one can find τούμαντίον, but neither θάτερον (5.26) nor ταυτό (29.14). At least, some of the word-slips could have been used, if not to list all occurrences, at any rate to give totals and various forms. — 3. An unfavourable consequence of the method of cataloguing single words only is that almost all fixed combinations are not to be found here. Δ’ον and μεν ον are listed, but not e.g. ὡς τὸ πολὺ, ἀλλὰ (...) γε, καὶ τί δῆ, καὶ μήν, ἄρα γε, ἢσθ’ ὅτε, μικροῦ δειν, ἂμα καὶ, τί δαι. Under ἄρχη we find a lot of accusatives mentioned, but not that many of these have an adverbial function nor that in these cases Dio almost exclusively writes την ἄρχῃν.

Not all these objections reflect on the editor, but the usefulness of this Index would have been increased if some of them had been met. Despite these objections, it was a right decision to publish this work.

AMSTERDAM, Free University

D. M. SCHENKEVELD


When reviewing G. Bowersock’s Julian the Apostate (1978) in this journal some years ago (Mnem. 35, 1982, 207-8), I regretted the fact that his book was more an ‘outer’ than an ‘inner’ biography and that Julian’s spiritual and intellectual development had been insufficiently dealt with. Mrs. Athanassiadi-Fowden, who is a lecturer in Ancient History at Athens University, has redressed the balance, albeit in a somewhat idiosyncratic way. In the first chapter (13-51: The Gardens of Alcinous), she discusses the period from 331 to 355, emphasizing that Julian was never a convinced Christian, but that from his early years he had been in search of a both emotionally and intellectually more satisfactory form of belief. The second chapter (52-88: Miles Mithrae) deals with his years in Gaul and the events up to Constantius’ death in 361, with special attention to the development of Julian’s idea of kingship and state and his excessive need of praise. The third through sixth chapters (89-120: Julianus Augustus; 121-160: Paideia; 161-191: the Priest King and the Philosopher Priest; 192-225: Towards the Persian Campaign) treat his two final years and discuss inter alia the discrepancy between Julian’s rejection of absolute monarchy and hereditary kingship in the Epist. ad Themistium and his actual

behaviour, his decentralizing policy towards the cities and municipal councils, Julian’s solar theology, the role of Iamblichus in the formation of his religious syncretism, the essential unity of religion and culture (paideia) in his thought, his objections to Christianity and Judaism, his increasing identification with Alexander the Great in the final phase, etc. All Julian’s major writings are carefully analyzed in these chapters.

This is done with great empathy and sympathy, and it must be said that the book makes for lively reading. Sometimes, however, this reviewer had the impression that the author’s enthusiasm for her subject has made her somewhat uncritical towards both the sources and to Julian himself. As to the sources, she sometimes takes them at face value where more caution would have been in order; she sometimes takes them as the basis for speculations about Julian’s state of mind, which are certainly suggestive, but unprovable (e.g., pp. 25, 61); she also fails to use Ephraem the Syrian as a source, although Bowersock emphatically drew attention to the importance of this author. As to Julian himself, there is a constant tendency in the book to gloss over the more unpleasant aspects of his character and to excuse his faults, even the outrageous deeds which his pagan contemporaries censured him for (e.g. pp. 98, 115, 229). There are also minor slips: p. 130 Aelius Aristides’ οἱ ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ δυσσεβεῖς (3,671 = 46, p. 403 Dind.) are more probably Jews than Christians (see M. Stern, Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism II, Jerusalem 1980, 217-8); on p. 157 n. 144 A.D. Nock has been misunderstood; on p. 165 it is said that “Julian makes a point of exploiting all the standard weapons of Jewish anti-Christian polemic”, but hardly anything is known about fourth-century Jewish anti-Christian polemics (see J. Maier, Jüdische Auseinandersetzung mit dem Christentum in der Antike, Darmstadt 1982); p. 184 ἡ βασιλεύουσα τῶν ἀπάντων πόλεων is not “the queen of cities”, but “the city that rules over all”. The book is well documented, but in bibliographical matters there are several omissions. To those already indicated by Bowersock in his review in CR 33 (1983) 81-83, I would add: p. 18 n. 22 H. Blum, Die antike Mnemotechnik (1969); pp. 163-5 M. Stern, op. cit. II 502-72, and C. Aziza, Julien et le judaïsme, in R. Braun-J. Richer (edd.), L’empereur Julien. De l’histoire à la légende, Paris 1978, 141-158; from this same French volume, the existence of which the author acknowledges at least on one occasion (p. 227 n. 11), two other important contributions should have been referred to: P. Huart, Julien et l’hellénisme, 99-124, and R. Braun, Julien et le christianisme, 159-88. And why refer to