



Review

Reviewed Work(s): *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, Volume 2: A.D. 395-527*
by J. R. Martindale

Review by: Roger S. Bagnall

Source: *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 77, No. 2 (Dec., 1981 - Jan., 1982), pp. 183-184

Published by: The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc. (CAMWS)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3296924>

Accessed: 12-06-2017 14:15 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc. (CAMWS) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Journal*

BOOK REVIEWS

The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, Volume 2: A.D. 395-527. By J. R. Martindale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980. Pp. xliii + 1342. \$140.00.

This massive volume brings the *PLRE* to the two-thirds mark. Its characteristics remain essentially the same as in the first volume: full citation of primary sources, much less attention to secondary literature (though now increased in response to criticisms), brevity, extensive fasti for numerous offices, many stemmata. Purely religious figures are, as before, excluded along with persons of lower status. Any meaningful verdict on the quality of a reference work of this kind can come only after years of constant use, which is exactly what *PLRE* will have. The appearance of this volume transforms for the years it covers the basic conditions of scholarly work, as its predecessor did for the fourth century. Whatever quibbles on details there may be, one can only be thankful for the industry, thoroughness, and judgment manifested on every page.

The dust jacket of the volume quotes from reviews of volume 1, among them that of W.H.C. Frend, who said, "the modest appeal for errors to be corrected in volume iii is not likely to result in many extra pages being needed." The appeal was perhaps more realistic than modest, to judge from the remarks in the preface to volume 2 (p. viii) and the articles correcting errors and adding information (the latest in *Historia* 29 [1980] 474-97). No doubt the reviewer's remark was intended kindly; but the history of late antiquity is still a young field as ancient history goes, and the documentation is far less thoroughly digested than is the case for earlier periods. It would be not only astonishing but deeply disturbing if there were *not* a constant flow of corrections to this work; and it is a tribute to the qualities of *PLRE* that it stimulates the work which adds to our knowledge and helps to make it obsolete.

The following observations, made almost at random, are offered as a minor contribution to such progress (I owe a few of these to my colleague K.A. Worp). Caecina Mavortius Basilius Decius 2 (p.349): Martindale writes correctly that his consulate in 486 was "apparently not recognized in the East." The evidence cited for this view is only from *CJ*. More illuminating for the contemporary behavior is the usage of the papyri, which ignore him altogether (cf. R.S. Bagnall and K.A. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* [Zutphen 1978] 120—a work published too late to be taken account of). Fl. Dagalaiphus 2 (p.340) was consul in 461; to the testimonia of that consulate must, I believe, be added *IGX*,2,1,776; the editor (Edson), Habicht, and now D. Feissel (Centre de Recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, *Travaux et Mémoires* 7 [1979] 310) have opted for the homonymous consul of 366. But this is impossible: the other consul in that year was Gratian, and emperors are always named before private individuals in consular formulas. The consul of 506 (mentioned by Feissel as an unlikely alternative) is also impossible, as he was always known as Areobindus (cf. *PLRE* II 143). The consul of 461 is therefore of necessity the man.

The papyrus references are not always up-to-date; for example, with Fl. Dexicrates (p. 357) we miss *BGU* XII 2180, published in 1974 (see now also *Cd' E* 54 [1979] 291, where the form Dexicrator is found); and for Pusaesus (p.930) there is no reference to P. Wisc. I 10 (published 1967), where he has the praenomen Flavius, attested in no other source and hence missing from *PLRE*. Fl. Gaiolus (p. 490) is attested in a Latin papyrus cited from Wessely's *Schrifttafeln*; and "Wessely mentions another document which names Gaiolus and is dated c. 398, but gives no reference." This is *CPLat.* 199, for which see now *BASP* 18 (1981) 51-52. One major problem of typographical errors: references to the addenda and corrigenda were inserted in most (but not all) affected entries as references to p. 0000, and of these only one was replaced by page reference in

final proof; and that is wrong (p. 339, read xxxvi, not xxxvii). The reader will want to insert his own cross-references, which are easily found.

More interesting than such errors, of course, is new evidence. Here I limit myself to two items. First, for Sarapodoros (p. 977), see now *CPR* VI 6, another document from 439; it turns out that the last two lines of *SPP* XX 121, Sarapodoros' other dated document, are actually the start of the newly-published text and not of the *SPP* one. Secondly, Fl. Neaptius (p. 773) is a ghost-comes. His sole attestation is in *P. Bon.* 46; Martindale suggests *comes Aegypti* as a possible office, based on the nature of the context in which he is mentioned. An examination of the original papyrus in Bologna, however, shows (as I will demonstrate in detail elsewhere) that instead we have Fl. Abundantius who, happily enough, appears on p.3 as *comes Aegypti* in A.D. 412. We thus have a second attestation for Abundantius and a date for the papyrus. The name Neaptius should itself have been cause for suspicion!

Papyrologists, epigraphists, and others will continue to grind out new material and corrections of the old. But we will do so now within a context and on a solid foundation, without the great and often wasteful effort required hitherto. For this we must be grateful to Martindale and the editorial committee, as well as to the steadfast support of the British Academy; and we await with high hopes the third volume.

ROGER S. BAGNALL

Columbia University

La musica nella tragedia greca. By MARIO PINTACUDA. Cefalù: Lorenzo Misuraca Editore, 1978. Pp. i + 233. L. 4000.

Mario Pintacuda has published simultaneously two volumes which examine the music of Greek tragedy. The first, *Tragedia antica e musica d'oggi*, discusses a great number of twentieth-century, Italian musical productions of Greek tragedies, some of which are associated with such illustrious composers as Luciano Berio and Gian Francesco Malipiero, but the catalogic nature of the material in this brief volume will have little interest for classical readers outside of Italy. The other, *La musica nella tragedia greca*, deserves a more general audience because it contains a considerable (but not exhaustive) amount of material necessary to examine the music of Greek tragedy. This includes the internal evidence of the fifth-century tragedians, the evidence of Old Comedy, particularly Aristophanes' *Frogs* and the musical fragment attributed to Pherecrates' *Chiron*, and assorted passages from the *Vitae*, pseudo-Plutarch's *de Musica*, Pollux 4, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Comp.*). P. only rarely gives this evidence fresh analysis, however, and he has gleaned much from such predecessors as T.B.L. Webster (*The Greek Chorus* [London 1970]) and W. Kranz (*Stasimon* [Berlin 1933]); he borrows all his metrical summaries—they are hardly analyses—from standard commentaries on individual plays. Only occasionally does P. express his own ideas. Ultimately this volume falls far short of being the last word on an important subject, but because P. has packaged within it much valuable evidence it still deserves a careful reading by those interested in considering the musical aspects of Greek tragedy.

Preceding the six parts of the book is a twenty-one page introduction which attempts a review of twelve musical fragments belonging either to tragic or hymnic music, a listing of the relevant ancient musicological or critical sources, and a summary of modern scholarship in Greek music and musicology. The review of the musical fragments merely condenses the information to be found in Pöhlmann's indispensable *Denkmäler altgriechischer Musik* (Nürnberg 1970), although D. Jourdan-Hemmerdinger's Leiden papyrus is supplemented to Pöhlmann's listings. Potentially controversial issues, for example the attribution of Pap. Wien G 29825 a/b to Aeschylus, are glossed over, and