sometimes seen in such enterprises, of exceeding the brief of the passage in question. Throughout the commentary on Books 64 and 65, the reader is kept closely aware of the parallel treatments of Tacitus, Suetonius, and Plutarch.

The Flavian emperors have all benefited in recent years from modern biographical treatments; thus, the extension of the commentary to include Books 66 and 67 performs an especially valuable service in contributing to a widening of accessibility to the 'post-Julio-Claudian' period and its wealth of controversies. Rightly or wrongly, family parallels with the Severans (a dynasty-founder with two variably appealing sons) abound. One wonders, however, with M., how far this may have led Dio to distortion; it is, for example, an interesting suggestion (p. 25) that Dio's Vespasian is the kind of emperor 'whom he would have wished Septimius to be'. Further, Dio's Domitian emerges as a mature embodiment of evil—the precursor of the odious and unredeemed Caracalla—whereas other sources allow for deterioration and some positive comment (pp. 203–6).

The commentary is well-indexed, and provided with helpful and attractively produced maps; the only problem is that, on Map 1 ('The Vitellian Invasion of Italy'), principal locations on the river Po have been misplaced. Other than that, M. is indeed to be congratulated on the production of a commentary that is informative, relevant, and scholarly, and one which ultimately has the great advantage of being thoroughly user-friendly. It is surely a 'must' for all those who work in and study the field of the early Roman Empire, a new tool of high quality and value.

University of Lancaster DAVID SHOTTER

VITA CONSTANTINI

AVERIL CAMERON, S. G. HALL: *Eusebius,* Life of Constantine. *Introduction, Translation and Commentary.* Pp. xvii + 395, 1 map, 11 figs. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Paper, £19.99. ISBN: 0-19-814924-7.

The *Life of Constantine* has in the past been less fortunate than some other works of Eusebius in its editors and English translators. Heikel's unsatisfactory edition of 1902 has still not been replaced for the three appended speeches that formed an integral part of Eusebius' design; the full text of one of these (the speech delivered by Constantine in Nicomedia at Easter 325) has never yet been rendered into English; and the translation of the two speeches of Eusebius published in 1976 is not wholly reliable (in the opening paragraph of the speech of 336, for example, it mistook the jussive main verb θελγόντων for a participle and transformed the participles μετιόντες and ἀσπαζόμενοι into main verbs to produce '[they] pursue and embrace . . . in order to please' instead of 'let those who pursue . . . charm'). The four books of *Life* proper, however, were superbly edited by Friedhelm Winkelmann in 1976, and there is now a reliable translation in the Clarendon Ancient History Series. Averil Cameron and Stuart Hall have rendered the *Life* into English expertly and accurately. The translation is preceded by a lengthy introduction (pp. 1–53) and followed by a substantial commentary (pp. 183–350), both of which set out the issues involved in interpeting an unusually problematical text for the most part with lucidity and fairness.

More than thirty years ago, the Clarendon Press commissioned me to edit and translate the *Life of Constantine* for the then new series of Oxford Early Christian Texts. After very little preliminary work, I decided that it would be labour wasted to

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.39 Published online by Cambridge University Press

embark on an *editio minor* in parallel and competition with the critical edition towards which Winkelmann had already made great progess. Since it seemed unlikely that the Akademie Verlag in East Berlin would make his text available before publication, the project was dropped—and I realized that I anyway lack the talents of an editor or a translator. Cameron and Hall do possess the requisite skills, and they have produced a translation of Winkelmann's text (with a few changes, all duly signalled), which, so far as I have checked, appears to be completely exempt from errors that might seriously mislead those who use it. If C. & H.'s rendition is sometimes inelegant, the apparent fault results from deliberate choice. They consciously decided to 'stay close to the original in the hope of conveying its very characteristic tone' (p. v). Hence scrupulous fidelity to the tenor of Eusebius' Greek often reproduces his vagueness and pomposity.

A historical and literary commentary demonstrates its value only over the course of time as readers consult it with a wide range of varied questions. A reviewer must select what interests him most or strikes him immediately. Inevitably, therefore, he runs the risk of partiality. The difficulties are increased when a commentary which sets out 'to explain and elucidate the context' of each passage in a controversial text is itself selective (p. v). In this particular case, I feel such difficulties all the more keenly, since, while C. & H. constantly draw upon my work and pay it handsome compliments, their own views compel them to register, explain, and justify disagreements with my published work. Controversy is of course the lifeblood of scholarship. But disagreement between scholars only advances understanding of the ancient world if both ancient evidence and modern views are reported accurately. I feel obliged, therefore, to enter a regretful caveat. For I think that C. & H. sometimes fail to report the relevant evidence or my interpretation of it fairly. Let me illustrate the nature of this serious charge from three central issues in contention.

(i) Is the *Life of Constantine* a literary unity conceived by its author in its present form? Or is the text as it survives a conflation of two separate drafts combined by a posthumous editor? The latter view was proposed by Giorgio Pasquali in 1910; his arguments were strengthened by Winkelmann in the introduction to his edition; and I have carried the case forward until in 1994 I felt confident that I could assign every passage in the *Life* to one of three categories: (1) a continuation of the *Ecclesiastical History* begun *c*. 325, then abandoned; (2) an unfinished panegyric of the dead Constantine which Eusebius started to write when he learned of the emperor's death on 22 May 337; and (3) additions composed by the editor who published the *Life* shortly after Eusebius' death to link (1) and (2) together ('The Two Drafts of Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*', *From Eusebius to Augustine. Selected Papers 1982–1993* [Aldershot, 1994], no. XII). C. & H. explicitly reject this analysis with appeal to C.'s paper 'Eusebius' *Vita Constantini* and the Construction of Constantine', *Portraits. Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, edd. M. J. Edwards, S. Swain (Oxford, 1997), pp. 145–74. But they make a series of admissions which seem to me to concede virtually the whole of my case: neither Eusebius nor the manuscripts call the work a *bios* (p. 29); the work is 'a literary hybrid' (p. 27), 'an uneasy mixture of panegyric and narrative history' (p. 1), which Eusebius left 'unfinished or unrevised' (p. 3); the chapter headings were probably supplied by 'the editor whom many scholars believe to have been responsible for publishing the work' (p. 52). Hence, although it may be true that 'modern discussion has . . . centred around the *VC*'s perceived combination of biography and encomium' (p. 29), and although I attempted that approach in 1981, I believe that in 1989 I changed the terms of the traditional debate by identifying the two strands in the *Life* as panegyric, which in the ancient world was not a literary genre distinct and separable from laudatory

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.39 Published online by Cambridge University Press

biography ('Two Drafts', pp. 3–4), and a continuation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*. It is *petitio principii* to apply Eusebius' statement of his aims in 1.10–11 to both parts of the 'hybrid' work (p. 29) in order to disprove my argument that 1.1–9 is the preface to a panegyric, 1.10–11 to a history.

(ii) Did Constantine in 324/5 forbid the traditional practice of sacrificing animals to the pagan gods? Eusebius alleges that he did. C. & H.'s note on *VC* 2.45.1 fails to harmonize two drafts or layers of different dates (pp. 243–4): my brief article in *AJP* 105 (1984), 69–72 is cited twice with full title, on the second occasion introduced by the phrase 'but see'. More serious, the imperial constitution addressed to Creperius Madalianus in 341 as *vicarius Italiae* (*CTh* 16.10.2, cf. *ILS* 1228) is attributed to the eastern emperor Constantius, even though I have consistently and repeatedly construed it as showing that in 341 Constans extended to the West the prohibition of animal sacrifice which his father had enacted in 324/5 for the East and never attempted to enforce, perhaps never even promulgated in the West (*Constantine and Eusebius* [Cambridge, MA, 1981], p. 246). Such a lack of expertise in handling the *Theodosian Code* is inexcusable, though apparently not uncommon in Oxford (cf. *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 4 [1997], 296–7).

(iii) C. & H. confidently assert that 'Eusebius' statement that [Constantine] chiefly promoted Christians to high office is a clear exaggeration' (p. 45). The relevant footnote first cites Raban von Haehling and Ramsay MacMullen, on whom this assertion is based, then my 'Statistics and the Conversion of the Roman Aristocracy', *JRS* 85 (1995), 135–47, which demonstrates that after 317 Constantine did indeed show a marked preference for Christians in the highest offices of state. C. & H. cannot perhaps be faulted for publishing in 1999 an assertion disproved in 1995. But they can be faulted for not directing readers to reviews of von Haehling's book (listed in *JRS* 85 [1995], 138 nn. 27, 28) which detected the fatal flaws in his statistics as long ago as 1979/80.

University of Toronto T. D. BARNES

A RELIABLE COMPANION TO THE *METAMORPHOSES*

D. E. Hill (ed.): *Ovid* Metamorphoses IX–XII. Pp. vii + 230. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1999. Paper, £16.50. ISBN: 0-85668-646-8.

The earlier volumes of this commentary were not noticed in *CR*, and this review must therefore double as a retrospective acknowledgement of the solid service that Hill has done and is continuing to do to the study of this great poem. His text is based on that of Tarrant's forthcoming OCT and is thus superior to any other in print. The translation, helpfully for those struggling with Ovid's Latin, is line-for-line, designed to give a six-beat blank verse effect; the result, though inevitably conveying an imperfect notion of Ovid's linguistic art—a shortcoming of which H. is well aware and to which his notes often usefully draw attention—is accurate and reads easily and idiomatically. The notes are succinct, informative, and stimulating, and I have not infrequently profited from them in writing my own commentary on Books 7–9. It was a good idea in particular to quote generous extracts from Frazer's translation of Apollodorus *in extenso* by way of providing at least a serviceable outline of the complex mythographical background to Ovid's narrative.

Study of this and other commentaries reveals how much still remains to be done,

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.39 Published online by Cambridge University Press