Comment rendre compte d’une telle diversité de 'dons' et de situations? Mis à part l’exposé de quelques généralités sur l’organisation politique du monde hellénistique, ou bien une réflexion philosophico-sociologique sur les relations entre dominant et dominé, le travail le plus utile pour l'historien ne consisterait-il pas à choisir puis à étudier en détail quelques cas représentatifs des diverses situations dans lesquelles se manifestaient l’évergétisme et (ou) les exigences des souverains? A cet égard, les grands chapitres découpsés par B. (cf. supra) me semblent constituer des cadres un peu trop vastes pour des analyses de ce genre. D’un côté, B. est conduit à insérer l’examen des dons ou des exigences des souverains dans de longs résumés d’histoire politique (ainsi pp. 57–63, lorsqu’il rappelle les étapes de l’expédition d’Alexandre-le-Grand en Asie et les consécration faites alors par le conquérant à diverses divinités, ou bien pp. 105–114, lorsqu’il évoque les heurs et malheurs des Athéniens livrés au bon plaisir de Démétrios Poliorcète). D’un autre côté, il se voit obligé de traiter d’une seule et même manifestation d’évergétisme dans des chapitres différents, d’où des répétitions (par exemple, les dons faits par les souverains aux Rhodiens après le séisme de 227 font l’objet de plusieurs développements, qui se recoupent en partie, pp. 124–5, 179–180, 189). En revanche, l’exposé de B. devient vivant, sinon toujours très neuf, lorsqu’il commente de près tel ou tel texte illustrant les relations entre un roi et ses oblégés, ainsi pp. 127–129 (Eumène II, Séleucos IV et Ptolémée V en compétition pour obtenir ou renforcer l’entente avec la Confédération achaïenne en 185 a. C., d’après Polybe XXII, 7–9) ou pp. 137–138 (Eumène II et la cité d’Apollonia du Rhénydacos peu après 188, d’après le décret publié et commenté par M. Holleaux, Etudes II, 73–125). C’est pourquoi un choix de commentaires approfondis, portant sur un petit nombre d’exemples bien documentés illustrant eux-mêmes divers modes de relations entre les souverains et les cités hellénistiques, aurait été peut-être plus instructif, à notre avis, que la synthèse qui nous est proposée dans ce volume, dont la qualité est cependant indiscutable.

Philippe Gauthier


Paschoud has produced a revised version of the first volume of the Budé edition of Zosimus almost thirty years on from its original appearance, and eleven years after Tome III, 2e partie (covering Book VI, with an Index) was published. The young author (P) of 'Roma aeterna. Études sur le patriotisme dans l’Occident latine à l’époque des grandes invasions', published in 1967, began work the same year on Zosimus (Z). The task was to occupy him for over two decades: vol. I, covering Books 1–2, appeared in 1971; there followed II 1, Book 3, and II 2, Book 4, in 1979; III 1, Book 5, with an 'appendice des textes parallèles', in 1986.
and III 2, Book 6, with further appendices and index to the whole work, in 1989. Meanwhile P. had been recruited by Johannes Straub into the Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium: he contributed numerous papers to its proceedings; after the last of the old Colloquia (1989) took a leading role, with G. Bonamente and others, in reviving the enterprise (himself editing volumes II and VII of the *nova series*, ‘Colloquium Genevense’ MCMXCI and MCMXCVIII); and in 1996 produced the Budé *Aurelian and Tacitus*, a landmark in HA studies.

The study of late antiquity has been placed on an entirely new footing in the past four decades. It would be invidious to offer a league table of the major contributions, but P.’s own *œuvre* would certainly be placed very high in any ranking. His ‘liste des ouvrages’ in the present volume registers nearly thirty items of his own published between 1967 and 1997, but this does not include anything like his total production, most of it, though by no means all, on late antiquity. In this field a seminal role was of course played by the late André Chastagnol, a founding member of the Bonner Colloquia. It was fortunate that Budé’s *commission technique* entrusted Chastagnol for each volume of Z, and for the *HA Aur. and Tac.*, ‘d’en faire la révision et d’en surveiller la correction’ in collaboration with the editor. After Chastagnol’s death, this task was taken over for the present volume by a younger colleague, Bruno Bleckmann, who likewise ‘a contrôlé la partie historique’ of P.’s latest Budé commentary on the *HA*, the vi-tae from Probus to Carinus (2001). Bleckmann’s own researches have proved a major inspiration to students of the 3rd and 4th centuries A.D., not least to P. himself, as the work under review repeatedly makes clear.

One may comment first on formal differences from the edition of 1971, helpfully summarised by P. here, pp. CVII–CX. Much of the Introduction is little changed, with some notable exceptions, especially on sources (cf. below). It now occupies just over 100 pages compared with 87; to be sure, the font used in the new edition is slightly larger. The bibliography lists twice as many items as before, and a great many further works are cited in the notes. Users of the original vol. I will register with relief that the Budé system of annotation, with some notes at the foot of the translation, in many cases incomplete, others entirely at the end, e.g. ‘(Voir la fin de cette note p. 131)’, has been superseded (as already in later volumes of this edition). The Greek text still has the apparatus beneath each page, and here and there a few brief notes under the translation discuss textual problems; but the historical notes are all placed at the end (129–283, 20); as in 1971, there are 103 of them on Book 1, 70 on Book 2. Some are short – indeed in a few cases very short (e.g. 1, n. 5: ‘Il s’agit de Persée, roi de Macédoine de 179 à 168’) – but many are in effect densely packed articles, often appreciably longer than in the first edition. III 1 and 2 very helpfully included appendices with text and translation of relevant fragments of Eunapius, Olympiodorus and Johannes Antiochenus and extracts from Sozomenus and Philostorgius. I 2 does the same for Eunapius frags. 1–7a and 89 (Mueller). III 2 had a further appendix on ‘travaux récents concernant Zosime (1970–1987)’, but not the «exposé liminaire sur le progrès des études concernant Zosime» promised in the ‘Avant-propos’ to III 1, which was deferred to I 2, where it is kept fairly brief.

The Introduction begins as before with the notice on Z. by Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 98), in the text and translation by R. Henry (Budé 1960). Photius declared that Z., rather than
writing history himself, had simply transcribed Eunapius, the only differences being Z.'s greater concision and restraint towards Stilicho. Photius further noted that there were two editions of Eunapius' history and conjectured that Z. had also produced two – although he had not seen a first edition –, since the one he had before him was called 'New History'. P. discusses Z.'s rank (comes and ex-advocatus fisci), known only, as to Photius, from the single MS; date, opting for the first third of the 6th century, under Justin I (not least because of 2, 38, 4 on the chrysarzgyron, abolished by Anastasius); and possible identity with Zosimus of Gaza and (or) of Ascalon (cf. PLRE II Zosimus 2, 4 and 6). Like Mendelsohn and others, P. has no doubt that Photius was mistaken about 'New History' meaning 'new edition'; it probably meant «Histoire d’un nouveau genre», viz. it was an «allusion à la totalité païenne militante» of Z.'s work. Z. begins with appeal to Polybius, who set out to describe the extraordinarily rapid rise of Rome: he himself will show how the empire «s’est non moins rapidement défait». At this point comes P.'s first important revision. He is now (as already in III 2, p. 21) convinced by A. Baldini, Le due edizioni della Storia di Eunapi et le fonti della Storia nuova di Zosimo, ASFLM 19, 1986, 45–109, at 85–86, that Z., as for the whole of his work up to 4, 25 (aside from occasional comments), was reproducing Eunapius and that the latter, not Z., was the «Polybe de la décadence». P. himself differs from Baldini in identifying the rapid decline that paralleled Polybius' 53 years of rise as A.D. 363–410 rather than 326–378 (cf. p. XXII and n. 85 on i, 57, 1, pp. 173f). Z. clearly intended to go beyond 410 (at least until the death of Zeno in 491) and book 6 was unrevised; he probably died while midway through his projected work. All this is clearly set out by P. In the next section, on general characteristics of Z.'s work, P. now believes that the scale of Z.'s treatment was entirely dependent on that in Eunapius – specifically, on the first edition for the years up to A.D. 354. The most recent debates about the relationship between the two editions of Eunapius, the date at which the first was published and the relationship between the accounts in Ammianus and in Eunapius (and Libanius) are discussed only briefly, likewise new work on Z.'s use of Olympiodorus after 5, 25, when Eunapius was no longer available, until the end, in each case with reference to the appendix in III 2. P. summarises his present view on p. LXIX: Z followed two sources only, Eunapius from 1, 1–5, 25, Olympiodorus from 5, 26 to the end. On all this one will now need to consult A. Baldini, Storie perdute (III secolo d.C.) (Bologna 2000): not an easy read for the uninitiated.

Where the new introduction further differs from that in I 2 concerns Eunapius' source. In I 1 p. LV, P. summarised the theory of W. Hartke (Geschichte und Politik im spätonischen Rom. Untersuchungen über die Scriptores historiae Augustae, 1940, esp. 74ff and Römische Kinderkaiser, 1951, esp. 129ff) that Eunapius had used the lost Annales of Nicomachus Flavianus: Hartke argued that this work had covered the Constantinian dynasty from the death of its alleged founder Claudius II until that of the usurper Procopius, and that it was used by Ammianus, Eunapius and the authors of the Epitome de Caesaribus and Historia Augusta. This would explain much in Eunapius and in Zosimus: the western colouring and their senatorial and Rome-centred political and religious ideology. P. indicated a cautious inclination towards this viewpoint in 1971; and contributed a valuable additional piece of support in his Cinq études sur Zosime (1975) 79ff (on the play of words in Z 4, 16, 1). He is now a passionate proponent and a good deal more space is devoted to Flavianus, both in Introduction and notes. The reasons are straightforward (p. LXII): J. Schlumberger’s study, Die Epitome de Caesaribus (München 1974), strengthened Hartke’s theory; P. himself has been much engaged with the Historia Augusta; and, perhaps most important, much new light was shed on the ‘agan’ historiographical tradition by B. Bleckmann’s dissertation, Die Reichskrise der III. Jahrhunderts in der späantik und byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung. Untersuchungen zu den nachdionischen Quellen der Chronik des Johannes Zonaras (München 1992). Bleckmann’s work (heralded by his article on Zonaras and a pagan source for Constantine, Historia 40, 1991, 24–53) was greeted with enthusiasm by P. in a detailed discussion, AnTard 2, 1994, 71–82. Plenty of sceptics remain about the nature and influence of Flavianus’ history. This is not the place to launch another discussion about ‘storie perdute’. Instead one may refer to P.’s own empassioned reply to Anglo-Saxon critics (especially T. D. Barnes, R. W. Burgess and Alan...
Cameron, who dismiss the influence of the lost *Annales* either without arguments or with minimal and selective citation: see P.’s Budé Histoire Auguste Tome V. 2, Vies de Probus ... et Carin (2001) XIIIff. It may be noted here that not all ‘Anglo-Saxon’ students of the period are sceptics: cf. the reviewer’s chapter, ‘The Historia Augusta and Pagan Historiography’ (delivered in April 1999), in: G. Marasco, ed., Later Greek and Roman Historiography, Fourth to Sixth Centuries, Leiden (‘forthcoming’).

Z.’s book 1, after the neo-Polybian ‘préambule’, 1–4, and the sketch covering the period from Augustus to Severus, 6–8, deals in much more detail with the period from Caracalla or at any rate from Gordian III to Carinus: for the years up to 238 we have Herodian for comparison; for what follows only Zonaras and some very brief and, in the case of the *HA*, very dubious secular writers; and Christian sources. P’s commentary has all the necessary references to parallel passages in Victor, *Epit. de Caes.*, *HA*, Zonaras, etc., and on modern literature has been comprehensively updated. References to many older works are retained, notably to M. Besnier, L’Empire romain de l’avènement des Sévères au Concile de Nicée (1937). For francophone readers this is no doubt sensible; and in any case, CAH XII, only slightly later (1939), has still not been replaced.

Gaps are few. Mention of the excellent study by E. Kettenhofen, Die syrischen Augustae in der hist. Überlieferung (1979) somewhere in nn. 31–35 would have been helpful. The battle of ‘Verona’, at which Decius defeated Philip (n. 48), not in fact named by Z. or by Zonaras, could usefully have been emended in the light of R. Ziegler, in: Roma Renascens. FS I. Opelt (1988) 385ff, who showed convincingly that the place was really Beroia (as in Joh. Ant. FHG IV 597f) – in Macedonia – with interesting implications. But these are minor matters.

P.’s densely packed fifty-two pages covering Z. 1, 11–73, on the years 217–285, make an ideal basis for anyone beginning research on this period or setting out to teach it. They should, it need hardly be added, be consulted in conjunction with P.’s two Budé commentaries covering the last part of the *HA*.

Z.’s account of Diocletian and the first tetrarchy was lost with the fourth quaternion of the sole MS – in fact the lacuna begins at the end of Probus’ reign, 1, 71, 4; 1, 71, 5–73, 3, a sentence on Carus and brief remarks on Carinus and his fall, are supplied from three fragments of Joh. Antioch. A serious loss, for Z. must have given not only a detailed, but a very positive picture of Diocletian: the lacuna was probably, as with the missing folio after 5, 22, «une mutilation volontaire destinée a faire disparaître quelque passage par trop hostile au christianisme», P. comments (p. LXXXIX). As we have it, book 2 begins with an excursus on the Ludi Saeculares, 2, 1–7, and takes up the narrative with the second tetrarchy: 8–39 are devoted to Constantine I, 40–55 to the years 337–354. Z.’s motives for the excursus are discussed pp. XXIXf, his sources on the Games pp. XLVII, where P. now comes out in favour of the details going back to Phlegon of Tralles (whose *Macrobr. also contains the Sibylline oracle given by Z. in 6), as rewritten by Eunapius, himself probably inspired by Flavianus. The very full commentary on these sections (fourteen pages, now conveniently available in continuous form instead of being chopped up between foot notes below the translation and end notes) is basically unchanged but has been updated by citation of half a dozen contributions subsequent to 1971. There has been a flood of literature on Constantine I since the first edition of this work and P. does his
best to take account of it. Much of the commentary on the chapters dealing with Constantine, beginning with n. 13 on 2, 8 (this note dealing in particular with the date of Diocletian’s death, the marital or other status of Helena and the nature of the tetrarchy), has had to be extensively revised, necessarily in succinct – but always enlightening – fashion. It would be superfluous to comment on more than a few examples. Unquestionably the best known and most controversial passage in Z.’s work, as P. comments (p. 234), is 2, 29, the ‘pagan version’ of Constantine’s conversion, on which P. published an article in Historia 1971, reprinted in his Cinq Études (1975). This is a key element in the case for Flavianus – or, if not for Flavianus, for a Latin, senatorial, pagan historical work – being Eunapius’ and hence Z.’s source. P. refrains from entering into controversy on all aspects of Constantine, but has pretty full reference to recent work, from Barnes (1981) to Bleicken (1992) and beyond, including, on Constantine’s ‘refusal to ascend the Capitol’, still hotly debated and on which P. has modified his own view somewhat, his convincing refutation, MusHelv 34, 1997, 9ff, of G. Fowden, JRS 84, 1994, 146ff. All the Constantinian notes are a model of clarity and fairness and should be essential reading.

On an apparently minor point, n. 43, now much longer than in I, P deploys Bleckmann’s convincing explanation, JbAC 38, 1995, 38ff, of 2, 31, 3, the odd story of Constantine’s alleged military debacle against the Taifali; note P’s comment, ‘Bleckmann parle prudemment d’une source sénatoriale païenne de la fin du 4e siècle; je n’hésiterai pas pour ma part à prononcer le nom de Nicomaque Flavien’.

The pagan interpretation of the (negative) effects of Constantine’s conversion clearly lies behind this brief anecdote, placed significantly just after the account of the foundation of Constantinople. By no means all of this part of Z. is directly about religion, of course. P.’s notes on the passages dealing with Constantinople, the praetorian prefecture and the magistri militum, the military reforms and fiscal policies, in effect condensed essays, will be a mine of information for anyone interested in the period. Z., for all his distortions, supplies information not to be found elsewhere. In other words, P.’s Zosime I 2 is an essential tool for anyone studying Constantine, to be used together with a work that appeared just before it, the commentary by Averil Cameron and S. G. Hall on Eusebius’ Life of Constantine (Oxford 1999, with translation) – in which, it may be noted, Z. is not cited all that often.

In comparison with the commentary on 2, 8–39, sixty pages, that on the years 337–354, 2, 40–55, is much briefer, less than twenty. Even so, there is much of great value here and plenty of recent bibliography, e.g. on Magnentius, Vetranio and the battle of Mursa, with contributions by Bleckmann to the fore. As before, at the end of the volume, there are two maps of Northern Italy and the Upper Danube and of the Lower Danube and the straits, and plans of Antioch and Constantinople. P. characterises his translation as having a «fidélité un peu servile» to the original, which he calls «un ouvrage sans prétentions littéraires et sans qualités esthétiques»; and notes that his purpose was above all to make an author very largely neglected until his first edition more accessible to students of late antiquity. When Vol. I first appeared it was already too late fully to counteract the unfortunate influence of the inaccurate English version by J. J. Buchanan and H. T. Davis (San Antonio 1967); cf. the stern comments in III 2, p. 111.
Happily, not least through the renewed interest in Z inspired by P.’s own work, non-francophone students not inclined or equipped to go unaided through the Greek can now turn to other, reliable renderings, in Italian (F. Conca, 1977), English (R. T. Ridley 1982), Czech (A. Hartmann, 1983) and German (O. Veh, 1990). But no one should neglect to consult P., whose notes are so much fuller, better informed and more interesting than those in the other versions. Further, it may be remarked, whatever he himself says about the literary quality of his translation, one could not call P.’s own style lacking in aesthetic qualities. He does indeed concede that «le lecteur moderne accordera volontiers à Photios que la langue de Zosime est simple, peut-être même qu’elle est élégante». To this non-francophone reader P.’s French is always elegant, a delight to read and sometimes enriched by a vocabulary for which only larger lexica supply translations. It is impossible to do justice to so comprehensive and informative a commentary in the space of a short review: it will be a continuing pleasure as well as a great benefit to be able to consult such a work.
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