Panegyrische Zeitgeschichte des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts. Ediert, übersetzt und kommentiert von Bruno Bleckmann und Carlo Scardino. Mit einem Beitrag von Johannes Wienand. Paderborn: Brill Schöningh 2023 (Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike C 1–21). L, 444 p. € 129.00/$ 134.00. ISBN: 978-3-506-79045-3.

Most students of ancient history and historiography are likely to have played some version of a rarefied parlour game in which they are invited to imagine, whether in the sands of the Fayyum or on a dusty shelf of an Athonite library, the miraculous rediscovery of the complete text of a hitherto fragmentary or lost history. If Tyche granted the opportunity to reverse the vagaries of textual transmission and retrieve one work from wreckage or oblivion, which would you pick? While this is doubtless a game scholars of any period can play, those specialising in Late Antiquity may feel they have more at stake, considering the significance of textual fragments in reconstructing even basic outlines of events, especially in darker decades of the third and fifth centuries, and given the development of a strand of scholarship devoted to editing, translating and studying late Roman fragmentary histories, independent of wider-ranging corpora.[1] Beyond personal caprice, answers to this question would partly depend on disciplinary priorities. The appeal of certain works primarily lies in factual content, all the more so if it enlightens momentous events: who would not relish the chance to read Olympiodoros' full account of 410, regardless of later criticism of his method and artistry? Literary-historiographic considerations, in contrast, could yield other choices: a complete Dexippos or Priskos, besides intrinsic value, might also illuminate the evolution and intertextuality of subsequent historical writing. In any case, the competition would naturally favour a handful of higher-profile histories in Greek that survive as collections of substantial fragments, princi-

1 By revitalising and refocusing older philological scholarship, R. C. Blockley: The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire. 2 vols. Liverpool 1981–1983 (Arca 6/10), offered a new point of departure, at least in anglophone publishing, rather than a future standard in terms of classifying fragments or editorial technique (see, e.g., the superior edition of P. Carolla [ed.]: Priscus Panita, Excerpta et fragmenta. Berlin/New York 2008 [Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana 2000]). Four decades on, L. Van Hoof/P. Van Nuffelen (eds.): The Fragmentary Latin Histories of Late Antiquity (AD 300–620). Edition, Translation and Commentary. Cambridge 2020, manifests both greater methodological rigor and the transformed academic landscape of Late Antiquity.

pally via extant volumes of Constantine VII's *Excerpta*. Within each sample, however proportionally small or potentially unrepresentative, we can at least glimpse something of the extent, character and importance of what might have been.[2]

The book under review assembles a selection of fragmentary historical works that are unlikely to be anyone's singular choice for redemption. Most survive as much sparser textual debris. More than half are known only through testimonia, without a single word of the text, and are thus strictly 'lost'. Yet, a more varied and tantalising assortment of historiographic production in Late Antiquity would be hard to imagine, and this fascinating and well-designed contribution should pique the interest of all those engaged with late Roman history and historical literature. The volume is the latest addition to "Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike" (KFHist), the eleventh since its inaugural publication in 2015.[3] A twelfth, devoted to selected Latin secular historiography, appeared simultaneously.[4] This already well-established series, overseen by Bruno Bleckmann and Markus Stein, and based at the Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, thus seems to be well on its way to implementing an ambitious publishing schedule embracing nearly 90 Christian and pagan authors and anonymous works from the third to sixth centuries, classified in nine modules (A–I) according to period, genre and/or language. Each volume comprises a re-edited text(s), with facing German translation, and philological-historical commentary. If ostensibly Jacoby-esque in conception, KFHist differs in several important respects. By combining "minor" and "fragmentary" works, in both Greek and Latin, the series obviates some artificial boundaries erected by conventional generic

2 In this context, Pia Carolla's new edition of *Excerpta de legationibus Romanorum*, integrating a previously overlooked branch of the *stemma codicum*, will have philological implications for the study of Greek fragmentary historiography: P. Carolla (ed.): Excerpta historica quae Constantini VII Porphyrogeniti dicuntur. Vol. 1: De legationibus Romanorum ad gentes. Berlin forthcoming (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana).

3 See the KFHist project website at https://kfhist.awk.nrw.de/. See a full list of published volumes at https://brill.com/display/serial/KHS.

4 B. Bleckmann/B. Court/A. Knöpges (eds.): Profane Zeitgeschichtsschreibung des ausgehenden 4. und frühen 5. Jahrhunderts. Ediert, übersetzt und kommentiert. Paderborn 2023 (Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike D 1–5). Reviewed by M. Festy in: Plekos 26, 2024, pp. 493–498 (URL: https://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2024/r-profane_zeitgeschichtsschreibung.pdf).

and/or linguistic categorisations. The decision to include verse as well as prose compositions is unorthodox but, arguably, may accord with contemporary notions of writing and reading history.[5] Also in contrast to comparable projects, KFHist is not bound by Jacoby's self-denying ordinance to include only fragments explicitly attributed to nominally ascribed or otherwise attested works, but, under certain circumstances, admits anonymous "rekonstruierte bzw. durch quellenkritische Operationen ermittelte Historiker" (p. 12). In addition, owing to interdisciplinary collaborations, the commentaries, even on small textual specimens, can offer a finer balance of historical and philological insight. While the original publisher Schöningh Verlag has since become an imprint of Brill, the uniform format persists, with a choice of finely produced hardback or e-book.

This volume groups 21 works (KFHist C 1–21), one "minor", the others fragmentary/lost, by far the largest assemblage in the series so far.[6] The texts are edited by Carlo Scardino, translations and, typically, introductions are by Bleckmann, and the commentaries are a joint endeavour. The exception is C 1, Praxagoras, where Johannes Wienand is responsible for the introduction, translation and historical commentary. The foreword recognises that publication coincides with important activity in this field, noting that the project benefited from recent editions of several of these works, sometimes accompanied by commentaries and/or studies. Specific debts are acknowledged to relevant entries in Brill's New Jacoby (BNJ and BNJ^2), in some cases newly published, though KFHist often supersedes that project in editorial acumen and detailed commentary. Credited also is the more expansive inventory of late antique historical writing in Clavis Historicorum Antiquitatis Posterioris (CHAP) (2020).[7] Paweł Janiszewski's monograph on third-

5 In this volume, e.g. Sokrates (hist. eccl. 6.6.36 = KFHist C 16, test. 1) advises readers of a church history who desire a more detailed account (φίλον ἀκριβῶς μαθεῖν) of Gainas' revolt (399–400) to read Eusebios Scholastikos' four-book hexametric poem. Van Hoof/Van Nuffelen (note 1), p. 3 expressly omit verse compositions on grounds of genre.

6 The closest parallel among prior volumes is B. Bleckmann/J. Groß (eds.): Historiker der Reichskrise des 3. Jahrhunderts I. Ediert, übersetzt und kommentiert. Paderborn 2016 (Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike A 1–4/6–8). Reviewed by P. Rance in: BMCR 2017.08.47 (URL: https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2017/2017.08.47/).

7 P. Van Nuffelen/L. Van Hoof (eds.): Clavis Historicorum Antiquitatis Posterioris. An Inventory of Late Antique Historiography (A. D. 300–800). Turnhout 2020

and fourth-century lost and fragmentary Greek secular historiography (2006) is a recurring point of reference, though a long-awaited second volume (2023) on Latin works had not yet appeared.[8]

A general introduction (pp. 1–12) explains the concept and selective criteria of KFHist module C: "panegyrische Zeitgeschichte" or "panegyrical contemporary history". Included are fourth- and fifth-century authors who wrote narrative accounts of recent or current events, either with a primary focus on the deeds of individual emperors or, in the absence of an active imperial protagonist, celebrating military successes of the Roman state, with the common purpose of extolling the incumbent ruler or dynasty. This classification of a *Zwischenform* of encomium and historiography appreciates that, despite ancient theoretical and practical distinctions, compositional and performative boundaries could substantially overlap. Although hardly exclusive to this era, a combination of rulers pursuing prestige and careerist writers seeking preferment fostered a type of 'personenzentrierte Geschichtsschreibung' (p. 1), distinct from 'Biographie', which requires careful evaluation of authorial motives, historical content and rhetorical packaging. If this taxonomy may seem overly capacious, and does in fact group works of very different form and nature, the basic traits of panegyric and history define most specimens, while the framework of the Constantinian and Valentinianic-Theodosian dynasties provides a cohesive historical-literary environment. At least twelve of the 21 works, including the better-attested texts, concern one of two individuals: Constantine or Julian. The latter represents something of a "Sonderfall" (p. 3, n. 3) in attracting such compositions after his death, though nonetheless written on the basis of autopsy and encomiastic in purpose, and variously responding to his extraordinary persona, contentious reign and sudden death, against the backdrop of his disastrous Persian expedition, which possibly inspired more first-hand accounts than any other event in Late Antiquity. These Julian-centred texts include his own 'autobiographical' (or 'autopanegyrical') writings. It is perhaps because of their lim-

(Corpus Christianorum. Claves – Subsidia 5). Online version: https://www.late-antique-historiography.ugent.be/database.

8 P. Janiszewski: The Missing Link. Greek Pagan Historiography in the Second Half of the Third Century and in the Fourth Century AD. Warsaw 2006 (Journal of Juristic Papyrology. Supplements 6); and now Id.: The Missing Link II. The Lost Latin Historiography of the Later Empire (3rd–5th Century). Leuven 2023 (Journal of Juristic Papyrology. Supplements 44).

ited scope and intrinsically 'contemporary' function that works of "panegyrische Zeitgeschichte" often proved ephemeral, surviving only insofar as they were later incorporated into broader historical narratives, largely or wholly divorced from their original purpose. Previously Felix Jacoby categorised eight of the fourth-century authors under the rubric "II.B: Spezialgeschichten, Autobiographien und Memoiren" (FGrHist 219–223, 225–226, 238 = KFHist C 1–2, 6–11), and three others as "III.C: Autoren über einzelne Länder" (FGrHist 738, 749, 780 = KFHist C 4, 13, 20). In addition, KFHist C incorporates fragmentary/lost works (C 5, 12, 14–19, 21) that Jacoby excluded on account of language, genre, methodology and/or date. In contrast, others admitted by Jacoby are rejected on the grounds of doubtful authenticity (p. 4, n. 2).[9]

The constituent authors and texts can be briefly summarised (using nominal spellings preferred in KFHist). The once profuse panegyrical literature devoted to Constantine is here represented by two lost historical works of Praxagoras (C 1, pp. 13–88) and Bemarchios (C 2, pp. 89–97), along with the extant *Origo Constantini* (Anonymus Valesianus pars prior) (C 3, pp. 99–188), which, though its compositional date and transmission remain unclear, evidently incorporates contemporary material. The deeds of Constantine's sons were reportedly treated in two lost works: Eustochios (C 4, pp. 189–193) on Constans (some would emend to Constantine) and, if correctly construed, Proba (C 5, pp. 195–204) on Constantius II. Episodes of Julian's life and reign are narrated in his own *biblidion* (C 6, pp. 205–227) and in writings by Kyllenios (C 7, pp. 229–237), Oreibasios (C 8, pp. 239–261), Kallistion/Kallistos (C 9, pp. 263–272), Magnos of Karrhai (C 10, pp. 273–319), Eutychianos (C 11, pp. 321–337), Philagrios (C12, pp. 339–350) and Seleukos (C 13, pp. 351–363). In this context also are detected fragments of two anonymous historical texts embedded in John of Antioch's *Chronicle*, one concerning Julian (C 14, pp. 365–376), the other Jovian (C 15, pp. 377–392), the latter, in contrast to the rest of the volume, an example of "Invektivgeschichtsschreibung" (p. 11). For the following era, the merest traces of panegyrical-historical production are discerned in reports of mostly verse compositions: two epic poems by Eusebios Scholastikos (C 16, pp. 393–414) and Ammonios (C 17, pp. 415–420) that commemorated the suppression of Gainas' coup in 399–400; the Empress Eudokia's hexametric *Persika* (C 18, pp. 421–426)

9 A few reported specimens from the Tetrarchic period (pp. 4–6) are excluded owing to their uncertain genre or historicity.

concerning brief Roman-Sasanian hostilities in 421–422; two *Isaurika*, one in verse by Christodoros of Koptos (C 19, pp. 427–432) during the reign of Anastasios, another in prose by Pamprepios of Panopolis (C 20, pp. 433–438) presumably under Zeno; and finally, extending into the sixth century, Kolluthos of Lykopolis' epic-panegyric *Persika* (C 21, pp. 439–444) on renewed Roman-Sasanian conflict in 502–506. Bleckmann's preliminary survey (pp. 8–11) of numerous lost historical works composed in verse during the Principate foregrounds presentation of these testimonia and reduces any temptation to assume that they reflect a peculiarly late antique taste. Unremarkably, almost all the testimonia and fragments are transmitted via indirect traditions. The edited texts thus depend on collation of the best modern editions of the source or 'cover text', though some innovation or greater precision is occasionally possible (notably C 10 Magnos). Only for the *Origo Constantini* was it necessary to consult a manuscript witness. The apparatus criticus is selective and sober.

In several cases, questions hang over the nature of a work or the identity of an author. This is especially a problem with texts documented solely in bio-bibliographical entries in the *Suda*, typically using the compiler's (or a prior editor-copyist's) descriptive label rather than an authorial title. Reported or inferred lost writings of Julian Caesar can be variously envisaged as *commentarii*, official bulletins, letters and/or orations, or some generic hybrid. Likewise, the genre of Kyllenios' composition – historiography, oratory or 'pamphleteering' – remains conjectural. Pamprepios' *Isaurika* could be purely ethnographic, thus previously Jacoby (FGrHist 749), and as Bleckmann concedes: "die vielleicht gar keinen zeitgeschichtlichen Bezug hatten [...] ist dementsprechend ein Grenzfall" (pp. 434–435). The subject of Eustochios' work has also been questioned. *Suda* ε 3755 uniquely records Εὐστόχιος· Καππαδόκης, σοφιστής. ἔγραψε τὰ κατὰ Κώνσταντα τὸν βασιλέα [...] Bleckmann/Scardino (p. 38, n. 6, p. 191, p. 192 app. crit.) note Janiszewski's observation that one manuscript of the *Suda*, Laur. Plut. 55.1, alternatively reads Κωνσταντῖνον, prompting his inference that this lost text might have concerned not Constans but his father, arguably a more likely theme or era. Bleckmann adds "Dafür könnte sprechen, dass der aus dem Osten stammende Autor kaum Verbindungen zu Constans gehabt haben kann" (p. 191). Although Bleckmann/Scardino do not endorse Janiszewski's proposal, some qualifying remarks are required. First, owing to the corrupted antigraph and stemmatic position of Laur. Plut. 55.1 (Adler's F), it is exceptionally unlikely that variant

Κωνσταντῖνον represents a superior tradition against all other witnesses.[10] Second, Janiszewski himself saw nothing inherently incongruous in Eustochios writing about/for Constans, whose territory included Greece (337–350), a magnet for eastern sophists.[11] In addition, given that much of the historical tradition concerning Constans is overtly hostile, a positive portrayal of his reign need not be assumed.

Regarding C 9, Bleckmann (pp. 264–265) is rightly cautious about the identification of Kallistos, *protector domesticus* in Julian's retinue in 363 (Sokr. hist. eccl. 3.21.13–15), with Kallistion, *assessor* to the Praetorian Prefect of Oriens in 364 (Lib. epist. 1233), despite coinciding dates and poetic interests.[12] Bleckmann observes (p. 264) that the distinct career paths of *protector* and *assessor* could be grounds for doubt. More fundamentally, however, one might question why Kallistion ever came to be classified as an *assessor*; although this inference, apparently originating in PLRE, is now widely stated as fact in scholarship, it is not at all clear from Libanios' obscurely allusive letter that Kallistion had this title or role.[13] Similarly, in the case of C 13, Bleckmann acknowledges uncertainty as to whether the grammarian Seleukos of Emesa (= PLRE 1, Seleucus 3), of unspecified date, who composed a two-book *Parthika* according to *Suda* σ 201 (= C 13, test. 1), should be identified with the homonymous and well-documented friend of Julian and correspondent of Libanios (= PLRE 1, Seleucus 1), who had promised (ὑπέσχου), at least, to write an account of Julian's expedition: Lib. epist. 1508.6–7 (365) (= C 13, test. 2). In this context, Bleckmann remarks that "Seleukos bei Libanios aus Kilikien und nicht [...] aus Emesa stammt" (p. 353), though this Seleukos' connection to Cilicia seems to be a rather flimsy inferential construct (Lib. epist. 770, 771), which, even if correct, would merely entail his appointment to a pagan priesthood or provincial governorship there in 362, requiring no previous or personal link to the region. Bleckmann (pp.

10 A. Adler (ed.): Suidae Lexicon. Vol. 1. Leipzig 1928, pp. IX, XIII–XIV. Janiszewski (note 8), pp. 380–381 seems not to appreciate the particular difficulties. J. Pàmias: Eustochios (738). In: BNJ², 2018, does not register the variant.

11 Janiszewski (note 8), pp. 381–382. See also remarks in Pàmias (note 10).

12 F. Jacoby: Kallistion (223). In: FGrHist, 1929, identified a single author, thus also Janiszewski (note 8), pp. 390–393; A. Kaldellis: Kallistion (223). In: BNJ, 2009, and now F. Guidetti: Kallistion (223). In: BNJ², 2024. In contrast, PLRE 1, 1971, p. 176 separately lists Callistio and Callistus 1.

13 See now Guidetti (note 12), Commentary.

196–197, 203–204) also notes specific interpretative difficulties in ascribing to Proba (C 5) a lost verse epic on the civil war between Constantius and Magnentius (350–353), presumably panegyrising the victor, with a view to exculpating her husband's role in the usurper's regime. The argument hinges on the first eight lines of Proba's *Cento Vergilianus de laudibus Christi*, where she vaguely alludes to her prior writings on savage strife between kings. These remarks are ostensibly explained by a subscription appended to the *Cento* uniquely in the (recently rediscovered) eleventh-century codex Patavinus (olim Padolironensis) 527, f. 109v, which states that Proba wrote this Christian work after composing a historical epic: *cum Constanti{n}i imperatoris bellum adversus Magnentium conscripsisset* (= C 5, fr. 2).[14] While this reconstruction represents majority opinion, there is some dissent, most recently (uncited) Sigrid Schottenius Cullhed, who rejects a "biographical reading" of Proba's initial lines and dismisses the subscription as "conjecture of a medieval scribe". This view has received some endorsement.[15] Even if it amounts to little more than alternative conjecture, counterarguments may be warranted.

Two larger sections devoted to Praxagoras (C 1) and the *Origo Constantini* (C 3), together comprising around two-fifths of the volume, are substantial studies in their own right. Wienand provides an exhaustive and bibliographically rich introduction to Praxagoras and his writings (pp. 15–49), which should become a primary point of reference. His commentary locates Praxagoras as a witness to a rapidly changing world and elucidates the contexts

14 KFHist C 5, fr. 2 (p. 200) misplaces the subscription at f. 105v, which is the end of the preceding text. Until recently, the basis of all studies was a transcription by B. de Montfaucon: Diarium Italicum. Paris 1702, p. 36, who inspected the codex in the Abbey of S. Benedetto in Polirone, near Mantua. Thereafter this codex went astray for more than three centuries and was only lately recognised as Padua, Biblioteca del Seminario vescovile, 527: see A. Fassina/C. M. Lucarini (eds.): Faltonia Betitia Proba, Cento Vergilianus. Berlin/Boston 2015 (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana 2017), pp. VII–VIII, XLVII–XLVIII (Pd). While Bleckmann/Scardino cite the current classmark at p. 200, at p. 196 the codex is described as "von Modena", a residue of older scholarship that referenced a "Mutinensis", though the manuscript appears never to have been in or connected with that city.

15 S. Schottenius Cullhed: Proba the Prophet. The Christian Virgilian Cento of Faltonia Betitia Proba. Leiden/Boston 2015 (Mnemosyne. Supplements 378), pp. 114–117, quoting p. 117, affirmed in Van Nuffelen/Van Hoof (note 7), s.v. Proba, "This is indeed likely"; again Van Hoof/Van Nuffelen (note 1), p. 3, n. 12, "in fact, most likely spurious".

and implications of this elite pagan (if very young) author's encomiastic portrayal of Constantine. Notable is Wienand's sensitivity to reflections of Constantinian messaging, especially shifting modes of legitimation (dynastic, collegial, military, unificatory, restorative), while tracing the incorporation of narrative elements from a broader repertoire of Constantine's '*gesta*'. Integrated treatment of all three of Praxagoras' lost works illuminates his sociocultural milieu and plausibly aligns his literary objectives with the efforts of the 'old' Greek aristocracy to respond to – and come to terms with – Constantine's regime, after he became master of Greece from 316/317, as well as the subsequent emergence of a new imperial centre at Constantinople. Some might question the editorial classification of source material: while FGrHist/BNJ 219 treat Photios' summary (Bibliotheca 62: 20b 29–21b 18) as a testimonium, KFHist classes the whole text as a fragment (C 1, fr. 1) and its concluding clauses (fr. 1.9–11) as simultaneously a testimonium (p. 50). In either case, Photios' review of Praxagoras' work is not in any sense an "Exzerpt" (p. 36 et passim). In addition, as the vocabulary and style of test. 1/fr. 1 are evidently those of Photios, notwithstanding an alleged syntactical echo of Praxagoras' wording at fr. 1.8 (p. 82), consultation of Photios' other writings, especially his *Lexicon*, might have furnished insights into his lexical usage: e.g. discussion of καλοκἀγαθία as an imperial virtue (pp. 82–83); cf. Photios, Lex. κ 126 (Theodoridis II 354), which draws from a prior lexicographical tradition the rather prosaic gloss ἀγαθότης.

The introduction to the *Origo Constantini* covers, succinctly and sensibly, historical and generic categorisation, date and textual evolution, scribal orthography, and principles of constituting the text, with an especially lucid exposition of the particular issue of interpolations from Oros. 7.28, as well as possible redactional omissions/lacunae/deletions in the received text. The edition and translation are well presented and the commentary insightful; one can envisage their utility in teaching (e.g. historiographische Lektüre). Although the *Origo Constantini* has been edited, analysed and commented upon often, the exposition is thorough and not without innovation. Scardino re-edits the text on the basis of the *codex unicus* (Berlin Ms. Phill. 1885) and judicious evaluation of the numerous emendations and conjectures of well over a dozen editors/commentators going back to Henri Valois' *editio princeps* (1636). Two alternative readings are proposed, plausibly in both cases: § 23 *sensu* Scardino: *sensus* B: *consensu* Mommsen et edd.: *exercitus* Valesius; § 34 *barbarico* B et edd.: corr. *barbarici* Scardino ex Oros. 7.28.29 – though anticipated

in e.g. Gardthausen (1875) p. 288.24 app. crit.; whence, presumably, Rolfe (1939) p. 528. Bleckmann's commentary offers some new interpretations, notably of military-geographical details: e.g. § 7 *Flaminiam*, understood as the late Roman *provincia* rather than the *via* (pp. 148–149); § 17 on whether *apud Philippos* should mean Philippi or Philippopolis, and thence the location of *campus Ardiensis* (pp. 162–163). Some potentially relevant bibliography appeared too late to be included.[16]

A trio of authors with more substantial remains forms the centrepiece of the volume: Julian, Oreibasios and Magnos. Investigation of evidence for Julian's *biblidion* (C 6) enhances the possibility that his historical reportage of recent events – distinct from orations and documentary bulletins – extended beyond a single monographic treatment of the battle of Argentoratum/Strasbourg in 357. Similarly written from the viewpoint of the emperor's inner circle, Oreibasios (C 8), as Julian's friend and personal physician, belongs to a tradition of imperial doctor-historians/memoirists. The loss of his account of the Persian expedition is especially regrettable. Bleckmann's introduction incorporates a broader discussion of the problems of differentiating a textual connection from mere circumstantial concurrence among separate witnesses to events, showing how hard it is to exclude a common source for Ammianus and Eunapius/Zosimos, especially when Ammianus combines *visa* and *lecta* (22.8.1). Given Eunapios' explicit use of Oreibasios, Ammianus' knowledge of this work is at least a plausible hypothesis, though many basic questions linger about Oreibasios' text, including its format, purpose, scope, milieu, circulation and reception, and what modern terminology (memoir, history, memoranda, diary) might best be applied. The cited testimonia include a concise report in Philostorgios 7.15.5 (= C 8, test. 9) that Oreibasios was with Julian (αὐτῷ συνῆν) in his final hours, and by implication tended to his wound, within a longer, uncited account of the emperor's death. John Lydus also indicates that Oreibasios treated Julian's wounded abdomen on his deathbed (mens. 4.118 = C 8, test. 10).[17] Accepting that, overall, the sources provide differing and incompatible accounts of Julian's injury, one might wonder whether more of Philostorgios 7.15 should have been included in this testimonium, beyond the mere mention of Oreibasios, or even

16 E.g. A. Omissi: Hamstrung Horses: Dating Constantine's Departure from the Court of Galerius. In: Journal of Late Antiquity 16, 2023, pp. 4–26.

17 Amm. 25.3.6–23 alludes to anonymous "medical treatment" (*medicinae ministeriis*). Eun. vit. soph. 498–499 is curiously silent.

categorised as a putative 'fragment', especially as Philostorgios uniquely records seemingly technical details about the wound, using medical vocabulary: 7.15.2: πλήττει μὲν αὐτὸν ἐν ἰσχύϊ κατὰ τὸ περιτόναιον, ἅμα δὲ τῇ αἰχμῇ ἐξελκομένῃ καὶ κόπρος τις ἐπηκολούθησε συνεπισπωμένη τῷ αἵματι, "[the spear] struck him with force in the *peritoneum*, and when the blade was drawn out, an outflow of some faeces followed along with the blood"; this would occur with such a perforation. In any case, the renown of this medical writer and his imperial patient has prompted modern '*medici*' to offer a surgical diagnosis of the procedures Oreibasios employed on Julian's abdominal wound, itself perhaps another (this time medico-historical) parlour game.[18]

In some respects, Magnos (C 10) is the highlight of this section, perhaps not surprisingly, given Bleckmann's prior comprehensive study.[19] The introduction offers an astute assessment of the frequently discussed material embedded in Malalas' *Chronographia* 13: what can be inferred from its character, the difficulties of delimiting cited excerpts or recognising unsignalled excerpts, and the enduring debate about possible textual interaction with Ammianus and/or Eunapios/Zosimos, noting uncertainties inherent in all reconstructions. Bleckmann wisely prefers not to take a firm position on the disputed identification of the author Magnos of Karrhai and a *tribunus* named Magnos who distinguished himself at the siege of Maiozamalcha according to several external sources (Amm. 24.4.23–24; 25.8.18; Zos. 3.22.4; Suda α 2094). All previous editions consist of a single large fragment comprising Ioh. Mal. 13.21–23 (C 10, fr. 1), framed at either end by explicit citations of Magnos that appear to mark the termini of a modified extract. In addition, Bleckmann/Scardino include most of Ioh. Mal. 13.27 (C 10, fr. **2), on the grounds that, although Malalas here does not specify a source, he probably drew other parts of his narrative of Julian's expedition from Magnos, and 13.27 in particular shares traits with the preceding extract, notably precise geographical and prosopographical information. As the authors acknowl-

18 J. Lascaratos/D. Voros: Fatal Wounding of the Byzantine Emperor Julian the Apostate (361–363 A. D.): Approach to the Contribution of Ancient Surgery. In: World Journal of Surgery 24, 2000, pp. 615–619; with N. Papavramidou/H. Christopoulou-Aletra: The Ancient Technique of "Gastrorraphy". In: Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery 13, 2009, pp. 1345–1350.

19 B. Bleckmann: Magnus von Karrhai: Zur Bedeutung der Malalas-Chronik für die Rekonstruktion der Zeitgeschichte Julians. In: L. Carrara/M. Meier/C. Radtki-Jansen (eds.): Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas. Quellenfragen. Stuttgart 2017 (Malalas-Studien 2), pp. 99–133.

edge, the antecedents of this more impressionistic approach to Malalas' use of Magnos – and his compositional method in general – can be variously traced back to the late nineteenth century (sometimes with unfortunate results), but no editor has previously sought to implement the implications and justify those choices on internal grounds, rather than by drawing parallels or inferring connections with other extant accounts of the Persian campaign (detailed discussion at pp. 277–281).

Scardino's re-edition of Magnos benefits, albeit slightly, from enhanced understanding of the textual tradition of Malalas' *Chronographia* since Hans Thurn's edition (2000).[20] In fr. 1, multispectral imaging of the palimpsested "Fragmentum Tusculanum" (Tusc.), as part of the Tübingen-based "Projekt Malalas", permits occasional refinements to or confirmation of previously uncertain readings (see apparatus criticus), but nothing that alters the text or meaning.[21] In fr. **2, through closer attentiveness to the indirect tradition of Malalas' text via the *Chronicon Paschale*, Scardino registers several incorrect/rejected variants that Thurn apparently chose to omit from his apparatus, again without consequence for the text.[22] Here a potential challenge is that the *Chronicon Paschale* appears to be based on the first redaction of Malalas' work, whereas the direct witnesses (Oxon. Barocc. 182 and Tusc.) transmit the second redaction. The commentary, both historical and philological, is well-balanced, informative and perceptive. Notable is the classification of C 10, test. **2c (pp. 384–385) = *Suda* α 2094, a much-discussed historical fragment concerning the *tribunus* Magnos at the siege of Maiozamalcha, which several previous studies assigned to Eunapios, but which Roger

20 J. Thurn (ed.): Ioannis Malalae Chronographia. Berlin/New York 2000 (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis 35).

21 Separate from this technological advance, the only substantial difference is Scardino's rejection of a lacuna that Thurn posited in C 10, fr. 1.8: καὶ ἐπικρατὴς γενόμενος (p. 288.40, with commentary at p. 309) = Ioh. Mal. 13.21 (Thurn p. 254.80–81): καὶ *** ἐπικρατὴς γενόμενος (καὶ O : καὶ ***κη Tusc.). In support of Scardino's view, one could also adduce identical wording at Ioh. Mal. 13.23 (Thurn p. 256.24): καὶ ἐπικρατὴς γενόμενος. See also R. Penella: Magnus Carrhaeus (225). In: BNJ, 2012, Commentary to fr. 1.8.

22 An exception occurs in C 10, fr. 2.7 (p. 294.36, with commentary at p. 319) = Ioh. Mal. 13.27 (Thurn p. 259.13): deletion of a καὶ that Thurn, certainly in error, placed at the end of a restoration from Chr. pasch. 554.16: <προσέζευξεν [...] Ἀμίδης>.

Blockley rejected from his conspectus of Eunapian fragments.[23] Bleckmann more sensitively conveys the interpretative difficulties: "Aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach hat die Suda (bzw. der Redakteur der konstantinischen Exzerpte) [...] Eunap falsch zitiert [...] durch unzulässige Kürzung und Auslassungen" (p. 297), an assessment that rightly relies more on the demonstrable compositional history and sources of the *Suda* than on hypothetical and conflicting inferences about the interrelationship (or not) of Ammianus, Eunapios/Zosimos and/or Magnos.[24] One reservation concerns Julian's reported speech at Circesium just before crossing the border in fr. 1.5 = Ioh. Mal. 13.21 (Thurn p. 253.62–66): Bleckmann infers that "[d]ie von Julian gehaltene Rede wird bei Magnos von Karrhai nur summarisch wiedergegeben" (p. 303). Can we know this? Could not Malalas alternatively have abridged Magnos at this point, reducing a speech-episode to a terse narrative summary, a common procedure for epitomators?

Two other authors merit additional observations. First, regarding the testimonia to Eutychianos, the citation in Ioh. Mal. 23.13 = C 11, test. 1/fr. 1.1 (p. 326) is remarkable for its technical specificity: στρατιώτης ὢν καὶ βικάριος τοῦ ἰδίου ἀριθμοῦ τῶν Πριμοαρμενιακῶν, "soldier and currently *vicarius* of his own unit the *Primoarmeniaci*" (= *legio prima Armeniaca*). The German rendering "Soldat und Vicarius" (p. 327) misses the nuance. Analogous wording occurs in a sixth-century documentary papyrus P. Lond. 5 1724.83 (578–582), witnessed by a στρ(ατιώτης) λεγ[(εῶνος)] Σ[υ]ή[ν]η[ς] καὶ ἀπὸ βικαρ(ίων), "soldier of the *legio* of Syene and *ex vicariis*" (i.e. having formerly served as *vicarius*). Both formulae (ὢν καί and καὶ ἀπό) signify that *vicarius* in an army unit was not a permanent rank but a temporary deputising post, in effect 'acting *tribunus*', to which, whenever necessary, one of several senior regimental grades, typi-

23 Blockley (note 1), Vol. 1, p. 156, n. 3, following A. D. E. Cameron: An Alleged Fragment of Eunapius. In: CQ 13, 1963, pp. 232–236, though Cameron's analysis was more sophisticated and arguably warranted categorisation of this fragment as 'dubia' rather than its deletion.

24 Bleckmann (p. 297) cites unpublished T. M. Banchich: The Historical Fragments of Eunapius of Sardis. Diss. Buffalo, NY 1985, pp. 53–54. Thomas Banchich gives a published demonstration of the same analytical principle in: An Identification in the *Suda*: Eunapius on the Huns. In: CPh 83, 1988, p. 53, regarding *Suda* α 1018 (cf. α 1019, 3279). This fragment is also overlooked by Blockley. Similar arguments might apply to *Suda* λ 490 = KFHist C 16, fr. **2, text and translation at pp. 406–407, with commentary at pp. 413–414.

cally *primicerius*, was appointed.[25] Warren Treadgold contends that Eutychianos is a fictitious source that Malalas made up and inserted. Against this opinion, one might reasonably ask whether the accurate hierarchical and regimental nomenclature used by Malalas is something he (or a prior chronicler) would or could have invented.[26] Notable also is that Eutychianos, as *vicarius*/acting *tribunus*, would be comparable in seniority to Magnos, if one prefers to identify the homonymous *tribunus* as the historian. With respect to another proposed testimonium in *Patria Constantinopoleos* 1.58 = C 11, test. 2 (pp. 326–327), although this late tenth-century compilation is notoriously unreliable, it may be tempting to identify Eutychianos πρωτοασηκρήτης, ὁ γραμματικός here with ὁ χρονογράφος [...], στρατιώτης ὢν καὶ βικάριος cited by Malalas, principally on the grounds that both sources refer to a Eutychianos who participated in Julian's Persian expedition (see commentary p. 332). If so, however, it must also be accepted that the *Patria* credits this Eutychianos (καθὼς ἱστοροῦσιν Εὐτυχιανὸς [...]) as a/the source for preceding details on Constantine's twelve noble 'helpers' in the foundation of Constantinople. Accordingly, as this type of unhistorical fabrication would not be incongruous alongside tales of dreams or saintly interventions ascribed to Eutychianos in Ioh. Mal. 13.24 = C 11, fr. 1.2–3 (p. 328), one should perhaps avoid drawing a sharp dividing line when considering whether Eutychianos was a "Zeitzeuge" or "Legendenerzähler" (p. 336).

Second, in the case of Philagrios, a *notarius* in Julian's entourage, Lib. epist. 1434.2 = C 12, test. 1 (p. 344) remarks on the detail and precision of his text: ἅτε τὸν πόλεμον ἐν γράμμασιν ἔχων [...] ἀκούω γάρ σε τὸ ἀεὶ γινόμενον γραφόμενον σκέπτεσθαι χωρίων τε φύσεις καὶ μέτρα πόλεων καὶ ὕψος φρουρίων καὶ ποταμῶν πλάτος καὶ ὅσα δρᾶσαί τε καὶ παθεῖν συνέβη, "as you have the war written down [...] For I have heard that, in writing down what happened in each case, you examine

25 P. Rance: *Campidoctores Vicarii vel Tribuni*: The Senior Regimental Officers of the Late Roman Army and the Rise of the *Campidoctor*. In: A. S. Lewin/P. Pellegrini (eds.): The Late Roman Army in the Near East from Diocletian to the Arab Conquest. Proceedings of a Colloquium held at Potenza, Acerenza and Matera, Italy (May 2005). Oxford 2007 (BAR International Series 1717), pp. 395–409, at pp. 399–401.

26 W. Treadgold: The Early Byzantine Historians. Basingstoke/New York 2007, pp. 247–251, p. 314, n. 11; again Id.: The Byzantine World Histories of John Malalas and Eustathius of Epiphania. In: The International History Review 29, 2007, pp. 709–745, at p. 725, pp. 728–729. Treadgold himself elsewhere misconstrues *vicarius* as a permanent regimental rank: Id.: Byzantium and Its Army, 284–1081. Stanford 1995, p. 88, p. 95.

the nature of localities and dimensions of cities and the height of fortresses and width of rivers, and whatever happened to have been done and suffered". In light of Philagrios' position, Bleckmann follows some older studies in inferring a kind of journal: "Zu den Aufgaben, die Philagrios als *notarius* während des Perserfeldzugs Julians wahrzunehmen hatte, gehörte anscheinend, eine Art Kriegstagebuch zu führen" (p. 342).[27] Perhaps, but whether this was an official document, compiled as part of his notarial duties, or a private record (diary, *commentarii*/*hypomnemata*), is not indicated and must remain uncertain. Of relevance here is uncited epist. 1220.8, where Libanius more obliquely alludes to the many participants in Julian's expedition who have written, drafted or planned accounts, potentially ranging across formal histories, private memoirs and official records. They include στρατιῶται δέ τινες [...] ἔδοσαν ἡμερῶν τέ τινων ἀριθμὸν καὶ ὁδοῦ μέτρα καὶ προσηγορίας τόπων, "certain soldiers [...] (who) provide the particular number of days and distances by road and approaches to locations". Although a *notarius* is not strictly a "soldier" (though he likewise performs *militia*), this characterisation is broadly consistent with the description of Philagrios' work in epist. 1434.2. Whether or not Philagrios is meant, Libanios implies that other such accounts of particular detail and specificity existed, and were not necessarily a consequence of the office of *notarius*.

Throughout the book, observed typos and slips are few and mostly minor.[28] Errors are rare and inconsequential.[29] The text and translation elicit a handful of quibbles:

27 See e.g. W. Enßlin: Philagrius (4). In: RE XIX.2, 1938, col. 2106–2107: "Kriegstagebuch" (col. 2106); G. Sabbah: La méthode d'Ammien Marcellin. Recherches sur la construction du discours historique dans les *Res Gestae*. Paris 1978 (Études anciennes): *commentarii* (p. 202).

28 P. 38, n. 6: Κώνσταντῖνον > Κωνσταντῖνον; p. 108: Φιλίππος > Φίλιππος; p. 156: ταῦτον > τοῦτον (Zos. 2.11.1); p. 172: "Rech" > 'Reich'; p. 184: "Konstantinpel" > 'Konstantinopel'; p. 196: "über Constantius" > 'über Magnentius'; p. 231: "fr. 23,7 Blockley" > 'fr. 23,2 Blockley'; p. 329: "Herr" > 'Heer'; p. 353, n. 2: "PRLE" > 'PLRE'. At p. 375: "Zum Terminus 'Küste der Barbaren' s. auch Zos. 3,10,3" – the phrase is not found. Cited items missing from the Bibliography: Green, Proba's Introduction (cited p. 203); Banchich, Historical Fragments of Eunapius (p. 241, n. 5, p. 22, n. 1, p. 259, p. 297); Übersetzung von Thurn-Meier (p. 298, p. 314).

29 P. 307: the verbal root of *exculcator* (> **sculcator*) and *proculcator* is not *collocare*/**culcare* (thus originally C. Du Fresne Du Cange: Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis. Vol. 1. Paris 1678, col. 1062–1063; rev. ed. L. Favre. Vol. 2. Niort 1883–1887, pp. 410c–411a, s.v. *collocare*), but rather *ex*/*pro* + *calco* (> *-culco*): see

C 7, test. 1 (p. 234): the transmitted text reads ἔπαινον νεανικόν τινα καὶ λαμπρὸν, rendered "etwas ungestüme und glänzende Lobrede" (p. 235), in reference to Julian's auto-encomiastic writings. The apparatus, with further discussion in the commentary (p. 236), indicates previous editorial doubts about νεανικόν and records proposed emendations: "ἱστορικόν Blockley: ἀκριβῆ Müller".[30] In fact, Blockley (Eun. fr. 23.2) accepted νεανικόν, which he translated "high-spirited" (p. 35). It was Barthold Niebuhr who posited ἱστορικόν, as reported in Blockley's apparatus. In addition, the commentary can be supported by examples of the same adjectival/adverbial combination in other works, both ancient and canonical (e.g. Demosth. *In Midiam* 131; *In Cononem* 35) and contemporary (Lib. decl. 8.1.5; Greg. Nyss. *Contra Eunomium* 1.83).

C 10, test. 1 (p. 284): Ioh. Mal. 13.1 should read 13.21, likewise the facing translation (p. 285).

C 10, fr. 2.2 (p. 292, line 10): ἀφορίσας συγκλητικὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν πατρίκιον Ἀρίνθαιον translated "er (d. h. Jovian) bestimmte einen Senator, den *patricius* Arinthaios" (p. 293). The commentary clarifies "Wenn Malalas ihn als Senator bezeichnet, ist dies auf jeden Fall irreführend" (p. 316). But Malalas errs only if one insists on translating συγκλητικός narrowly as "senator". This is the case elsewhere, but does not seem necessary or justified when the term can designate even Persians (p. 292, lines 16–17): Σουρραεινᾶ, συγκλητικοῦ καὶ πρεσβευτοῦ Περσῶν, "Surrhaeinas, dem Senator und Abgesandten der Perser" (p. 293). The anomaly is resolved by non-specific "counsellor, adviser" (implicit in fr. 2.2 in possessive αὐτοῦ). Likewise, at C 11, fr. 1 (p. 328, line 8): μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας συγκλήτου translated "mit seinem Senat" (p. 329), where the commentary (p. 334, with variant lemma "mit seinem eigenen Senat") explains "Gemeint sind hier die Würdenträger der unmittelbaren Umgebung Julians [...], nicht aber der Senat". Why then translate "Senat", when σύγκλητος commonly means generic "council, assembly", and here evidently the emperor's *concilium*?

P. Rance: *Sculca*, **sculcator*, *exculcator* and *proculcator*: The Scouts of the Late Roman Army and a Disputed Etymology. In: Latomus 73, 2014, pp. 474–501, esp. pp. 495–501, with bibliography. P. 381: strictly speaking, codex Turonensis 980 is not an "ursprünglich aus Zypern stammende[...] Handschrift"; this tenth-/eleventh-century manuscript was undoubtedly produced in Constantinople and had simply ended up on Cyprus by 1627.

30 As the text edited in FGrHist/BNJ terminates before this clause, the issue does not arise. See most recently T. Banchich: Kyllenios (222). In: BNJ², 2016, T1.

C 14, fr. 1.4, (p. 370, line 15): ὡς ἂν λάθοι translated "damit er verborgen blieb" (p. 371) (repeated as a lemma at p. 375). The optative expresses purpose or potential rather than outcome, thus preferably "[...] verborgen bliebe".

C 16, test. 2 (p. 398): ἔγωγε ἐντυχὼν ἥσθην translated "habe ich vorgefunden und mich darüber gefreut" (p. 399). In this (late Byzantine) marginal annotation, ἐντυγχάνω means simply "read" rather than alternative "meet with, chance upon, encounter", thus "habe ich gelesen". The usage is formulaic in contemporary reader-notices (e.g. Vat. Pal. gr. 278, f. 174v: ἐνέτυχον δὲ αὐτὸς τοῦτο [scil. βιβλίον]; Marc. gr. Z. 398, f. 206v: ἐντυχῶν [sic] δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ τοιοῦτον [βιβλίον]). See also in this volume pp. 214–215: C 6, test. 2, line 5 (= Zos. 3.2.4): ἐντυγχάνοντι, "liest"; pp. 398–399: C 16, test. 1, line 2 (= Sokr. hist. eccl. 6.6.36): ἐντυγχανέτω, "soll er [...] lesen". In addition, the philological commentary to this reader's note in tenth-century Laur. Plut. 70.7, f. 352r, is concerned about an apparent lack of grammatical sense and posits "dass es sich bei der Randnotiz nicht um das Original, sondern um eine Abschrift handelt" (p. 408). Unless I misunderstand, this proposition is clearly wrong. Inspection of the folio shows that the marginal text, written in different ink by a much later cursive hand, is evidently an original annotation.[31] Correspondingly, the proposed emendations (p. 398: test. 2, app. crit. and p. 408), though ingenious, editorially treat this note according to rules one would apply to a formal composition. More importantly, a short study by Günther Hansen (cited p. 398) identifies the annotator as one Germanos, a professed avid reader, who was also responsible for two other such annotations in the same codex (ff. 209r, 391v), and whose script seemingly dates to the fourteenth/fifteenth century. Surely the most remarkable point here is that a copy of Eusebios Scholastikos' now-lost *Gainias* could still be found at that date, even if its stated location, ἐν τῇ μονῇ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων ἐν τῷ καλῇ στενῶ, remains a mystery.[32]

This is a most rewarding volume to read. Bleckmann and Scardino, with Wienand, have ably presented and explained little-known and poorly under-

31 See https://tecabml.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/plutei/id/1360526.

32 G. C. Hansen: Germanos, der findige Leser. In: ByzZ 84/85, 1991/1992, pp. 24–25. The annotation at f. 391v, naming Germanos, was previously published in A. M. Bandini: Catalogus codicum graecorum bibliothecae Laurentianae. Vol. 2. Florence 1768, col. 668.

stood texts, which hint at the variety and vitality of historical writing in the fourth and fifth centuries.

Philip Rance, Freie Universität Berlin
Friedrich-Meinecke-Institut
Gastwissenschaftler
rance@zedat.fu-berlin.de/philip.r.rance@gmail.com

www.plekos.de

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Philip Rance: Rezension zu: Panegyrische Zeitgeschichte des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts. Ediert, übersetzt und kommentiert von Bruno Bleckmann und Carlo Scardino. Mit einem Beitrag von Johannes Wienand. Paderborn: Brill Schöningh 2023 (Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike C 1–21). In: Plekos 27, 2025, S. 73–90 (URL: https://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2025/r-panegyrische_zeitgeschichte.pdf).
