own linguistic competence. A number of examples may be adduced. When discussing *Resurr*. 4.6 the author affirms that 'für das Wortspiel mit *cupere* [wird] das Verb *recuperare* neugeprägt . . . *Recuperare* bleibt Hapaxlegomenon; es ist . . . eine Augenblicksbildung' (p. 255). Here W. has failed to realize that *recuperare* is just the alternative spelling of *reciperare*, for which the entry in *OLD* fills half a column. The final text to be examined in Chapter V is taken from *Anim*. 38.3 (' "ex omni ligno", inquit, "edetis", et secundae post diluvium geniturae supermensus est: "ecce dedi vobis omnia in escam tamquam olera faeni" '). W. sees in this use of *supermetiri* an 'Anspielung auf die Herrschaft der Menschen über die Meerestiere' in Gen. 9.2, which is quoted in the following nonsensical form: *καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἰχθύας τῆς θαλάσσης ὑπὸ χεῖρας ὑμῖν δέδωκα* (p. 170). This passage of the LXX should in fact read: *ὁ τρόμος ὑμῶν . . . ἔσται . . . ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἰχθύας τῆς θαλάσσης· ὑπὸ χεῖρας ὑμῖν δέδωκα*. Of greater concern, however, is the misinterpretation of *supermensus est*, which cannot refer to the 'Herrschaft' of Gen. 9.2; the meaning is simply 'maiore liberalitate mensus est alimenta hominibus' (Forcellini s.v.). In an attempt to explain *properabilis* at *Anim*. 43.3 W. asserts that *properare* can mean 'schnell entschwinden' (p. 310). Two passages are adduced in corroboration: Cic. *Manil*. 36 and Ov. *Am*. 1.13.3. In the first the term *properare* does not occur at all, while in the second, where W. misquotes 'quo properas, Aurora?' as 'quid properas? Aurora.' (*sic*), the meaning is shown to be the very opposite of 'entschwinden' by the immediately antecedent *vĕnit*. Similarly on p. 305 *inviscare* (*Anim*. 1.3) is taken to signify 'poison'. The Latin itself is often gibberish. Sometimes two separate passages are garbled on a single page (e.g. 'ceteris praemissis horum filiorum nuncupavit' for 'praetermissis . . . filium' and 'corrobat' for 'corroborat'; p. 129); the same thing happens only half a dozen pages later ('cenae paratura vitae aeternae et saturitatem figurat' for 'vitae aeternae saturitatem' and 'quid plurius' for 'pluribus'; p. 136). The Greek is no better: though the first non-biblical passage to be cited consists of less than one line, it contains no fewer than three bloomers (*ἐπειδὴ δὴ* [*sic*] *δὲ ἀγένητόν ἐστιν, καὶ ἀδιάφθορον* [*sic*] *αὐτὸ ἀνάγκη ἐστίν* [*sic*; read *εἶναι*]; p. 97 with n. 285).

University of Nebraska—Lincoln NEIL ADKIN

AMMIANUS

G. SABBAH (ed., trans.): *Ammien Marcellin* Histoire. *Tome VI*. Livres xxix–xxxi (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. lxvi + 367, maps. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-01408-X.

This volume brings to its conclusion the Budé edition of Ammianus. A stimulating introduction deals with the structure, collective and individual, of the final books, the subject matter, and the date of composition. Unfortunately constraints of space preclude detailed discussion, which must give pride of place to S.'s text.

Its most striking feature is the desire to preserve the readings of V as often as possible. In a number of cases this commendable ambition achieves a successful result. In the instances that follow V's reading may surely be allowed to stand against the consensus of all or most recent editors. 29.1.5: *praesidalem* (cf. n. 13); 29.1.9: *idem*; 29.1.18: *et*; 29.1.31: *consonans*; 29.1.32: *postrema* (cf. n. 49); 29.1.33: *ipsis*; 29.1.34: *pacem* (cf. n. 54); 29.2.5: *procero generatus*; 29.2.16: *aduliscentiae*; 29.2.27: *lacer*

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.56 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(preceded by *laniatus*); *condemnatus*; 29.5.35: *particulatim diffluens*; 29.5.40: *nominis* (so also at 29.6.19); 29.5.41: *ingentium*; 29.5.47: *minacissime*; 29.6.1: *mota est inexcita* (cf. n. 192); 29.6.12: *raptorum*; 29.6.14: *perrumpere* (the historic infinitive is rare in AM, but should not on that account be emended to extinction; cf. 31.5.9, 7.12); 29.6.14: *disiectamque*; 29.6.15: *plurimum* (probably unparalleled, but intelligible); 30.1.22: *exteriore* (a remarkable phrase, but better sense than any correction); 30.2.2: *aliquot*; 30.4.7: *fulminibus* (cf. n. 252); 30.4.8: *eos* (cf. 4: *in illis partibus*); 30.4.18: *uana* (though the sense is surely '[rendered] futile', sc. by their prolix obfuscations, not 'sans valeur'); 30.5.10: *non scitabat*; *ante suos cellens*; 30.5.13: *prope* (cf. n. 287); 30.8.8: *inpendium*; 30.8.13: *numquam*; 30.9.4: *propulsanda*; 31.2.12: *hoc*; 31.5.9: *inrumpere* (cf. 29.6.14, 31.7.12); 31.7.3: *numquam* (yet the translation has 'nulle part', as if S. accepted Valesius's *nusquam*!); 31.7.6: *confisi*; 31.7.12: *coire* (cf. 29.6.14, 31.5.9); 31.14.2: *ne propinquitatem*; *ferret*; 31.14.3: *contradictoris*; 31.15.13: *lucubrationibus* (cf. n. 575); 31.16.3: *permixtis*.

On other occasions S.'s retention of V's readings is less convincing. At 29.1.31 *artum* leaves *ex . . . leui* hanging. (The translation reads 'fait de . . .', but 'fait' has no equivalent in the Latin.) In 29.5.2 *nauatur* is perhaps undermined by *ciebat* preceding and *docebat* following, and *nauabatur* should be preferred. 29.5.7: *propriorum* does not supply an adequate antithesis to *insidiis*, which favours Gelenius's *proeliorum*. 29.5.19: *fauentis* merits consideration as the *lectio difficilior*, but *fauentis supplicis* can stand only as a very harsh asyndeton (as S.'s translation recognizes), and the constant ascription of fear to suppliants favours *pauentis*. 29.5.23: the defence of *scientes* at n. 155 is not entirely convincing. If it indicates bad faith it can be regarded as otiose after *maliuoli*, whereas *nescientes* accords well with AM's habitually patronizing manner towards the morally obtuse. 30.4.19: *imperato* is intelligible, but the sequence of events is seen from the point of view of the delinquent advocates, which favours *impetrato*. 30.7.6: *saepe* is the obvious resolution of V's *sepe*, but makes little sense: the object of the exercise was to keep the enemy from taking such action not often but at all. Gelenius's *se* should therefore be read. 30.10.3: *in eo* is not impossible, but weaker than *ideo*. 31.2.4: the second *apud eos* is surely to be deleted, despite n. 357. 31.2.25: *ignorabant* might be supported by *etiam nunc*, but the thought would be extremely elliptical and there is no real antithesis, so *ignorant* is probably to be preferred. 31.5.13: *pessum concitas* is perhaps too harsh; of the solutions canvassed in n. 422 the best is perhaps *pessum copias concitas*. 31.5.17: *honeste* is intelligible, but the lack of an epithet makes *morte* seem rather feeble, so better *honesta*.

S. also gives due credit on occasion to the readings of other manuscripts: 31.8.10: *cum raptis promptis* (W^2HT); 31.12.14: *munus militare* (E) (cf. nn. 522, 523); and to those of Gelenius and Accursius: 29.1.31: *praescitionum*; 29.2.23: *rigidis* (cf. n. 91); 29.5.48: *adaptatis* (cf. n. 183); 30.8.2: *praerupti*; 30.9.4: *bella sollertissimus*; 31.2.24: *feminae* (cf. n. 378); 31.5.2: *uertere*; 31.13.19: *nec ulla* (*in* add. Sabbah); 31.15.13: *ascensusque*; 31.16.7: *audaciae fracto*.

But at 29.4.6 S. opts for *intemperantis* (Acc.); this means that *culpa* has to serve as antecedent for *quae*, which is very forced. The choice of Acc.'s *hanc* in 30.1.7 deprives *legionem* of its only possible grammatical standing as direct object of *conpulit*. At 30.4.14 Acc.'s *impune* is inconsistent with *aliquotiens sunt damnati* (16). In 31.7.16 *ea* (E^2, Acc., Gel.^{2}) is very feeble. V's *iustorumque* in 31.14.3 points to Valesius's *iustorum iniustorumque*, not to *iustorum* (Acc., Gel.^{2}). At 31.10.3 *Romanorum uerum* of the MSS (defended at n. 477) is again excessively weak.

S. is commendably reticent about promoting his own emendations to the text. Among the more attractive are 29.3.2: *ut in irascente*; 30.9.1: *obscure, obsurdescens*;

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.56 Published online by Cambridge University Press

30.10.4: *apertus* (cf. n. 346); 31.1.4: *uaga aquila* (cf. n. 349); 31.2.17: *uiuendi sed etiam armaturam* (at least the best suggestion yet); 31.3.5: *a Greuthungorum ualle*; 31.7.3: *locis in solis* (retaining V's *repperiens* with *fames*) (cf. n. 448); 31.7.8: *cruditati* (cf. n. 457); 31.10.21: *et adrogantius custodiret* (cf. n. 492); 31.12.8: *exercuere*; 31.16.2: *proditum*. In the notorious crux at 29.4.1 S. reads *in regendo uerius milite barbaris quam pellendis*. This is admittedly close to V, but the order is harsh and surely what is required is a choice of ways of dealing with the barbarians. Simplest might be to substitute *regendis* for *regendo* in S.'s text.

The notes are in general concisely informative on questions of prosopography, topography, and imperial administration; they sometimes also explain and attempt to justify S.'s readings. AM's language and thought attract much less attention. The treatment of Theodosius' campaign against Firmus is somewhat strange. The introduction briefly acknowledges the links with Sallust's *Bellum Iugurthinum* and remarks on the hollowness of Theodosius' success, yet the notes repeatedly present as strained and desperate panegyric precisely those passages where AM is most concerned subtly to undermine the official version of Theodosius' achievement. (Cf. further *Histos* 1 [1997]: www.dur.ac.uk/classics/histos.) The treatment of Sapor's embassy concerning Armenia (30.2.1ff.) is also inadequate. (Cf. *Chiron* 26 [1996], 281ff.) But these are minor blemishes which do not detract from the value of a work which leaves all who study AM deeply indebted to S. and his fellow editors.

University of Liverpool ROBIN SEAGER

ORALITY

E. A. MACKAY (ed.): *Signs of Orality. The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*. (*Mnemosyne* Supplement 188.) Pp. x + 261, 16 pls, 7 figs. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 1999. Cased, $85.50. ISBN: 90-04-11273-1.

This book is an exceptionally important collection of papers originally delivered at a conference entitled 'Epos and Logos'. Its eleven challenging essays explore various aspects of 'orality' in Homer (Chapters I–V) and the influence of the oral tradition on other genres such as vase-painting and inscriptions (Chapters VI–VII), Greek and Roman oratory (Chapters VIII and XI), Platonic and later dialogues (Chapter IX), and Virgil's *Aeneid* (Chapter X). Many of them are ground-breaking and open up new approaches to Greek and Roman literature.

J. M. Foley's introduction provides a theoretical link for the whole volume. Chapter I by E. J. Bakker radically changes the perspective on the studies of 'oral poetry'. By asking the question, 'What do we mean by "oral" or "orality"?', he attempts to redefine the terms. First he points out that the contrast between 'oral' and 'literate' is not a clear-cut dichotomy, but a continuum in which different shades of orality and literacy can come in. On the one end of the continuum is oral composition in performance, and on the other is composition by writing. However, an orally composed text may be written down (writing in the sense of transcription) or a text composed by writing may be transmitted orally. Then he points out that the concept of 'oral' is a construct of our own literate perspective, denoting a lack of the literate conception of language which cannot exist without writing. In other words, before

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.56 Published online by Cambridge University Press