

the extent to which there are links between the speeches and the liturgy, but the typological use of Biblical characters is also mentioned. Chapter V seeks to reveal the political aims of the orations for the deceased emperors: here B. examines the circumstances of the death of Valentinian, a difficult matter, and the question of Valentinian's relation to the church. In the case of Theodosius there is the stress on the succession of both sons, which is clear enough, and the location of Theodosius in a tradition of Christian rulers stretching back past Gratian and Constantine to the Old Testament.

In all this there is very little which could not be found for themselves by attentive readers of Faller's Vienna edition or those of Mannix and Banterle, along with a few basic reference works. B.'s text operates at a remarkably general level, and the obsessively frequent refrain of *Zusammenfassend lässt sich festhalten . . .*, followed by summary or repetition, adds to the frustration. It is as if anything like scholarly controversy, comparative detail, or Latin quotation were considered too vulgar or contaminating for the main argument. The footnotes do, however, make up for this to some extent. They show that B. is prepared to engage fruitfully with other scholars over certain issues; and they provide the Latin passages which are almost totally barred from the main text. The reader's task could have been made easier if some form of highlighting or emphasis had been used, but it is not, except in a single instance where B. compares passages of Psalm 114 quoted in the oration for Theodosius with the Vulgate text. Some notes reach an enormous length. It is not often that one sees an avowed excursus embedded in a footnote, as here on p. 135.

The work concludes with a list of passages in these orations to which B. refers—significantly, the vast majority of these, like his cross-references, refer to footnotes—and a bibliography. In this subtitles might have been given more consistently (so that, for example, the reader would know that Nixon 1987 was a translation), and it is surprising that MacCormack—whose 1975 paper on panegyric and its clone of the following year is one of few general studies (at the time of writing) of the genre of panegyric in Late Antiquity—is to be found under C. But perhaps Scottish telephone directories should follow suit.

University of Glasgow

R. P. H. GREEN

JEROME'S EUSEBIUS

G. BRUGNOLI (ed.): *Curiosissimus Excerptor. Gli 'Additamenta' di Girolamo ai 'Chronica' di Eusebio*. (Testi e studi di cultura classica, 12.) Pp. lix + 245. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 1995. ISBN: 88-7741-856-7. Paper, L. 35,000.

Jerome translated Eusebius of Caesarea's *Chronici canones* from Greek into Latin in 380/1, making additions involving Roman history and literature and continuing it from 326 to 378. Eusebius' original no longer exists and must be reconstructed from Jerome, an Armenian translation, two Syriac epitomes, and a variety of later Greek historians who used Eusebius as a source. The standard edition of Jerome's translation is that of Rudolph Helm (2nd edn 1956), which marks all entries that are completely the work of Jerome with an asterisk and those entries that are partly Jerome's and partly Eusebius' with a bracketed asterisk. The chief problem is that in

the entries marked (*) Helm made no attempt to identify what was Jerome and what was Eusebius. Omissions and errors involving these diacritical marks contribute to the difficulty of analysing Eusebius' original and Jerome's contributions.

B.'s task of identifying Jerome's additions to Eusebius' *Canones* is therefore important for understanding Eusebius' original, Jerome's methods of translation and composition, and his historiographical and chronological accuracy, and for identifying his sources. To fulfil his purpose B. quotes all entries that he believes Jerome has added or augmented. These are copied from Helm's edition without their all-important chronological framework, though B.C. and A.D. dates (incorrect when calculated from Olympiads) are included. Jerome's contributions are printed in bold. To these entries are added a selection of other unmodified Eusebian entries that are irrelevant, yet make up about one-third of the total. B. also includes the complete text of Jerome's continuation, entries that create no source problems with regard to Eusebius and are accurately marked in Helm. The second part of the book quotes in full a number of parallels for each entry, usually the Armenian translation, a few Greek or Syriac witnesses, and other Latin parallels (see below). With the exception of the Armenian translation, this seems to derive entirely from the *testimonia* in Helm's edition.

B. neither analyses nor draws any conclusions from his collection of quotations and *testimonia*. His introduction and *testimonia* show that he knows little about fourth-century historiography or Jerome's Latin sources. He makes no comment on the chronological changes Jerome introduced to Eusebius' original and he says nothing about the words and entries that Jerome omitted from the original. B.'s method of citing Jerome's additions lacks the subtlety of Jerome's methods of augmentation and translation. B. states that all bold represents an addition by Jerome, yet it must also indicate places where B. believes that Jerome has simply translated Eusebius under the influence of other Latin sources, which is a very different matter.

This reveals B.'s fundamental problem: he seems to believe that the existence of *any* Latin writer who offers exact or close parallels to individual items of Jerome's vocabulary in the same context indicates that Jerome has added to or modified Eusebius under the influence of that source, regardless of the evidence for Eusebius' original wording. He cites parallels from over twenty different supposed 'sources', yet only two of these were actually used by Jerome and some were even written after the *Chronicle* was translated. I append a very few examples of different errors, with B.'s text of Jerome first, then some of the parallels as cited by B., with bold font as in B.

- (i) **Terrae motus Romae et solis defectio** (p. 54).
ἐν Ῥώμῃ σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο (Syncellus).
 terrae motus magnus Romae fuit et eclipsis solis (Syriac epitome)†.
 †Not cited by B.
- (ii) **Otho tertio regni sui mense apud Betriacum propria manu occubuit** (p. 57).
Ὄθων ἐβασίλευσε μῆνας τρεῖς [καὶ] ἑαυτὸν διεχειρίσατο (Cedrenus).
 [Otho] regnavit menses III et se conficit (Arm).
apud Betriacum* uictus semet gladio transfixit . . . adeo amabilis militibus **propriis**, ut plerique corpore eius viso **suīs manibus** interierint (*Epit. de caes.***).
 *Correctly identified. **Written after the *Chronicle*.
- (iii) **Senatus Traianum in deos refert** (p. 65).
Τραιανὸν ἢ σύγκλητος θεὸν ἐψηφίζατο (Syncellus).

inter Diuos relatius est (Eutropius).

(This is one of only a few ways to translate the Greek.)

- (iv) **siti oppressis pluua** diuinitus missa est (p. 70).

δίψει πιεζομένους ὄμβρος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο (*Chronicon Paschale*).

quum . . . siti laborabant . . . pluua missa est (Arm.).

pluua impetrata, cum siti laborarent (HA**); **imbres in siti illa impetrauit** (Tertullian).

- (v) Commodus **strangulatur in domo Vestiliani** (p. 72).

Κόμμοδος αἰφνίδιος ἐτελεύτησεν ἀποπνιγείς ἐν οἰκίᾳ Βεστυλιανοῦ (*Anonymus Matritensis*).

Comodus ex improviso obiit dilaceratus in palatio Bestiliani (Arm.).

in **Vestilianas aedes** . . . **strangularunt** (HA**); **strangulatus** (Eutropius); **domo Victiliana** (*Chron. urbis Romae*).

- (vi) Decius cum filio in **Abryto occiditur** (p. 78).

[*Δέκιος*] *ἐσφάγη μετὰ τοῦ νιού* . . . ἐν Ἀβρύτῳ (Syncellus).

Decius cum filio in Abrito occisus est (Arm.).

occisus praetorio Abrypto (*Chron. urbis Romae*).

A detailed examination of pp. 68–77 (ten pages out of the eighty-one that cover Jerome's translation of Eusebius' original text) found that thirty-five entries are irrelevant for the purposes of the book, since they contain no text added or augmented by Jerome; four contain original observations by B. of material added by Jerome but missed by Helm; thirty are entries already noted by Helm as being completely the work of Jerome; and twenty-seven contain errors where B. has mistakenly identified the work of either Jerome or Eusebius (i.e. almost three errors per page).

B. does, however, uncover a number of additions made by Jerome but missed by Helm and has identified many of Jerome's additions in entries noted by Helm with a (*). Unfortunately, because of B.'s faulty methodology, the reader cannot accept these without checking each entry against the surviving witnesses to Eusebius' original, something that one has always had to do with Helm's edition.

University of Ottawa

R. W. BURGESS

TOLLE LEGE

G. CLARK (ed.): *Augustine: Confessions Books I–IV* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics Imperial Library). Pp. x + 198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Cased, £37.50/\$59.95 (Paper, £13.95/\$21.95). ISBN: 0-521-49734-5 (0-521-49763-9 pbk).

Teachers wishing to introduce Latin students to Augustine's *Confessions* have always faced a problem. The commentary of Gibb and Montgomery gives little help to the modern student, the Loeb text has an antiquated translation and very few notes, and the recent commentary of O'Donnell is a bit on the expensive side. One therefore welcomes such an initiative from the Imperial Library.

I expressed my great admiration elsewhere (*CR* 45 [1995], 452) for C.'s general introduction to the *Confessions*, and since much of the material naturally reappears in