vv. 2163–76 is unnoticed. At the end, a hint about the lost *Epodes* of Horace is lacking. In addition, we can surely expect that a real and argumentative position should be taken, instead of, in most cases, simply ignoring the latest research (including attempts at textual emendation), and that an explanation of the editor's own should be given for the problems encountered (e.g. the comment at p. LIII, 'non sempre giustificata', is too short and lacks argument; v.111 is again shortened and incorrectly cited: problematic is the addition *ab ore*. On v. 884 the alphabetical order of examples is underscored, but the discussion does not take the necessary conjecture into account.).

The translation is also at times questionable, e.g. that of the very first sentence ('audiui . . . uirum . . . dicere' or more likely 'audiui . . . dicere fabulam' as Plin. *NH* 28.123?). Verse 825 is to be used to explain 226; the cited parallels are not comparable (the structure is different and there is no object). The explanation of the alphabet markings vv. 329–41 is nice, but does not respect the wording. Verse 719 is no real proof for 1280 (*q* is comprised of two *litterae*, but not the syllable *-ptum*). The system of case studies and demonstrations is often not understood (particularly vv. 520–777, 1238, 1258–81; 1201–57 is not mentioned as an excursus) as well as the obvious structure of *De syllabis* with its two large parts, obviously separated from each other also by the change of metre (pp. XXXII–XXXIII; v. 279 'rite metro . . . heroico' is simply paraphrased, not explained). The separation of the two consonant vowels as a particular group (vv. 146–81, 520–777) does not represent Terentianus' classification. The importance of *caesura* in *De metris* is not observed after v.1719 (p. XXXV).

There is no room left here for additional criticism of detail. C. presents an introductory reference to vv. 1603–5 'et si non ualebo plurima/ attingam uel pauca tamen . . .', appropriately assessing her performance. Terentianus' own warning is not enough respected (vv. 317–23 'labor . . . ferendus in legendo est maximus:/ non enim cursim aut remisse tam minuta acumina . . .'); he was in fact correct: 'pro captu lectoris habent sua fata libelli' (v. 1286).

University of Regensburg JAN-WILHELM BECK

SERMONIS POMPA ROMANI

D. AMHERDT: *Sidoine Apollinaire: Le quatrième livre de la correspondance*. Pp. 589. Bern, etc.: Peter Lang, 1999. Cased, £40. ISBN: 3-906766-82-9.

This commentary deals with one of the longest and most interesting of Sidonius' books of correspondence. It includes a letter by Claudianus Mamertus to Sidonius (Amherdt compares the presence of letters from Symmachus' father and from Ausonius in Book 1 of Symmachus' collected correspondence), a succulent letter of praise addressed by Sidonius to Claudianus, and a further letter, Letter 11 to Petreius, bearing a tribute and an epitaph on the same Christian philosopher. It also contains the letter (12) in which Sidonius, before slagging off the senseless blockhead who had lost the letter he was carrying, reveals that he is helping his son read Terence by forgetting his sacred calling (*professio*) and consulting what he evidently called Menander's *Epitrepontem*. Most of these letters were written after Sidonius' consecration as bishop in 470.

No text is provided; there are good and helpful editions in the Budé and Loeb series, and the addition of a text would have added to the book's already considerable bulk. But it does lead to difficulty in following up A.'s copious cross-references; since he

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.388 Published online by Cambridge University Press

refers only by section, a reader looking up, say, his main note on the expression *deus bone* has to leaf through six pages of Section 1.2 to find it. Textual problems are discussed briefly and very selectively; indeed, in most letters they are entirely ignored. Two comments: at 1.2 perhaps the solution is neither the manuscripts' *maturum* nor Leo's *declamatorium*, and at 3.1 it could be argued that if Sidonius can get away with the phrase *Plinii, vel avunculus vel Secundus*, he should be allowed *Varrones, vel Atacinus vel Terentius*. Both these Varros are Terentii, but both Plinies are Secundi.

There is a helpful introduction with sections on the life of Sidonius, his letters, and their style. Each letter is preceded by a careful discussion of date, addressee, and *généralités*. The thrust of the notes is on elucidating epistolary conventions and the modes of expressing friendship, and on the battery of unusual words that delightfully assails the reader on every page. Often, of course, there is little to be said beyond classifying them as *hapax legomena*, or as words used in early Latin that reappear after several centuries, or as words formed in late antiquity's favourite ways; but occasionally more could be said, for example on the meaning of *vultuosus* at 12.1 (A. gives two meanings without choosing between them), and at 7.2 (on p. 216), where he seems to misunderstand the interpretation of this passage offered by TLL. A few other comments: at 2.3 (p. 103) *ecquo* is surely not an adverb, as in Cic. *Phil.* 13.24, but an adjective qualifying *occupatu*; at 3.1 (p. 120, the first lemma) one should read *quempiam* for the unfortunate hybrid *quemquiam*, also in Loyen; at 5.1 (p. 188) the citation of *apices* from Juvencus 3.475 is certainly inapposite if by 'lettre' A. means epistle. Juvencus may there have been thinking of Hebrew script or mimicking Roman legal diction.

This commentary breaks little if any new ground, but will be found useful by those who are seeking a detailed introduction to the conventions of letter writing, as they were practised by this fascinating and historically important man, and his remarkable deployment of sesquipedalian vocables prodigiously configured and preciously conjoined for prolific communication with fellow-members of the Gallic élite.

University of Glasgow ROGER GREEN

HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE LATE EMPIRE

D. ROHRBACHER: *The Historians of Late Antiquity*. Pp. viii + 324. London and New York: Routledge, 2002. Paper. ISBN: 0-415-20459-3 (0-415-20458-5 hbk).

R.'s investigation of the historiography of the later empire is divided into two parts. He first surveys a selection of a dozen historians, four classicizers (Ammianus, Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus), three epitomators (Aurelius Victor, Eunapius, Festus), four ecclesiastical historians (Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret), and the oddball Orosius. He then considers their handling of seven different topics: historiography, government, the Roman past, religion, barbarians, Julian, and Theodosius I. The author chapters follow the same format of Life and Work (under which issues of shape, purpose, and literary style are reviewed), concluded by a brief note of editions and English translations. The topical chapters review, clearly but often descriptively, how the different authors dealt with particular themes; the sub-divisions of each chapter (different barbarians, the phases of Julian's career) ensure that the material is presented in digestible quantities. The different approaches of the epitomators are clearly brought out, demonstrating that even with such

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.388 Published online by Cambridge University Press