very regrettable that precisely at this point his text is plagued by a glaring printing error: *allatus*. In 23.3.9 Gelenius' *contextae* is better than Mommsen's *confectae*; in 24.1.3 V. does not accept Heraeus' *ubi convenisset*, but prints the main manuscript's *venisset*, which he renders by 'dove apparisse utile', which is evidently much nearer to Valesius' *usu venisset*; † *procia* (24.3.11) is rightly substituted by *pro copia*.

In the translation one does not encounter many details arousing strong dissent. In 20.8.11 *secus* means 'wrongly' rather than 'in modo diverso'; 'con una buona dose di improvvisazione' is far too euphemistic for *temere* in 21.5.13; one fails to understand how the problematical datives *victui* and *quieti* (24.3.9) can mean 'grazie al cibo e al riposo'. As was already hinted at above, V. sometimes translates a text which differs from the one he prints: in 21.5.2 'che sarà possibile lodare' does not render his *laudari . . . potuerunt*, but Seyfarth's *poterunt*; in the difficult passage in 22.5.4 he prints *ut sunt sibi feralibus*, but he in fact renders Mommsen's *ferales*.

Concerning the general presentation of the translation, three facts should be reported: (i) whereas Selem and Caltabiano use footnotes to inform the reader about certain details (persons, facts, dates, etc.) in their translations, V. puts such information in a parenthesis [. . .] within his translation; (ii) such parentheses should not be confused with the ones denoted as (. . .): these are part of the translation itself; (iii) in V.'s Latin text . . . denotes a lacuna, but in his translation he uses . . . to introduce a surprising turn. The result of this threefold strategy may become clear from an example in the first chapter of Book 14: *Cuius acerbitati uxor grave accesserat incentivum germanitate Augusti turgida supra modum, quam Hanniballiano regi fratris filio antehac Constantinus iunxerat pater, Megaera quaedam mortalis* (14.1.2) becomes 'Alla crudeltà sua era aggiunta [anno 351], quale pesante incentivo, la moglie [Costantina], superba oltre misura per essere sorella di [Costanzo] Augusto (il padre Costantino l'aveva prima fatta sposa [anno 335] del figlio di suo fratello [Flavio Dalmazio], cioè di Annibaliano il re [del Ponto]); lei . . . una specie di Megera umana!' Some readers will find this handy, others may judge differently.

As may have become clear above, a competent and affectionate familiarity with the language and the contents of the *Res Gestae*, impressive learning, and some remarkable idiosyncrasies are the hallmark of these volumes. There are no indices; presumably, these will in due time be incorporated in the final volume.

Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam J. DEN BOEFT

AMMIANUS' NARRATIVE

F. WITTCHOW: *Exemplarisches Erzählen bei Ammianus Marcellinus: Episode, Exemplum, Anekdote*. Pp. 414. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2001. Cased, DM 138. ISBN: 3-598-77693-4.

In his introduction W. observes that his use of the techniques of linguistics and narratology may give rise to irritation and opposition in some readers. To this category I unashamedly confess I belong: in the face of such terms as 'Narratologie' and 'Narrativität' a serendipitous derivation from 'Narr' springs readily to mind. I shall concentrate on such insights into ancient historiography and the work of AM as emerge intermittently from the fog of jargon.

In his preliminary remarks W. notes pertinently that historians such as Tacitus were aware that they were not merely making use of examples drawn from the past but were also themselves creating a repertory of examples to be drawn upon by future

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.110 Published online by Cambridge University Press

generations. But whereas Tacitus offers relatively few instances of anecdote and example, AM is rich in both.

W. defines the structure of an episode (abstract–orientation–setting–evaluation–result–coda), then (pp. 92–109) applies this schema to 18.6.11–23. This passage consists of no less than six episodes, but recognition of this fact(oid) does nothing to enhance comprehension. Nor do the subsequent analysis (pp. 119–23) of Tac. *Ann.* 1.70 and the comparison with AM offer anything of interest on either author. Meanwhile, from p. 104, W. is guilty of a fault common to such modes of analysis, first assuming that AM was consciously trying to write in accordance with the model foisted on him, then rebuking him for failing to meet its criteria.

Comparing and contrasting their presentation of the character of emperors (pp. 129–45) and treatment of treason trials (pp. 146–52), W. sees Tacitus as more interested in specific reactions in specific situations, AM as concerned with typical reactions in exemplary situations. The contrast is perhaps overstated and rests on an oversimplified view of the supposed ancient belief that character does not develop, but some valid points are made. On treason W. examines 16.8 and suggests that AM sets out to choose the most spectacular examples, in contrast to e.g. Falanius and Rubrius in *Ann.* 1.73. One might doubt the need for appeals to theory here: Tacitus and AM simply had different points to prove or illustrate and picked their exempla accordingly.

Book 23 is then examined in some detail (pp. 154–75). There is much on its episodic structure, again based on the tacit assumption that AM was writing in full knowledge of modern theory. But there are also acute analyses written in intelligible German of 23.1 and 23.2.3–5. The treatment of 23.2.8 is, however, flawed by the misunderstanding of *rapientibus multis* (cf. p. 167 n. 32). On 23.3.2 W. writes (p. 167) as if AM were expressing belief in the story of Julian giving Procopius the purple; in fact, *dicitur* and the stress on the lack of witnesses deliberately encourage scepticism.

On AM's attitude to Christianity, W. rightly refutes (p. 187) Sabbah's selective distortion of the mission of the bishop of Singara (20.7). His overall conclusion, that AM is critical of any religion only when it leads to excess and works against reason, is sensible enough. He then deals (pp. 195–222) with problems arising from Julian's persistent disregard or misinterpretation of the omens that foretold the Persian disaster. AM is not claiming that, if Julian had got these things right, the disaster might have been prevented; his mistake was to try to avoid the inevitable. W. states (p. 209, cf. p. 215 n. 213) that AM blames the disaster on Constantius. The reference is of course to Constantine, but in any case AM says nothing in 25.4.23 about the outcome of the war, only that Constantine, not Julian (as his critics alleged), was responsible for starting it.

Under *fatum* and *uirtus* there is a lengthy discussion of Julian's usurpation. The Nebridius incident (pp. 249–55) does not fit the 'standard' pattern of episode or anecdote. But W. offers an extremely acute analysis of AM's respect for Nebridius' position and Julian's behaviour (noting Libanius' different attitude), and draws an apposite contrast with Constantius' treatment of Amphilochius at 21.6.2. However, it matters more than he allows (p. 253 with n. 92) whether or not *ut* is inserted (as it surely should be) before *futurorum praescius*; Seyfarth omits *ut* from his text but translates as if it were present. In any case, *exsultabat* is pejorative, and what happens is not what Constantius predicted. When he moves on to Book 22 his discussion of 22.7.3–4 (the philosopher Maximus) says nothing of the relevance (or not) of the Cicero citation, while on 22.9.9–11 there is only a late and partial explanation of why this incident exemplifies Julian's *patientia*.

In AM's account of Julian's early career (pp. 289–308) Julian is compared with

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.110 Published online by Cambridge University Press

classic exemplars of his various virtues before he can serve as an exemplar himself. Constantius is similarly treated before the direct confrontation with Julian himself. The anecdote of Hormisdas and the horse sets Julian and Constantius against each other in relation to Trajan (pp. 302–4). But in general there are fewer anecdotes in Books 17 and 18, and they are not so much apologetic as contributions to the picture of Julian as an ideal ruler. The Liberius episode (15.7.6–10), though W. often writes Libanius for Liberius, is contrasted with the treatment of Silvanus' supporters (15.5.35–6.4).

W. then compares and contrasts AM and Aurelius Victor, rightly noting in passing (pp. 321–4) that AM owes very little to Tacitus. There are interesting discussions of Vict. 10.1–6 (pp. 333–7) and 28.3–9 (pp. 343–7). In general, Victor's anecdotes about the conduct of emperors (e.g. 11.5–6 on Domitian) do not serve as examples of 'imperial' behaviour; to be effective, a character anecdote needs to be simultaneously remarkable and representative.

A final chapter, largely self-contained, deals with the question of AM's intended audience. (It is unfortunate that the work of Frakes, on which W. bases much of his treatment, is missing from the bibliography.) His conclusion, that AM was addressing all who played any part in the running of the empire, is, however, eminently plausible.

In fine, then, students of AM will, if they work hard, find some matters of interest in this book; what literary theorists will make of it I am happily unable to judge. Of the numerous misprints, the confusions between Constantius and Constantine, Liberius and Libanius noted above are the most serious. The most amusing, to me at least, is the scandinavianization of my own nomenclaturality in the bibliography (for the explanation of which, see p. 259 n. 111).

University of Liverpool ROBIN SEAGER

CLAUDIAN'S POLITICAL POEMS

J. L. CHARLET: *Claudien: Oeuvres. Tome II.1. Poèmes politiques (395–398)* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. lxxxviii + 222. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2000. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-01416-0.

J. L. CHARLET: *Claudien: Oeuvres. Tome II.2. Poèmes politiques (395–398)* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous la patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. 227. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2000. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-01416-0.

This edition of the political poems composed by Claudian in the turbulent last months of the life of Theodosius the Great and in the four still more troubled years that followed exhibits in abundance the many virtues of the Budé series. A very generous editorial policy permits a pleasant, easy-to-read typeface, substantial introductions both to the whole and to the individual poems, and copious notes; great care is taken to provide an elegant and accurate translation; and the learning and sensitivity of the chosen editor are not in doubt. Add in the fact that the quality of the production is very high indeed, with errors as scarce as swallows in winter, and it must be said that every page is a rebuke to the shoddiness that seems to grow ever more common in academic publishing outside of France and Italy. But more striking,

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.110 Published online by Cambridge University Press