

de certains termes latins (*e.g.* corriger p. 92 *Marie-Claude* ; p. 259 *recherches* ; p. 399 *Imperator* ; p. 445 *Conservator*). Pour qui s'intéresse en particulier à la langue du discours de Nazarius et en général à celle des orateurs latins tardo-antiques, ce commentaire minutieux et détaillé constitue une mine d'informations. Monument d'érudition, il satisfera les philologues par les multiples rapprochements de langue ou de style opérés avec des œuvres antérieures, ou encore par les riches réflexions formulées sur le genre encomiastique. Quant aux historiens, ils auront peut-être plus de mal à en tirer profit en raison du caractère sommaire de l'index, conçu autour d'un nombre d'entrées très réduit, et de la minceur relative des 39 pages d'introduction historique comparées aux 377 pages du commentaire linéaire.

Antony HOSTEIN

Jan DEN BOEFT, Jan Willem DRIJVERS, Daniël DEN HENGST & Hans C. TEITLER (Ed.), *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXX*. Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2015. 1 vol., 257 p. Prix : 110 €. ISBN 978-90-04-29995-5.

The penultimate instalment of the commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus follows the well-established mould of the series with detailed line-by-line discussion of philological and historical questions. As usual, the commentary provides a wealth of information and is a good guide to recent scholarship on the various aspects the text touches upon and to the numerous problems posed by the text. Indeed, several conjectures are proposed. The authors should receive praise for their continuing commitment to the project and for offering readers of Ammianus a fixed point of reference to start their own investigations. A commentary is not meant to be read from front to cover and as a format it imposes restrictions on its authors. I felt, for example, that the genre of the commentary is not the most suitable vehicle to assess the meaning projected by entire passages, such as the digression on Roman lawyers (30.4) or the virtues and vices of Valentinian (30.7-9). A commentary also implies making choices about what to comment and how much information to give, and readers are bound to approach Ammianus sometimes with other questions in mind than the commentators. The following list of suggestions is therefore offered with due modesty as notes to an important scholarly undertaking. The discussion of Valens' dedication to trials might have been broadened to include how Ammianus seems to play with the idea of Valens as a *princeps clausus* (p. 63). The evidence for the bar as the principal way of social advancement could have been more extensively discussed (p. 65). The fragment of Hermippus cited p. 71 is edited and commented as FGrHist 1026 F 53 (J. Bollansée). The discussion of the satirical digression on lawyers argues that the four types of lawyers distinguished by Ammianus refer to existing groups (p. 80-82), but the discussion did not allow me to really grasp how the commentators see this. On p. 110 it might have been good to assess what was known about Probus' glorious ancestry, to which Ammianus alludes (30.5.4). The commentators do not seem to be very interested in medical detail (see p. 146 on 30.6.5). The discussion of Valentinian's virtues and vices could have been enhanced by situating it more explicitly, on the one hand, within the context of ancient judgements on the emperor (see, *e.g.*, Hier., Chron. a. 365, which has the same emphasis as Ammianus on *avaritia* and *crudelitas*) and, on the other, in that of late ancient thought about imperial virtues,

which cannot be considered to be a mere continuation of classical ideas (esp. regarding capital punishment). The commentators cite many parallel sources for what Ammianus has to say, but the interdependency of these sources could be taken more into account: e.g. at p. 142 it does not have much sense to quote both Socrates and Sozomen as the latter does not do much more than rewrite the former. Only rarely there is too much information: that the Greek ἀναβλεψς is the equivalent of the Latin *strator*, “groom”, does not add anything to our understanding of Ammianus (p. 138). There is repetition of the material of the burial of Valentinian I (p. 148, 196).

Peter VAN NUFFELEN

Matthias GERTH, *Bildungsvorstellungen im 5. Jahrhundert n. Chr.: Macrobius, Martianus Capella und Sidonius Apollinaris*. Berlin – Boston, De Gruyter, 2013. 1 vol. VIII-269 p. (UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZUR ANTIKEN LITERATUR UND GESCHICHTE, 111). Prix : 119,95 €. ISBN 978-3-11-030197-7.

In this slightly revised version of his doctoral dissertation (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, 2011), Matthias Gerth sets out to analyse Late Antique views on “learning” or “education” – civil or intellectual education, designated more comprehensively by the German term *Bildung*. As such, the study can in a way be considered a supplement to and refinement of the authoritative *Das lateinische Christentum und die antike pagane Bildung* (Tübingen, 2007) by the author’s doctoral supervisor Peter Gemeinhardt. Limiting the historical scope of his analysis to the 5th century AD, the author selects three literary works, viz. Macrobius’ symposiastic dialogue *Saturnalia*, Martianus Capella’s allegorically framed encyclopaedia of the liberal arts *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, and Sidonius Apollinaris’ collection of literary letters. An important common feature of these three works (prominent in the cases of Macrobius and Martianus Capella) is that the authors style themselves as fathers addressing their sons with educational advice. Although Gerth duly motivates his choice not to include technical texts on specialist issues (*Spezialschriften*) nor Augustine’s (allegedly) specifically Christian reflections on *Bildung*, it might have been rewarding to include the other works composed by Macrobius and Sidonius Apollinaris, as well as other authors who wrote on the subject during the 5th century AD. This would have resulted in a more complete outlook on the differences and possible “interactions” between Christian and pagan authors, as well as between “specialist” and more “vulgarizing” writings. In general, one can say that Gerth builds his study on a thorough, carefully contextualized and philologically informed close-reading of his source texts. In the course of the study, he raises and (tentatively) answers interesting questions relating to (1) the philological or textual nature of ancient learning in general, and the importance of etymology within learning (the author should have taken into account Mark Amsler’s *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1989); (2) the presence and relevance of bilingual competence in Late Antiquity and the continuing transfer of “Greek learning” to a Latin context; (3) the backward orientation or *Rückwärtsgewandtheit* (cf. Thorsten Fögen in *Listy filologické* 121 [1998], p. 206) prevailing in the intellectual climate of Late Antiquity, manifesting itself clearly in the