

## EUTROPIUS

J. HELLEGOUARC'H (ed.): *Eutrope*, Abrégé d'histoire Romaine (Collection Budé). Pp. lxxxv + 274. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-01414-4.

Very few classicists read their Eutropius today. With his spare style and the often tedious account of bare (all too frequently military) facts, he is not exactly gripping. However, in the Middle Ages taste was different: a healthy number of manuscripts survive from the early ninth to the twelfth century, while Paul the Deacon grafted his own material onto Eutropius in the late eighth century to produce the *Historia Romana*. Furthermore, within a few years of its composition, the *Breviarium* was translated, somewhat freely to be sure, into Greek by one Paeanius, thus providing us with a very early textual witness.

The 1979 Teubner of Eutropius by Santini (2nd edn, 1992) often makes one wince with its bad judgement. Now Hellegouarc'h gives us a far more judicious text, with the additional benefits of a lengthy Introduction, copious notes, and a French translation. The various topics chosen for discussion in the Introduction are handled with skill and will add much to the reader's appreciation of Eutropius' slender work. By far the weakest section (pp. lviii–lxxii) is devoted to the manuscripts, and shows a surprising unawareness of the considerable work done in this area. While one may not be concerned that a French scholar would choose (at his peril) to ignore *Texts and Transmission* (ed. L. D. Reynolds, Oxford, 1983), how could he be so lamentably unaware of B. Munk Olsen's magisterial volumes *L'Étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI et XII siècles* (Paris, 1982–)? Although he does not specifically discuss Eutropius, nevertheless Munk Olsen has a great deal to say about several of the manuscripts. There are a dozen manuscripts which H. should have dated differently or located more accurately. So much of interest is missed: thus there is no realization that I (Oxford, Lincoln College 100) was written at Malmesbury by several hands, including that of the celebrated scholar William. Nor is one pleased to see Br (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 129) described as originating in the Abbey of St Augustine at Cambridge (instead of Canterbury)!

The text itself is the work of a seasoned scholar: the choices made largely win immediate assent and the apparatus criticus is usually well laid out (although I was bewildered by the incomprehensible note on p. 142 on 10.16.3 *principes/principem*). One pervasive problem kept me constantly consulting H. Droysen's admirable *MGH* edition of 1879: there is quite insufficient use of the Greek translation of Paeanius. Maybe it is unreasonable to expect that the Greek could also be given alongside (as in Droysen), but without such reference the reader is often left floundering. For example, we need to be told (p. 47 on 4.4.2) that *Quinquaginta* is supported by Paeanius, as is *tria* also; that (p. 50 on 4.8.1) *septuaginta* is likewise guaranteed, as is *Memmius* (4.9.1). Scores of other readings could be similarly bolstered by a clear reference to Paeanius.

There are few passages where the text is unsatisfactory, but three suggestions come to mind. One itches to emend 7.12.1 *et qui etiam Tiberii dedecora purgaverit*, as well as 8.16.1 *et qui septuagenariam attigisset aetatem* to *ut qui* in each case (a marked mannerism of Eutropius). Also at 10.8.3 *per crinitam stellam . . . eam Graeci cometen vocant*, the last four words should surely be deleted as an intrusive gloss (compare Servius *Aen.* 10.272 *Cometae autem Latine crinitae appellantur*, whence Isidore *Etym.* 3.71.17).

There are gratifyingly few misprints: 16.3 *familia* (read *familia*); 7.15.1 *quaeretur*

(*quaereretur*); 18.17.1 *Saluius* (*Saluius*); 10.9.2 *Contantinum* (*Constantinum*). While it may be considered inappropriate for someone who is not a native speaker of French to comment on the translation, it does give the impression of being more elegant than the jejune Latin. One is particularly delighted to read the description of Caesar's relationship with Cleopatra (6.22.2) *cum qua consuetudinem stupri habuerat* given the racy 'avec laquelle il avait eu coutume de se livrer à la débauche'.

*Amherst College*

†PETER K. MARSHALL

## THE ROMAN NOVELS

H. HOFMANN (ed.): *Latin Fiction. The Latin Novel in Context*. Pp. xi + 277. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-415-14721-2.

The ancient novel has become more popular among scholars than ever. In recent decades numerous editions, commentaries, and translations, both of the preserved complete novels and of fragments, have been published. Scholarly studies on the genre and its representatives have become prolific, and their range is quite impressive. One only needs to think of the Groningen Colloquia on the Novel (of which H. was the founder) and the recent Third International Congress on the Ancient Novel (Groningen, July 2000).

Given the present abundance of publications, handbooks for students become necessary. For the Greek novels, we already possessed J. R. Morgan, Richard Stoneman (edd.), *Greek Fiction. The Greek Novel in Context* (London and New York, 1994). The present volume is intended as a companion, and covers the wide field of the 'Latin novel'. The editor, H. (now professor of Latin at the University of Tübingen), has assembled sixteen well-written essays, in which renowned specialists reflect on the current state of research concerning the Roman novelists.

Petronius' *Satyrica* and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* are, of course, prominent: there are four contributions on each. After a general introduction by H., there is an opening essay on Petronius by Gareth Schmeling. In a piece on the *Cena*, John Bodel analyses the rather complex structure and main themes of this most famous part of the *Satyrica*. The various other inserted stories in the novel, such as that of the 'widow of Ephesus', are covered in an essay by Graham Anderson, while Catherine Connors uses a medieval work inspired by Petronius, called the 'Petronius redivivus', to cast light on the rôles of *arbitrium* (judgement) and poetry in the *Satyrica*. The essays on Apuleius show a similar division: a general essay by Gerald Sandy, a piece on the Greek sources by Hugh J. Mason, one on the central story of Cupid and Psyche again by Sandy, while the other inserted tales are dealt with by Nancy Shumate.

The remaining essays cover areas decidedly less familiar to most readers. There are rather brief essays on the late Latin *Historia Apollonii regis Tyrae* by Schmeling, and on the *Ephemeris belle Troiani* of Dictys Cretensis and the *Acta diurna belli Troiani* of Dares Phrygius by Stefan Merkle. These are followed by two longer pieces on 'the Latin Alexander' (from Curtius Rufus to fourth-century works) by Richard Stoneman, and on the entertaining qualities of hagiographic texts by Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich.

The final part of the book contains a group of four papers highlighting aspects of the 'Nachleben' of Latin fiction. Claudio Moreschini studies the history of the interpretation of Apuleius' Cupid and Psyche (dealing with Fulgentius, Boccaccio, and