae* wich *commutatione ac fine*. Heck & Wlosok have chosen *materiae* since accusative with infinitive is more likely with *colligitur* than nominative[50].

5) Prose rhythm. Heck and Wlosok mention prose rhythm[51] as a criterion for textual choices in some twenty places. As an

---

[49] *Ad loc., Inst. Div.* 2.218.
[50] Hofmann-Szantyr, 365; *ThlL* III 1617.75-1618.25.

introduction to the perilous nature of this enterprise let us observe
how Stangl long ago had promoted it in discussing *Inst.* 1.20.27,
where HMKSR give *aedem Veneri Caluae consecrauerunt*
(B gives *consacrauerunt*); Brandt following DVP reads
consecrarunt. Heck & Wlosok print the former reading, branding
the latter as *numero peiore*. If we accept the common assumption
that Lactantius employed Cicero's metrical *clausulae* but with a
narrower range of choices[52], none of them including the ditrochee
(– ◡ – ×), Heck & Wlosok can hardly be blamed for suspecting the
ditrochee in *consecrarunt*. In fact, however, Lactantius uses both
clausulae, cretic–spondee (– ◡ – – ×) as in *consecraverunt* and
ditrochee with equal frequency[53]. Moreover each of these readings
uses a standard accentual *cursus*, the *velox* (´ ° ° ° ° ´ °) in the first
instance, *Caluae cōnsĕcrāuērūnt* and the *trispondaicus* (´ ° ° ° ´
°) in the second, *Caluae cōnsĕcrārūnt*; Lactantius' practice was to
use both metrical and accentual *clausulae* simultaneously in what
is known as the *cursus mixtus*[54]. These observations lead us to
conclude that the criterion for choosing among the two variants

[51] In the notoriously complex field of prose rhythm, I follow the analysis
offered by Steven M. Oberhelman, "The history and development of the
cursus mixtus in Latin literature," *CQ* 38, 1988, 228-42. On Lactantius
in particular, see Oberhelman's "The cursus in late imperial Latin prose:
a reconsideration of methodology", *CP* 83, 1988, 146; *Rhetoric and
Homiletics in Fourth Century Christian Literature*, Atlanta 1991, 122-3;
and *Prose Rhythm in Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, Lewiston,
Queenston, Lampeter 2003, 260-1. See the bibliographies in these works
for a complete survey on prose rhythm, including the pioneering series of
articles in *CQ* and *CP* by Oberhelman and his earlier collaborator Ralph
G. Hall.

[52] L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry*, Cambridge 1963, 158; six
Ciceronian *clausulae* are surveyed by Stephen Casey, "«*Clausulae*» et
«*cursus*» chez Lactance", in J. Fontaine-M. Perrin (edd.), *Lactance et son
Temps*, Paris 1978, 160, following previous systems; Oberhelman includes
eight, "*History and Development*," 238.

[53] I base this, and similar assertions to follow, upon my own examination
of *Inst.* 1.1. Out of 139 clausulae noted, Lactantius uses 32 cretic-spondees
and 34 double trochees. Bold face type marks stressed syllables to be noted
in determining the *cursus*.

cannot be which rhythm is "better" or "worse"—I should prefer to say instead "more or less frequent in Lactantius"—but rather whether Lactantius prefers the normal to syncopated forms of the 3rd person plural of the perfect indicative; in fact he does so prefer, although there are instances of his using syncopated and other alternative forms of the perfect to produce an acceptable *clausula* not otherwise available[55]. Using prose rhythm for textual decisions is not always so straightforward as one might hope.

I find myself unreservedly in agreement with Heck & Wlosok in five instances:

At 1.7.1 the tradition offers *Colophŏnĕ rēspōndēns*, a most respectable cretic + spondee with *cursus planus* (´ ° ° ´ °); Brandt emended to *Colophōnĕ rĕsĭdēns,* a quite un-Ciceronian 4th pæon + longum with *cursus medius* (´ ° ´ °); I found no such metrical clausula in *Inst.* 1.1. To me Brandt's emendation is useless, and I am happy to agree with Heck & Wlosok that it is *contra numerum* as well.

At 1.9.6 more *codd.* offer *moderātŭs ēt iūstŭs ēst*, a dicretic with *cursus tardus* (´ ° ° ´ ° °); DVPW's *moderātŭs ēst ēt iūstūs*, a cretic + molossus with *cursus trispondaicus*, is un-Ciceronian and not to be found in *Inst.* 1.1 either, *contra numerum* indeed.

At 1.11.50 all *codd.* but P offer *plūs hăbĕăt īn sē*, 1st pæon + spondee; P reads *plūs hăbēbăt īn sē*, ditrochee + spondee. The meter of this is un-Ciceronian, nor to be found in *Inst.* 1.1; *contra numerum* is right. It is troubling, however, that neither reading offers a recognizable *cursus*

At 2.2.22 all *codd.* but R read *inferiōrĭbūs sūbiăcētīs*, cretic + ditrochee with *cursus velox*; R offers *inferiōrĭbūs sūbĭcĭtīs*, cretic + choriamb, a non-Ciceronian rhythm of which I found no example in *Inst.* 1.1, with the rather *cursus disponeus dactylicus*

---

[54] For Lactantius' use of the "rich *cursus mixtus*" see Oberhelman, "*History and Development*," 237-8. He observes that *Inst.* is particularly high in the *trispondaicus*—"*The Cursus*," 146.

[55] Harald Hagendahl, *La Prose métrique d'Arnobe*, Göteborg 1937, in *Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift* 42, 188 n. 3, 195 n. 5.

of wich I found only four instances in 1.11. Therefore I concur with Heck & Wlosok in regarding the reading of R as *contra numerum*.

At 1.11.44 Heck & Wlosok do not print the reading of R, *regnāssĕ dēprēndĭmŭs*, a dicretic with *cursus tardus*, though they rightly regard it as *numero meliore* in comparison with what the other *codd.* offer, *regnāssĕ dēprĕhēndĭmūs*, ditrochee + cretic, un-Ciceronian and not to be found in *Inst.* 1.1 at least. As noted above in regard to *Inst.* 1.20.27 Lactantius chooses alternative verb forms to achieve clausulae, and there is an instance of *prendere* at *Opif.* 5.13, *mēmbrūm quō prēndĕrē*, molossus (or spondee) + cretic with *cursus tardus*—there are instances of both in *Inst.* 1.1. But Lactantius' choices in the case of *pre(he)ndere* and its compounds will not be discernible until the final fascicle of this edition is available with its index of forms.

In the following instances I find myself in partial agreement with Heck & Wlosok:

1.16.2 reads as follows:

nam quamuis ipso religionum capite destructo universa sustulerim, libet tamen persequi cetera et redarguere plenius inueteratam persuasionem, ut tandem homines suorum pudeat ac paeniteat errorum.

*A*ll the manuscripts offer the clausula *uniuērsă sūstŭlĕrīm*, cretic + tribrach with *cursus tardus*. An error in R, already corrected by the first hand but accepted by Brandt, gives *uniuērsās sūstŭlĕrīm*, a spondee or molossus + tribrach with *cursus tardus*; Heck & Wlosok regard this clausula as *numero peiore*. Cretic + tribrach is barely discernible as a clausula in Cicero, occurring 2.8% of the time in contrast to 2.2% in non metrical texts[56]; I found six instances in *Inst.* 1.1, and none of spondee or molossus + tribrach, so one might agree with Heck & Wlosok about the rhythm; but surely a much more significant criterion is the context of *universa*, parallel to *cetera* in the

---

[56] For statistics on Cicero I rely upon W. H. Shewring, "Prose-Rhythm and the Comparative Method," *CQ* 24, 1930, 164-73, continued in CQ 25, 1931, 12-22. A convenient summary of statistics appears in the second part, 13 (table) and 15 (explanation).

following phrase rather than agreeing with an accusative *religiones* understood from *religionum* in its own phrase.

At 1.14.10 R offers in **uīn**clă̆ cōn**iēc**tōs, a standard cretic + spondee with *cursus planus*; all the other *codd.* offer *in* **uīn**cŭlă̆ cōn**iēc**tōs, an un-Ciceronian choriamb + spondee with the rare *cursus ditrochaicus*; such a meter does not appear at *Inst.* 1.1 either. Heck & Wlosok label this one *numero peiore*, but I think *contra numerum* would be more accurate. Other instances of *uincla* can be found at *Inst.* 5.22.14 and *Epit.* 34.11.

At 1.15.18 Heck & Wlosok choose R's **ē**ssĕ prŏ̆fĭ̆**tē**tūr, 1st pæon + spondee with *cursus trispondaicus*, over *codd.* **ē**ssĕ prŏ̆fĭ̆tĕ̆**rē**tūr, a clausula they regard as *contra numerum*. It is true that this pattern is not regarded as Ciceronian, nor did I find an example in *Inst.* 1.1. Perhaps a more convincing argument, though, is the fact that Lactantius uses *dum* with the indicative throughout *Inst.* 1 & 2 in various senses, temporal, causal, and concessive; the only example of *dum* with the subjunctive that I have found is conditional, at *Inst.* 6.24.40.

At 1.16.13, HMR read *nōn* **uĭ**dēt quaē̆ sĕ̆**quān**tūr, cretic + ditrochee with *cursus trispondaicus*; D[1] reads *habet* with the same clausula; the other *mss.*, here DVPKS, read *nōn* **uĭ**dĕ̆āt quaē̆ sĕ̆**quān**tūr, choriamb + ditrochee with *cursus velox*, which Heck & Wlosok regard as *numero peiore*. Both meters are found in Cicero[57], and in *Inst.* 1.1 I found 13 instances of the former and four of the latter. I cannot be sure, then, that one meter is 'better' than the other; here the criterion needs to be whether a subjunctive is more likely than an indicative. I am attracted more to the subjunctive, but of course both are possible.

At 2.3.7 more *codd.* read er**rā**rĕ̆ sē **sēn**tĭ̆ūnt, a double cretic with *cursus tardus*; DVR offer ēr**rā**rī **sēn**tĭ̆ūnt, molossus + cretic with *cursus medius*. Both meters are used both by Cicero[58] and Lactantius; in *Inst.* 1.1 I found 17 of the former and one of

[57] Shewring, "*Prose-Rhythm*", 15 with n. 1.
[58] Double cretic 8.3% vs. 2.9% in non metric texts; molossus + cretic 7.7% vs. 5.4% in non metric texts according to Shewring, "*Prose-Rhythm*", 13, 15.

the latter. So although the former rhythm may be quite a bit more frequent in Lactantius, I disagree with Heck & Wlosok in branding the latter *contra numerum*.

In the following instances I am surprised to find myself in clearer disagreement with Heck & Wlosok:

At 1.1.1 they prefer the reading of P (and possibly D), **pe**nitus dēdĭ**dī**ssēnt (ditrochee with *cursus velox*), to that of the other *codd.*, **pe**nitūs dĕ**dī**ssēnt (ditrochee with *cursus trispondaicus*), which they claim to be *numero peiore*; but judging from my survey of *Inst.* 1.1, where I found 19 and four instances respectively, both clausulae are normal in Lactantius. Perhaps the criterion should rather be whether Lactantius is more or less likely to use *dare* or *dedere* here. Hagendahl says that Lactantius prefers simple to compound verbs[59]; Brandt's index lists 16 instances of *dare* vs. two or three (the text is insecure at *Mort.* 48.3) of *dedere*.

At 1.1.10 Heck & Wlosok condemn as *contra numerum* Brandt's reading quo**dam**mod(o) ādsĕ**rēn**da (e)st (ditrochee with *cursus trispondaicus*); but Lactantius uses this rhythm as well as that of the tradition, quo**dam**modo dīssĕ**rēn**da (e)st (ditrochee with *cursus uelox*); out of 34 ditrochaic clausulae in *Inst.* 1.1, I found six instances of ditrochee with *trispondaicus* and 19 of ditrochee with *velox*. Therefore ditrochee with trispondaicus cannot be branded *contra numerum*; and though I agree with Heck & Wlosok in adhering to the tradition, prose rhythm is not a decisive factor in this choice. The most one can say is that ditrochee with *velox* may turn out to be somewhat more common in Lactantius.

At 1.11.36 seven *codd.* offer **quī**dquĕ fīn**gā**tūr, a standard cretic + spondee with *cursus planus*; DVP read **quī**dquĕ fĭgū**rē**tūr, an un-Ciceronian choriamb + spondee with *cursus trispondaicus*. But after finding two of these meters in *Inst.* 1.1, ĕrŭdĭĕ**bā**mūs with an unrecognizable *cursus* at 1.1.8 and cogno**uīs**t(i) ĕt hŏnō**rās**tī with *cursus trispondaicus at 1.1.13*, I cannot agree to call them *contra numerum*. Lactantius uses

---

[59] *Prose Métrique*, 163 n. 3 with several examples.

both *fingere* and *figurare* of poetic elaboration in this passage, so the choice is difficult on the basis of diction as well.

Four choices are on offer at 1.11.43: DVR *iuuar(i) ā **dĕ**ō **pŭ**tāt*, trochee + cretic with *cursus ditrochaicus*; P *iuuarī **pŭ**tăt ā **dĕ**ō*, dactyl + cretic with *cursus planus*; HMKS *a deō iū**uā**rī **pŭ**tāt*, molossus + cretic with *cursus ditrochaicus*, which Heck & Wlosok think possibly correct *numeri causa*; B *a de(o) ādiū**uā**rī **pŭ**tāt* again molossus + cretic with *cursus ditrochaicus*. Trochee + cretic is found in Cicero at a rate slightly above that in unmetrical prose[60]; I found six instances in *Inst.* 1.1. Dactyl + cretic is un-Ciceronian, nor could I find an instance in *Inst.* 1.1. Molossus + cretic is found in Cicero[61], and I found one other instance at *Inst.* 1.1.9, *ād **pau**cōs **pēr**tĭnēt* with *cursus medius*. I am not clear why Heck & Wlosok regard HMKS's reading as any more persuasive than B's with regard to *numerus*, which is identical with both readings, nor why they regard that clausula as preferable to DVR's. The statistics from Cicero are undecisive; DVR's reading is closest to what I found in *Inst.* 1.1, but that is a small sample.

At 1.15.23 Heck & Wlosok, while printing the tradition *caelo **me**rĭtă **lŏ**cā**uē**rūnt*, a 4th pæon + spondee with *cursus velox*, call it *contra numerum*; but in fact the meter is Ciceronian[62] and I found ten instances in *Inst.* 1.1 as well. One *cod.* of Cic. *Leg.* 2.8.19, which Lactantius quotes here, offers **me**rĭtă uŏcā**uē**rūnt with the same clausula; the reading of the other *codd.*, **mĕ**rĭtă uŏ**cā**uĕrīnt, and Feldhügel's emendation **mĕ**rĭtă lŏ**cā**uĕrīnt, not only use an un-Ciceronian rhythm but are doubly unsuitable for Lactantius because the accentual clausula ´°°°°´°° is not in the repertoire of the *cursus*[63].

[60] 4.9% for Cicero vs. 4.4% unmetrical, Shewring, "*Prose-Rhythm*", 13, 15.

[61] 7.7% for Cicero vs. 5.4% unmetrical according to Shewring, "*Prose-Rhythm*", 13, 15.

[62] 2.9% in Cicero vs. 1.9% unmetrical according to Shewring, "*Prose-Rhythm*", 13, 15.

[63] J. G. F. Powell follows Lactantius' *locaverunt* for his 2006 *Oxford Classical Text*, defended by Andrew Dyck, *A Commentary on Cicero, De Legibus*, Ann Arbor 2003, 295.

At 1.1.23 Heck & Wlosok condemn as *contra numerum* the reading of editors and the tradition, all except R, *per praecĭpĭtĭūm lābāntūr* (dispondee with *cursus trispondaicus*); R reads *per praecipĭtĭă lābāntūr* (4th pæon + spondee with *cursus trispondaicus*). But in *Inst.* 1.1 Lactantius uses a dispondaic clausula in eight instances, as compared with ten instances of 4th pæon + spondee. Doubtless Heck & Wlosok recall that Cicero is said to have avoided dispondaic clausulae[64], at least in oratory (except that it is frequent in *Cum senatui gratias egit*)[65]; not so with Lactantius, however. Perhaps instead he follows Cicero's practice in philosophical and rhetorical works. In any case, *contra numerum* is quite inappropriate a judgment, and in this passage it seems that the other codices ought to be preferred to R.

In three further passages Heck & Wlosok condemn the same dispondaic clausula, wrongly in my view, although I agree with their following the majority of the *codd.* in these instances. At 2.6.5 most *codd.* offer *si desiderant ălĭquĭd ē tērrā*, 4th pæon + spondee with *cursus trispondaicus*; PR² followed by Brandt and Monnat offer *aliquīd dē tērrā*, double spondee with the same *cursus trispondaicus*, which Heck & Wlosok call *contra numerum*. At 2.8.44 most *codd.* read *mutātă dīssōluāt*, cretic + spondee with *cursus planus*; B offers *mutet āc dīssōluāt*, double spondee with *cursus trispondaicus*, which Heck & Wlosok call *contra numerum*. At 2.16.12 the tradition reads *magnitūdĭnĭs āttŭlērūnt*, dactyl + dispondee with *cursus velox*; P reads *ātuēxērūnt*, *recc.* and editors *āduēxērūnt* from Valerius Maximus 1.8.2 whom Lactantius quotes/paraphrases here. Again Heck & Wlosok call this *contra numerum*.

At 2.17.9 the tradition reads *animāntēs āccēpĕrīmūs*, molossus + ditrochee with *cursus velox*; *recc.* and many editors read *animāntēs āccēpĭmūs*, molossus + cretic with *cursus tardus*. Heck & Wlosok suggest in the *app.* that this reading may be right *suadente numero*; but both the ditrochee and molossus are found in Cicero preceding a cretic[66], and in *Inst.* 1.1 I found

---

[64] Shewring, "*Prose-Rhythm*", 13, 15.
[65] Shewring, "*Prose-Rhythm*," CQ 24, 1930, 171.
[66] Ditrochee 25.3% vs. 17.2% in unmetrical texts; molossus + cretic 7.7% vs. 5.4% according to Shewring, "*Prose-Rhythm*", 13, 15.

three molossus + ditrochee and one molossus + cretic; so to me the latter meter is not awfully persuasive.

In conclusion let me report what I found to be a startling discovery about Lactantius' prose rhythm. In four instances within the short compass of *Inst.* 1.1, all of them at the end of a period, he uses a dactyl + spondee, called the "heroic clausula" because it is identical to the conclusion of a dactylic hexameter line; this is contrary to Ciceronian practice which avoided obvious poetical clausulae. At 1.1.7 in all *codd.* we read **ue**ram rēlĭgĭ**ō**nēm with *cursus velox*; in all *codd.* at 1.1.9, **uī**uĕr(e) ăd **ōm**nēs with *cursus planus*; in all *codd.* at 1.1.21 **ui**ām rĕuŏ**cān**dī with *cursus trispondaicus*; in R alone at 1.1.25 *nec ulla sapientia sine religi**ō**nĕ prŏ**bān**dā* with *cursus planus*; a fifth instance in P²MWKS is at 1.5.18, followed by Brandt, *per s(e)* **ip**sām mŏuĕ**ā**tūr, with *cursus trispondaicus*. On first sight Heck & Wlosok appear entirely reasonable to reject as *contra numerum* R at 1.1.25 in favor of the rest of the tradition, *nec ulla sine religione pro**bān**dă săpĭ**ēn**tĭă*, a 1st pæon + cretic with *cursus tardus*; however this meter is neither Ciceronian nor to be found in *Inst.* 1.1. The choice at 1.5.18 is more straightforward, where they reject as *contra numerum* the reading of P²MWKS in favor of BVP¹R, followed by Monat, *per s(e)* **īp**să mŏuĕ**ā**tūr, a classic 1st pæon + spondee with *cursus planus*; however it is interesting that B shows a macron above the *a* in *ipsa*, added then erased.

Had Lactantius desired to avoid the heroic clausula he could easily have altered his word order in all these instances, as we regularly find Cicero doing to achieve clausulae. At 1.1.7 he could have placed the verb last, *ad ueram religi**ō**nēm dīrĭ**gān**tūr*, producing a ditrochee with *cursus trispondaicus*; at 1.1.9 he might have moved the verb and written *bene autem uiuere* **pēr**tĭnĕt ăd **ōm**nēs to achieve a classic 1st pæon + spondee with *cursus trispondaicus*; 1.1.21 could be standardized by writing *ad uiam revo**can**di rēctĭ**ō**rēm* to get ditrochee with *cursus trispondaicus*. At 1.1.25 the *codd.* have already demonstrated how a change of word order could repair a heroic clausula; but it went wrong. Let me suggest swapping the last two words around: *sapĭ**ēn**tĭă prŏ**bān**dā* will again provide a classic 1st pæon + spondee with *cursus trispondaicus*. At 1.5.18, in order to keep the accusative *ipsam*—hardly necessary, of course—let

me propose *per sē mŏuĕ**ā**tŭr īpsām*, a dactyl + ditrochee, not unknown in Cicero, with *cursus ditrochaicus.*

But enough of this; to castigate Lactantius is even more shocking to me than disagreeing with Heck and Wlosok. Rather let us ask, do Lactantius' heroic clausulae in *Inst.* 1.1 have anything to say to us? It is remarkable that the four of them occur at emphatic moments in his argument. In *Inst.* Lactantius undertakes to demonstrate that persecution of Christians is absurd because Christianity, far from being a revolutionary force undermining Greco-Roman civilization, in fact provides its fulfilment together with some fundamental corrections. In doing so he maintains a continuous dialogue with ancient authors, most notably Cicero, whose prose style he imitates with astonishing success, but also with Roman poets, especially Vergil and Lucretius[67]. It is particularly remarkable that Lactantius employed the full range of Ciceronian metrical clausulae; yet he combined with them at every point the newer clausulae based on accentual *cursus* that appear to have arisen in northern Africa in the third century. However, at four crucial moments in *Inst.* 1, passages where he stresses significant corrections offered by Christianity to prevailing cultural norms, Lactantius also departs from the Ciceronian metrical canon in the most striking way possible, by employing the heroic clausula. At 1.1.7 he contrasts true wisdom, the province of the learned in antiquity, with something now available to everyone through Christianity, true religion; recall that the subtitle of *Inst* 1 is *De falsa religione.* At 1.1.9 he contrasts speaking well, the province of the few, with everybody's job, living well; at 1.1.21, contrasting truth with what is commonly thought to be wisdom, he calls upon his readers, caught up in error, to regain the straight path; at 1.1.25 he concludes 1.1 with his claim that no sort of wisdom can be approved of without religion. The daringly un-Ciceronian heroic clausulae at these crucial and climactic places highlight how Lactantius, a traditionalist with a new message, provides a new interpretation of ancient culture.

[67] Jackson Bryce, *The Library of Lactantius*, New York-London 1991, traces Lactantius' use of these authors in detail.

Summation. Heck and Wlosok are in the process of providing readers of Lactantius not only with a definitive text, but by its *apparatus* and *indices* a remarkable set of useful tools as well. We wish them godspeed in finishing this magnificent work, which is the culmination of a lifetime of assiduous and brilliant service to Lactantius' text on the part of Professor Heck.

Jackson Bryce
Carleton College, Northfield
jbryce@carleton.edu