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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

Scholars long ago acknowledged the importance of literary borrowing, or *imitatio*, in the work of Ammianus Marcellinus. They began to devote considerable attention to it in the late nineteenth century. Wölfflin, for example, discussed Ammianus as an imitator of Tacitus.¹ Martin Hertz produced studies of Ammianus' use of Sallust and of Aulus Gellius.² Hugo Michael, a pupil of Hertz, studied the influence of Cicero upon Ammianus.³ Numerous other articles and dissertations have been devoted to this aspect of Ammianean studies as well.⁴ Most of these works tend merely to list parallel passages from Ammianus and his supposed model(s). This type of activity culminated in the 1958 London dissertation of E. E. L. Owens. Owens gathered all the phraseological parallels which had been noted previously and himself added many new parallels. His interest was almost purely linguistic in nature. He tried to assess whether or not each instance represented a genuine borrowing or was merely a coincidental similarity. He also discussed how Ammianus adapted his various borrowings to fit syntactically or rhythmically in their new settings.

Most of the above mentioned studies, while useful, offer little more than a conspectus of parallel passages from Ammianus and other authors. The only broader significance
attributed in these studies to his practice of *imitatio* was as an aid to textual criticism. Little effort has been given to evaluating the real significance of his borrowings. Henry Rowell complains of this in his 1964 *Semple Lectures*:

In connection with the existing literary tradition, it can be mentioned here that Ammianus' "imitations" of earlier authors have been diligently collected. Investigation, however, has not gone beyond this first elementary stage. Why Ammianus repeats or reflects the words of another author at a specific place in his text raises questions regarding his immediate intention, the way in which it is implemented, the effect of the reminiscence on the reader who is familiar with the original context, its purely stylistic function, etc. All these questions remain unanswered. Even less do we know about any principles or patterns underlying Ammianus' imitative procedure.

As Rowell suggests here, much serious work remains to be done in this area. That is not to say that there have not been some broad general surveys of Ammianus' knowledge of earlier authors. Such surveys have been made by Barnard, Camus, Cichocka and Roselle among others. However, these are all somewhat vague and general treatments. They concentrate in large part upon Ammianus' literary name-dropping and his most obvious borrowings (such as quotations identified in the text by Ammianus himself). While the purposes to which they ascribe Ammianus' borrowings - the ostentatious display of learning and moral instruction - are valid, these are far from a complete explanation of the phenomenon. Even in the
case of these uses existing studies do not present and evaluate all of the evidence. And Ammianus does use his borrowings in other ways as well, perhaps most obviously as precepts for the emperor to follow. Thus there is indeed need for further study along the lines suggested by Rowell.

It is my intention here to try to answer, insofar as is possible, such questions as why Ammianus chose to borrow particular passages from given authors and what the purpose of his imitation was in each case. In addition, I shall examine other areas in which earlier authors exercised literary influences on Ammianus, especially with respect to the structure of his work and his techniques of characterization. Quellenforschung is not a primary concern of my study, but will be taken into account where appropriate.

There are certain dangers involved in the study of imitatio. There is always the possibility that any given instance of it is accidental, as was noted by J. J. Hartman:

Exoriatum aliquis multarum literarum, vir tenacissima memoria et sano praeditus sobrioque iudicio, qui ingenti locorum parallelorum congesto diggestoque numero ostendat quam saepe factum sit ut forte et casu talis nascetur consensus quamque sit difficile pro certo demonstrare consulto recentiorem scriptorem antiquioris verba in suum convertisse.

A. Güillemin expresses similar concerns in her slightly later general study of imitatio in Latin literature. Given the nature of education in antiquity, with its heavy emphasis on memorizing passages and imitating the style of various models,
a certain amount of accidental or unconscious imitation is inevitable. Yet, while this warning is generally valid, in the case of Ammianus it carries less weight. Late antiquity was an age of ostentatious antiquarianism, in which gratuitous displays of learning were common; to prove this, one need only point to Macrobius. Most of the literary works of the age are full of allusions to earlier authors.\textsuperscript{10}

Ammianus himself put an extremely high value on learning. This is emphasized in the Roman digressions, where he criticizes the neglect of it (28.4.14):\textsuperscript{11}

\begin{quote}
  quidara detestantes ut venena doctrinas
  Juvenalem et Marium Maximum curatiore
  studio legunt, nulla volumina praeter
  haec in profundo otio contractantes, quam
  ob causam non iudicioli est nostri, cum
  multa et varia pro amplitudine gloriarum
  et generum lectitare deberent audientes
  destinatum poenae Socraten coniectumque
  in carcerem rogasse quendam scite lyrici
  carmen Stesichori modulantem ut doceretur
  id agere, dum liceret, interroganteque
  musico, quid ei poterit hoc prodesse mori-
  turo postridie, respondisse, ut aliquod
  sciens amplius e vita discusat.
\end{quote}

Not only does this show Ammianus' love of learning, but his method of expressing his own ideas about proper conduct through \textit{exempla} from the literary/rhetorical tradition. Furthermore, Ammianus often judges public officials by the extent of their reading. An example of this is his remark concerning Orfitus, an urban prefect, at 14.6.1:

\begin{quote}
  vir quidem prudens et forensium negotiorum
  oppido gnarus, sed splendore liberalium
  doctrinarum minus quam nobilem decuerat
  institutus.
\end{quote}
Such judgements are common in the Res Gestae. Obviously Ammianus considers wide reading in the classical authors to be a basic qualification for any position of importance. And a man with such views is very likely to make frequent displays of his own learning, especially through the practice of imitatio in his own writings.

This is, indeed, the case with Ammianus. He is a blatant literary name-dropper. His work is not only full of reminiscences and allusions, but even contains many direct quotations. He sometimes identifies these by naming the author (especially in the case of Cicero). But more often he does not. Ammianus wrote for an educated audience and he expected them to recognize his borrowings. Through his use of citations and allusions, Ammianus both made appeal to the authority of antiquity to support his own opinions and sought to reinforce a common cultural and intellectual bond with his audience.

I intend, in this study, to examine in detail Ammianus' use of earlier literature. I shall proceed author by author, in a roughly chronological order, although whenever possible I shall group the authors by genre. My present study is, of course, limited to writers of the Roman Republic. In examining the influence of each author on Ammianus I shall first assess, insofar as is possible, the extent of Ammianus' knowledge of the author: what works of the writer in question did he know and was his knowledge of them direct or indirect. There were many handbooks and florilegia available in the fourth century. Since these do not, for the most part,
survive, it is often difficult to tell if Ammianus had read a particular author in extenso or had merely read excerpts.

Our only guides in this are the availability of given works to Ammianus (i.e., is it mentioned or used extensively by contemporaries of Ammianus) and the extent of Ammianus' own use of it. In cases where Ammianus borrows both frequently or extensively, or makes use of less than striking passages from his model, one can assume he probably had read all or most of the work in question.

In evaluating the significance of Ammianus' imitations of his literary antecedents we must first establish whether or not he has some purpose in alluding to a given author or work. Certainly some instances of imitation will turn out to be chance similarity or unconscious and unintentional borrowing. But many of his borrowings are intentional and do have a purpose. This is made clear by the fact that, in many cases, there is a strong similarity of context between the passage in Ammianus and the one in his source. Also Ammianus often makes repeated allusion to an author, work, or small group of works in similar contexts throughout the Res Gestae. I will give special attention to this type of borrowing in an effort to show that there are definite patterns behind much of Ammianus' literary borrowing. It is by dividing Ammianus' uses of a particular author (when sufficiently extensive) into categories that we can deduce his intentions and purposes. This is especially true with regard to Cicero. Ammianus makes more extensive use of Cicero than
of any other author. It is immediately apparent to the reader of the *Res Gestae* that many of these occur in contexts in which Ammianus enunciates various moral and political principles. Other patterns of use, both of Cicero and of other authors, will emerge in the course of my investigations. These patterns will, I hope, be of value in determining the impact of Ammianus' reading on his interpretation of the events which he describes in the *Res Gestae*. While Ammianus had a wide practical knowledge of the empire and its workings, he discusses these in light of theories formed largely through his reading of earlier authors, especially such figures as Sallust and Cicero. Only by coming to a clear understanding of the extent of literary influences on Ammianus can we properly evaluate the reliability of his history.
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Chapter II
LATIN REPUBLICAN POETRY

Scholars have noted the possible use of Ennius, Plautus, Terence and Lucilius in Ammianus. It has also been put forth that Ammianus did not know Lucretius. In this chapter I shall examine Ammianus' knowledge of these authors and comment on how he uses them or does not use them in the Res Gestae.

i. Ennius

It is unlikely that Ammianus had any first-hand knowledge of Ennius. After the second century of our era texts of Ennius were scarce. Most of Ammianus' contemporaries, both Christian and pagan, show only an indirect acquaintance with Ennius. All of the citations of Ennius found in the works of Symmachus and Jerome can be found in Cicero, whence in all probability they were derived. Augustine's knowledge of Ennius is likewise second-hand.

The only Ennian quotation in Ammianus occurs at 23.5.9:

nam et oracula dubia legimus, quae non nisi casus discrevere postremi, ut fidem vaticinii Delphici, quae post Halyn flumen transmissum maximum regnum deiectorum praedixerat Croesum, et aliam, quae Atheniensibus ad certandum contra Medos oblique destinaverat mare, sortem- que his posteriorem, veram quidem, sed non minus ambiguam:
The line which Ammianus cites is a popular one, occurring in Cicero (Div. 2.116), Quintilian, Minucius Felix, Aurelius Victor, Augustine, Jerome and several grammarians. Here it is fairly obvious that Ammianus is borrowing from Cicero. Cicero discusses and compares the oracles given to Croesus and Pyrrhus. The borrowing is to some extent confirmed by the fact that Ammianus twice (18.5.6; 31.2.11) uses a phrase from div. 2.115. This phrase, flexiloquis et obscuris, seems to occur only in these three passages in extant Latin literature.

The third oracle, that which was given to the Athenians during the Persian Wars, was probably derived from Herodotus 7.140 ff. This seems to be Ammianus' own addition to the other material which he has borrowed from Cicero. It is not, so far as I can ascertain, connected with either of the other two oracles elsewhere. Why does Ammianus add it? Classen refers to the passage as an example of the juxtaposition of Greek and Roman elements, a favorite device of Ammianus. He does not, however, point out that here the combination is borrowed from another author. Ammianus had his combination of a Greek and a Roman prophecy without adding the third. No one has yet pointed out the obvious answer. Ammianus is commenting on an ambiguous omen which has be-fallen Julian during the Persian campaign. He borrows a convenient bit of material from Cicero; where would he be more
likely to look for such material, given his great fondness for Cicero, than in *de divinatione*? But he adds an extra example which is called to mind by the circumstances: Hellenes fighting Medes. Ammianus wishes to compare Julian and his campaign to the Persian Wars of the fifth century B.C.10

The fact that the quoted line comes from Ennius is irrelevant. For all intents and purposes, Ammianus is here borrowing from Cicero. He may merely keep the verse form to preserve the amphiboly. So I agree with Owens11 that Ammianus shows no first-hand knowledge of Ennius, but would add that he really makes no use of him at all.

**ii. Plautus**

Plautus seems in general, not to have been read much in late antiquity, although texts were available. Nonius Marcellus (saec. IV or V) had access to two separate editions: one of all twenty-one "Varronian" plays and another of selected plays.12 The Ambrosian Palimpsest is roughly contemporary with Ammianus. However, authors of the third and fourth centuries seldom seem to cite or borrow from Plautus. Lactantius cites Plautus only twice and very likely did not read him.13 Jerome apparently read Plautus and "is likely to have read commentaries on him at school."14 Augustine, on the other hand, displays a rather slender knowledge of Plautus.15
On the pagan side, Kroll has cited a number of phraseological parallels in Symmachus. Unfortunately, none of these is especially close in wording and many verge on being proverbs and clichés. In some cases they may represent survivals in the vulgar language rather than literary borrowings. Ten possible borrowings from Plautus have been pointed out in Ammianus. I shall examine each of these in the order in which they occur in the Res Gestae.

The phrase perquisitor malivolus at Amm. 14.5.7 seems to recall Stichus 385 malivoli perquisitores auctionum perierint. According to Lewis and Short perquisitor occurs only in these two passages (OLD and Forcellini list only the Plautine use). This leads Owens and de Jonge to believe that Ammianus is drawing on Plautus here. He probably is. But no one has noted that the very rarity of the phrase may suggest that Ammianus found it in a lexicon or handbook of phrases.

Roselle has suggested that Epidicus 529 multiplex aerumna me habet is echoed by Amm. 14.6.4 post multiplices bellorum aerumnas. This is not exactly a compelling parallel. Aerumna is a common word (occurring 44 times) in Ammianus. One might note especially Amm. 27.4.4 post multiplices pug-narum aerumnas.

Ammianus 15.3.5 ut clam mordax canis seems to be a borrowing from Bacchides 1146 clam mordax canis. Owens points out that clam is used to modify an adjective only in these two passages. I agree that borrowing is indicated, but
once again suspect indirect borrowing through a lexicographical source due to the rarity of the combination. It is the sort of thing which might turn up in a collection of quaint phrases.

Lindenbrog's implausible comparison of Amm. 15.12.1 and Captivi 795-99 has already been dismissed by Hagendahl and Owens. It requires no further discussion here.

Ammianus echoes Epidicus 12:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Thesprio: } & \text{minu' iam furtificus sum} \\
& \text{quam antehac.} \\
\text{Epidicus: } & \text{quid ita?} \\
\text{Thesprio: } & \text{rapio propalam.}
\end{align*}
\]

at 15.13.1:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hunc Prosper adaequitabat pro magistro equitum} \\
\text{agente etiam tum in Galliis militem regens, ab-} \\
\text{ecte ignavus et, ut ait comicus, arte despecta} \\
\text{furtorum rapiens propalam.}
\end{align*}
\]

The fact that Ammianus is borrowing is confirmed by his reference to a comic poet as his source. Ammianus seldom directly names his sources. Of the poets from whom he borrows Ammianus names only Vergil, but he does make indirect references to Plautus here and to Terence at 14.6.16. Whether the borrowing here is direct or indirect is uncertain. Galletier and Fontaine suggest that the Plautine passage may have been found in a collection of sententiae. This is a very plausible suggestion. A knowledge of the immediate context of the Plautine line would add point to its use here: the comparison of a corrupt imperial magistrate to a slippery slave. Still this might have been provided by
R. B. Steele has noted that *Mostellaria* 514 *nihil ego formido; pax mihi est cum mortuis* is very similar to Ammianus 18.7.7:

\[\text{Dum haec celerantur, Sabinianus inter rapienda momenta periculorum communium lectissimus moderator belli internecivi per Edessena sepulchra quasi fundata cum mortuis pace nihil formidans more vitae remissioris fluxius agens militari pyrrice sonantibus modulis pro histrionicis gestibus in silentio summo delectabatur orainoso sane et incepto et loco, cum haec et huiusmodi factu dictuque tristia futuros praenuntiantia motus vitare optimum quemque debere saeculi progressione discamus.}\]

Here I think that the borrowing is fairly certain, Ammianus repeats almost the entire phrase, altering it only to fit the new context syntactically and rhythmically. While direct borrowing cannot be ruled out, it is a memorable phrase and Ammianus may well have found it in an intermediate source. De Jonge (*ad loc.*), who fails to notice the Plautine allusion, suggests that Ammianus intends to hint at magical activities and bad omens here. I would say that Ammianus' intent here is clearly to mock Sabinianus and a phrase from comedy would be appropriate. Indeed, Sabinianus provides a dual target: he is a Christian (presumably praying at the shrines of various martyrs) and an inept military commander. Ammianus has little affection for either. The phrase *pro histrionicis gestibus* also supports this interpretation. In addition to showing the foolish Sabinianus amusing himself with useless
manoeuvres, the phrase also suggests that Sabinianus' command is a farce. One might adduce the "coronation" of Procopius (26.6) which also has strong overtones of the mime (for discussion of this see pages 97-98.

Ammianus 19.12.13 quasi e promptuaria cella is a possible echo of either Plautus' Amphitryo 156 quasi e promptuaria cella or Apuleius' Apologia 56 e cella promptuaria. Owens argues that Ammianus borrows from Plautus here on the grounds that both use quasi and both are speaking of physical punishment or violence. These are not especially strong arguments. Quasi is quite common in Ammianus; it occurs fifty times in the Res Gestae. Note in particular 23.4.8 quasi ex lance vinculis trabis alterius continetur, which follows the same general pattern. Furthermore, I do not entirely agree with Owens' assessment of the context:

Criminibus vero serpentibus latius per implicatos nexus sine fide distentos quidam corporibus laniatis exstingubantur, alii poenis ulterioribus damnati sunt bonis ereptis Paulo succentore fabularum crudelium quasi e promptuaria cella fallaciarum et nocendi species sugerente complures, cuius ex nutu prope dixerim, pendebat incidentium omnium salus.

The emphasis of Ammianus seems to be on the trumping up of false charges rather than on the actual punishments meted out. Note criminibus, per implicatos nexus sine fide distentos, succentore fabularum crudelium, fallaciarum et nocendi species sugerente complures (which I take as hendiadys: suggesting several types of false charges, i.e. of maiestas). It is
possible that Ammianus associated the word **succentor**, which is quite rare, with **cento**: "a stitcher-together of cruel fictions." Thus the context fits Apuleius better, if context can be considered a valid criterion. Apuleius is referring to false accusations brought against him in the passage of his *Apologia* which is under discussion here.

The change in word order can easily be explained, since the Apuleian phrase results in a rhythm unusual in Ammianus:

'***'  while the order he uses conforms with one of his standard rhythms: '***'. Ammianus does seem to draw on Apuleius on other occasions. On the other hand, Ammianus does use the word **fabularum**, which suggests the idea of a grim comedy. The use of a comic allusion to describe Paulus at 14.5.7 also lends support to taking this passage as a Plautine allusion. The arguments in favor of a Plautine source seem a bit stronger, but the question cannot be resolved with any certainty.

**Plautus' Poenulus 973** *alicua fortuna fuerit adiutrix tibi* has been advanced as a possible source for two phrases in Ammianus: 21.16.13 *felicitas est fortuna adiutrix consiliorum bonorum* and 26.2.9 *fortuna consiliorum adiutrix bonorum*. However, 21.16.13 is an explicit quotation by Ammianus of a letter of Cicero to Cornelius Nepos (= *ad Corn. Nep. fr. 2.5* in the OCT edition). 26.2.9 is also probably based on this passage, inasmuch as Ammianus mentions a letter of Cicero to Nepos at 26.1.2 (it is uncertain whether this is the same letter as at 21.16.13). The phrase is merely a variant of a
W. Seyfarth has suggested that there are Plautine allusions at Ammianus 28.4.12-13:

Horum domus otiosi quidam garruli frequentant variis assentandis fitimentis ad singula ulterioris fortunae verba plaudentes parasitorum in commodois facetias affectando. ut enim illi sufflant milites gloriosos obsidiones et pugnas adversum milia hostium isdem ut heroicis aemulis assignantes, ita hi quoque columnarum constructiones alta fronte suspensas mirando atque parietes lapidum circumspectis coloribus nitidos ultra mortalitatem nobiles viros extollunt. poscuntur etiam in conviviis aliquotiens trutinae, ut apposita pisces et volucres ponderentur et glires, quorum magnitudo saepius replicata non sine taedio praesentium ut antehac inusitat laudatur assidue maxime, cum haec eadem numerantes notarii triginta prope assistant cum thecis et pugillaribus tabulis, ut deesse solus magister ludi litterariori videretur.

Hadrianus Valesius had earlier noted the verbal echo of Cicero de amicitia 98:

Nec parasitorum in commodois assentatio faceta nobis videretur, nisi essent milites gloriosi.

Seyfarth would add reference to Miles 46 septem milia, the number which Pyrgopolynices claims to have killed in one day. Seyfarth also thinks that isdem ut heroicis aemulis assignantes is meant to recall Miles 61-62:

Artotrogus: rogitabant: 'hicine Achilles est?' inquit mihi. 'immo eius frater' inquam 'est.'
These are the most vague of parallels and refer to stock features of the miles gloriosus, not specifically to Plautus. Seyfarth's final suggestion that Miles 38 (Artotrogus) tabellas vis rogare; habeo, et stilum, where Artotrogus is adding up the number of enemies that Pyrgopolynices has killed, is behind the notarii triginta, who add up dainties at dinner, is ludicrous. This has nothing in common with the passage in the Miles beyond the idea of reckoning, which is hardly sufficient grounds to assume a Plautine allusion. It should be obvious that Ammianus takes Cicero as his point d'appui. This is supported by a strong verbal echo. The addition of a couple of stock characteristics of the miles gloriosus could come from a number of sources other than Plautus.

Another of the possible borrowings from Plautus is Pseudolus 884 ut digitos praerodat suos. At Ammianus 28.4.34 we find digitos praerodentes. However, this seems to be a common type of expression in both Greek and Latin. Otto cites a number of similar phrases, especially in Greek comedy. The main argument in favor of an allusion to Plautus here is the unusual word praerodo. Aside from Plautus it is found mainly in technical works. It occurs three times in Pliny's Natural History (7.83; 9.145; 17.265) and once in Columella (5.10.1). It is also found at Horace, Ser. 2.5.25, Hyginus' Fabulae 274.1, and Julius Obsequens' Liber Prodigi-orum 61. Such contexts suggest that praerodo is of the vulgar, rather than the literary, language. I would argue that the phrase in Ammianus is a popular saying and not an
allusion to Plautus. Borrowing is far from certain.

There seems little reason to believe that Ammianus read Plautus directly. Of the ten possible borrowings four can be removed immediately: Amm. 14.6.4 / Epidicus 529; Amm. 15.12.1 / Captivi 795-799; Amm. 21.16.13 / Poenulus 973; Amm. 28.4.12-13 / Miles 38, 46, 61-62. In addition, Amm. 28.4.34 / Pseudolus 884 is not at all certain and at 19.12.13 there is doubt as to whether Ammianus draws on Plautus, Apuleius or even a third source.

In other cases it is reasonably certain that Ammianus is borrowing from Plautus. But in almost every instance there is at least some grounds for suspecting indirect borrowing. Roselle has suggested that Ammianus may have acquired his knowledge of Plautus from Varro's de scaenicis and de comoediis Plautinis; "On the basis of his reading about Plautus' plays he could very well borrow a quotation or two from the commentary."37 While this is a possibility, there is no evidence to show that Ammianus read these works or that they were even available to him. Roselle claims that Varro is mentioned by name five times in the Res Gestae. This is simply untrue. M. Terentius Varro Reatinus is never mentioned in the extant books of Ammianus. Presumably Roselle has mistaken references to the two comites named Varronianus, the father and son respectively of Jovian. They are mentioned a total of five times between them.

Some observations can be made about Ammianus' use of Plautine material, although it was probably indirect. The
borrowings seem to be heavily concentrated in the earlier of the extant books: one in Book 14, two in 15, one in 18, and one (either Plautine or Apuleian) in 19. The alleged references to Plautus in later books are doubtful, as I have argued above. It is also worth noting that all of these instances refer to cruel, corrupt or inept imperial officials: 14.5.7 and 19.12.13 both refer to Paulus, an imperial notarius who was an infamous informer and hanging judge. 15.3.5 discusses another informer, Mercurius. 15.13.3 deals with Prosper, a corrupt magistrate in Gaul. Ammianus clearly is mocking the inept Sabinianus at 18.7.7. It is more than likely that Ammianus meant to ridicule these men by describing them with comic tags.

iii. Terence

Terence was a tremendously popular author in late antiquity. His works were central to the educational curriculum in the west. He was one of the four authors (together with Cicero, Vergil and Sallust) who were included in the Quadriga of Arusianus Messius. This was a manual of phrases which remained a standard handbook at least as late as the time of Cassiodorus (cf. Inst. 1.15.7). Jerome and Augustine seem to have known Terence well and made extensive use of his works. On the other hand, Lactantius appears to have known
Terence only at second-hand and Symmachus also may have been dependent on indirect knowledge: the parallels which have been pointed out are less than compelling and many seem proverbial in nature. Thus it is quite possible that Ammianus knew Terence's works directly, but there is no a priori reason to assume this, especially since Ammianus was educated in the east.

Eight possible Terentian allusions and citations have been noted. Once again I shall discuss each in order of appearance.

The first is at Ammianus 14.6.16: ne Sannione guidem, ut ait comicus, domi relictto. This is taken as a reference to Eunuchus 780 solus Sannio servat domi. Sannio seems to have been a stock character of comedy and mime. It is quite possible that Ammianus is drawing on a different comic writer (who has himself imitated Terence) or borrowing indirectly from Terence. The phrase is found in Nonius Marcellus (p. 61,5 M = 84,5 L):

Sanniones dicuntur a sannis qui sunt in dictis fatui et in motibus et in schemis; quos moros vocant Graeci, Terentius in Eunucho: solus Sannio sunt domi.

Ammianus' parenthetical ut ait comicus may mean no more than that his source attributed the phrase to a comic author.

Ammianus 16.12.3 satis pro imperio may be a borrowing from Phormio 196 sati' pro imperio. Donatus glosses the phrase as imperiose in his commentary on the Phormio. De Jonge
(Commentary, ad loc.) notes that this is a rather unusual usage. Owens, citing TLL 7.570.18 ff., thinks that this may be an official or colloquial phrase. There does not seem to be sufficient evidence to warrant this. Livy may also use pro imperio for imperiose at 3.49.5. The phrase is sufficiently unusual that taken with satis it very likely is borrowed from Terence. Still it may be an indirect borrowing: the very oddity of the usage may indicate use of a lexicon or phrase book of some sort. The gloss by Donatus indicates that the expression had found its way into the lexicographical and exegetical tradition of late antiquity.

Hertz, following Gelenius, reads vietus... senex at Amm. 18.5.5 and cites Eunuchus 688 for this emendation. The Fuldensis reads victus; Clark and Seyfarth (probably correctly) accept the emendation of Heraeus: cultus. Vietus, which means shrivelled or wrinkled, makes no sense in this context:

stetitque sententia, ut Sabinianus cultus quidem senex et bene nummatus, sed imbellis et ignavus et ab impetranda magisterii dignitate per obscuritatem adhuc longe discretus praeficiendus eois partibus mitteretur...

The antithesis of the sentence demands a positive attribute which vietus is not.

Ammianus 24.3.8 cum vere atque ex animo dicitur has been compared to Eunuchus 175 utinam... ex animo ac vere diceres. Owens cites similar phrases from other authors: Livy 40.46.9 id ita ut vere, ut ex animo velitis evenire; Jerome ep.
It is a pedestrian expression; there is no reason that Ammianus could not have formulated it on his own.

The alleged borrowing of Amm. 25.4.14 fortunae ... bonae gubernatrix from Eunuchus 1046 fortuna ... quae gubernatrix fuit is far from certain. Owens cites two undated inscriptions, CIL 13.7792 (Cologne) and 12049 (Remagen), in which fortunae gubernatrici occurs. One might add to these Cicero Att. 15.9.1 haec casus gubernet; Lucretius 5.107 fortuna gubernans; Ovid Trist. 5.14.29 rara ... virtus quam fortuna non gubernet; Valerius Maximus 9.12 prout fortuna gubernaculum rexit; Lactantius Inst. 3.29.7 simulacrum fortunae cum copia et gubernaculo fingunt; Carm Epigr. 2121 O Fortuna, hominum dubia quae fata gubernas. The image is very common. Also, Fontaine, in a useful note, reminds us that Tyche was the special deity of Antioch, the hometown of Ammianus, and that she was commonly depicted as a gubernatrix on imperial coinage. The case for a Terentian allusion here is very weak.

Another possible borrowing is found at Amm. 25.4.22 labro inferiore demisso, opima et incurva cervice. This is similar to Eunuchus 336 incurvo' tremulu' labiis demissis ingens. Owens has cited partial parallels at Pliny NH 11.173 and Donatus ad Ter. Hecyr. 689. One might add Petronius 52.5 demisso labro and 69.4 inferius labrum. It should also be pointed out that the last three words of the Terentian phrase are cited more than once in the grammarians and lexicographers: Verrius Flaccus (Funaioli I 520, no. 26) and Charisius (Keil,
GL 1.103.9). Opima is used as an epithet of cervix elsewhere:
cf. Seneca Phaedra 1042 and Suetonius Claudius 30. Submissis
cervicibus at Amm. 14.10.14 shows that Ammianus uses similar
descriptive language in other places. The main argument for
assuming that Ammianus borrows from Terence here is the juxta-
position of labro demisso and the incurvus in both contexts. Incurvus, as Owens points out, is not really uncommon in
Ammianus (11 occurrences). There is also a strong possibility
that Ammianus is drawing upon physiognomical sources here.
Physiognomical writers enjoyed great popularity in the fourth
century. Ammianus seems to have had some interest in this
pseudo-science; he often uses physical descriptions in his
characterizations. Some possible verbal parallels can be
adduced from extant physiognomical authors: Anon. Physiog.
Lat. 48 (= 2.67 Förster) inferius labrum; Adamant. 370 (2.21
Förster) δὲ γὰρ ἐστραμμένος τράχηλος ὑβριστοῦ καὶ ἀνοήτου καὶ
ὑποχανοῦ, εἴ μὴ ἄρα διὰ μανίαν αὐτὸ ποιεῖ. It is, of course,
necessary to remember that Ammianus might have had access to
other physiognomical handbooks now lost. Lastly, I should
note that Roselle was greatly struck by the occurrence of
both this and the "reference" to Eunuchus 1046 in the same
chapter. However, the borrowing at 25.4.14 is probably no
borrowing at all, as I have shown above. The allusion at
25.4.22 is also uncertain. Roselle's observation is at best
a bit of circumstantial evidence in favor of borrowing.

R. B. Steele has noted that Amm. 27.6.12 nihil alienum
putare, quod ad Romani pertinet latus (V, statum, edd.) is an
adaptation of Heautontimoroumenos 77 homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto.\textsuperscript{54} There is no reason to assume direct borrowing here. The line is a much quoted one: Cicero off. 1.30; legg. 1.33; Seneca ep. 95.53; Juvenal 15.140; Ambrose off. 3.7.45; Augustine ep. 155.14; c. Iul. 4.16.83 (= PL 44.781). It is a proverbial saying: cf. Otto, Sprichwörter 165-166. As for Ammianus' use, I think that there can be little doubt but that he borrowed the line indirectly and that Cicero was his source. Ammianus seems to have known both de officiis and de legibus.\textsuperscript{55} As I shall argue in Chapter IV, Ammianus tends to use Cicero heavily in speeches dealing with the conduct of state affairs. This citation occurs in such a speech. In the passage which immediately follows, 27.6.14:

\begin{verbatim}
numquam a statu naturae discedens inter-pidae legumque similes quae omnibus una eademque loci in multiplicibus advertimus causis.
\end{verbatim}

three passages of de officiis are echoed:

\begin{verbatim}
ut nihil a statu naturae discedas nihil a dignitate sapientis, robusti animi est magnaeque constantiae (1.67)

optandumque est, ut ii, qui praesunt rei publicae, legum similes sint (1.89)

leges sunt inventae, quae cum omnibus semper una atque eadem voce loquentur. (2.42)
\end{verbatim}

Although none of these is located especially close to the
Terentian citation in *de officiis*, still the fact that this following paragraph is nothing but an amalgam of phrases from the treatise suggests that it was much on Ammianus' mind as he was writing this part of his work. Indeed, the multiple citation from widely separated parts of *de officiis* suggests that Ammianus may have been mining it for suitable sentiments to insert here.

The last possible allusion to Terence occurs at Amm. 28.4.27:

Cumque mutuum illi quid petant, soccos
Miciones videbis et Lachetas, cum adiguntur, ut reddant, ita coturnatos et turgidos, ut Heraclidas illos, Cresphontem et Temenum putes.

Barnard sees here an allusion to Micio, the *senex* in the *Adelphi*, and Laches, a *senex* in the *Eunuchus* and in the *Hecyra*. This was also the opinion of Wilamowitz, although Barnard does not cite him. But it should be pointed out that these are stock characters. Laches also occurs as a *senex* in Menander's plays *Heros*, *Perinthia* and *Kitharista*, and in frr. 572, 663 Körte. It is common in the other comic poets as well: Aristophanes 2.991 Meineke; Ephippus 3.335 (2) (by Porson's conjecture); Alexis 3.476 (1); Philemon 4.10 (1); Crobylus 4.567 (1). Micio is somewhat less common, but one is found at Alexis 3.415 (1). They were, no doubt, cultural bywords and Ammianus is unlikely to have had a specific source in mind.
Did Ammianus know the works of Terence directly? Based on the available evidence it is probable that he did not. Two of the verbal parallels (Amm. 14.6.16 / Eunuchus 780 and Amm. 16.12.3 / Phormio 196) are probably borrowings, but, for the reasons stated above, I suspect that they come from an intermediate source. The adaptation of Terence at Amm. 26.6.12 almost certainly is taken from Cicero. Nowhere else has Ammianus shown knowledge of Heautontimoroumenos. The other "borrowings" which various scholars have adduced are quite doubtful. Nevertheless it should be pointed out that most of the verbal parallels (three, excluding Amm. 18.5.5 / Eunuchus 688) are from the Eunuchus. This would lend support to the suggestion that Ammianus did know this play in its entirety.

If we take only Amm. 14.6.16 and 16.12.3 as fairly certain (and I still have some doubts about the latter), whether direct or indirect, the usage seems similar to that of Plautus. Both of these allusions occur in the earliest of the extant books of the Res Gestae. Once again the contexts are those of ridicule. Ammianus 14.6.16 is a mocking description of the long trains of servants and attendants which the Roman nobles drag along on their jaunts about town. At Amm. 16.12.3 the arrogant words of barbarian chieftains to Julian are described:

cuius asseveratione eadem subinde replicantis
ad maiora stimulati fiducia missis legatis
satis pro imperio Caesari mandaverunt, ut
Here also an allusion to comedy might serve to add to the characterization (note that Julian smiles — ridens — at their arrogance). However, it does not seem likely that satis pro imperio would be immediately recognizable as a comic locution to many readers.

iv. Lucilius

The only allusion to Lucilius occurs at Amm. 26.9.11:

Excessit autem vita Procopius anno quadragesimo amplius mensibus decem corpore non indecoro nec mediocris staturae subaquilus humumque intuendo semper incedens, perque morum tristium latebras illius similis Crassi, quam in vita semel risisse Lucilius affirmat et Tullius.

Despite Barnard's rather silly assertion that this mention of Lucilius suggests Ammianus to be "a connoisseur of Latin antiquities," it is clear that Ammianus did not know Lucilius. By the end of the second century texts of Lucilius were quite rare. According to Ogilvie, from the third century on no writer knew Lucilius first-hand. Here Ammianus obligingly tells us his source by mentioning Cicero. His allusion clearly follows Cicero (fin. 5.92, Tusc. disp.)
3.31). Why refer to Lucilius at all? Ammianus may well have wanted to multiply his authorities and flaunt his "learning."

v. Lucretius

Owens has observed that Ammianus apparently did not know Lucretius’ poem. This is, of course, an argumentum ex silentio: no one has adduced any phraseological parallels. The validity of his assertion can, to some extent, be tested. Ammianus 19.4 (the account of the plague at Amida) is an obvious place to look for reminiscences of the famous plague passage in Lucretius (6.1090-1281). Ammianus refers explicitly to Homer and Thucydides, but not to Lucretius. A comparison of the two passages shows little evidence for borrowing of any sort. Only two rather tenuous parallels appear. Amm. 19.4.2:

quae genera morborum unde oriri solent
breviter explicabo

follows the same general structure as Lucretius 6.1090-1092:

nunc ratio quae sit morbis aut unde repente
mortiferam possit cladem conflare coorta
morbida vis hominum generi pecudumque cater-
vis expediam.

But this pattern is fairly standard for opening a digression in Ammianus; note especially 20.11.26:
Also Ammianus 19.4.4 *plaga paulatim serpens* might call to mind Lucretius' use of similar images, as at 6.1120 *aer inimicus serpere coepit, ... paulatim repit*. But Ammianus is fond of serpent imagery for describing evils of all sorts, e.g. 15.8.7 *malo ... iam proserpenti* (of barbarian attacks). Serpent imagery is common in ancient literature in general and is even found in medical literature. 63

In view of Ammianus' fondness for joining Greek and Roman elements, 64 it would be surprising for him to overlook this opportunity to link two of the most famous descriptions of plagues, those of Thucydides and Lucretius, if the Lucretian passage was in fact known to him. But this is not the only missed opportunity. Ammianus also mentions Epicurus (30.4.3) and Democritus (15.1.4; 16.5.1; 22.8.3; 28.4.34), who are the Greek philosophical counterparts of Lucretius. Never once does he allude, even by the most tenuous of verbal echoes, to Lucretius in these passages. Nor have I been able to detect Lucretian echoes in any of the scientific digressions which are also likely spots for Ammianus to borrow Lucretian material. 65 Ammianus may have read Lucretius, but there is no evidence of this in the text of the *Res Gestae*. Nor is this surprising. In late antiquity Lucretius seems to have been read mainly by the Christian apologists, such as Arnobius, Lactantius, Jerome and Augustine. 66 Kroll cites only two very slight parallels in Symmachus. Claudian appears to be the only
pagan author of this time who displays much knowledge of Lucretius, but his interest was no doubt mainly poetical.67

vi. Conclusions

Ammianus' knowledge of Republican Latin poetry is very slender.68 He seems to know Ennius and Lucilius only through Cicero and makes no real use of them.69 He apparently did not know Lucretius. Only Plautus and Terence may have been familiar to him, and these very possibly through indirect sources (except perhaps for the Eunuchus). Use of phraseological borrowings from the comic poets seems consistently to occur in negative characterizations. These uses are heavily concentrated in the earlier of the extant books of the Res Gestae, which is interesting in view of Barnard's opinion that "one sees a slightly heavier overtone of Greek literature in the earlier books, balanced by a greater awareness of Latin, particularly of Cicero, in the later books."70 The more certain verbal borrowings all occur in the earlier books that we have. It may well be the case that this distribution reflects Ammianus' reading at a given time during the composition of the Res Gestae. He might have been reading an anthology or a collection of Republican locutions which included citations from the comic poets or even (less likely) the actual plays.
ENDNOTES

1 Cf. Ogilvie (1978) 8-10, but see also Jocelyn (1967) 55-56. Jocelyn argues that complete texts of the Annales may have survived as late as the fifth or sixth centuries A.D.

2 Kroll (1891) 29; Hagendahl (1958) 165 n. 2, 185 n. 2, 250, 269.

3 Hagendahl (1967) 170-72, 377.

4 The citation from Ennius = Annales 179 Vahlen.

5 Cf. J. Vahlen's edition (1903) 32-33.

6 Jerome is the only other author to combine these two oracles. He also borrows from Cicero; see Hagendahl (1958) 234-35.

7 Cf. A. S. Pease's edition of de divinatione at 2.115 and Michael (1874) 34.

8 Bude 42.49 n. 109.

9 Classen (1972) 43; Barnard (1966) 82-83.

10 Note also Barnard (1966) 70: "When Ammianus begins to relate the story of Ursicinus' Persian campaign, in 359, he is, of course, prone to call more frequently upon Herodotus. He cannot resist calling Sapor's huge army, as seen from a mountain-top, an equal of the army of Xerxes."

11 Owens (1958) 43.

12 Lindsay (1901) 2 and (1904) 24-25, 78-79.

13 Ogilvie (1978) 11.

14 Hagendahl (1958) 269-274.

16 Kroll (1891) 26-29.

17 Owens (1958) 42 ff.

18 Owens (1958) 43 and de Jonge, Commentary, ad loc.

19 Roselle (1976) 54.


21 Owens (1958) 42, citing TLL 3.1247.10 ff. This undermines the suggestion of Valesius that Ammianus is here translating from Greek. The image itself is not uncommon; cf. Otto (1890) 69.

22 Hagendahl (1921) 26 n. 1 and Owens (1958) 42. The passages have very little in common:

ERGASILUS:
ne quis in hac platea negoti conferat quicquara sui.
nam meumst ballista pugnum, cubitus catapultast mihi,
umerus aries, tum genu ad quemq' iecero ad terram dabo,
dentilegos omnis mortalis faciam, quemque offendoro.

HEGIO:
quae illaec eminatiost nam? nequeo mirari satis.
(Captivi 795-799)

Celsioris staturae et candidi paene Galli sunt omnes et rutili luminumque torvitate terribiles, avidi iurgiorum et sublatius insolentes. nec enim eorum quemquam adhibita uxore rixantem multo se fortioré et glauca peregrinorum ferre poterit globus tum maxime, cum illa inflata cervice suffrendens ponderansque niveas ulnas et vastas admixtis calcibus emittere coeperit pugnos ut catapultas tortilibus nervis excussas.
(Amm. 15.12.1)

23 Hagendahl (1921) 26 n. 1 and Owens (1958) 9 ff. Cf. also Camus (1967) 69.

24 Budé 1.265 n. 272.

25 Steele (1922) 24.
Archbold (1980) s.v. quasi.

Budé 2.222 n. 298 (Sabbah) claims that succentor is a technical term from the theatre and equals ὑποδολεύς. There is no evidence to support this. The word apparently occurs here for the first time in extant Latin literature. It is found elsewhere only in Christian writers as a musical technical term. Cf. Augustine Enarr. in Psalm. 87.1 (= PL 37.1109-1110):

Proinde quemadmodum dicuntur in arte musica, sicut ea docti homines latine dicere potuerunt praeceuror et succentor; praeceuror scilicet qui vocem praeemittit in cantu, succentor autem qui subsequetur canendo respondet: ita hoc cantico passionis, praeecedentem Christum subsequitur chorus martyrum in finem coelestium coronarum.

Cf. also Isidore of Seville 6.19.13:

tres autem gradus in cantando: primus succentor, secundus incentor, tertius accentor.

Lewis and Short wrongly define the latter occurrence of succentor as "promoter" and group it with Amm. 19.12.13. Isidore 7.12.26 is merely a partial quotation of the above cited Augustine. All of the standard lexica (Porcellini-De Vit, Lewis and Short, and Souter) give unique definitions for succentor in Ammianus, i.e. "promoter." Even the verb from which it is derived is very rare; Lewis and Short cite only Petronius 69.4 and Calpurnius Eclog. 4.79 for succino with the meaning "to sing in accompaniment." What exact force Ammianus ascribed to the word is uncertain, but it should be noted that he tends to avoid technical terms in general; cf. Cameron and Cameron (1964) 326. See now also de Jonge, Comm. on Amm. 19.12.13.

Owens (1958) 20 ff. discusses the modification of borrowed phrases to fit Ammianus' normal rhythmic pattern; on Ammianus' prose rhythm in general see Harmon (1910).

Cf. Fletcher (1937) 393-94 and the bibliography cited there.

Owens (1958) 112.

33 Seyfarth (1969) 453-54.

34 See Hanson (1965) on the *miles gloriosus* and his stock characteristics.

35 Owens (1958) 43.


37 Roselle (1976) 54.

38 Budé 1.235-36 n. 163 (Galletier and Fontaine) has an interesting discussion of *somniorum ... comes* which epithet Ammianus also applies to Mercurius here. It is described as a "soubriquet triplement raillieur" because (1) Mercurius was probably not really a *comes*; (2) the title itself is a parody of the highly specialized imperial titles; (3) the name Mercurius is associated (through the mention of dreams) with the god Mercury.

39 Cf. Marrou (1956) 278.

40 Hagendahl (1958) 270-72 and (1967) 254-64.

41 For Lactantius see Ogilvie (1978) 11-13; for Symmachus see Kroll (1891) 29-31.


43 Owens (1958) 44.

44 Budé 1.208 n. 56; de Jonge, Commentary, ad loc. Note especially Cicero *de orat.* 2.251 *quid enim potest esse tam ridiculum quam Sannio est* (which is also quoted by Nonius Marcellus).

45 Owens (1958) 45.

46 Ogilvie (1965) 488 apparently takes the *pro imperio* as "in accordance with his authority" which creates a problem, inasmuch as Valerius held no office at the time.
47 Hertz (1874b) 271 and Owens (1958) 44.
48 Owens (1958) 44.
49 Owens (1958) 45.
50 Budé 42.234 n. 581.
51 Owens (1958) 44.

52 Budé 42.241 n. 596: "Ammien s'attache à marquer surtout idealment, les traits physiques symboliques du caractère: rectitude, force, agilité. Le détail devrait être commenté à partir de l'Anonymus de physiognomia. À quelque rares exceptions près, ce portrait demeure assez 'générique.'" See also Evans (1969) 5-6, 15-17, 75-76, 95-96 and Sabbah (1978) 421-428.

53 Roselle (1976) 54.
54 Steele (1922) 24; cf. also Verdière (1970) 1072.
55 Owens (1958) 129-130, 133-37; Michael (1874) 36-37.

56 Barnard (1966) 95. Cf. also Wilamowitz (1876) 301-302: "Ammianus Marcellinus XXVIII 4 27 in uno excursuum illo- um quibus aeternae urbis perditos mores tumido ore descripts de senatoribus haec dixit, cumque mutuum ... Temenum putes. adfables comicos senes Hecyrae Adelphorumque esse Terentia- narum et Gelenius intellexit nec potest fugere nisi editores quales nuper Ammiano contigerunt." He goes on to note that the source of the tragic characters mentioned by Ammianus is unknown. He suggests a possible reference to Euripides.

57 Cf. fr. 1299-1300 Marx.
59 Ogilvie (1978) 8; however, Nonius Marcellus seems to have had access to editions of books 26-30 and 1-20 of Lucilius.

60 It is noteworthy that here again (see above n. 6) our only other late antique source for such an allusion is Jerome, a great reader of Cicero; see Warmington, ROL 3.420.

On serpent metaphors in general cf. Gartner and Heyke (1964) 63. An example from medical literature is Serenus Sammonicus 14.25 proserpit ad intima vulnus.

Classen (1972).

Amm. 17.7.9-4 (earthquakes); 20.3.2-12 (eclipses); 20.11.26-30 (rainbows); 25.2.5-6 (falling stars); 25.10.2-3 (comets). In this connection it should perhaps be noted that Hagendahl (1958) 16 ff. points out that Arnobius tends to use topics, arguments and phraseology from Lucretius in discussing physical and biological problems. A reading of Ammianus' scientific digressions leaves the clear impression that Ammianus relied heavily on Greek handbooks and especially doxographical sources. Grimm (1965) 83 ff. argues that Ammianus draws on a compilation of some sort for his account of the plague at Amida.

Kroll (1891) 41-42.


Camus (1967) 37 notes that Ammianus' knowledge of Greek poetry is not great and that his use of it is mainly ornamental.

See Zillinger (1911) on Cicero's numerous citations from Roman poetry. It is not impossible that some of Ammianus' comic citations come from lost works of Cicero, such as the Hortensius, which were still available in the fourth century.

Barnard (1966) 105-6. As Owens (1958) 12-13 observes, there has never been a proper study of the distribution of literary allusions and borrowings throughout the Res Gestae.
Chapter III
CATO MAIOR

There are three citations of Cato Maior in Ammianus (14.6.8; 15.12.4; 16.5.2). In addition, Cato is mentioned on three other occasions (26.10.10; 28.1.34; 34.4.21), each time in conjunction with another historical figure as a moral exemplar. While these mere mentions tell us nothing specific about Ammianus' use of Cato's works, they do show his general attitude toward Cato, which is influenced partly by what Ammianus knows of Cato's literary endeavors.

Our initial question concerns the extent of Ammianus' knowledge of Cato. De Agricultura, inasmuch as it survives, must have been available somewhere during the fourth century. Whether or not Ammianus was acquainted with it is uncertain, since he makes no reference to it in the Res Gestae. It is unlikely that he would have had much occasion to use it in an historical work. The Origines and the speeches of Cato would have been of more use to Ammianus. Yet the speeches may have existed only in fragments by his time. The latest of our major sources for them are Gellius and various grammarians and lexicographers. In the case of Festus and very likely others this is an indirect knowledge based on the work of Verrius Flaccus. The Origines, on the other hand, may well have been available, since the Servian commentary on the Aeneid is a major source of its fragments. But once
again there is always the possibility that Donatus, and through him Servius, gathered this material from earlier compilations and not from a complete text of the work. Since we have only fragments of these works, it is impossible to know for certain if Ammianus made use of them, unless he specifically had attributed something to them. He did not. There were also collections of sayings (dicta memorabilia) assigned to Cato. One of these is the most likely source for Ammianus' citations.³

The first citation occurs in the famous Roman digression in Book 14:

quam autem sit pulchrum exigua haec spernentem et minima ad ascensus verae gloriae tendere longos et arduos, ut memorat vates Ascreaeus, Censorius Cato monstravit. qui interrogatus, quam ob rem inter multos .... statuam non haberet, "malo," inquit, "ambigere bonos, quam ob rem id non meruerim, quam, quod est gravius, cur impetraverim mussionare."

(Amm. 14.6.8)

The use of inquit and the clausula ambigere bonos (rare in Ammianus) suggest direct quotation here.⁴ The unusual clausula is a strong indication that Ammianus is following a Latin source and is not translating from Plutarch where the bon mot is also found.⁵ In addition, the fact that Ammianus has two more witticisms from Cato, neither of which is found in Plutarch, suggests that he may have had access to a somewhat different collection of dicta,⁶ although it is possible that Plutarch simply omitted these two from his collection of Catonian sayings.
Here Cato is quoted appositely in a passage which castigates the luxuries and the pretensions of Ammianus' contemporaries. It is worth noting that two other literary figures, Simonides and Hesiod, are also mentioned in the same paragraph. Ammianus displays no great knowledge of these poets. Simonides is referred to only here and at 16.5.8 (an anecdote about his powers of memory, where he is mentioned together with several others). Hesiod (Ascraeus), who is linked somewhat more closely to Cato, is apparently referred to only here. Owens has pointed out that Ammianus does not, as a rule, indicate the source of a borrowing. All three quotations of Cato are identified by name, although each could have been presented as an anonymous bon mot. The name of Cato had great moral authority and this alone provides sufficient reason for using it. In this instance Ammianus is also employing a favorite device: the juxtaposition of Roman and Greek figures. Still one has the feeling that Ammianus is engaged in name-dropping and that when he names a number of literary figures in a single passage he is very likely pretending to more erudition than he has -- he wishes to draw attention to his "knowledge" of these authors.

The second citation occurs at Ammianus 15.12.4:

vini avidum genus affectans ad vini similitudinem multiplices potus et inter eos humiles quidam obtunsis ebrietate continua sensibus, quam furoris voluntariam speciem esse Catoniana sententia definit, raptantur discursibus vagis, ut verum illud videatur, quod ait defendens Fonteium Tullius: "Gallos
Again we find Cato used in a passage critical of current moral practices (this time those of the Gauls). The expression *Catoniana sententia* might indicate use of a collection of sayings. Although the word *sententia* is used some 67 times by Ammianus only four times does it seem to have the meaning of "saying" or "bon mot." Each of these accompanies a *bon mot*, usually one traceable to a literary source. The word's normal meaning in Ammianus is "judicial decision" or "opinion." Here the Catonian allusion seems to be one of more general application, while the Ciceronian quotation is specific to the matter at hand. Once more there is an impression that Ammianus is padding his references and trying to show off his erudition.

The last actual quotation from Cato occurs at 16.5.2:

> Primum igitur factuque difficile temperantium ipse sibi indixit atque retinuit, tamquam astrictus sumptuariis legibus viveret, quas ex rhetris Lycurgi, id est axibus, Romam translatas diuque observatas et senescentes paulatim reparavit Sulla dictator, reputans ex praedictis Democriti, quod ambitiosam mensam Fortuna, parcam virtus apponit. id etiam Tusculanus Cato prudenter definiens cui censorii cognomen castior vitae indidit cultus: "magna," inquit "cura cibi, magna virtutis incuria."

The presentation of this has some features in common with the other two Catonian citations. As at 14.6.8, Ammianus uses *inquit*; in addition, *cura cibi* is the same type of clausula
as ambigere bonos. Definire is used to introduce citations both here and at 15.12.4. Once again the quotation has a moral reference, occurring in a literary flourish attached to an account of Julian's virtues. Cato's bon mot is joined to a similar one by Democritus, in accordance with Ammianus' usual practice of linking Greek and Roman elements. Also worth noting is the fact that Ammianus' knowledge of Democritus seems to be merely superficial, as is the case with Simonides and Hesiod at 14.6.8.

Cato is also mentioned three times without accompanying citation or literary allusion. While I have included these as being references to Cato the elder (as has Seyfarth in the index nominum of his Teubner edition), I should note that possibly one or more of them can be taken as being to Uticensis, who is referred to specifically at 14.8.5 and 28.4.21. The first occurs at Ammianus 26.10.10:

ubi vero consiliis impiis iura quidem praetenduntur et leges et Catonianae vel Cassianae sententiae fuco perliti residerint iudices.

Here Ammianus uses Cato, along with L. Cassius Longinus, as an example of a stern judge.

A similar use of Cato's name in connection with the law courts occurs at 30.4.21:

et iudices patiuntur interdum doctos ex Philistionis aut Aesopi cavillationibus, quam ex Aristidis illius Iusti vel Catonis disciplina productos.
While this might be viewed merely as the combining of a Greek and a Roman in an exemplum, it is an unusual comparison in earlier Latin literature. It is not however unique in Ammianus' day: Ausonius twice links Cato and Aristides. One instance is at Parentalia 22.3-4:

Nec solus semper censor Cato nec sibi solus
Iustus Aristides his placeant titulis.

The second is at Mosella 386-88:

Nec sola antiquos ostenta Roma Catones,
Aut unus tantum iusti spectator et aequi
Pollet Aristides veteresque inlustrat Athenas.

It is not an illogical juxtaposition; it is very likely that Ammianus thought it up on his own. It is also possible that he had Plutarch in mind. The point of the comparison of their disciplina (whatever Ammianus meant by this: perhaps self-restraint) to the cavillationes of Aesop and Philistion is also unclear.

The last mention of a Cato is at Ammianus 28.1.39:

quae verba effectui propere iuncta terruis-
sent profecto Numae Pompilii similes et Catonem.

Ammianus is describing the chilling effect of the statement of a wicked judge: nullum se invito reperiri posse insontem. Both the choice and the collocation of Numa and Cato are a bit odd, although I am not sure who would be more appropriate in this context. Here it is more probable that Cato
Uticensis is meant, especially in view of his choice of death in preference to Caesar's clemency.

From the above discussion we can draw some conclusions. All of Ammianus' allusions to the elder Cato involve moral exempla. Direct citation seems to be concentrated in the earliest of the extant books, with one each in Books 14, 15, and 16. There is no special reason for him not to cite Cato later on. Certainly similar occasions present themselves: the citation in Book 14 is in the digression criticizing the morals of contemporary Rome; a very similar passage occurs at 28.4 where no mention is made of Cato. 16.5 is an encomium on Julian's morals, but so is 25.4 where no reference to Cato is found. It is difficult to say why Ammianus would choose to allude to an author in one passage and not in another where the context is the same. Yet here there is a possible explanation. The distribution of allusions to Plautus and Terence is also heavily concentrated in the same books, as I have noted in Chapter II. Perhaps the simplest explanation is that Ammianus was reading a collection of Cato's dicta or a more general collection containing sayings from a variety of sources. It does seem fairly certain that Ammianus' knowledge of Cato's works was limited to such dicta, at least in the Res Gestae. This is not unusual for the time. Symmachus and Jerome both seem to have known only maxims of Cato.
ENDNOTES


2 Ammianus often uses literary culture as a criterion for judging a man; See p. 4 above.


4 Ammianus sometimes inserts a verb of speaking in a direct quotation; cf. Owens (1958) 46 and 136. On the clausula see Owens 26-28, 46 and Blomgren (1937) 93 ff. The Catonian phrase cura cibi at Amm. 16.5.2 is another example of this same clausula, which is Harmon (1910) type Cy.

5 Plutarch, Cato Maior 19.4; Moralia 198e, 820b. Cf. Jordan's edition of Cato 104n. Obviously if Ammianus were translating from Greek he would much more likely use one of his own more characteristic clausulae.

6 Budé l.206 n. 49.

7 Camus (1967) 36 states that Ammianus seems to have had only a fragmentary knowledge of Greek lyric poetry. The confusion over the attribution of the "Simonidean" fragment at Amm. 14.6.7 — it is not among the existing fragments and Plutarch (Demosthenes 1) attributes it to Euripides "or whoever it was;" cf. the note ad loc. in Rolfe's Loeb edition of Ammianus and Roselle (1976) 32 — might indicate its occurrence in an anthology. The use of such anthologies was common in Greek schools; cf. Marrou (1956) 67. The Hesiodic citation also seems ideal material for a school anthology. Cf. also Budé l.206 nn. 46 and 48.

8 Classen (1972) regards the parallel between the two as far-fetched and so probably original to Ammianus. It does not seem so odd to me. Both are known as the authors of moral gnomai and both wrote works on agriculture. That Ammianus intends to link them is made clear by the chiastic word order.

9 Owens (1958) 9 ff.
Cato is mentioned at Symmachus Epp. 1.4; 3.44; 7.15; Claudian De Quarto Consulatu Honorii Aug. 411; De Manlii Theod. Cons. 163-65; Ausonius Parentalia 22.3-4 Mosella 386-88.

Ammianus' use of literary figures and the occasions on which he names and/or cites them is discussed in the Appendix.

Cf. Jordan's edition 110, Dicta no. 78.

In addition to the passage under discussion cf. 15.5. 23 mirabamur illam sententiam Tullianum, which is followed by what may be a fragment of de republica; cf. Michael (1874) 13. Amm. 26.10.12 sententiae Tullianae is followed by a phrase from de off. 2.27. Amm. 25.3.15 philosophorum sententia generalli perdoctus is also followed by a sententious phrase quantum corpore sit beatior animus.

Cf. Jordan's edition 110, Dicta no. 79.

Cf. note 4 above.


For Cassius, a man proverbial for his severity, see Ammianus 22.9.9; 30.8.13 (joined with Lycurgus in both instances), and Cicero Verr. 2.3.137, 146; off. 2.27; Rosc. Amer. 85; Brutus 97. Cf. also Otto (1890) 77, s.v. Cassius. See also p. 123 below.

Cato is often compared to Fabricius; cf. Cicero off. 3.16 and 87; Apuleius Apol. 18. Seneca Cons. ad Helv. 13.5-7 does mention Cato the elder and Aristides in reasonably close proximity to one another, but they are not really linked as they are here.

Plutarch compares Aristides and Cato Maior in his parallel lives. Ammianus may be dependent on Plutarch for information on Heraclitus at 21.16.14; cf. Classen (1972) 42 and Bywater (1876). Ammianus' possible uses of Plutarch require further investigation.

Various critics have proposed emendations to Catonem: Valesius Catonum, Novak Catonis. As Blomgren (1937) 58-59 points out, this type of inconcinnity is not uncommon in
Ammianus; cf. 27.12.2 quosdam optimatum et satrapas. It should also be noted that Numae Pompillii similis may echo Livy 1.20.2:

\[
\text{sed quia in civitate bellicosa plures} \\
\text{Romuli quam Numae similis reges putabat} \\
\text{fore iturosque ipsos ad bella...}
\]

and 4.3.17:

\[
\text{ut vir fortis ac strenuus, pace belloque} \\
\text{bonus, ex plebe sit, Numae, L. Tarquinio,} \\
\text{Ser. Tullio similis.}
\]

21 Elsewhere (16.7.4 and 21.14.5) Numa is linked with Socrates, but these passages shed no light here.

22 Cf. Finke (1904) 67-68.

23 On Symmachus see Kroll (1891) 60. For Jerome cf. Hagendahl (1957) 206. Hagendahl has found only one citation of Cato Maior in Jerome, at ep. 66.9.2 scitum est illud Catonis: "sat cito, si sat bene" (= Jordan 110, Dicta no. 80).
It is only natural that Ammianus' work shows the influence of his predecessors in the historical genre. Indeed, he is often said to have considered himself a successor and continuator of Tacitus, and many have studied the relationship of the two authors. Here, however, I am concerned only with the historians of the Republican era. Two of these, Julius Caesar and Sallust, have had sufficient impact on Ammianus to warrant discussion.

i. Caesar

Ammianus certainly had some knowledge of Caesar's Commentaries. He refers directly to Caesar's literary activities at 25.2.3. He gives an extended paraphrase of BG 1.1.1-3 at 15.11.1-5, not to mention a number of other possible verbal echoes and borrowings. Still, the extent of Ammianus' knowledge of Caesar remains a matter for speculation. There are far fewer verbal reminiscences from Caesar than from Sallust and Tacitus. Some might suspect that Ammianus had only a second-hand knowledge of Caesar's writings. I would suggest that Ammianus probably had read in full the Gallic War, and very possibly the Civil War as
well. We know from Symmachus (Ep. 4.18.5) that complete
texts of the Gallic War at least were available in Rome
in Ammianus' day:

priscas Gallorum memorias deferri in manus
tuas postulas. revolve Patavini scriptoris
extrema quibus res Gai Caesaris explicantur,
aut si impar est desiderio tuo Livius, sume
ephemeridem C. Caesaris decertam bibliotheca-
culae meae, ut tibi muneri mitteretur. Haec
teste origines, situs, pugnas, et quidquid fuit
in moribus aut legibus Galliarum docebit.

Not only did Ammianus' contemporary Symmachus own a copy of
the Bellum Gallicum, but he recommended it to a friend as
a source of exactly the sort of information Ammianus gives
in 15.9-12. A somewhat later contemporary, the Christian
historian Orosius also seems to have known the Bellum
Gallicum. Since Ammianus both served in Gaul himself and
also deals extensively with events in Gaul, especially those
which took place under the Caesar Julian, whom he compares
more than once to Julius, it is highly unlikely that Ammi-
anus would have failed to read Caesar's works. I think that
the following analysis of his use of Caesar's writings will
help to confirm that he did know at least the Bellum Gal-
licum in its entirety.

The first aspect of Ammianus' use of Caesar that I wish
to discuss is the comparison of Julian to Julius Caesar,
particularly during his account of Julian's years in Gaul.
This comparison involves direct references to Caesar, verbal
allusions to and borrowings from his work, and possibly
structural influences.

In 15.8 Ammianus describes Julian's elevation to the rank of Caesar and his assignment to Gaul. Then, in 15.9-12, he gives us a long digression on Gaul and her peoples. This is placed at what Ammianus considers to be the beginning of a new and important part of his history: the career of Julian. He makes this clear at 15.9.1:

Proinde quoniam -- ut Mantuanus vates praedixit excelsus -- opus moveo maius maiorque mihi rerum nascitur ordo, Galliarum tractus et situm ostendere puto nunc tempestivum, ne inter procinctus ardentibus proeliorumque varios casus ignota quibus dam expediens imitari videar desides nauticos attrita linnea cum rudentibus, quae licuit parari securius, inter fluctus resarcire coactos et tempestates.

The allusion to Vergil (Aen. 7.44-45) obviously indicates a break with what has gone before. Thus the digression marks a beginning and is structurally analogous to the description of Gaul at the opening of the Bellum Gallicum. Ammianus 15.11-12 are especially significant. 15.11.1-5, as I noted above, are almost a paraphrase of BG 1.1.1-3:

Temporibus priscis, cum laterent hae partes ut barbarae, tripertitae fuisset creduntur in Celtas eosdemque Gallos divisae et Aquitanos et Belgas, lingua institutis legibusque discrepantes. et Gallos quidem, qui Celtae sunt, ab Aquitanis Garunna disterminat flumen, a Pyrenaeis oriens collibus postque oppida multa transversa in oceano delitescens. a Belgis vero eandem gentem Matrona discindit et Sequana, amnes magnitudinis geminae; qui fluentes per Lugdunensem post circumclausum ambitu insulari Parisiorum castellum Lutetiam nomine consociati meantesque protinus prope castra Constantia
funditur in mare. horum omnium apud veteres Belgae dicebantur esse fortissimi ea propter, quod ab humaniore cultu longe discreti nec adventiciis effeminati deliciis diu cum trans-rhenanis certavere Germanis. Aquitani enim, ad quorum litora ut proxima placidaque merces adventiciae convehuntur, moribus ad mollitiem lapsis facile in dicionem venere Romanam.

(Amm. 15.11.1-5)

Gallia est omnis divisa in partis tres, quarum unam incolunt Belgae, aliam Aquitani, tertiam qui ipsorum lingua Celtae, nostra Galli appellantur. Hi omnes lingua, institutis, legibus inter se differunt. Gallos ab Aquitanis Garumna flumen, a Belgis Matrona et Sequana dividit. Horum omnium fortissimi sunt Belgae, propterea quod a cultu atque humanitate provinciae longissime absunt, minimeque ad eos mercatores saepe commeant atque ea quae ad effeminandos animos pertinent important, proximique sunt Germanis qui trans Rhenum incolunt, quibuscum continenter bellum gerunt. (BG 1.1.1-3)

As if this extended verbal borrowing were not enough, Ammianus refers to Caesar by name in the very next sentence (15.11.6):

regebantur autem Galliae omnes, iam inde uti crebritate bellorum urgenti cessere Iulio dictatori, ...

There are other, perhaps less obvious verbal echoes of Caesar elsewhere in this digression. These include Amm. 15.11.13:

in Aquitania, quae Pyrenaeos montes et eam partem spectat oceani, quae pertinet ad Hispanos, prima provincia est Aquitania,...

which is rather similar in expression to BG 1.1.7:

Aquitania a Garumna flumine ad Pyrenaeos montis et eam partem Oceani quae est ad
Hispaniam pertinet; spectat inter occasum solis et septentriones.

Another probable reminiscence is Ammianus 15.11.16:

et quoniam ad has partes opere contexto pervenimus, silere super Rhodano maximi nominis flumine incongruum est et absurdum.

This bears at least a mild resemblance to BG 6.11.1:

quoniam ad hunc locum perventum est, non alienum esse videtur de Galliae Germaniae-que moribus et quo differant hae nationes inter sese proponere.

This passage from the Bellum Gallicum also introduces an ethnographic digression on the Gauls and Germans. Very likely Ammianus had read both passages in Caesar when he was preparing this excursus and so had the above type of introductory formula in mind.

The entire digression closes with a direct reference to Caesar's victorious campaigns in Gaul (15.12.6):

nam omnes Gallias, nisi qua paludibus inviae fuere, ut Sallustio docetur auctore, post decennalis belli mutuas clades <subegit Caesar> societatique nostrae foederibus xit aeternis.

The reference to Sallust is to Hist. frag. 1.11, whence Ammianus has borrowed the phrase nisi qua paludibus inviae fuere. Subegit Caesar is Lindenbrog's suppletion; there is a lacuna of approximately 13 letters in V. But it is reasonably certain that Caesar's name should be there, and at any
rate decennalis belli provides a clear allusion to Julius Caesar to close the digression. 6

Ammianus seems to go out of his way to invoke Julius Caesar in this digression and to suggest the comparison of Julian to him. As I have shown above, 15.11-12 contains extensive (and often very obvious) phraseological borrowings from Caesar's Bellum Gallicum. Indeed, these sections seem to be set apart from the first half of the digression (15.9-10). The extended paraphrase of Caesar at 15.11.1-5, with the mention of Caesar by name at 15.11.6 and the closing sentence at 15.12.6 function as a sort of ring composition, drawing further attention to Julius Caesar and his accomplishments. The story of Julian's venture in Gaul is then interrupted by a short account of doings in the Orient (15.13). When Ammianus again takes it up at 16.1 he almost immediately resumes the implied comparison of him to Julius Caesar (16.1.2):

quia igitur res magnae, quas per Gallias virtute felicitateque correxit, multis veterum factis fortibus praestant,...

Certainly Caesar must be included among the veteres here, especially in view of his prominence in 15.11-12. The phrases used at 15.12.6: belli mutuas clades and (if we accept Lindenbrog's suppletion) subegit Caesar, could equally well apply to Julian's experiences in Gaul.

The placement of Ammianus' description of the Battle of Strasburg may also be significant in terms of the comparison
with Caesar. The climax of Caesar's initial campaign in Gaul was his battle with the German Ariovistus, of which an account concludes the first book of the Bellum Gallicum, as the last event in the year's fighting. Likewise, in Ammianus, we find Julian's battle with the Alemanni at Strasburg is placed at the end of Book 16 to mark the climax of the initial phase of his reign in Gaul. However, this battle does not conclude the season's campaign; the opening sections of Book 17 continue with further military operations conducted by Julian against the Germans in the summer of 357. We must conclude that the break is a deliberate and artificial one. Ammianus wants to emphasize the importance of the battle at Strasburg. It is just possible that he had in mind book one of the Bellum Gallicum and followed its construction. Ammianus presents the opening phase of Julian's reign in Gaul in a manner structurally similar to that of Caesar's account of his first year in Gaul: he opens with an ethnographic digression and closes with a climactic battle.

Another passage of Ammianus in which he may have been thinking of Caesar is the description of Julian's crossing of the Abora river into Persia (23.5). There are several general parallels with Caesar's bridging of the Rhine (BG 4.16-19). In both instances considerable importance is attached to the symbolic aspects of the crossing. Caesar plainly states that he is crossing the Rhine to strike awe and fear into the Germans (BG 4.16.1):
Ammianus stresses in a different way the symbolic importance of Julian's river crossing. At Ammianus 23.5.16-23 Julian delivers a speech to his troops, in which he lists the many Roman generals and emperors, such as Lucullus, Pompey, Antony and Trajan, who had campaigned in the region. Julian also mentions other traditional enemies of Rome: Veii, Carthage and Numantia. The whole effect of the speech is to underscore the historical significance of the crossing into Persia. While Julius Caesar is, of course, not among the Romans who fought against the Parthians, we must remember that he did plan to invade Parthia, but was prevented from doing so by his assassination. Indeed, Ammianus' use of Parthos at 23.5.4 expeditionem in Parthos may be intended to recall Caesar, although Ammianus does tend to use the terms Parthi and Persae interchangeably. At any rate, Ammianus reminds us of the Gallic connection at 24.4.25:

maxime omnium id numeri Gallicani fremitu laetiore monstrabant, memores aliquotiens eo ducante, perque ordines discurrente cadentes vidisse gentes aliquas alias suppliantes.

Julian's most ardent supporters on the Persian campaign are the Gallic troops who recall their earlier victories together in Gaul. This is certainly similar to Caesar's situation; he relied heavily upon the loyalty of his Gallic legions. A final similarity between the passages in Ammianus and
Caesar is that in each case there is a geographical/ethnographical digression nearby. In Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* it comes slightly before the crossing; BG 4.10 is a brief account of the Rhine and its environs. In Ammianus there is the long Persian digression (23.6) immediately following the river crossing.

It is quite possible that Ammianus desires here to suggest that Julian was a restless conqueror in the mold of Julius Caesar. Certainly the parallels are well established for the Gallic activities of the two. Caesar also had ambitions in the East. At the time of his death he was making preparations for an invasion of Parthia. Julian actually carried out the invasion of this troublesome neighbor.

To reinforce the suggestions above, I now wish to add some additional (mostly circumstantial) evidence that Ammianus wanted to maintain a comparison of Julian and Julius Caesar, especially in the parts of the *Res Gestae* which deal with Julian's exploits in Gaul. Ammianus continually makes reference to both the fortuna and the clementia of Julian. While these are not uncommon imperial virtues, both are especially associated with Julius Caesar. The fact that Ammianus repeatedly ascribes both virtues to Julian almost from his first mention of him (15.8.21 imperatorem clementem et f auntum) may be significant for the comparison of the two men.

Caesar himself made much of his luck (fortuna/felicitas); note, for example, BG 1.40.12 felicitatem Helvetiorum bello
perspectam; 4.23.5 hoc unum ad pristinam fortunam Caesaris
defuit; 6.3.5 paulum ad summam felicitatem defuisse. Indeed,
it became proverbial. So also does Ammianus frequently refer
to the luck of Julian. At 15.8.21, as I have noted above, we find the first reference to it, combined with the other Casarian virtue of clemency. At 16.1.2 Ammianus mentions the felicitas with which Julian, who surpassed even the exploits of the veteres, had restored Gaul. Two further references to Julian's good luck occur in the description of the battle of Strasburg: 16.12.13 fortunati rectoris and 16.12.18 felicissime omnium Caesar. Other instances include 17.1.14 ut faustus Caesar exultabat et felix; 22.9.1 ei ... velut mundanam cornucopiam Fortuna gestans propitia, cuncta gloriosa defendebat et prospera; 25.4.14 felicitas ita eminuit, ut ipsis quodammodo cervicibus Fortunae aliquam­
diu bonae gubernatrix evectus.

The clemency of Caesar was also famous. Not only does Caesar himself refer to his clemency, it is also much discussed in Cicero's correspondence (at least part of which Ammianus read). Also, other writers contemporary with Ammianus mention it. We find the expression clementia Caesaris used in de viris illustribus 80.4 (on Cato Uticensis), with more examples of Caesar's forgiveness occurring at 81.5, 82.5, and 83.6. There are also in the works of St. Augustine four citations of Cicero on Caesar's mercifulness. Ammianus is full of references to the clementia (or lenitudo) of Julian. In the chapter introducing Julian, as noted above, Ammianus
calls him *imperatorem clementem et faustum*. Similar phrases occur at 21.12.20 *placabilis imperator et clemens* and 24.4.6 *serenus imperator et clemens*. Other references to this trait of Julian are found at 16.1.4, 16.5.12-13, 17.8.4, 22.9.6, 22.14.5, and 25.4.9. Concerning these we should observe that 16.1.4 *clemens ut Antoninus* compares Julian to Marcus Aurelius rather than to Caesar, and 16.5.12 *incusent iura clementiam, sed imperatorem iustissimi animi legibus praestare ceteris decet* and 22.14.5 *clementia principis* are passages in which Julian is purportedly speaking. Still, in view of the references to the clemency of Caesar in other contemporary writers, the great emphasis given to Julian's clemency, and other indications of a comparison of Julian and Caesar, there is some possibility that Ammianus had Caesar in mind when he dwelt upon this particular virtue of Julian.11

There is one passage where Ammianus makes a direct comparison of Julian and Julius Caesar (25.2.3):

*ipse autem ad sollicitam suspensamque quietem paulisper protractus, cum somno, ut solebat, depulso ad aemulationem Caesaris Iulii quaedam sub pellibus scribens obscuro noctis altitutine sensu cuiusdam philosophi teneretur, vidit squalidius, ut confessus est proximis, speciem illam Genii publici, quam, cum ad Augustum surgeret culmen, conspexit in Galliis,*...

Here Ammianus compares their common practice of devoting time to literary endeavors even while on campaign.12 Although the passage deals with events of the Persian campaign and the last days of Julian's life, it is perhaps significant that
mention of Caesar occurs in a place where Ammianus is look­ing back to Julian's days in Gaul.

There remain for discussion several instances of phrases that Ammianus might have borrowed from Caesar's writings. Ammianus 21.13.7 re tamen magnum ei difficultatem ad capessendum consilium adferente is very close to BG 7.10.1 magnum haec res Caesari difficultatem ad consilium capiendum ad­ ferbat. Also similar to this same passage are BC 1.48.3 and 3.51.6. All four of these passages refer to difficulties of a military nature, but there seems to have been no special reason for borrowing apart from that. Likewise, the other parallels from Caesar which have been noted seem to suggest nothing more than the mere borrowing of a convenient phrase: Amm. 26.5.12 ardens ad redeundum and 27.3.12 ad rapiendam episcopi sedem ardentes / BG 6.34.7 omnium animi ad ulciscendum ardebant; Amm. 27.9.2 adfinitate Remigii confisus / BC 3.83.1 adfinitate Pompei confideret; Amm. 30.9.2 temporis compulsus angustiis / BC 3.41.4 angustiis rei frumentarias compulsum.

There is also, at 29.2.18, a saying attributed to Caesar:

no esse (ut Caesar dictator aiebat) miserum esse instrumentum senectuti recordationem crudelitatis.

We have no knowledge of Ammianus' source for this. It probably comes from a collection of dicta memorabilia, perhaps one sim­ ilar to that found in Plutarch's Moralia. It is used in a
passage which criticizes Valens for the magic and treason trials held in the Orient in 371. Indeed, its use reminds one of that of the *dicta* of Cato elsewhere in Ammianus (see Chapter III).

ii. Sallust

Sallust was a popular author throughout antiquity and the Middle Ages. He was read widely in the fourth century. Both Symmachus and Augustine, for example, draw frequently on all three of his works. Ausonius (13.2.61-65) refers to the *Catiline* and the *Histories*:

iam facinus, Catilina, tuum Lepidique tumultum, ab Lepido et Catulo iam res et tempora Romae orsus bis senos seriem conecto per annos; iam lego civili mixtum Mavorte duellum movit quod socio Sertorius exul Hibero.

Aurelius Victor, Septimius, and Sulpicius Severus also made use of Sallust's writings. In the West, at least, Sallust was studied extensively in the schools, as Jerome (adv. Ruf. 1.16) tells us:

puto quod puer legeris Aspri in Vergilium et Sallustium commentarios, Volcati in orationes Ciceronis...

Jerome assumes that any educated person will have read not only Sallust himself but also a commentary on his works. Even in the Greek East the study of Sallust was not unknown. There
are seven papyri of Sallust. Most of these are of the fourth century. All three of Sallust's works are represented. One of the papyri, PSI 1.110, preserves a fragment of the Catiline together with some Greek glosses, which suggest that Sallust may have been used by Greek speakers (and other Easterners) as a text for learning Latin.17

In view of this vogue which the works of Sallust enjoyed, one would expect Ammianus to be familiar with them and to use them both as a source for Republican history and as a stylistic model. Yet Ammianus' use of these, especially of the Histories, has been the subject of much discussion and of much disagreement. V. Gardthausen, who made a special study of the sources used by Ammianus in geographical passages, argued that Ammianus did not know the writings of Sallust directly, but rather drew his information from a geographical work which had assimilated the geographical materials in the Histories. A. von Gutschmid, in a review of Gardthausen's monograph, suggested that Ammianus had indeed used Sallust, but only in the form of an anthology of his geographical digressions from the Histories (similar to the surviving collection of speeches and letters). Later M. Hertz rightly asserted that Ammianus knew and used Sallust's Histories in their entirety. Hertz noted that not all of the passages used were from geographical digressions. For example Hist. 4.16 (cf. Amm. 20.6.6) is from a narrative passage dealing with the siege of a Pontic city, presumably Heraclea. Hertz also observed that Ammianus made some use of the Jugurtha,
but almost none of the Catiline. Since this study by Hertz appeared much effort has been put into compiling lists of phraseological borrowings in Ammianus from earlier authors and to examining his sources. Yet his general conclusions on Ammianus' use of Sallust seem to be upheld. As we shall see in the course of this chapter, Ammianus very likely did use the Histories directly, and in a complete or nearly complete form. His borrowings are drawn from all five books and from a variety of contexts: geographical digressions, speeches and narrative. Since a great deal of the Histories has been lost it is safe to assume that there are a fair number of other borrowings, phraseological and otherwise, which can no longer be identified. At any rate, Ammianus made considerable use of this work. He also made extensive use of the Jugurtha, but not much of the Catiline. A rough count of passages in which Ammianus borrows from Sallust either phrase or matter gives the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jugurtha</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historiae</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catilina</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This count is based on the passages discussed in this chapter. It includes all of Ammianus' certain borrowings and most of the probable ones. While it is necessarily an inexact tabulation due to questions of probability and occasionally to the possibility of multiple sources (e.g. similar passages in both the Jugurtha and the Catiline or in both Sallust and
Tacitus), the relative frequency of use should be fairly reliable.

As the above discussion suggests, most of the work done on the relation of Sallust and Ammianus has concentrated on the extent of his knowledge of Sallust's corpus and on listing individual borrowings. In the remainder of this chapter I shall categorize these borrowings in an effort to show a number of patterns. On the more substantive side we find common statements of historiographical principles, similarities in both the content and phrasing of moral judgements (especially in criticism of contemporaries), borrowing of geographical and ethnographical material in excursuses, and of various historical anecdotes. Many of these are made obvious by verbal similarities. There are also strictly verbal borrowings to be examined. These include expressions for time of day and of year, topographical descriptions, phrases used in descriptions of sieges and other military matters, and miscellaneous phraseological borrowings.

There are three passages in which Ammianus borrows from Sallust in the course of explaining his own historiographical methods to the reader. At 28.1.2 Ammianus tells us that he will describe briefly and selectively some treason trials at Rome:

ac licet ab hoc textu cruento gestorum exquisite narrando iustus me retraheret metus multa reputantem et varia, tamen praesentis temporis modestia fretus carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna sunt, explanabo, nec pigebit quid ex his, quae apud veteres acciderunt timuerim docere succincte.
This is a fairly obvious echo of Catiline 4.2:

\[
\text{statui res gestas populi Romani carptim,}
\text{ut quaegue memoria digna videbantur, per-
scribere.}
\]

Ammianus repeats verbatim the key words concerning the selec-
tion and presentation of material.\textsuperscript{21}

Again at 23.6.62 and at 25.10.3 Ammianus pauses to ex-
plain his procedures:

\[
\text{et gentes quidem variae hos incolunt tractus,}
\text{quas nunc recensere alio properans superfluum}
\text{puto. (23.6.62)}
\]

\[
\text{quae digere nunc vetat aliorsum oratio}
\text{properans. (25.10.3)}
\]

In both places Ammianus is explaining his omission of a pos-
sible digression at that particular point. In each case
he uses \textit{alio} (or \textit{aliorsum}) \textit{properans}, the same expression
which Sallust uses in the same context at Jugurtha 19.2:

\[
\text{silere melius puto quam parum dicere quoniam}
\text{alio properare tempus monet.}
\]

This verbal similarity in similar passages strongly suggests
borrowing.\textsuperscript{22} These three Sallustian echoes clearly imply
that Ammianus carefully noted the remarks of his predecessors
on the writing of history, not only applying their principles
to his own writings but even repeating them in similar phrases.\textsuperscript{23}

Another area in which Ammianus draws on Sallust is the
moral criticism of his contemporaries. The two historians
had quite similar views on proper conduct. One has only to read the prefaces to the Catiline and the Jugurtha in conjunction with Ammianus' Roman digressions (14.6 and 28.4) to see this; both authors roundly condemn their fellow Romans for greed, gluttony, and every other sort of moral lapse. It is possible that Ammianus was influenced to some extent in this by his reading of Sallust, in whom he found a kindred spirit. 24 At any rate he often borrows phrases from Sallust in his outbursts of moral indignation.

A good example of Ammianus' borrowing in this department is 28.4.5 tanta plerosque labes insanabilium flagitorum oppressit, a phrase which calls to mind Catiline 36.5 tanta vis morbi atque uti tabes plerosque civium animos invaserat. Ammianus is describing the degenerate behavior of the urban throng of his day, just as Sallust describes the urban mob (Cat. 37.1 cuncta plebes) which backed Catiline. Ammianus takes from Sallust the metaphor of disease and also the structure and much of the vocabulary of the phrase. 25 We find a second metaphorical expression borrowed from Sallust at Ammianus 31.4.10 insidiatrix aviditas materia malorum fuit. Here Ammianus condemns the greed of Roman border officials in their dealings with the Goths. He borrows the words materia malorum from Catiline 10.3-5:

igitur primo pecuniae, deinde imperi cupid
crevit: ea quasi materies omnium malorum
fuere. namque avaritia fidem probitatem ceter-
asque artis bonas subvortit; pro his super-
biam, crudelitatem, deos neglegere, omnia
venalia habere edocuit.
The echo suggests that Ammianus had this general denunciation of greed in mind as he described one particular instance of it. 26

Ammianus 14.1.4 civili iustoque imperio ad voluntatem converso cruentam is another example of his use of reminiscences from a general theoretical statement by Sallust to describe a particular moral lapse, in this case Gallus Caesar's reign of terror. Here Ammianus draws on two Sallustian passages: Catiline 10.6 imperium ex iustissimo atque optimo crudele intolerandumque factum and Jugurtha 85.35 hoc est utile, hoc civile imperium. The first is from the preface of the Catiline, the same part, in fact, which we have seen echoed at Amm. 31.4.10. The second is from the famous speech of Marius. 27

Ammianus also borrows from Sallust expressions of moral disapprobation to apply to individuals. A notable example of this is Ammianus' ridicule of Procopius at 26.6.16:

ad hoc igitur dehonestamentum honorum omnium ludibrio sublatus et ancillari adulatione beneficii allocutus auctores opesque pollicitus amplas et dignitates ob principatus primitias processit in publicum...

Here Ammianus clearly is drawing on the speech of Lepidus in Sallust's Histories (1.55.22): Fufidius, ancillari turpis, honorum omnium dehonestamentum. 28 The reminiscence here is also noteworthy because Ammianus very rarely indulges in the sort of word play found in the borrowed phrase. A second expression of contempt which Ammianus seems to have borrowed
from Sallust is 26.10.2 *incultis moribus homo*, which describes the cruel and uncultured Serenianus, a crony of Valens. The same words are also found in the speech of Marius (*Jug.* 85.39): *sordidum me et incultis moribus aiunt.*

Geographical/ethnographical digressions were a traditional feature of ancient historiography, so it is not surprising that they have a prominent place in the *Res Gestae*. Ammianus was well aware of the tradition and paid close attention to the practices of his predecessors, especially Caesar, Sallust and Tacitus. The geographical digressions of Sallust in particular were famous in antiquity. The mere fact that an inordinately large number of the surviving fragments of the *Histories* are from these digressions attests to their popularity. Avienus, a contemporary of Ammianus, praises the geographical knowledge of Sallust in his own work *Ora Maritima* (4.32-36):

```
interrogasti, si tenes, Maeotici situs quis
esset aequoris, Sallustium noram id dedisse,
dicta et eius omnibus praetuludicatae auctori-
tatis ducier non abnuebam.
```

There has even been speculation, as we saw above, that there was an anthology of geographical passages from the *Histories*. It is only to be expected that Ammianus should use Sallust both as one of his stylistic models for this type of composition and as a source of material on the various regions which Sallust discussed.

One aspect in which Sallust influences the digressions in
Ammianus is that of introductions and conclusions. Sallust usually introduces his digressions by stating that circumstances require breaking off from the narrative at that point. He also often expresses a concern for brevity. Both of these elements can be found in Ammianus. In fact, some of his introductory statements seem to be rather closely modelled on Sallust. An example of this is Ammianus 23.6.1:

res adigit huc prolapsa ut in excessu celeri
situm monstrare Persidis descriptionibus
gentium curiose digestis, in quibus aegre
vera dixere paucissimi

follows the same structure and uses some of the same vocabulary as Jugurtha 17.1 res postulare videtur Africae situm paucis exponere. Ammianus' concluding formulae also bear some resemblance to those of Sallust, but, since in this case similar formulae occur in Tacitus as well, it is uncertain which model Ammianus may have been using.

We also find evidence, in the form of either borrowed matter or phrase, of Ammianus' use of Sallust in the body of his geographical digressions. Several fairly certain borrowings from Sallust can be spotted in the Gallic digression (Amm. 15.9-12). The first is at 15.10.10 Saguntinis memorabilibus aerumnis et fide, a passage which echoes Histories 2.64:

Saguntini fide atque aerumnis incliti prae mortalibus, studio maiores quam opibus, quippe apud quos etiam tum semiruta moenia, domus intectae parietesque templorum ambusti manus Punicas ostentabant.
A second echo of this same fragment seems to occur at Ammianus 15.11.12:

Aventicum, desertam quidem civitatem sed non ignoblem quondam ut aedificia semiruta nunc quoque demonstrant.

Finally, there is an explicit reference to Sallust near the end of the digression (15.12.6):

nam omnes Gallias, nisi qua paludibus inviae fuere, ut Sallustio docetur auctore, post decennalis belli mutuas clades subegit Caesar societatique nostrae foederibus vinxit aeternis.

The Sallustian passage to which Ammianus refers here is Histories 1.11:

omni Gallia cis Rhenum atque inter mare nostrum et Oceanum, nisi qua paludibus invia fuit perdomita.

While Ammianus obviously used many sources for this digression Sallust was certainly an important one. There may well be other references to the lost portions of the Histories which we are no longer able to identify.

The third book of Sallust's Histories included a digression on Pontus (fragments 61-80). Although there are no obvious borrowings, Ammianus must have read it while preparing his own description of Scythia (22.8). There are a number of correspondences in subject matter and an occasional verbal similarity. Both, for example, describe Scythia's shape as resembling a bow: Hist. 3.63 speciem efficit Scythici arcus /
Amm. 22.8.10 in speciem Scythici arcus. They also have similar comments on the water of the Black Sea: Hist. 3.65
atque ipsum mare Ponticum dulcius quam cetera / Amm. 22.8.46
omnis autem circumfluuo ambitu Pontus et nebulosus est et
dulcior aequorum ceteris. Ammianus may have drawn some of
his material on the nomadic ways of the Scythians from Sallust;
unfortunately we have only one fragment to go on, Hist. 3.76
Scythae nomades tenent, quibus plaustra sedes sunt (cf. Amm.
22.8.42 habitatula vilesque supellectiles plaustris imposi-
tae sunt). Lastly, Ammianus' use of the name Criumetopon for
a promontory (22.8.20) may be from his reading of Sallust.
Nonius (= Hist. 3.77) remarks on Sallust's use of the name
as though it were unusual: ita et Sallustius in situ Ponti
de promunturiis Paphlagonum et <eo,> quod Criumetopon appel-
lavit, posuit.

In Ammianus' long digression on Persia (23.6) we find
two phraseological borrowings from Sallust. His description
of Persian marriage customs (23.6.76):

pro opibus quisque asciscens matrimonia plura
vel paucia, unde apud eos per libidines varias
caritas dispersa torpescit.

seems to be modelled on Sallust's account of African practices
in this regard (Jug. 80.6-7):

verum ea necessitudo apud Numidias Maurosque
levis ducitur, quia singuli pro opibus quis-
que quam plurimas uxores, denas alii, alii
pluris habent, sed reges eo amplius. ita
animus multitudine distrahit: nulla pro
socia obtinet, pariter omnes viles sunt.
In addition to the general similarity of content and structure, Ammianus repeats the words *pro opibus quisque* from Sallust. A similar adaptation of a Sallustian phrase occurs just a few sentences further on, at Ammianus 23.6.79 *nec stando mingens nec ad requisita naturae sedens*. Sallust uses the words *ad requisita naturae* in *Histories* inc. 3 *profectus quidam Ligus ad requisita naturae*. This expression seems to have been considered a Sallustian coinage, as we can see from Quintilian, *Institutiones* 8.6.59 *ut Sallustius, ad requisita naturae*. These two borrowings show Ammianus using Sallust in a more general way. In the first instance he adapts from Sallust the description of customs among one people to describe similar practices of another people. We do not know the context of the second passage from Sallust, but, since it refers to a Ligurian, it may well be part of an illustration of Ligurian habits. At any rate, this sort of borrowing indicates the wide range of materials Ammianus had in mind when writing a digression. He not only read up on the subject matter, he even sought out suitable terminology and descriptive phrases from other ethnographical accounts.

Ammianus also used Sallust as a general source of information on Roman history. An example of this is found at Ammianus 23.5.56 *cameli a Mithradate exinde perducti, et primitus in obsidione Cyzicena visi Romanis*. This seems to be based on *Histories* 3.42 (= Plutarch, *Lucullus* 11) *Σαλούστιον δὲ ὑπενδόω τότε πρῶτον Ἀρδαῖ ρωμαῖοις καμήλους λέγοντος.*
Since our only citation of this fragment is in Greek verbal similarity cannot be proven. Still, Sallust is the most likely source. Ammianus cannot be using Plutarch, who denies the claim of Sallust that camels were first seen by the Romans during the Third Mithradatic War. Nor can this source be Livy who says the Romans first encountered camels at Magnesia in 194 B.C. (27.40.12).\(^40\)

Perhaps the single most important use that Ammianus made of Sallust is as a stylistic model, from whom he often borrows a phrase or expression. Sallust was highly regarded by the late antique literati. Symmachus (ep. 5.68.2) says:

\[
\text{statuerit hoc scriptor stilo tantum probandus}
\text{nam morum eius damnatione non sinunt, ut ab illo}
\text{agundae vitae petatur auctoritas.}
\]

Augustine also praised Sallust as being \textit{lectissimus pensator verborum} (\textit{beat. vit.} 31). Sallust was also one of the four authors used by Arusianus Messius in his handbook of phrases, the \textit{Quadriga}. Arusianus compiled this handbook around 395 A.D., the very time Ammianus was completing his \textit{Res Gestae}. It is only natural that Ammianus studied Sallust in order to improve his own Latinity.

Ammianus appears to borrow time expressions of various sorts from Sallust. At Ammianus 24.4.22 we find the phrase \textit{plerumque noctis processit}. The same expression is used by Sallust at \textit{Jugurtha} 21.2 and 109.4, and without \textit{processit} at 48.6. There are other similarities between the Ammianus passage and \textit{Jugurtha} 21.2 (discussed below) which suggest he may
have had that passage specifically in mind. *plerumque noctis* occurs only in Sallust and Ammianus. A bit further along, at Amm. 24.5.8, is another borrowing of this type from Sallust: *vigilia secunda praecipiti*. This seems to be modelled on hist. 2.87A *praecipiti iam secunda vigilia*. In both cases we are dealing with military contexts, and *vigilia* is itself military.

Ammianus apparently uses Sallustian terms for the time of year. Servius, in commenting on Vergil Georgics 1.43, gives a list of such terms (= Sallust hist. inc. 38):

> ut primo mense veris novum dicitur ver, secundo adultum, tertio praeceps, sicut etiam Sallustius dicit ubique.

Servius' note shows us that at least one near contemporary of Ammianus considered these expressions to be characteristic of Sallust. In Ammianus we find *vere adulto* at 17.13.28, *adullo vere* at 19.11.2, 20.8.1, *adulta hieme* at 20.1.3, 25.9.1, and *autumno praecipiti* at 19.9.1. Ammianus also often uses terms borrowed from Sallust to describe the physical characteristics of a landscape. He imitates hist. 4.24 *Italiae plana ac mollia* no less than three times: 14.2.5 *loca plana persultat et mollia*, 24.1.2 *per plana camporum et mollia*, 27.5.4 *per plana camporum*. Ammianus 23.6.54 *pleraque sunt ibi deserta aquarum paenuria* echoes *Jugurtha* 48.4 *planities deserta penuria aquae*. Ammianus 31.7.10 *tumulosos locos* (cf. 21.10.3 *tumulosis collibus*) appears to be modelled on *Jugurtha* 91.3 *locum tumulosum*. The rarity
of the word tumulosus makes borrowing very likely. Ammianus uses Sallustian phrases to describe three different types of land (plains, desert, and hills) in six passages. This is unlikely to be a coincidence. He probably noted such phrases in his readings for later use in adorning his own writings.

One of the largest groups of Sallustian imitations is in passages dealing with military matters: descriptions of troops and accounts of battles and sieges. As a soldier Ammianus knew about these things from personal experience, but his accounts of them are usually in keeping with the literary tradition. An example is the way in which Ammianus describes the armored cavalry, the cataphracts. He appears to draw much of his descriptive terminology from Sallust:

et sequebantur equites catafracti (hist. 4.64)

equis paria operimenta erant, namque lindeo ferreas laminas in modum plumae adnexuerant (hist. 4.65)

qui praegrediebantur equites catafracti, ferrea omni specie (hist. 4.66)

Ammianus 24.4.15 et primi Romani hostem undique lamminis ferreis in modum tenuis plumae contectum fidentemque is clearly patterned after Histories 4.65. More general reminiscences are found at Ammianus 24.2.10:

tum defensores animo praestantes et viribus per propugnacula ciliciis undique laxius pansis, quae telorum impetus cohiberent, obiecti scutis vimine firmissimo textis et
crudorum tergorum densitate vestitis validissime resistebant ferrea nimirum facie omni, quia laminae singulis membrorum liniamentis cohaerenter aptatae fido operimento totam hominis speciem contegebant.

The close proximity of these two passages in Ammianus suggests that he was reading the corresponding passages in Sallust as he was writing these.\(^{47}\)

Ammianus seems to echo Sallust in Julian's *cohortatio* at 23.5.19:

adero ubique vobis, adiumento numinis semipterni, imperator et antesignanus et contumalis ominibus secundis, ut reor.

This is quite close to the words of Marius at *Jugurtha* 85.47-48:

egomet in agmine ut in proelio consultor idem et socius periculi vobiscum adero, meque vosque in omnibus rebus iuxta geram. et profecto dis iuvantibus omnia matura sunt.

The contexts are very similar; Marius was about to take charge of the Numidian war, Julian was addressing his troops at Circesium just before going on the offensive against the Persians. The allusion to the speech of Marius is no accident. I suspect that just as Sallust's Marius compared himself to the Senate's armchair generals and stressed his personal activity in the field, so Ammianus is comparing Julian to his predecessor Constantius, who preferred using generals to going on campaign himself.\(^{48}\)

There are several distinct references to Sallust's works
in narrative passages where Ammianus is describing field operations. One such allusion is found in the complaints of Julian's Gallic forces at 17.9.4-5:

quò trahimus spe meliorum abolita olim guidem dura et perpessu asperrima per nives tolerantes et acumina crudelium pruinarum? sed nunc, pro nefas, cum ultimis hostium fatis instamus fame ignavissimo mortis genere tabescentes. et qui nos turbarum existimet concitores, pro vita loqui sola testamur non aurum neque argentum petentes, quae olim nec contractare potuimus nec videre, ita nobis negat, velut contra rem publicam tot suscepisse labores et pericula confutatis.

This brief "speech" contains two separate echoes of Pompey's letter to the Senate (hist. 2.98.1):

si adversus res vos patriamque et deos penatis tot labores et pericula suscepissim, quotiens a prima adulescentia ductu meo scelestissimi hostes fusi et vobis salus quaesita est, nihil amplius in absentem me statuissetis, quam adhuc agitis, patres conscripti, quem contra aetatem proiectum ad bellum saevissimum cum exercitu optime merito quantum est in vobis, fame, miser-rima omnium morte, confecistis.

In both passages we find the same complaint about the horrors of hunger (fame) and the same emphatic statement of services to the state. However, Ammianus reverses the order and makes Sallust's opening his climax. 49

Ammianus borrows extensively from Sallust to describe a surprise attack on the Roman expedition by the Persians (24.4.22):

cum itaque noctis plerumque processisset, aeneatorum accentu signo dato progrediendi
ad pugnam ad arma concursum est et consulto
murorum invaduntur utrimque frontes,...

This is obviously modelled on Jugurtha 21.2 where Jugurtha's men also stage an unexpected night attack: 50

sed ubi plerumque noctis processit, obscuro
etiam tum lumine milites Iugurthini signo
dato castra hostium invadunt,...

Again at 25.1.18 Ammianus borrows a Sallustian phrase to describe the effect of a Persian surprise attack: nihil perpetiens iam remissum. Sallust depicts the Roman forces in Africa as subject to the same tension at Jugurtha 53.6 dolus Numidarum nihil languidi neque remissi patiebatur. 51 Ammianus seems to draw heavily on both the Jugurtha and the Histories in his books concerning the Persian expedition (23-25).

This probably reflects the fact that both of Sallust's works deal with wars in similar types of country. In each case the Romans faced a war of attrition against an enemy who preferred raids and surprise attacks to set battles. Thus both the Jugurthine and the third Mithradatic wars provide numerous parallel situations to Julian's Persian campaign.

Accounts of sieges also have verbal imitations of Sallust. At 20.6.4 Ammianus refers to retaliatory actions carried out by the besieged townspeople of Singara with the words contra haec oppidani. In the Jugurtha we find contra ea oppidani (57.5) and contra haec oppidani (76.4) used in the same context. 52 Just a few sentences down is another Sallustian
expression at Ammianus 20.6.6: *lapidum recens structorum*, *madoregue infirmarentur*; cf. *hist.* 4.16 *ne* *ex* *latere nova* *munimenta madore infirmarentur*. Both passages refer to walls of besieged towns which are weak because the mortar is still wet. There is still another echo of Sallust in Ammianus' account of the siege of Bezabde (20.11.22): *fortunas suas sitas in extremo iam cogitantes*. Sallust said much the same about the besieged people of Cirta: *ubi intellegit omnis suas fortunas in extremo sitas* (*Jug.* 23.2). The similarity of words and context makes the imitation obvious. The time expression *vigilia secunda praecipiti* (Amm. 24.5.8) which I discussed above is placed in the account of a skirmish at the siege of a Persian stronghold. The Sallust passage (*hist.* 2.87A) also refers to a night attack during the siege of Isaura Nova.

There remain for discussion a fairly large number of miscellaneous phraseological borrowings. A few occur in similar contexts in both authors. Many, however, are adapted to entirely different settings. Most can be considered strictly stylistic influences.

A few of these borrowings are legalistic in nature. Ammianus twice imitates Sallust's words at *Catiline* 52.36:

*convicti confessique sint caedem, incendia aliaque se foeda atque crudelia facinora in civis patriamque paravisse.*

At 26.3.3 Ammianus recounts the crimes of Hilarinus, a charioteer:
Later Ammianus applies the same participles to Numerius (29.2.17):

convictum confessumque, quod exsecto vivae mulieris ventre atque intempestivo partu extracto, infernis manibus excitis de permutatione imperii consulere ausus est.

In all three cases the crimes described are especially heinous: treason, murder and witchcraft (itself a form of treason). The collocation of the two participles in question is found elsewhere only at Tertullian bapt. 17.5. Another apparently borrowed phrase having to do with legal matters is Ammianus 16.6.3 tamquam per saturam; cf. Jugurtha 29.5 quasi per saturam. In both instances the expression refers to the unjust acquittal, through irregular procedures, of a wrongdoer.

A few others of the miscellaneous borrowings have contexts similar to the original. Ammianus imitates Jugurtha 35.1 profugus ex patria aberat twice: 18.6.16 ad Persas abierat profugus and 28.6.24 in urbem Romam abierat profugus. The passage from Jugurtha is on the flight of Massiva from Africa to Rome. Ammianus 28.6.4 also deals with the flight of a man, Flaccianus, from Africa to Rome. In both cases the men fleeing are the innocent victims of tyrants, in one case Jugurtha, in the other Romanus, the count of Africa. Another such borrowing is Ammianus 18.6.20 ex gratia quod,
which introduces the reason why the satrap of Corduene was willing to aid the Romans. This is probably an imitation of Jugurtha 80.4 id ea gratia ... quod, which introduces an explanation of why Bocchus aided Jugurtha. 58

The rest of the imitations of Sallust are purely stylistic and may be listed with scant comment. Ammianus appears to borrow two phrases at 14.2.10:


nam sole orto magnitudine angusti gurgitis
sed profundi a transitu arcebantur et, dum piscatoris quaerunt lenunculos vel innare temere contextis ratibus parant,...

The reference to the fishing boat is from hist. 1.25 incidit forte per noctem in lenunculum piscantis (cf. also Amm. 16.10.3 lenunculo se commisisse piscantis). The woven rafts presumably allude to Histories 3.6 temereque textis ra<ribus>. 59 Ammianus 14.10.7 ecce autem ex improviso is probably taken from Jugurtha 14.11 where we find the same words. 60

The phrase noxarum conscientia which Ammianus uses at 15.8.2, 16.12.61, and 21.15.4, was probably taken from Histories 2.87D conscientia noxarum. Ammianus, like Sallust, uses the plural in each instance; he also used this same part of the Histories elsewhere (Amm. 24.5.8 / hist. 2.87A). 61 Sallust hist. 3.84 fiducia gnaritatis locorum is also thrice imitated by Ammianus: 16.2.10 iuvante locorum gnaritate and 27.10.9 (= 30.1.12) locorum gnaritate confisi. Gnaritas occurs only twice elsewhere (in Donatus' commentary on Terence). 62 Ammianus borrows several times from Jugurtha 4.7:
The borrowing is most extensive at 16.9.1 per furta et latrocinia potius quam bonis artibus ad imperia et honores nituntur.

cf. also 19.13.1 per furta et latrocinia and 31.7.2 per ...

Another probable borrowing from Sallust is at Ammianus 25.7.12 inter dissensiones et turbamenta (cf. 26.7.8 in publicis turbamentis). Turbamentum seems to occur only in these passages, Sallust hist. 1.55.25 maxime turbamenta rei publicae, and Tacitus hist. 1.23 turbamenta vulgi. Ammianus may have borrowed from either. We do know that he used the same passage of Sallust (the speech of Lepidus) elsewhere. The last imitation that I wish to mention here is Ammianus 26.4.3 multa secum ipse diu volvens (divolvens V), which is modelled on Jugurtha 113.1 haec Maurus secum ipse diu volvens. The emendation diu volvens is generally accepted, although it creates a clausula which is unusual in Ammianus. Still, Ammianus sometimes allows such a clausula when he borrows a phrase verbatim from another author.

As we have seen, Ammianus made extensive use of Sallust. He shared many of Sallust's moral viewpoints and often borrowed a phrase from him in criticizing the lapses of his contemporaries. Ammianus also made great use of Sallust's geographical and ethnographical digressions, both as a
source and as a model. The stylistic influence of Sallust is pervasive. Ammianus often quarried phrases and expressions from him. Many of these fall into distinctive groups: time expressions, topographical descriptions, and military affairs, especially battles and sieges. It is likely that Ammianus either read model passages as he composed various episodes or else noted suitable phrases in the course of his readings and saved them for future use.
1 Wölfflin (1870) seems to be the first to stress the relation of Ammianus and Tacitus. See most recently Flach (1972), Blockley (1973) and Roselle (1976) who give full references to earlier work on the subject.

2 On Symmachus' knowledge of Caesar see Kroll (1891) 2 and 80. For Orosius' use of Caesar see Sihler (1887) 28-29.


4 Owens (1958) 150.

5 This could also be a reminiscence of Sallust Jug. 79.1; cf. de Jonge, Commentary ad loc., Klotz (1910) 81 and Fesser (1932) 16.

6 Cf. de Jonge, Commentary ad loc. and Klotz (1910) 83.

7 See Blockley (1977) 218.

8 There is a large body of scholarship dealing with Caesar's luck. Some of the more recent items include Ericsson (1944), Rambaud (1953) 256-264 and Brutscher (1958).

9 On Caesar's clemency see especially Coulter (1931), Treu (1948) and Rambaud (1953) 283-293.

10 Cf. Augustine epp. 104.16 and 138.9; c. Adim. 11; and civ. dei 9.5. See also Hagendahl (1967) 482, 513.

11 See also the remarks of Bickel (1918) 289-292 on Caesar's clemency in Ammianus. Bickel, however, is concerned only with the apophthegm of Caesar which Ammianus cites at 29.2.18 (discussed below).

12 For Caesar's habit of writing while in the field see Suetonius Jul. 56.5 and Pronto p. 221N. Classen (1972) 43 discusses the significance of the comparison of Julian and Caesar here from a somewhat different point of view.
13 See Fletcher (1937) 381 and Owens (1958) 151.

14 BC 148.3 quae res magnas difficultates exercitui Caesaris attulit; BC 351.6 Pompeians magnam res ad receptum difficultatem afferebat.

15 On collections of Caesarian sayings see Cicero fam. 9.16.4 Caesarem, cum volumina iam confecerit apophthegmatorum. Cf. Suetonius Jul. 56.7 and the remarks of Bickel (1918) 289-292.

16 For Symmachus' use of Sallust see Kroll (1891) 76-80. Augustine draws heavily on Sallust; cf. Hagendahl (1967) 631-649 for a full discussion. Two of Hagendahl's observations are especially worth noting: (1) Sallust is, if we take into account the size of his corpus relative to that of Cicero, the most quoted in late antiquity of all Latin prose writers (631); and (2) Augustine used the Histories only (but rather extensively) in de cistitate dei (633). For the other authors mentioned here see the preface to Maurenbrecher's edition of the fragments of the Histories 3-4.


18 Gardthausen (1873) 549-550, von Gutschmid (1873) 739, Hertz (1874a) esp. 8-13, 15-16. See also Malotet (1898) and Weinstein (1914).

19 See, for example, Wirz (1877), Finke (1904), Fesser (1932), Fletcher (1937), and Owens (1958).

20 I omit both from my tabulation and from discussion in this chapter many vague and tenuous parallels suggested by Wirz (1877) and some later scholars. At the best these indicate a strong general influence on Ammianus' language by Sallust. They do not permit any specific inferences as to Ammianus' knowledge or use of Sallust.

21 Cf. also Cat. 4.5 and Amm. 14.4.2. For further discussion see Fesser (1932) 16, Owens (1958) 152 and de Jonge, Commentary ad loc.
Arminianus' remarks at 15.1.1 on his methods of gathering information are reminiscent of Herodotus 2.99.1 and Thucydides 1.22.

See Earl (1967) 96-121, esp. 121.

Cf. also Sallust Jug. 32.4 tanta vis avaritiae animos eorum veluti tabes invaserat, Cat. 10.6 ubi contagio quasi pestilentia invasit (of ambitio) and hist. 1.77.19 si tanta torpedo animos obrepit. See also the remarks of Owens (1958) 156, 165.

Materia malorum also occurs at ad Herenn. 2.34 and Augustine civ. dei 19.8 as is pointed out by Owens (1958) 154. One should note, however, Augustine often borrows from Sallust in civ. dei, cf. Hagendahl (1967) 631-634.


Cf. Amm. 16.2.2 ancilli adulatione posthabita and HA Claudius 5.4 Gallus Antipater, ancilla honorum et historicum dehonestamentum. See Hertz (1874a) 13 and Fesser (1932) 22.

See Fesser (1932) 22 and Owens (1958) 172 who point out that Ammianus may also be using Solinus 7.21 homines ... incultis moribus. Ammianus very likely knew the phrase from Sallust. The speech of Marius is a famous passage and Ammianus shows knowledge of it elsewhere: Amm. 14.1.4 / Jug. 85.35 and Amm. 23.5.19 / Jug. 85.47.

See Malotet (1898) 1-29, Weinstein (1913) 5, Camus (1967) 80-81, Cichocka (1975) and Emmett (1981).

On the popularity of Sallust's geographical digressions see Gutschmid (1873) 739.


Cf. Amm. 16.7.4, 31.2.12. See also Fesser (1932) 16-17 and de Jonge, Commentary on 15.11.16.

For discussion of concluding formulas in Ammianus and

35 Cf. Mela 2.92 Saguntum illam fide atque aerumnis inclu-
tam which may also be a borrowing from Sallust. On hist. 2.64 and Amm. 15.10.10 and 15.11.12 see Gardthausen (1873) 549, Hertz (1874a) 9 and Sontheimer (1926) 21.

36 Owens (1958) 176 notes that inviae fuere gives an un-
usual clausula, as often happens when Ammianus borrows a phrase
from another author. Nisi qua is also found at hist. 2.84 and Amm. 15.4.3, 10.1. Its frequent use in this book is note-
worthy.

37 Other (more tenuous) correspondences include Amm. 22.8.25
and 33 / hist. 3.74, Amm. 22.8.27 / hist. 3.73. For further
discussion of Ammianus' use of Sallust here see Hertz (1874a)
6-8, Fesser (1932) 21 and Owens (1958) 185-186.

38 Wirz (1877) 630 noted the general similarity of the
phrases; Fesser (1932) is certain that Ammianus borrowed from
Sallust here.

39 Hertz (1874a) 11 cites also HA Carac. 6.6 cum ad re-
quisita naturae discessisset, to which Owens (1958) 190 adds
Deut. 23.12 ad quem egrediaris ad requisita naturae. The
phrase seems to have been common in late Latin. Still it is
likely that Ammianus borrowed it from Sallust. He knew and
used the Histories, often in digressions of this sort. He
also knew Quintilian and may have known the reference from
there.

40 See Finke (1904) 22-23. Finke 23-25 suggests other
borrowings of this sort, such as the reference to Curio at
29.5.22 (cf. hist. 3.49-50). Unfortunately most of these
parallels must remain speculative due to the fragmentary
nature of the Histories.

41 Hertz (1874a) 15 and Owens (1958) 164.

42 Fesser (1932) 12. Fesser 19 lists other time expres-
sions with possible antecedents in both Sallust and Tacitus.

43 Hertz (1874a) 11, Fesser (1932) 11-12, Owens (1958)
190.

44 Fesser (1932) 11 and Owens (1958) 188.
45 Cf. Mela 1.21 plerque ... ob sitim caeli terrarumque deserta sunt; for discussion see Owens (1958) 167.

46 Hertz (1874a) 15 and Owens (1958) 173. Lewis and Short and the OLD cite only the Sallust passage for tumulosus.

47 Cf. Amm. 29.3.4 where species ferrea is applied to cataphracts. Cataphracts are also referred to at 16.10.8, 24.6.8, 25.6.2, 28.5.6 and 29.1.1 without any noteworthy similarity to the Sallustian passages. See Hertz (1874a) 12-13 and Owens (1958) 189.

48 The similarity of these passages was first pointed out by Wirz (1877) 630. Owens (1958) 172 discusses the linguistic aspects of the imitation. Ammianus does make use of Marius' speech elsewhere, e.g. Amm. 14.1.1 / Jug. 85.31 and Amm. 26.10.2 / Jug. 85.39.

49 Hertz (1874a) 11, Fesser (1932) 18 and Owens (1958) 182 all agree on borrowing here.

50 See Hertz (1874a) 15 and Owens (1958) 164.

51 Cf. Jug. 88.2 nihil apud se remissum ... pati. See Fesser (1932) 15 for examples of similar phrases in Amm.

52 Wirz (1877) 630 and Owens (1958) 169.

53 TLL 7.38.9 ff. gives only nine occurrences of mador. Cf. Amm. 17.7.12 post madores imbrium (Anaximander on the effect of heat and moisture on the earth) and 30.1.10 infirmati periculoso madore (of men weakened by swimming).

54 Cf. also Cat. 52.11 res publica in extremo sita est.

55 See Fesser (1932) 12 who merely refers to this as a time expression and does not discuss the military aspects.


57 Hertz (1874a) 15 and Fesser (1932) 17.

58 Cf. Jug. 54.4 id ea gratia eveniebat quod and Cicero nat. deor. 3.87 id ea gratia ut. Ea gratia occurs only in these four passages; cf. Owens (1958) 169. See also Amm. 19.12.9 and 31.5.14 for hoc gratia quod.
There is a problem with the text of Ammianus here; see Fesser (1932) 12-13 and Meurig-Davies (1949) 182. Cf. also Amm. 25.8.2 ratibus temere textis and 31.5.3 ratibus transiere male contextis.

Cf. Varro Menip. 141 et ecce de improviso.

See Owens (1958) 182.


For further discussion see Fesser (1932) 17 and Owens (1958) 159.

Amm. 26.6.16 / hist. 1.55.22. Also as Owens (1958) 178 points out composita occurs in both passages.

Wirz (1877) 635-6, Fesser (1932) 22. On the clausula see Harmon (1910) 170, 177.
Educated men of late antiquity considered Cicero, along with Vergil, to be one of the pillars of traditional pagan culture. Men such as Symmachus looked to him both for a literary model - unus aetate nostra monetam Latiaris eloquii Tulliana incude finisti (Ep. 1.3.2) - and as a source of pleasure: erat quippe in his oblita Tulliana melle festivitas (Ep. 1.31.1). Cicero was also much read and admired by Christian luminaries of the period. Cicero's Hortensius induced Augustine to take up the serious study of philosophy. Jerome's fondness for Cicero was so great that it led to feelings of guilt: Ciceronianus es, non Christianus. Ambrose produced a Christian version of Cicero's de officiis. Cicero's writings furnished standard texts for the schools of the day, as Jerome tells us (adv. Ruf. 1.16):

\[
puto quod puer legeris Aspri in Vergilium et Sallustium commentarios, Volcati in orationes Ciceronis.\]

The relatively numerous papyri of Cicero attest to his popularity in the East at this time as well. We have more papyri of Cicero than of any other Latin author except Vergil. Most of them can be dated to the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. As was the case with some of the Sallust papyri, we find a fair number of the Cicero papyri equipped with aids for
readers more at home in Greek. P. Ryl. 3.477, a fifth century fragment of the divinatio in Q. Caecilium, is provided with scholia in both Latin and Greek. Three different papyrus fragments of the Catilinarians, P. Vindob. inv. G 30885 a & e, P. Vindob. L 127, and P. Ryl. 1.61, have a Latin text accompanied by a literal Greek translation. P. Ryl. 1.61 also has long marks over two vowels, as if it were used to learn proper pronunciation. These papyri probably represent school texts used by Greek speakers to learn Latin.

It is quite possible that Ammianus himself, while a schoolboy in Antioch, learned Latin from the works of Cicero and Vergil, in editions similar to those used in Egypt. Ammianus had a wide ranging knowledge of Cicero's works and a great respect for them. He mentions Cicero by name some twenty-three times, often in connection with a direct quotation from one of Cicero's writings. Since Ammianus very seldom does this in the case of other authors, we may assume he thought Cicero's name carried extraordinary authority.

His borrowings of both matter and expression suggest a knowledge of most of the surviving works of Cicero and also of several which are no longer extant. Much more of Cicero's corpus was available in Ammianus' day. I have already mentioned the Hortensius, one of the lost philosophical treatises, in connection with Augustine. Ammianus himself preserves fragments of several lost speeches and treatises. At 30.8.7, for example, he quotes from the pro Oppio (frag. 5). There are two possible borrowings from Cicero's speech in
toga candidati. Ammianus 15.12.4 contains what seems to be a direct quotation from the pro Fonteio (8). There seems also to be a fragment of the oratio Metellina at 19.12.18. Ammianus 30.4.10 contains a quotation from the de republica (5.11); another possible citation of this work is found at Ammianus 15.5.23.

The influence of Cicero's works on Ammianus is extensive, and greatly colors his views on morals, politics and culture. Ammianus' uses of Cicero's works are varied; they include the borrowing of material, phrases and, occasionally artistic techniques (such as methods of characterization). Sometimes the use of borrowed phrases is incidental, perhaps completely unintentional. For example, Ammianus 22.2.3 aeriis serpenti-bus et pinnigeris seems to echo Cicero Timaeus 35 alterum pin-nigerum et aerium. Ammianus 22.8.9 quantum potest cadere sub aspectum likewise appears to be based on expressions found in the Timaeus: 11 omnia quae sub aspectum cadat; 15 ut sub aspectum et tactum; and 52 si neque sidera neque sol neque caelum sub oculorum aspectum cadere potuissent. Neither of the borrowings is especially significant; the contexts in Cicero and in Ammianus have little in common. The fact that both occur in the same book of the Res Gestae and that Ammianus seems not to draw on the Timaeus elsewhere suggests that he may merely have been reading that particular work of Cicero at the time and a few phrases happened to stick in his mind.
Many of Ammianus' borrowings, however, are purposeful. I have divided these into a number of categories, although some overlapping between them is inevitable. The first four of these, historiographical theory, methods of characterization, morals and politics, reflect the borrowing of ideas (often with the source made clear through the actual naming of Cicero or through verbal borrowing) and techniques. The next four categories consist of material borrowings: historical anecdotes, science and philosophy, oratory and rhetoric (history and theory). The final two groupings are primarily verbal in nature: proverbial expressions and purely stylistic borrowings (**flosculi**). Citations of earlier authors with whom Ammianus was not directly acquainted are omitted here, as they have been treated already.

i. **Historiographical Theory**

Cicero is not the first author to come to mind when thinking of historiography. Still he does discuss the "rules" for writing history in two well known passages: **de oratore** 2.62-64 and the letter to Lucceius (**fam.** 5.12). The passage from **de oratore** is of some interest here:

nam quis nescit primam esse historiae legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat? deinde ne quid veri non audeat? ne qua suspicio gratiae sit
in scribendo? ne qua simultatis? haec scilicet fundamenta nota sunt omnibus. ipsa autem exaedificatio posita est in rebus et verbis. rerum ratio ordinem temporum desiderat, regionum descriptio- nem; volt etiam quoniam in rebus magnis memoriaque dignis consilia primum, deinde acta, postea eventus expectantur, et de consiliis significari quid scriptor probet, et in rebus gestis declarari non solum quid actum aut dictum sit, sed etiam quomodo, et cum de eventu dicatur, ut causae explicentur omnes vel casus vel sapientiae vel temeritatis hominumque ipsorum non solum res gestae, sed etiam, qui fama ac nomine excellant, de cuius- que vita atque natura. (62-63)

Certainly Ammianus' own statements on the writing of history reflect similar general views. Cicero tells us that the historian's first duty is to tell the truth; Ammianus often stresses the importance of veritas. An example is the introduction to the first Roman digression at 14.6.2:

cum oratio ad ea monstranda deflexerit, quae Romae geruntur, nihil praeter seditiones narratur et tabernas et vilitates harum similes alias, summatim causas perstringam nusquam a veritate sponte propria digressurus.

This remark also expresses a concern with causes, which is also required by Cicero: ut causae explicentur omnes. Ammianus puts into practice other of Cicero's desiderata. The need for regionum descriptio is reflected by the geographical digressions, although these are a standard feature of historical writing and need owe nothing to Cicero's influence. On the other hand, we have the obituaries of the emperors which might be included under Cicero's qui fama
ac nomine excellant, de cuiusque vita atque natura. These obituaries are really more akin to biography (cf. the Caesares of Suetonius) than history. The presence of this moralizing biographical element in Ammianus may owe something to Cicero's remark, as well as to the late antique tendency to write imperial biography instead of history.

The preface to book 26 is Ammianus' longest single discussion of historiographical principles (26.1.1-2):

dictis impensiore cura rerum ordinibus ad usque memoriae confinia proprioris convenere rat iam referre a notioribus pedem, ut et pericula declinentur veritati saepe contigua et examinatores contextendi operis deinde non perferamus intempestivos strepentes ut laesos, si praeteritum sit, quod locutus est imperator in cena, vel omissum, quam ob causam gregarii milites coerciti sunt apud signa, et quod non decuerat in descriptione multiplex regionum super exquisi silere castellis quodque cunctorum nomina, qui ad urbani praetoris officium convenere, non sunt expressa, et similia plurima praecipit historiae dissonantia discurre per negotiorum celsitudines assuetae, non humilium

Here Ammianus makes direct reference to Cicero and cites one of his letters to Cornelius Nepos (2.6 in the OCT edition) as an authority for omitting trivial everyday matters from the Res Gestae. Nepos was, after all, an historian and it is
possible that the letter in question was, as Sabbah has suggested, comparable to the surviving letter to Lucceius. Sabbah further speculates that the letter may even have discussed in detail the dangers of writing contemporary history. Whatever the actual contents of the letter, the citing of it in this context shows that Ammianus regarded Cicero as an authority on the writing of history and was acquainted with his opinions on it.

ii. Methods of Characterization

There is one particular (Ciceronian) technique of characterization used by Ammianus to which I wish to draw attention here: the use of metaphors derived from the stage. Ammianus often applies these to public figures such as courtiers, governors, and even an emperor. The metaphors always carry a negative connotation; they ridicule and mock their objects.

The first use of this technique in the extant books of Ammianus occurs at 16.6 where he describes a palace conspiracy against the magister equitum Arbitio. Ammianus expresses his distaste for palace intrigue frequently in the Res Gestae (e.g. 14.9.1-2, 15.5.28,32), and here he describes the actions of the conspirators with such unflattering terms as circumlatrabat and strepens immania. The whole account is then
closed with a stage metaphor:

cumque res in inquisitionem veniret necessariaisque negotio tentis obiectorum probatio speraretur, tamquam per satyram subito cubiculariis suffragantibus, ut loquebatur pertinax rumor, et vinculis sunt exuta persona, quae stringebantur ut consciae, et Dorus evanuit et Verissimus ilico tacuit velut aulaeo deposito scaenae. (16.6.3)

The characters (personae) are sent off and the curtain drops. Ammianus leaves us with the impression that the conspiracy was little more than a farce or mime.

We find a somewhat similar use of theatrical metaphor in Ammianus' account of the coronation of the usurper Procopius. Procopius, a kinsman of Julian, had gone into hiding after Julian's death in 363. Finally in 365 he emerged and raised a revolt against Valens. Ammianus, who always shows a strong regard for the legitimacy of the emperor and hostility toward a usurper, ridicules the crowning of Procopius as if it were a mime (26.6.15):

stetit itaque subtabidus - excitum putares
ab inferis - nusquam reperto paludamento
tunica auro distincta ut regius minister
indutus a calce in pubem in paedagogiani
pueri speciem purpureis opertus tegminibus
pedum hastatusque purpureum itidem pannulum
laeva manu gestabat, ut in theatrali scaena
simulacrum quoddam insigne per aulæum vel
mimicam cavillationem subito putares emersum.

Ammianus emphasizes the bizarre and unusual in his description. He first suggests that the emaciated Procopius resembles a ghost from the underworld; the idea of some evil
spirit which has come from hell to stir up civil strife may also be present in the image.²¹ Ammianus then dwells at great length on the outlandish purple and gold outfit of Procopius which makes him look like a palace page boy. Lastly, to close the description (note the ring composition: excitum putares - putares emersum) there is then simile of the mime performance. This simile gives the reader the impression that the whole episode is a farce, a bit of music hall fluff, which one need scarcely take seriously, although the revolt was indeed a very dangerous one for Valens.

Ammianus often uses theatrical terminology in discussing the conduct of various imperial officials. An example is his description of the character of Petronius Probus, a praetorian prefect and head of the powerful Anician house. Probus, who seems to have been a bête-noire of Ammianus, is portrayed in the worst possible light. His behavior, which alternates between haughty and servile, is described by means of theatrical terms (27.11.2):

et licet potuit, quoad vixit, ingentia largiendo et intervallendo potestates assiduas, erat tamen interdum timidus ad audaces, contra timidos celsior, ut videretur, cum sibi fideret, de coturno strepere tragico et, ubi paveret, omni humilior socco.

The phrase de coturno strepere tragico is used to denote arrogance and is balanced by omni humilior socco (cowardice).²² Ammianus almost portrays Probus as a miles gloriosus.
Another official whose activities Ammianus puts on stage, so to speak, is Romanus, the comes Africae. Romanus appears several times in the Res Gestae, always as a malefactor. In 28.6 Ammianus tells how the Tripolitani suffered because of the corruption and greed of Romanus, who seems to have been the Verres of his day. The opening lines set an almost tragic tone (28.6.1):

hinc, tamquam in orbem migrantes alium, ad Tripoleos Africanae provinciae veniamus aerumnas, quas, ut arbitror, Iustitia quoque ipsa deflevit. quae unde instar exar- sere flammarum, textus aperiet absolutus.

The same highly dramatic tone is maintained throughout the passage as Ammianus rouses our pity for the Tripolitani. Although these unfortunate people send envoys to the imperial court seeking relief, Romanus is able to forestall imperial agents sent to investigate the situation. Finally one of his creatures, a man named Caecilius, breaks when questioned under torture. It is at this point that Ammianus introduces his metaphor from the stage (28.6.29):

et ne quid coturni terribilis fabulae relinqu- querent intemptatum, hoc quoque post depositum accessit aulaeum. Romanus ad comitatum profectus secum Caecilium duxit cognitores accusaturum ut inclinatos in provinciae partem; isque Merobaudis favore susceps necessarios sibi plures petie- rat exhiberi.

The play is finished (depositum ... aulaeum), but there is still an afterpiece (exodium) to describe. Romanus goes to the imperial court where, through the intrigues of his friend
Merobaudes, he manages to clear both himself and Caecilius of all charges (28.6.29-30). Since the exodium at a theater was normally a mime or some similar production, we may safely assume that Ammianus is once again portraying court intrigues as being a stage farce.

The above examples will suffice to illustrate Ammianus' use of this technique. But we must ask why he chose to use it. It is not a common feature in the Latin historiographical tradition. Two possible literary antecedents come to mind. The first is Suetonius, who provides us with a few examples of this method of characterization. The other and much more likely model is Cicero. Cicero was fond of the theater and often used metaphorical language drawn from the stage. He frequently uses it in his speeches to ridicule opponents. An example is the delightful scene in the pro Caelio (65) where Cicero reduces the charges against Caelius to the absurdity of the mime:

mimi ergo iam exitus, non fabulae, in quo cum clausula non invenitur, fugit aliquis e manibus, dein scabilla concrepant, aulaeum tollitur.

Thus Cicero ends a vignette in much the same way as does Ammianus at 16.6.3. In the Verrines Cicero employs theatrical terminology to characterize the career of Gaius Verres:

itaque primum illum actum istius vitae turpissimum et flagitosissimum praeterrimitam. (2.1.32)
Cicero divides Verres' career into acts as if it were a play. He describes Verres himself as assigning roles (personae) to supporting characters. This type of stage metaphor is paralleled by Ammianus. As we have seen, he presents the corrupt and wicked governor Romanus (28.6.29) in a similar way. Ammianus also uses theatrical metaphor to describe another corrupt governor, Festinus, at 29.2.23. He may well have looked to the Verrines as a paradigm of how to indict a corrupt governor. 27

We also find theatrical expressions used to attack Antonius in the Philippics. An example is Phil. 2.65:

in eius igitur viri copias cum se subito ingurgitasset, exsultabat gaudio persona de mimo, modo egens, repente dives.

This sudden change of mask, as it were, is very like Ammianus' description of Petronius Probus (discussed above). 28 Ammianus also uses the metaphor of changing masks in his account of Festinus (29.2.23).

Ammianus' use of theatrical imagery is certainly in keeping with the general spirit of his age, with its artificiality and tendencies toward dramatic posing and viewing men as types rather than individuals. Still, as the above parallels
suggest, Ammianus may well have been influenced by Cicero in his use of this technique.

iii. Moral Principles and Criticism

The strongly moralizing tone of Ammianus' work is well known. There are many general observations on what constitutes appropriate conduct and numerous specific instances of moral criticism, both of groups and individuals. Most of these generalizations and criticisms are rooted in traditional Roman values which reach back to the days of the Republic. Not surprisingly, Cicero exercises a considerable influence on both the content and expression of Ammianus' moralizing comments.

Many of Ammianus' remarks criticizing the morals of his contemporaries are to be found in passages where he pauses to describe the character of a given individual. An example is the eulogy of Eutherius, the praepositus cubiculi of Julian (16.7.4-8). In this we find at least two Ciceronian allusions. Ammianus 16.7.6 *ita fidem continentiamque virtutes coluit amplas* repeats a collocation common in Cicero: *Verrines* 2.10 *fidem continentiamque; de domo 23 fides et continentia; Planc. 3 summam fidem, continentiam, pietatem innocentiam*. In the very next section (16.7.7) *comitem circumferens conscientiam bonam* recalls Cicero *Att. 10.4.5 haec igitur conscientia comite proficiscar*. These phrases
suggest at least a general Ciceronian influence in moral judgements. Somewhat more obvious use is made of Cicero in the characterization of Petronius Probus at 27.11. The entire chapter is a resounding condemnation of Probus. Ammianus supports one of his critical comments with a quotation from Cicero (Phil. 2.39) at 27.11.4:

namque fatendum est: numquam ille magnanimitate coalitus clienti vel servo agere quidquam iussit illicitum, sed si eorum quemquam crimen ullum comperat admisisse, vel ipsa repugnante Iustitia non explorato negotio sine respectu boni honestique defendebat. quod vitium reprehendens iam pronuntiat Cicero: "Quid enim interest inter suasorem facti et probatorem? aut quid refert, utrum voluerim fieri an gaud-eam factum?"

The fact that Ammianus not only quotes directly, but even identifies his source, shows his high regard for Cicero's authority in moral matters.

As is to be expected, the moral components of the imperial obituaries often include allusions to Cicero. That of Julian opens with an account of the four cardinal virtues, all of which Ammianus ascribes to Julian (25.4.1):

vir profecto heroicis connumerandus ingeniis, claritudine rerum et coalita maiestate conspicuus. cum enim sint, ut sapientes definiunt, virtutes quattuor praecipue, temperantia, prudentia, iustitia, fortitudo eisque accedentes extrinsecus aliae, scientia rei militaris, auctoritas felicitas atque liberalitas, intento studio coluit omnes ut singulas.

It is generally agreed that Ammianus is inspired here by the
discussion of the four cardinal virtues in *de officiis* (1.15 ff.). Of particular interest is *off.* 1.15 where Cicero first introduces the virtues:

> formam quidem ipsam, Marce fili, et tamquam faciem honesti vides, quae si oculis cernere-tur, mirabiles amores, ut ait Plato, excitaret sapientiae. sed omne, quod est honestum, id quattuor partium oritur ex aliqua. aut enim in perspicientia veri sollertiaque versatur, aut in hominum societate tuenda tribuendoque suum cuique et rerum contractarum fide, aut in animi excelsi atque invicti magnitudine ac robore, aut in omnium quae fiunt quaeque dicuntur ordine et modo, in quo inest modesta et temperantia. Quae quattuor quamquam inter se colligata atque implicata sunt, tamen ex singulis certa officiorum genera nascuntur: velut ex ea parte, quae prima descripta est, in qua sapientiam et prudentiam ponimus, inest indagatio atque inventio veri; eiusque virtutis hoc munus est proprium.

While this concept of the cardinal virtues goes back to Panaetius (and ultimately to Plato), it is through Cicero that it reaches the Latin authors of the fourth century. Ambrose imitates Cicero's account of the virtues in his own *de officiis ministrorum*. Julius Pomerius and Jerome also make extensive use of Cicero in their discussion of the cardinal virtues. So does Ammianus, who also echoes another Ciceronian passage later in this same chapter. Ammianus 25.4.16 *emendari se cum deviaret a fruge bona permit tens* appears to be based on *Att.* 4.8a.3 *permodestus ac bonae frugi* and *Cael.* 28 *emersisse ad frugem bonam.* It should also be noted that on several occasions elsewhere when one of the cardinal virtues is associated with Julian,
the phraseology has a Ciceronian flavor. In a letter to Constantius Julian attempts to explain how the soldiers elevated him to Augustus against his will and he is still loyal. Julian says *excellentissimam virtutum omnium adverte iustitiam* (Amm. 20.8.11), a phrase which closely resembles *una excellentissima virtus iustitia*. In two other passages Julian's temperance is remarked upon: 14.11.28 *temperatis moribus* and 15.8.10 *temporati mores*. Cicero has used the same expression, *temperatis ... moribus* at *fam. 12.27*. In addition, one of the cardinal virtues seems to be referred to in the obituary of Constantius. Ammianus 21.16.1 *popularitatem elato, animo contemnebat et magno* appears to be an adaptation of off. 1.61 *animo magno elato-que humanasque res despiciente*, where Cicero is praising the virtue of *fortitudo*. It is obvious that Ammianus thought these virtues essential for an emperor. Julian, his ideal emperor, possessed all four.

Also in the obituary of Constantius we find a long quotation from one of Cicero's letters to Cornelius Nepos (ad Corn. Nep. 2.5 in the OCT edition). This is at Ammianus 21.16.13:

> ut Tullius quoque docet crudelitatis increpans Caesarem in quadam ad Nepotem epistula: "neque enim quidquam aliud est felicitas" inquit "nisi honestarum rerum prosperitas. vel alio modo definiam: felicitas est fortuna adiutrix consiliorum bonorum, quibus qui non utitur, felix esse nullo pacto potest. ergo in perditis impi-isque consiliis, quibus Caesar usus est,
nulla potuit esse felicitas. feliciorque meo iudicio Camillus exsulans quam temporibus isdem Manlius, etiamsi -- id, quod cupierat -- regnare potuisset."

This general reflection with its historical exempla is part of a large-scale condemnation of the cruelty of Constantius. It illustrates both the auctoritas which Cicero enjoyed in the eyes of Ammianus and the educational purpose (docet) of Ammianus' moral observations.

In the obituary of Valentinian we likewise find echoes of Cicero in the moral evaluation of the emperor. Ammianus prefaccs his enumeration of the vices of Valentinian with the following statement (30.8.1):

nunc confisi, quod nec metu nec adulandi foeditate constricta posteritas incorrupta praeteritorum solet esse spectatrix, ...

While the wording is not exceptionally close, this remark does parallel the thought of Cicero pro Marcello 29:

servi igitur eis iudicibus qui multis post saeculis de te iudicabunt et quidem hau d scio an incorruptis quam nos; nam et sine amore et sine cupiditate et rursus sine odio et sine invidia iudicabunt.

At Ammianus 30.9.2 nullo contagio conscientiae violatus obscenae recalls Verrines 5.83 illos ad quos conscientiae contagio pertinebit. Two sections farther down, at Ammianus 30.9.4 amator munditarum, laetusque non profusis epulis sed exculitis there is a probable echo of pro Murena 76 non amat profusas epulas.
The obituary of Valens also has some moral observations couched in Ciceronian phrases. Ammianus 31.14.2 amicus fidelis et firmus echoes pro Caelio 14 firmus amicus ac fidelis. Also in 31.14.6 quae vitiorum labes etiam in his privatis cotidianisque rationibus impendio est formidanda we have a phrase borrowed from Qfr. 1.1.9 in his nostris cotidianisque rationibus. Ammianus often makes reference to this letter when he discusses political matters. Here both Ammianus and Cicero are suggesting that what is suitable conduct in private life is likewise suitable in public life.

Ammianus' criticisms of various individual vices also have a Ciceronian flavor. One activity which Ammianus particularly disdains is flattery (adulatio or adsentatio). In several of the passages in which he attacks flatterers Ammianus borrows phrases from de amicitia. Ammianus 15.5.37-38 discusses the evil effects of flattery on rulers, and cites anecdotes about Croesus and Dionysius as exempla. Ammianus' remark at 15.5.38 quae res perniciosa vitiorum est altrix calls to mind amic. 89 adsentatio vitiorum adiutrix procul amoveatur and 97 adsentatio quamvis perniciosa sit. These same passages are again alluded to in Julian's letter to Constantius (20.8.11): sed adulatione vitiorum altrice depulsa. The words immediately following, excellentissimam virtutum omnium adverte iustitiam, as we have seen above, are also borrowed from Cicero (nat. deor. 1.4). Ammianus attacks the practice of adulatio yet again in his second
Roman digression (28.4.12):

horum domus otiosi quidam garruli frequen-
tant variis assentandi figmentis ad singula
ulterioris fortunae verba plaudentes para-
sitorum in comoediis facetias affectando.
Ut enim illi sufflant milites gloriosos
obsidiones et pugnas adversum milia hostium
isdem ut heroicis aemulis assignantes, ita
hi quoque columnarum constructiones alta
fronte suspensas mirando atque parietes
lapidum circumspectis coloribus nitidos
ultra mortalitatem nobiles viros extollunt.

In this criticism of the nobility Ammianus draws heavily
on amic. 98 nec parasitorum in comoediis adsentatio faceta
nobis videretur, nisi essent miles gloriosi.36 Somewhat
related to this are Ammianus’ remarks on legacy hunters
(captatores) at 28.4.26 which end:

ut Tullius ait; “nec in rebus humanis quid-
quam bonum norunt nisi quod fructuosum sit;
amicos tamquam pecudes eos potissimum diligunt,
ex quibus se sperant maximum fructum esse cap-
turos.”

This, of course, is an almost direct quotation of amic. 79.37
Ammianus was clearly well acquainted with the de amicitia.
His use of it is too extensive to be attributed to phrases
taken from a handbook.38 The repeated use of the sections
on adsentatio (amic. 89-100) throughout the Res Gestae, use
which includes direct quotation (identified in the text by
reference to its author), clearly suggests that the allusions
are intentional and not just an accident. Indeed, this use
shows conclusively the degree to which Cicero influenced
Ammianus' moral views and his expression of them.

Another moral failing for which Ammianus rebukes his contemporaries is their desire for undeserved glory. The first instance occurs at Ammianus 14.6.8:

ex his quidem aeternitati se commendari posse per statuas aessimantes eas ardenter affectant quasi plus praemii de figmentis aereis sensu carentibus adepturi quam ex conscientia honeste recteque factorum easque auro curant imbretarei, quod Acilio Glabrioni delatum est primo, cum consiliis armisque regem superasset Antiochium.

Ammianus then goes on to refer to Hesiod (with an allusion to Works and Days 289 ff.) and to quote a bon mot of the elder Cato on statues and reputation. Ammianus' complaint about the contemporary mania at Rome for statues is thus firmly placed in a literary/rhetorical tradition. His remarks which are quoted above also recall Cicero's observations at rep. 6.8 (= Macrobius Somn. Scip. 1.4.2):

(Scipio:) sed quamquam sapientibus conscientia ipsa factorum egregiorum amplissimum virtutis est praemium, tamen illa divina virtus non statuas plumbo inhaerentes nec triumphos arescentibus laureis, sed stabiliora quaedam et viridiora praemiorum genera desiderat.

The similarity is more of thought than phrase, and since he is dealing with a fairly common theme his dependence on Cicero here is uncertain. 39

A similar type of vanity is discussed at Ammianus 22.7.3-4 where he criticizes the self-seeking pseudo-philosophers who surrounded Julian. His remarks include a moral
sententia from Cicero:

...nimius captator inanis gloriae visus praeclarique illius dicti immemor Tulliani, quo tales notando ita relatum: "ipsi illi philosophi etiam in his libris, quos de contemnenda gloria scribunt, ut in eo ipso, quo praedicationem nobilitatem despiciunt, praedicari de se ac se nominari velint."

This is, of course, a direct quotation from the pro Archia (26). Some have considered it a gratuitous display of learning on the part of Ammianus. But this is not the case at all. Ammianus desires to lend weight to his criticisms through appeal to the auctoritas of Cicero.

In closing this section I would like to examine one final Ciceronian echo, at Ammianus 22.4.2:

...laudari enim poterat, si saltem moderatos quosdam licet paucos retinuisset morumque probitate compertos. namque fatendum est pleramque eorum partem vitiorum omnium seminarium effusius aluisse ita, ut rem publicam inficerint cupiditatibus pravis plusque exemplis quam peccandi licentia laederent multos.

This is part of his account of Julian's wholesale dismissal of palace attendants and servants. Julian did this as soon as he had assumed sole power. In justifying the action Ammianus draws on Cicero de legibus 3.32:

...non solum vitia concipiunt ipsi (i.e. vitiosi principes) sed ea infundunt in civitatem, neque solum absunt, quod ipsi corrupuntur, sed etiam quod corrupunt, plusque exemplo quam peccato nocent.
This idea that **exempla**, whether furnished by contemporary figures or from literary/historical sources, can influence behavior is basic to Ammianus' view of the importance of history. Ammianus thinks that people will behave properly if they learn and follow the sort of moral maxims which he inserts in the *Res Gestae*.42

iv. Political Theory

One of the central concerns of Ammianus in the *Res Gestae* is the proper exercise of imperial authority. Indeed, one scholar has observed that "in some places Ammianus' work seems almost a manual for rulers."43 Ammianus often inserts general observations on the imperial office and, at appropriate points, precepts which the emperor or his officials should (but often do not) follow. Much of Ammianus' political commentary can be found in the speeches "delivered" by various emperors. The imperial obituaries and accounts of judicial proceedings also furnish Ammianus with an opportunity to air his views on good government.

Cicero strongly influences Ammianus' political thought. Many of the **sententiae** and observations found in political contexts are either quoted directly or paraphrased from Cicero. This might seem strange in view of the tremendous
political change which had taken place within the Roman state in the nearly four centuries which separate Cicero and Ammianus. Yet Ammianus views Roman political and constitutional history as continuous; his concepts of libertas and res publica ultimately derive from Cicero and Sallust. Thus much of what he found in Cicero must have seemed to him eminently suitable for expounding on the duties and obligations of the imperial office. While Ammianus draws freely on a wide range of Cicero's works, a small number of these provide most of his material in political contexts. Especially prominent are ad Quintum fratrem 1.1 (a letter from Cicero to his brother which deals with provincial administration), de officiis and de amicitia.

Ammianus' use of Cicero in this sphere is well illustrated by the speeches in the Res Gestae. Most of the dozen speeches are cohortationes addressed to the troops. These tend to have few or no borrowings from Cicero. But four of the speeches do make significant use of Cicero. Ammianus 24.3.4-7 is an address by Julian to his mutinous troops who had been angered by too small a donative. At the very beginning of the speech circumfluentes rerum omnium copiis recalls amic. 52 circumfluere omnibus copiis atque in omnium rerum abundantia vivere. The theme of Julian's speech is that wealth is inferior to glory; the Persians are wealthy, but men such as the Fabricii had true glory in spite of poverty. The Ciceronian passage discusses tyrants who are wealthy but lack friends. The point of all these remarks is that Julian
is announcing a new policy, but one based on tradition: he will fight Rome's enemies rather than bribe them. At the end of the speech Ammianus again alludes to Cicero: *nec enim ita vixi, ut non possem aliquando esse privatus* recalls Qfr. 1.1.23 *eaque si sic coluit ille, qui privatus futurus numquam fuit*. Cicero there discusses the duties of *imperium* and mentions Africanus. So Ammianus frames this speech with very apt borrowings, which suggest a consciousness of the context from which they come. It is unlikely that the phrases were actually used by Julian: both Julian's rabid philhellenism and the conventions of ancient historiography show them to belong to Ammianus.

Or consider Julian's deathbed speech (25.3.15-20).

25.3.18 *reputans autem iusti esse finem imperii, oboedientem commodum et salutem* calls to mind both off. 1.85:

```
omino qui rei publicae praefuturi sunt duo
Platonis praeccepta teneant: unum et utilitatem
civium sic tueantur, ut quaecumque agunt, ad
eam referant oblitit commodorum suorum
```

and also Qfr. 1.1.24:

```
est autem non modo eius qui sociis et civibus
sed etiam eius qui servis, qui mutis pecudibus
praesit eorum quibus commodis utilitatie
servire.
```

The reference to *de officiis* is especially apposite since it mentions Plato's opinions; Julian's death is generally regarded to be an imitation of Socrates. That these ideas also reflect Ammianus' own theory of government is confirmed
by the close verbal repetition at 29.2.18 (criticism of Valens, cf. Qfr. 1.1.7) and 30.8.4 (Valentinian's obituary). These passages will be discussed below at the appropriate point (pp. 117 ff.).

Two other speeches, both "delivered" by Valentinian, use Ciceronian allusions to good effect. The first (26.2.6-10) is on the occasion of Valentinian's accession to the throne. 26.2.9-10 are full of Ciceronian reminiscences:

\[
dabit enim, ut spero, fortuna consiliorum adiutrix bonorum, quantum efficere et consequi possum, diligenter scrutanti moribus temperatum. ut enim sapientes definiunt, non modo in imperio, ubi pericula maxima sunt et creberrima, verum etiam in privatis cotidianisque rationibus alienum ad amicitiam, cum iudicaverit quisquam prudens, adiungere sibi debet, non cum adiunxerit, iudicare. haec cum spe laetiorem polliceor, vos firmatatem factorum retinentes et fidem, dum hiberna patitur quies, animorum reparate vigorem atque membrorum ob nuncupationem augustam debita protinus accepturi.
\]

Compare with this Qfr. 1.1.38 quantum efficere et consequi possumus and 1.1.18:

\[
quae cum honesta sint in his privatis nostris cotidianisque rationibus, in tanto imperio... divina videantur necesse est.
\]

Ammianus also echoes amic. 85 quocirca ... cum iudicaris diligere oportet non, cum dilexeris, iudicare and ad Corn. Nep. 2.5 (= Amm. 21.16.13) felicitas est fortuna adiutrix consiliorum bonorum. Of especial interest here is the collocation of reminiscences of Qfr. 1.1, which is Ammianus'
favorite among the letters of Cicero,\textsuperscript{49} and \textit{de amicitia}, just as we found at 24.3.4-7. Ammianus seems to suggest that there are similar rules for the conduct of \textit{amicitia} and \textit{imperium}, and that the emperor should always conduct himself in such a manner that he could return to private life without fear. In fact, he seems to adopt the concept of the \textit{civilis princeps} (cf. 15.1.3 \textit{ad aemulationem civilium principum}).\textsuperscript{50}

Valentinian's address to Gratian at his adlection (27.6.12-13) also discusses the duties of a ruler. Here we find an interesting adaptation of Terence: Amm. 27.6.13 \textit{nihil alienum putare, quod ad Romani imperii pertinet latus} (\textit{latus} is the reading of \textit{V}, most editors print Heraeus' emendation \textit{statum}). This is, of course based on the famous tag \textit{Heauton}. \textit{77 humani nil a me alienum puto}. R. B. Steele and R. Verdière have both pointed this out, but failed to realize that it is very likely that Ammianus borrowed the phrase indirectly.\textsuperscript{51} Cicero quotes the line twice: \textit{off. 1.30 and legg. 1.33. The case for the use of \textit{de officiis} here is strengthened by the passage which immediately follows (Amm. 27.6.14). This entire passage of Ammianus is a tissue of borrowings from \textit{de officiis} (see pp. 25 ff. above for detailed discussion); obviously this work was much in his mind as he was writing about political matters.}\n
These examples show a pattern of use: in speeches which deal with the conduct of rulers and with duties owed to the state Ammianus has a definite preference for a few specific works of Cicero: \textit{de officiis}, \textit{de amicitia}, and \textit{ad Quintum}
As I have demonstrated, many of these borrowings are sufficiently apposite to suggest that Ammianus used them deliberately.

In the imperial obituaries we again find Ammianus imitating Cicero. One of the most important instances is in the eulogy of Julian at 25.4.1:

eisque accedentes extrinsecus aliae, scientia rei militaris, auctoritas, felicitas atque liberalitas intento studio coluit omnes ut singulas.

These are the four “political” virtues which Ammianus appends to the list of cardinal virtues (cf. above pp. 103 ff.). It is based on Cicero imp. Pomp. 28

ego enim sic existimo, in summo imperatore quattuor has res inesse oportere, scientiam rei militaris, virtutem, auctoritatem, felicitatem.

The similarity of context is obvious. Although the circumstances differ, both Ammianus and Cicero are presenting their subjects as the very model of a leader. The only change which Ammianus makes is the substitution of liberalitas for the vague and inappropriate virtus. He has, after all, just assigned to Julian the four praecipuae virtutes. The substitution may also reflect the change in circumstances since Pompey’s day. In the time of Ammianus the emperor was expected to provide the army with large donatives on a regular basis. At any rate, Ammianus clearly suggests that
these are the qualities required of a good emperor. They are much more specific than the cardinal virtues, which might be demanded of any good man.

The obituary for Valentinian (30.8) likewise includes Ciceronian reminiscences. Ammianus 30.8.7 preserves a fragment of the lost pro Oppio (frag. 5):^52

unde motum existimo Tullium praeclare pronuntiasse, cum defenderet Oppium: "et enim multum posse ad salutem alterius honoris multis, parum potuisse ad exitium probro nemini umquam fuit."

This observation is made in connection with an account of Valentinian’s cruelty. Ammianus generalizes on the need for imperial clemency and adduces the sententia of Cicero almost as a precept for emperors. The account of Valentinian’s saevitia concludes with another precept based on Ciceronian ideas (Amm. 30.8.14):

finis enim iusti imperii (ut sapientes docent) utilitas oboedientium aestimatur et salus.

As we have already seen above, in discussing 25.3.18, this is modelled on off. 1.85 and Qfr. 1.1.24. The similarity of these two passages in Ammianus suggests a common source which he followed closely in both cases.

A third context in which Ammianus often comments on imperial policies is that of trials, usually those for treason and other crimes against the state (e.g. witchcraft). It is obvious from the frequent accounts of these that the administration of justice is a major theme of the Res Gestae.
Ammianus considers it to be an important duty of the emperor to see that justice is carried out (Amm. 30.4.1-2):

navabatur enim opera diligens, ut homo rigidus audire cupiens lites a studio iudicandi revocaretur metu, ne ita ut Iuliani temporibus defensione innocentiae respirante frangeretur potentium tumor assumpta licentia latius solitus evagari. ...

... ille ad humilitandum celsitudinem potestatis negotiorum examina spectanda instissime arbitratus, ut monebat, abstinuit penitus laxavitque rapinarum fores, quae roborabantur in dies iudicum advocatorumque pravitate sentientium paria, qui tenuiorum negotia militaris rei rectoribus vel intra palatinum validis venditantes aut opes aut honores quaesivere praecelaros.

Ammianus is scandalized by Valens' failure to see personally that the judicial process is not corrupted. This can be associated with the cardinal virtue of *iustitia* which has been put forth in the obituary of Julian.

Ammianus expresses again and again the importance of justice tempered by mercy. In many of these passages we find both his words and his thoughts shaped by his reading of Cicero. At Ammianus 14.9.5, for example, there is a criticism of the savage treason trials conducted by Gallus Caesar:

Eusebius vero obiecta fidentius negans suspensus in eodem gradu constantiae stetit latrocinium illud esse non iudicium clamans.

This is based on Cicero *pro Roscio Amerino* 61 *putares hic latrocinium non iudicium futurum.*

Ammianus several times imitates Cicero *legg.* 2.13 *est lex iustorum iniustorum distinctio.* The first instance
is at 18.1.2 (Julian) erat indeclinabilis iustorum iniustorum-gue distinctor. The same words are applied to Valens at 31.14.3 (in his obituary):

ut sunt in palatiis nonnulli alienarum rerum avidi, si qui caducum vel aliud petisset ex usu, cum magna iustorum iniustorumque distinctione contradicturis copia servate donabat ei, qui petierat, tres vel quattuor alios absentes aliquotiens impetratorum participes iungens, ut castigatius agerent inquieti lucra, quibus inhiabant, hoc minui commento cernentes.

This is clearly a role which Ammianus expects the emperor to play. Indeed, in view of the use of lex in the Ciceronian passage, one might even say that Ammianus expects the emperor to personify the law.

At 19.12.18 Ammianus criticizes the excessive zeal of Constantius in prosecuting men suspected of treason:

Sed exsultare maestis casibus effrenate non decet, ne videantur licentia regi subjici, non potestate, ut imitandus sit Tullius, cum parcere vel laedere potuisset, ut ipse affirmat, ignoscendi quaerens causas, non puniendi occasiones, quod iudicis lenti et considerati est proprium.

Here Ammianus quotes what seems to be a fragment of Cicero’s oratio Metellina. The literary borrowing lends auctoritas to the plea which Ammianus makes for mercy in such circumstances. A similar situation exists at Ammianus 26.10.12-13 where Valens punished cruelly the adherents of Procopius:

imperator enim promptior ad nocendum criminantibus patens et funereas delationes asciscens
per suppliciorum diversitates effrenatius exsultavit sententiae Tullianae ignarus docentis infelices esse eos, qui omnia sibi licere existimarunt. haec implacabilis causae quidem piissimae, sed victoriae foedioris innocentes tortoribus exposuit multos vel sub eculo locavit incurvos aut ictu carnificis torvi substravit.

The sententia cited here is a fragment of uncertain origin. It provides a general reflection on the effects of unrestrained power. A verbal echo of off. 2.27 in causa impia, victoria foediore follows. These reminiscences and the mention of Cicero by name as an authority serve to magnify the injustice perpetrated by Valens. The numerous parallels between Ammianus 19.12.18 and 26.10.12-13 are also noteworthy. The contexts are virtually the same. In both we find the verb exsultare accompanied by the adverb effrenate (or its comparative form). Then in each case Cicero is mentioned by name and a sententia calling for clemency is adduced from his works. These similarities suggest an almost formulaic manner of composition in which Ciceronian sententiae play no small part.

At 27.9.10 Ammianus praises the judicial rectitude of Praetextatus, the urban prefect of 367/368. This praise concludes with an expression borrowed from Cicero:

in examinandis vero litibus ante alios id impetravit, quod laudando Brutum Tullius refert, ut cum nihil ad gratiam faceret, omnia tamen grata viderentur esse, quae factitabat.
This is an adaptation of Orator 34 itaque efficis ut, cum gratiae causa nihil facias, omnia tamen sint grata quae facis. Once again Ammianus names and quotes Cicero to lend weight to his own opinions.

In his description of the treason and magic trials held at Antioch in 371/372 Ammianus again borrows from an old favorite at 29.2.12:

nec tamen post haec tam paenitenda repressius actum est vel pudenter non reputante alta nimium potestate, quod recte institutis ne cum inimico-rum quidem incommodis in delicta convenit ruere voluntaria nihilque sit tam deforme quam ad ardua imperii supercilia etiam acerbitatem naturae adiungi.

This is an obvious allusion to Cicero Qfr. 1.1.37:

nihil est tam deforme quam ad summum imperium etiam acerbitatem naturae adiungere.

And again at 29.2.18 Ammianus recalls a phrase from this letter:

o praecelara informatio doctrinarum munere caelesti indulta felicibus, quae vel vitiosas naturas saepe excoluisti! quanta in illa caligine temporum correxisse, si Valenti scire per te licuisset nihil alius esse imperium, ut sapientes definiunt, nisi curam salutis alienae bonique esse moderatoris restringere potestatem, resistere cupiditati omnium rerum.

This is modelled on Qfr. 1.1.7: 57

cuius (i.e. Quinti) natura talis est ut etiam sine doctrina videatur moderata esse potuisse,
Ammianus seems to use this letter of Cicero as a handbook; whenever he is commenting on imperial policy or administration, reminiscences of it are likely to occur.

Finally, at 29.5.24, Ammianus describes the judicial proceedings against some traitors conducted by the elder Theodosius in his African campaign:

_"agebat autem haec Tullianum illud advertens, quod "salutaris vigor vincit inanem speciem clementiam."_

Ammianus here shows his approval of Theodosius' actions by quoting Cicero _ad Brutum_ 1.2.5.58

In the passages dealing with justice Ammianus does make more use of Cicero's speeches and rhetorical works than he does in either the political speeches or the obituaries. This may be because they are better suited to discussions of criminal justice. We do, however, find extensive use of _ad Quintum fratrem_ 1.1 in all three of the major political contexts. The influence of this particular work on Ammianus can hardly be overestimated.
v. Historical Anecdotes

Ammianus often inserts anecdotes from Greek and Roman history in the Res Gestae. Some of these provide exempla for the instruction of Ammianus' readers. Others merely add a bit of color or a learned touch. Many of these appear to be taken from Cicero.

Ammianus mentions Regulus twice in book 14. The first instance is 14.6.11 subsidiis amicorum mariti, inops cum liberis uxor alitur Reguli, which occurs in a passage where Ammianus is praising the virtue of old time Romans. The second is 14.11.32 substravitque feritati Carthaginis Regulum. Regulus is, of course, a famous example and many authors refer to him. However, the phrase feritati Carthaginis recalls Cicero nat. deor. 3.80 cur Poenorum crudelitati Reguli corpus praebitum est. It is likely that Cicero was Ammianus' source for this story.

Another historical figure who adorns the Res Gestae is Lucius Cassius, urban praetor in 111 B.C. He was noted for his severity as a judge. Ammianus refers to him three times: 22.9.9 ille iudicibus Cassiis tristior et Lycurgis; 26.10.10 et Catonianae vel Cassianae sententiae fuco perliti resid- erint iudices; 30.8.13 Lycurgos invenisse praedicabant et Cassios. This same Cassius is often found in the works of Cicero as an example of a stern judge. Cicero Brutus 97 is of particular interest:
turn L. Cassius multum potuit non eloquentia, sed dicendo tamen: homo non liberalitate ut alii, sed ipsa tristitia et severitate popularis.

The use of tristitia suggests the tristior of Ammianus 22.2.9. Cicero does not link Cassius with Cato or Lycurgus, but this merely reflects two traits of Ammianus: to pile up references and to join things Greek and Roman.61

Ammianus may also draw on Cicero for information about the death of Scipio Aemilianus. At 25.10.13 he refers to this in connection with the death of Jovian:

cumque huic et Aemiliano Scipioni vitae exitus similis evenisset, super neutrius morte quaestionem comperimus agitatem.

Cicero mentions the same fact at pro Milone 16 num igitur ullaque quaestio de Africani morte lata est.62

Ammianus closes his account of the usurper Procopius with reference to a Licinius Crassus (26.9.11):

illis similis Crassi, quem in vita semel risisse Lucilius affirmat et Tullius.

Here Ammianus actually names his source, Cicero. The passages to which he refers are de finibus 5.92 M. Crasso, quem semel ait in vita risisse Lucilius and Tusc. disp. 3.31 M. Crassi illius veteris, quem semel ait in omni vita risisse Lucilius. This Crassus seems to have been proverbial for his dour attitude.63

Another somewhat anecdotal reference to Cicero occurs
at Ammianus 15.3.3:

unde rumorum aucupes subito exstitere com-
plures honorum vertices ipsos ferinis mors-
ibus appetentes posteaque pauperes et divites
indiscrete, non ut Cibyratae illi Verrini
tribunal unius legati lambentes, sed rei pub-
licae membra totius per incidentia mala vexan-
tes.

In this condemnation of the emperor’s sycophants Ammianus
alludes to the Verrines. Two brothers from Cibyra served
as tools of Verres in Sicily; Cicero describes them at Verr.
4.47 immitebantur ille continuo Cibryatici canes.64 That
Ammianus here specifically has Cicero in mind is confirmed
by further verbal borrowing from Verr. 3.28 horum canum quos
tribunal meum vides lambere.

Ammianus also borrows non-Roman anecdotal material from
Cicero. An example is the description of Cyrus at 23.6.40:
Cyrus ille superior rex amabilis which seems to echo Cicero
rep. 1.44 nam illi regi ... etiam amabili, Cyro. Another
anecdote from Persian history occurs at Ammianus 22.8.4
unde iunctis pontibus Xerxes maria pedibus peragravit. This
is based on Cicero de finibus 2.112:

ut, si Xerxes, cum tantis classibus tantisque
equestribus et pedestribus copiis, Hellesponto
iuncto, ... maria pedibus peragrantes...

While Ammianus very likely knew this story from other sources,
such as Herodotus, the verbal echoes here point clearly to
Cicero.65 It is interesting to note that both of these al-
lusions occur in digressions (22.8: Thrace,; 23.6 Persia).
Finally, we have several references to the famous tyrant of Syracuse, Dionysius. In these Ammianus appears to draw at least part of his material from Cicero's Tusculan Disputations. The first mention of Dionysius in the Res Gestae occurs at 14.11.30 Dionysium, gentium quondam terror em Corinthi litterario ludo praefecit. At Tusc. disp. 3.27 Cicero tells us Dionysius quidam tyrannus Syracusis expulsus Corinthi pueros docebat. Unfortunately there is not sufficient similarity of phrasing to be certain of Ammianus' source here.66 Again at Ammianus 16.8.10 we find Dionysius:

\[
\text{ut Dionysius tyrannus ille Siciliae, qui ob hoc idem vitium et tonstrices docuit filias, ne cui alieno ora committeret leviganda, aedemque brevem, ubi cubitare sueverat, alta circumdedit fossa eamque ponte solubili superstravit, cuius dissectos asseres et axiculos secum in somnum abiens transferebat eosdemque compaginabat lucis initio processurus.}
\]

A very probable source of at least some of this is Tusc. disp. 5.58-59. Of special interest are the phrases 5.58 tondere filias suas docuit and 5.59:

\[
\text{et cum fossam latam cubiculari lecto circumdisset eiusque fossae transitum ponticulo ligneo coniunxisset, eum ipsum, cum forem cubiculi clauerat, detorquebat.}
\]

Once again the verbal similarity is enough to suggest but not to prove borrowing.67 Lastly, at 29.2.4 Ammianus refers to the sword of Damocles:
The story is also told by Cicero at Tusc. disp. 5.61-62. This time there is a somewhat greater verbal similarity. Tusc. disp. 5.62 in hoc medio apparatu fulgentem gladium e lacunari saeta equina aptum demitti iussit is reasonably close to what Ammianus has and might well be his source. 68

Most of these anecdotes are phrased in such a way that the source is obvious. Several times Ammianus actually ascribes an anecdote to Cicero. In view of Ammianus' extensive use of Cicero in other areas, we can probably assume that he remembered these stories and exempla from his reading of Cicero's works. Still, we must remember that this type of material often found its way into handbooks. It is possible (although I think unlikely) that Ammianus relied on such a collection here.

vi. Science and Philosophy

Ammianus occasionally refers to scientific and philosophical matters in the Res Gestae. He mentions a number of Greek philosophers by name, although these are mostly
references made in passing. He also refers now and again to various doctrines and beliefs. The majority of this material is found in passages set off from the narrative, such as prefaces and digressions. Ammianus appears to rely on a number of sources in these places, but at least some of the material comes from Cicero, especially his philosophical writings. Cicero's influence seems to be especially great in sections dealing with divination.

In the preface to the last six books of the Res Gestae Ammianus discusses certain aspects of writing history. One of his points is that it is impossible (and not worthwhile) to pile up many insignificant details. To show the futility of even trying to do so, he compares it to counting up all the atoms (26.1.1):

non humilium minutias indagare causarum, quas si scitari voluerit quispiam, individua illa corpuscula volitantia per inane atomos, ut nos appellamus, numerari posse sperabit.

This somewhat general statement could easily have come from a handbook. Yet it contains verbal similarities to several Ciceronian passages: acad. 1.6 de corpusculorum (ita enim appellat atomos) concursione fortuita loqui; nat. deor. 1.54 infinita vis innumerabilium volitat atomorum, quae interiecta inani cohaerescunt; 1.67 in individuis corpusculis. Ammianus uses quite similar terms and could easily have derived his knowledge from these passages.

There is a digression on eclipses at Ammianus 20.3.
Here again we find possible borrowings from Cicero, such as at 20.3.3:

```
ac licet utriusque sideris conversiones et
motus, ut scrutatores causarum intelligibilium
adverterant, in unum eundemque finem lunari
cursu impleto perenni distinctione conveniunt,
tamen sol non semper his diebus obducitur, sed
cum luna e regione velut libramento quodam igneo
orbi et aspectui nostro opponitur media.
```

Cicero uses like phrases at *Tusc. disp.* 1.62 *astra ... quorum conversiones omnisque motus* and 5.69 *cum totius mundi motus conversionesque perspexerit sideraque viderit.* At 20.3.8 Ammianus uses the expression *meta noctis,* which also occurs in Cicero's brief discussion of eclipses at *div.* 2.17: *quando illa (sc. luna) e regione solis facta incurvat in umbram terrae, quae est meta noctis.* This passage also has some similarities to 20.3.3 (quoted above). Finally, at Ammianus 20.3.12 *instar exigui subditum puncti* is used of the earth's position in the center of the universe. Cicero uses *instar puncti* in the same context at *Tusc. disp.* 1.40

```
persuadent enim mathematici terram in medio
mundi sitam ad universi caeli complexum quasi
puncti instar optinere.
```

While Ammianus obviously used sources other than Cicero (e.g. Ptolemy, who is mentioned at 20.3.4), these verbal echoes suggest that Cicero supplied at least some his knowledge of eclipses.

Ammianus speaks often of divination and omens. There is a digression, for example, at 21.1.7-14, where after
referring to omens of the impending death of Constantius, Ammianus gives a general account of divination. At 21.1.10 he mentions the Etruscan seer Tages. Cicero tells us about the same man in de divinatione (2.50-51). Ammianus concludes the digression with several borrowings from Cicero, such as 21.1.13:

quod et grammaticus locutus interdum est barbare et absurde cecinit musicus et ignoravit remedium medicus; sed non ideo nec grammatica nec musica nec medicina subsistit.

This is modelled on a passage in the Tusculan Disputations (2.12):

si grammaticum se professus quispiam barbare loquatur, aut si absurde canat is qui se haberi velit musicum.

A similar thought is found at nat. deor. 2.12:

at fortasse non omnia eveniunt quae prae-dicta sunt. ne aegri quidem quia non omnes convalescunt idcirco ars nulla medicina est.

Ammianus 21.1.13 seems to be a conflation of these two passages. Ammianus also quotes directly the words which follow the above citation from de natura deorum at 21.1.14:

unde praeclare hoc quoque ut alia Tullius: "signa ostenduntur" ait "a dis rerum futura-rum. in his si qui erraverit, non deorum natura, sed hominum conjectura peccavit."

Here Ammianus even identifies his source for us.
In the account of the Persian campaign Ammianus describes an omen in which a soldier and two horses are killed by a lightning bolt. Ammianus makes reference here to the fulgurales libri as an authority (23.5.13). These books are mentioned only in this passage and at Cicero div. 1.72 haruspicini et fulgurales et rituales libri. 

vii. Oratory and Rhetoric

It is not surprising that Ammianus draws heavily on Cicero in those parts of the Res Gestae in which he discusses oratory and rhetoric. In these passages Ammianus uses not only Cicero's rhetorical works, but also the speeches and the philosophical works.

The most important discussion of oratory in Ammianus is, of course, the famous digression at 30.4. Here Ammianus gives a potted history of forensic oratory and criticism of its contemporary practitioners. The digression is filled with both verbal and substantive borrowings from Cicero. At the very beginning of the digression (30.4.3) we find the Ciceronian expression amplitudo Ciceronis, which occurs at orat. 5. A bit further along, at 30.4.5, Ammianus again borrows from Cicero:

ut Demosthenes, quo dicturo concursus audiendi causa ex tota Graecia fieri solitos monumentis Atticis continetur.
This is obviously modelled on Brutus 289:

necesse fuisse, cum Demosthenes dicturus esset, ut concursus audiendi causa ex tota Graecia fierent.

Despite Ammianus' reference to the records of Attica the close verbal similarities show his true source. Ammianus lists some of the more famous orators of classical Athens and of the Roman Republic in 30.4.5-7. Every name Ammianus mentions is also found in Cicero's Brutus. This historical portion of the digression closes at 30.4.7 with a reference to Cicero himself:

post quos excellentissimus omnium Cicero, orationis imperiosae fulminibus saepe depressos aliquos iudiciorum eripiens flammis, "non defendi homine sine vitu-peratione fortasse posse, neglegenter defendi sine scelere non posse" firmabat.

The quotation is from a lost work of Cicero; it is preserved only here. It helps Ammianus to lead into his denunciation of contemporary lawyers by showing, on Cicero's authority, what their true business is.

At 30.4.8 Ammianus begins his diatribe against these men. The first charge is greed:

at nunc videre est per eos omnes tractus violenta et rapacissima genera hominum per fora omnia volitantium et subsidentium divites domus ut Spartanos canes aut Cretas vestigia sagacius colligendo ad ipsa cubilia pervenire causarum.
Here Ammianus seems to echo two passages in Cicero. The first is *Verr.* 2.190 *avaria* *tiae non iam vestigia sed ipsa cubilia videre* and the second is *Cluent.* 82 *pecunia vestigiisne nobis adoranda est an ad ipsum cubile nobis ducibus venire possumus.* *Vestigium and cubile* occur in all three passages. This metaphorical use of *cubile* is uncommon.  

Ammianus imitates Cicero at 30.4.10 *eloquentiam inanis quaedam imitatur adfluentia loquendi.* This is taken from *part., orat.* 81 *hanc oratoriam vim (sc. imitatur) inanis quaedam profluentia loquendi.* Immediately following this allusion Ammianus also quotes directly Cicero *rep.* 5.11 as part of his condemnation of the legal profession and its misuse of oratory:

> quarum artium scaevitate, ut Tullius asseverat, nefas est ad religionem decipi iudicantes. ait enim: "cumque nihil tam incorruptum esse debeat in re publica quam suffragium, quam sententia, non intelego, cur, qui ea pecunia corruperit, poena dignus sit, qui eloquentia, laudem etiam ferat. mihi quidem hoc plus mali facere videtur, qui oratione, quam qui pretio iudicem corrumpit, quod pecunia corrumpere prudentem nemo potest, dicendo potest."

At this point in the digression the allusions to Cicero disappear almost completely. Only one more is found, at 30.4.19:

> suave quoddam principium dicendi exoritur, Cluentianae vel pro Ctesiphonte orationum aemula ornamenta promittens.

So we can observe that Ammianus here uses Cicero mainly for the history of oratory, apart from a couple of general
observations upon what is the proper use of forensic oratory
and how it is sometimes perverted.

viii. Proverbial Expressions

Ammianus often makes use of proverbial sayings and
similar popular expressions. These are used, as Sabbah
has noted, to invoke and reinforce a common culture be-
tween Ammianus and his readers. They also lend greater
authority to his observations, especially if the sayings
can be ascribed to famous men. This is perhaps the most
important use of such expressions, as Macrobius observes
(Sat. 2.1.15):

horum nos ab invidia muniret auctoritas, etiam
si nostris cavillaremur, et cum veteribus dicta
referamus, ipsa aut utique auctorum dignitate
defendimur.

Many of the proverbial expressions and clichés which we find
in Ammianus have been borrowed from the works of Cicero, al-
though they are seldom identified as such by Ammianus. It
is possible that Ammianus collected these sayings in the
course of reading Cicero's works. It is also quite possible
that he used a collection of dicta memorabilia made by some-
one else. There is evidence that a collection of this sort,
made either by Cicero himself or by Tiro, was in circulation.
Macrobius refers to this (Sat. 2.1.12):
Macrobius' remarks imply that the collection was well known.

At Ammianus 14.1.7 we find the phrase etiam parietes arcanorum soli consci timebantur. This seems to be modelled on Cicero Cluent. 15 non parietes denique ipsos superiorum testis nuptiarum (sc. timuisse) and Cael. 60 non parietes (sc. metuet). In all three passages an extreme fear of informers is expressed.

Ammianus ascribes the use of a proverb to Julian at 16.5.10:

vetus illud proverbium "clitellae bovi sunt impositae; plane non est nostrum onus" Platonem crebro nominans exclamabat.

The proverb is expressed in exactly the same words at Cicero Att. 5.15.3, which is probably Ammianus' source. While Julian may actually have said this or something similar, it is more likely that Ammianus is here simply putting suitable words in his mouth.

Ammianus 16.2.47 pares enim quodam modo coiere cum paribus and 28.1.53 pares facile congregari paribus are imitations of Cicero senect. 7 pares autem veter proverbio cum paribus facillime congregantur. The similarities in wording strongly suggest borrowing.

At Ammianus 18.4.2 we have another popular expression which seems to be taken from Cicero: eadem incudem, ut
dicitur, diu noctuque tundendo. Cicero has used this same
metaphor at de orat. 2.162 eandem incudem diem noctemque
tudentibus. Ammianus adds only ut dicitur, to acknowledge
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it as a common expression.

Several times Ammianus uses proverbial expressions con­
cerning fortune. These include 26.8.13 versa rota fortuna
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and 31.1.1 fortunae volucris rota. There are similar phrases
in Cicero: Sulla 91 e volucrem fortunam and Pis. 22 for­
tunae rotam pertimescebat. Still these are too common to
claim with any certainty that Ammianus borrowed them from
Cicero.

At 28.1.39 Ammianus says ut nec in alienis malis quorum­
dam exarescerent lacrimae. This proverbial expression is
found in Cicero's part. orat. 57 cito enim exarescit lacrima,
praesertim in alienis malis. Similar phrases occur also at
inv. 1.109 and ad Herenn. 2.50 (which Ammianus probably
thought to be by Cicero). The fact that Ammianus quotes
Cicero (Qfr. 1.1.39) at 28.1.40 adds to the probability that
he borrows the proverb also from Cicero.

Another popular expression is res ipsa logueretur at
Ammianus 29.2.13. This is common in Cicero: Mil. 53 res
loquitur ipsa; 66 ut res ipsa loquitur; fam. 3.2.2 res ...
non pro se loqueretur; fam. 15.11.1 etsi res ipsa loguebatur;
Att. 3.1 res ipsa loqueretur. But apart from these passages
the phrase seems to occur only once, at Tertullian de pudic.
5 haec ipsa res loguuntur. A similar type of cliché occurs
at Ammianus 30.10.2 in eadem navi. This is found in Cicero (fam. 2.5.1), but also in Livy (44.22.12).

All of these proverbs have Ciceronian antecedents, although borrowing cannot always be proven. It is clear, at any rate, that Ammianus was influenced by Cicero to a considerable extent in the selection and use of proverbs.

ix. Flosculi

Cicero was highly regarded as a stylistic model by Ammianus and his contemporaries. The opinion of Symmachus is typical: ep. 1.3.2 unus aetate nostra monetam Latiaris eloquii Tulliana incude finxisti; 1.31.1 erat quippe in his oblita Tulliana melle festivitas; 9.110.2 prope est ut te arguere debeam, quod saeculo nostro Tullianum stili tam parcus invides. In view of this, it is not surprising that Ammianus often borrows a phrase from Cicero for no other reason than stylistic imitation. The Res Gestae contains literally hundreds of Ciceronian flosculi.

It is neither necessary nor worthwhile to enumerate here all of the purely stylistic borrowings from Cicero. I shall restrict myself to listing only a few examples:

Amm. 16.12.46 velut quodam furoris adflatu and 27.6.1 quasi adflatu quodam furoris / Cic. de orat. 2.194 sine quodam adflatu quasi furoris; Amm. 17.13.33 unum idemque sentientes and 20.8.5 unum semper atque idem sentientes / Cic. Cat. 4.14
sentiret unum atque idem and 4.19 unum atque idem senti-entem (cf. also Phil. 3.32 and 14.16); Amm. 21.16.18
concertatione verborum / Cic. de orat. 2.68 sine ieiuna con-certatione verborum (cf. also Tusc. disp. 2.30 and part. orat. 81); Amm. 30.7.4 concordia sibi iunctissimum / Cic. Cluent. 152 concordia coniunctissimus (cf. also Verr. 5.8 and fam. 11.13a.5). These are all merely verbal borrowings.
None seems to have any special significance. In many cases the borrowed phrase has occurred more than once in Cicero. This same type of general stylistic borrowing is common in many of Ammianus' contemporaries as well.

x. Conclusions

Ammianus makes more extensive use of Cicero than of any other author. Many of his borrowings are, of course, stylistic. The flosculi and, to a certain extent, the proverbial sayings belong in this category. In other cases Ammianus goes to Cicero for specific information. Examples of this include 30.4, the digression on oratory, in which Ammianus makes considerable use of Cicero's works, especially the rhetorica. Ammianus also, as might be expected, uses such works as de natura deorum and de divinatione as sources of information on divination and omens.

However, the real and important influence which Cicero exercised on Ammianus falls mainly in the area of moral and
political thought. As we have seen in this chapter, many of Ammianus' moral reflections and exhortations are drawn (and occasionally quoted directly) from Cicero. In moral questions Ammianus uses the full range of Cicero's writings. Likewise, in discussions of political theory and practice Ammianus relies heavily on Cicero. So heavily, in fact, that we sometimes find slightly anachronistic ideas being applied to the changed circumstances of Ammianus' day. Ammianus' political thinking seems to be influenced most greatly by a small number of Cicero's works: ad Quintum fratrem 1.1, de officiis, and de amicitia. References to these three works constantly crop up in every political context. Ammianus makes the greatest use of ad Quintum fratrem 1.1 which he regarded almost as a handbook for politics and government.
ENDNOTES

1 On Symmachus and Cicero see Kroll (1891) 61-76.

2 Augustine conf. 3.7 perveneram in librum cuiusdam Ciceronis cuius linguam fere omnes mirantur, pectus non ita. sed liber ille ipsius exhortationem continet ad philosophiam et vocatur Hortensius. Ille vero liber mutavit affectum meum et ad te ipsum, domine, mutavit preces meas et vota ac desideria mea fecit alia. Augustine's knowledge and use of Cicero is discussed at length by Testard (1958) and Hagendahl (1967) 479-588.


5 On P. Ryl. 1.61 as a school text see especially Moore (1929) 321-322. Gaebel (1970) discusses at length the bi- lingual papyri of Cicero and Vergil and their uses.

6 On Ammianus' naming of his literary predecessors see the Appendix.

7 Amm. 21.16.18 and 30.4.9; cf. Owens (1958) 101-102.

8 Amm. 15.12.5 hae regiones (i.e. Galliae) ... paulatim levi sudore, sub imperium venere Romanum also seems to echo Font. 12 qui (i.e. Galli) cum ipso M. Fonteio ferrum ac manus contulerunt multoque eius sudore ac labore sub populi Romani imperium dicionemque ceciderunt.
The quotation at Ammianus 15.5.23 has been ascribed to the de republica by some but is rejected by Ziegler in his edition of the fragments of that work. See Owens (1958) 148.


Cf. also Vulg. Lev. 13.12 quidquid sub aspectum oculorum cadit.

Another instance of this incidental use is the pro Balbo which is imitated repeatedly in 14.6.4-6: Amm. 14.6.4 pueritiae tempus extremum / Balb. 9 pueritiae tempus extremum; Amm. 14.6.5 fundamenta libertatis et retinacula sempiterna / Balb. 31 haec sunt enim fundamenta firmissima nostrae libertatis; Amm. 14.6.6 per omnes tamen quot orae sunt partesque terrarum / Balb. 9 tot habet triumphos quot orae sunt partesque terrarum. There is no real similarity of context or other special reason to allude to Cicero here. Other possible borrowings from the pro Balbo which have been suggested are dubious at best; cf. Owens (1958) 62-63.

Ammianus also refers to veritas in the prefatory remarks which begin books 15 and 26: 15.1.1 utcumque potui veritatem scrutari and 26.1.1 ut et pericula declinentur veritati. Barnard (1966) 29 discusses the importance of veritas in these passages.

The geographical digressions include 15.9-12 (Gaul), 22.8 (Thrace), 22.15-16 (Egypt), 23.6 (Persia), and 27.4 (Thrace).

There are obituaries of Constantius (21.16), Julian (25.4), Valentinian (30.7-9) and Valens (31.14). Cf. Field (1968) and Samberger (1969).

Works such as the Historia Augusta and Aurelius Victor's Caesares had largely replaced the more traditional historical writing.

Sabbah (1978) 72-75. Ammianus was probably familiar with the letter to Lucceius also, since there is a close verbal parallel between Amm. 21.13.12 and Cicero fam. 5.12.14; cf. Fletcher (1937) 379.
Ammianus had a negative opinion of the theater in general; cf. 14.6.18 and 25, 28.4.32. I discuss Ammianus' use of theatrical metaphors in much greater detail in my forthcoming article "Theatrical Metaphors in Ammianus Marcellinus" (to appear in Eranos).

Persona, in late Latin, is often used merely in the sense of person, but here, as at 29.2.23, may well retain its theatrical associations. The personae are alleged accomplices of Arbitio and are expected to incriminate him when they are questioned under torture. Thus they are important characters in the farce.

Blockley (1975) 57.

Ammianus' description of Procopius here calls to mind Claudian Ruf. 1.74-115, where Rufinus is depicted as the protege of the powers of Hell; cf. Cameron (1970) 69.

For similar uses of coturnus see Amm. 21.1.2, 21.16.1, 28.4.27.

In addition to 28.6, Ammianus also refers to Romanus at 27.9.1, 29.5.1-2 and 50, 30.2.10-11.

For example, Suetonius Tib. 24.1 impudentissimo mimo nunc adhortantis amicos increpans. See also Calig. 45.2 and Otho 3.2.

See Wright (1931), especially 94-106 which list Cicero's metaphorical uses of stage terms. Sutton (1984) discusses briefly the use of references to the stage in characterization.

Theatrical imagery and comic allusion abound in the pro Caelio. See Geffcken (1973) 24-27.

On Ammianus' knowledge of the Verrines see Michael (1874) 22-23 and Owens (1958) 96-100. Also similar to the passages cited from the Verrines is Phil. 2.34.

Ammianus quotes directly from the Second Philippic just a few lines down at 27.11.4.

See Michael (1874) 12, Owens (1958) 134 and Camus (1967) 63. There are other parallels from Cicero as well: fin. 4.18 temperantia, modestia, iustitia et omnis honesta; fin. 5.36 virtutum quas appellamus voluntarias, at prudentiam, temperantiam, fortitudinem, iustitiam et reliquas eiusdem generis; off. 1.121 iustitiam, fidem, liberalitatem, modestiam, temperantiam. Appended to the list of the cardinal virtues in Ammianus is a further list of what might be called political virtues which are based on Cicero imp. Pomp. 28. Cf. below pp. 116 ff.

For the influence of Cicero in this matter on the Latin fathers see Hagendahl (1958) 347-381.

Similar expressions occur in Plautus, Symmachus and the Historia Augusta; cf. Otto (1890) s.v. frux (pp. 147-148).

Michael (1874) 15. According to Owens (1958) 78 this is the only known borrowing from the pro Marcello in Ammianus.

Hagendahl (1924) 166: "sine dubio sumptum est a Cic. Cael. 14."

The borrowing from de amicitia here appears to be even more extensive. In introducing the letter to Constantius Ammianus uses the expression non repugnanter (20.8.4), which also occurs at amic. 91. Lewis and Short cite only these two passages for repugnanter; cf. the remarks of Owens (1958) 123.

This also ties in with the use of theatrical metaphors which was discussed the section above.

Michael (1874) 6 and 11.

Other probable borrowings from de amicitia include: Amm. 14.8.15 morte deleto and 22.11.2 deletus est morte / amic. 13 morte deleri; Amm. 21.16.11 capitall <odio> / amic. 2 capitall odio; Amm. 22.10.3 dolere delictis et gaudere correctione / amic. 90 delicto dolere, correctione gaudere; Amm. 24.3.4 circumfluere rerum omnium copulis / amic. 52 circumfluere omnibus rebus atque in omnium rerum abundantia vivere; 26.2.9 cum iudicaverit quisquam prudentes, adiungere sibi debeat / amic. 85 quum iudicaveris, diligere oportet, non, quum dilexeris, iudicare. See Michael (1874) 35 and Owens (1958) 121-123.
39 Similar sentiments can be found in Seneca clem. 1.1, the younger Pliny ep. 1.8.14, and Symmachus ep. 9.105; cf. Michael (1874) 11-12 and de Jonge, Commentary ad loc.

40 Cf. also Tusc. disp. 1.34.

41 See Michael (1874) 6 and 13, Owens (1958) 62.

42 This notion was widely held in the fourth century; cf. Blockley (1975) 157-167.


44 See Earl (1967) 96-121. It is worth noting that several of Cicero's works, such as the de republica appear to have had a considerable influence on political theory as late as the early Byzantine period and to have been used even in the Greek East; cf. Behr (1974) and Fotiou (1984).

45 Cf. also Verrines 3.9 istum rebus omnibus undique ereptis impune eludentem circumfluere atque abundare. In connection with this see also Amm. 14.6.8 / Cicero rep. 6.8 and Amm. 22.7.4 / Cicero Archia 26 which have been discussed above pp. 109 ff. (on moral theory).

46 See Michael (1874) 41.

47 Most of these parallels have been pointed out by Michael (1874) 9, 14-15, but he has done little to put them into perspective. The case for the influence of Qfr. 1.1 is strengthened by the use of corruptrix at Amm. 25.3.18 and at Qfr. 1.1.19. This word occurs in only three other places, all in Christian writers; cf. Owens (1958) 113.

48 Michael (1874) 11 and Fletcher (1937) 380.

49 Michael (1874) 39-41.

50 Wallace-Hadrill (1982) 32-48 provides a useful discussion, without, however, any reference to Ammianus. See also Earl (1967) 111 who underestimates the continuity of traditional ideas here in Ammianus.

The unusual clausulae here suggest that we have something very close to Cicero's own words; cf. Owens (1958) 101.

On the importance of justice as a theme in the Res Gestae see Earl (1967) 111-113.

Cf. Amm. 22.3.4 apud iudices iustorum iustorumque distinctore (criticism of a kangaroo court) and 28.4.1 iustorum iustorumque distinctor (praise of Olybrius, the urban prefect in 368); see also Owens (1958) 129.

On the source of the quotation see Owens (1958) 102.

On the identity of this fragment of Cicero see Owens (1958) 148.

Cf. also Cicero de fato 10 vitiosam enim naturam... edomtitam et compressam doctrina.

Cicero ad Brutum 1.2.5 has severitas, not vigor. Either Ammianus misquotes or uses a variant text.

Cf. Val. Max. 4.4.6 which says the Senate aided the family of Regulus.

Finke (1904) 43-44.

Other references to Cassius in Cicero include Rosc. Amer. 83, Verr. 3.137 and 146. Cf. also de orat. 3.199 non fuco inlitus. See Michael (1874) 19, 21, 23. For the linking of Greek and Roman elements see Classen (1972). Otto (1890) 77 sv. Cassius refers also to HA Avid. Cass. 5.6.

Cf. Michael (1874) 8, Finke (1904) 44-45. Owens (1958) 79 also refers to Livy epit. 59 and Vell. Pat. 2.4.6 as possible sources for Ammianus here.

Cf. also Pliny hist. nat. 7.79 and Solinus (1.72).

These brothers are also referred to at Verr. 4.30, 32, 33. See also Finke (1904) 42.

See also Ammianus 17.13.27 peragrans pedibus flumina.
Cf. Val. Max. 6.9 ext. 6 and Michael (1874) 8.

See also Val. Max. 9.13 ext. 4 which is also similar to the two passages discussed in the text. Hagendahl (1921) 81-82 argues for Ammianus' use of Cicero here. See also Michael (1874) 8 and Owens (1958) 146.

Cf. Sidonius Apollinaris ep. 2.13.7 mucro ... filio equinae saetae ligatus. He also is speaking of the sword of Damocles.

For example, Pythagoras, Anaxagoras and Plato are all named at 22.16.21-22 (the digression on Egypt) as Greeks who benefitted from the wisdom of Egypt. For complete references see the Appendix.

Cf. also Cicero fin. 1.17 ille atomos quas appellat, id est corpora individua propter soliditatem, censet in infinito inani and Lactantius de ira 10.12 individuis corpusculis.

Cf. also Cicero nat. deor. 2.15, Flacc. 94, Sest. 99 and the discussion by Owens (1958) 143.

See Pease's commentary on this passage of de divinatione.

Amm. 17.10.2 also refers to Tages. See von Scala (1898) 144.

See Rolfe's Loeb edition ad. loc. Also, as we have seen in chapter two above, the reference to Ennius ann. 179 at Amm. 23.5.9 is probably taken from div. 2.116.

The same expression is found at Amm. 22.16.22 (Egyptian digression) and 23.6.32 (Persian digression). Cf. Mart. Cap. 4.330 Socratis ... Platonisque amplitudinem.

Cf. also Cicero opt. gen. 22 ad quod iudicium concursus dicitur et tota Graecia factus esse. See Michael (1874) 8, 19. Also the clausula audiendi causa is unusual, as often happens when Ammianus is closely following a model; cf. Harmon (1910) 170 and Owens (1958) 25-29.

For a discussion of the identity of this fragment see Michael (1874) 7 and Owens (1958) 65. There is some general
similarity to Cicero div. in Caec. 60.

78 Cf. TLL 4.1272.84 ff. and Owens (1958) 70.

79 Sabbah (1978) 513-514.

80 Cf. also Macrobius Sat. 2.1.14 (= Cic. ad Corn Nep. frag. 1): *itaque nostri, cum omnia quae dixissemus dicta essent, quae facete et breviter et acute locuti essemus, ea proprio nomine appellari dicta voluerunt.*

81 See also Cic. fam. 4.14.3 and 6.3.3; Michael (1874) 24 and 27, Otto (1890) 266 s.v. paries (5) and (7).

82 Cf. also Quint. inst. 5.11.21, Michael (1874) 40, and Otto (1890) 57 s.v. bos (2).

83 Otto (1890) 264 s.v. par (1). Most of the other examples given by Otto have *similis* rather than *par*. He has omitted one instance which is roughly contemporary with Ammianus: a letter of Constantine to the bishops of Numidia (= CSEL 26.214.18-19): *recte proverbio signatum est, pares cum paribus congregari.*

84 Cf. Ammianus 28.4.26 and Otto (1890) 174 s.v. incus.

85 See Otto (1890) 142 s.v. fortuna (2) and Owens (1958) 96).

86 Michael (1874) 14 and 20; Otto (189) 184 s.v. lacrima (1). Otto omits the passage from Ammianus.

87 Owens (1958) 79.

88 Cf. also Jerome quaest. hebr. in gen., pref.: *quis in arce eloquentiae Romanae sterti, rex oratorum et Latinae linguae illustrator.*

89 Many examples of this type of borrowing are cited in Michael (1874) and Fletcher (1937).

90 Symmachus, for example, often borrows phrases from Cicero; cf. Kroll (1891) 61-76.
Ammianus' knowledge of Republican Latin poetry seems to have been limited. As we have seen, he knew Ennius and Lucilius only at second-hand. There is but one allusion to each in the Res Gestae (Amm. 23.5.9/Enn. Ann. 179 and Amm. 26.9.11/Lucil. frags. 1299-1300 M). In both cases there are rather obvious signs that Ammianus' source of the reference was Cicero. There is no evidence at all to suggest that Ammianus read Lucretius. Indeed, he passes up several excellent opportunities to allude to him, such as the account of the plague at Amida (19.4).

Ammianus makes somewhat greater use of the comic poets, Plautus and Terence. He does not mention either of them by name, but does obliquely refer once to each of them with the phrase ut ait comicus (15.13.3) of Plautus, 14.6.16 of Terence). There appear to be only a half dozen genuine reminiscences of Plautus in the Res Gestae. Nearly all of these smack of the handbook or lexicon. Often they consist of unusual locutions of the type commonly found in late antique dictionaries of Republican Latin. An example of this is perquisitor malivolus (Amm. 14.5.7/Plaut. Stich. 385), an extremely rare collocation of words. Ammianus' use of Terence is similar. Six possible borrowings have been noted, and of these only two are very probable. Once again they are
of such a sort as to suggest that Ammianus' source was a handbook. The reference to Sannio at Ammianus 14.6.16 could easily have come from an indirect source: Nonius Marcellus, in fact, discusses the use of the name Sannio to designate a type of character and refers to the Eunuchus of Terence in his discussion. The evidence is inconclusive, but I strongly suspect that Ammianus knew the works of Plautus and Terence only indirectly.

Most of the borrowings from Plautus and Terence are found in the earliest (14-19) of the extant books of Ammianus. A possible explanation for this distribution is that it reflects Ammianus' reading at the time when he was composing these books. Also, most of the allusions to the comic poets are used in negative characterizations. At 14.5.7 Ammianus borrows an expression from Plautus (Stich. 385) in a passage which criticizes the excesses of Paulus, a notorious informer and hanging judge. Another example is Ammianus 16.12.3 where the phrase *satis pro imperio* is taken from Terence Phormio 196 to describe the rudeness and arrogance of the barbarian chiefs before the battle of Strasburg. Whatever the source of Ammianus' reminiscences of Roman comedy, he seems to have made consistent and deliberate use of them.

Ammianus' acquaintance with the works of the elder Cato likewise seems to have been limited. As far as we can tell there are no references to the *Origines* or any of the other major writings of Cato. Ammianus apparently used only a collection of *dicta memorabilia*. He cites three witty
sayings of Cato (at 14.6.8, 15.12.4 and 16.5.3). Not surprisingly, he uses all of these as moral exempla. Again, as was the case with the comic poets, we find the use of Cato restricted to the first extant books of the Res Gestae.

The influence of the major historians of the late Republic on Ammianus is much greater. Ammianus was certainly familiar with Caesar's Bellum Gallicum. He may also have read the Bellum Civile, but the evidence for this is limited and inconclusive. There are relatively few verbal reminiscences. These fall mainly in the geographical and ethnographical digressions; most are in a single digression, the one dealing with Gaul (Amm. 15.9-12). The paucity of allusions and echoes is not really surprising. Caesar's vocabulary and style are somewhat plain, while Ammianus has a tendency to borrow striking or unusual phrases from his literary predecessors.

Caesar may have provided a structural model for the books of the Res Gestae which cover Julian's activities in Gaul. The placement of the Gallic digression (15.9-12) at the beginning of Julian's adventures and of the battle of Strasburg at the end of book sixteen parallels the arrangement of book one of the Bellum Gallicum. There Caesar opens with an ethnographic digression to set the stage and concludes his account of the first year's campaign with the defeat of the German Ariovistus. In connection with this, we should note the extensive borrowing of phrases and material from BG 1.1-3 at Ammianus 15.11.1-7. Ammianus maintains a
running comparison of Julian and Julius Caesar both in the books dealing with Gaul and in those concerning the Persian campaign. Usually the comparison is implied rather than directly stated; Ammianus makes it explicit at 25.2.3.

Ammianus knew all three of Sallust's historical works. He made extensive use of the Histories and the Jugurtha, and somewhat less of the Catiline. Sallust influenced Ammianus in a number of areas. One of these areas is that of historiographical principles. Several times in the course of explaining his procedures for handling various topics Ammianus borrows a phrase from a similar passage in Sallust. These allusions include remarks on brevity and selectivity (cf. Amm. 28.1.2/Sall. Cat. 4.2) and on the inclusion and omission of digressions (Amm. 23.6.62 and 25.10.3/Sall. Jug. 19.2).

Ammianus and Sallust display a remarkable similarity in their moral principles and judgements. The Roman digressions of Ammianus (14.6 and 28.4), for example, have much in common with the prefaces of the Catiline and the Jugurtha. Ammianus frequently inserts reminiscences of Sallust in passages which criticize the morals of his contemporaries. Often in these cases Ammianus adapts some general statement of Sallust on morals to apply to the lapses of a particular individual. An example of this is found in Ammianus' account of the greed of the Roman border officials (31.4.10). He describes their avarice as materia malorum, an expression which Sallust used
in the preface to the *Catiline* (10.3-5).

Sallust also provided Ammianus with a model for the writing of geographical and ethnographical digressions. Ammianus introduces and concludes many of his digressions with formulae modelled upon those of Sallust. He also borrows material from the digressions of Sallust. There are several examples of this in the Gallic digression: Amm. 15.10.10 and 15.11.12/Sall. *Hist.* 2.64 and Amm. 15.12.6/Sall. *Hist.* 1.11.

Sallust's greatest influence on Ammianus, however, is as a stylistic model. Ammianus bases many of his time expressions and topographical descriptions on Sallustian models. The largest group of purely stylistic imitations of Sallust occurs in passages dealing with military matters. Despite his own experience in military operations as a *protector domesticus*, Ammianus relies much more on the literary tradition than personal observations in his accounts of battles and sieges. An example of this is Ammianus 24.4.22 where he describes a night attack carried out by the Persians. Much of the phraseology there is borrowed from Sallust *Jugurtha* 21.2, although Ammianus was a participant in the battle and could easily have written an original account of it, had he wanted to do so. Indeed, the number of Sallustian reminiscences in such passages is so great that one suspects that while composing them Ammianus read appropriate passages in Sallust as models.

Cicero had by far the greatest influence of any author, Greek or Latin, on Ammianus. It is abundantly clear, from
hundreds of quotations and reminiscences, that Ammianus was intimately acquainted with a considerable number of Cicero's works. Not only are there many unacknowledged borrowings, but also more than twenty identified quotations from Cicero's various writings. In these cases Ammianus usually merely attributes to Cicero without further specification; occasionally he names the work as well (e.g. the pro Fonteio at 15.12.4, the pro Oppio at 30.8.7 and ad Corn. Nep. at 21.16.13 and 26.1.2). Ammianus does this for no other author except Vergil, and then only four times. Why does he refer to Cicero in this way so often? The likely answer is that he considered Cicero to be a great source of auctoritas, especially in the moral and political spheres. By citing Cicero directly and openly Ammianus thought to add more weight to his own opinions.

Cicero's stylistic influence on Ammianus is extensive. This is shown by the many flosculi which Ammianus has adapted from Cicero throughout the Res Gestae. Even his use of such common elements of the literary/rhetorical tradition as proverbs and historical anecdotes often exhibits signs of Ciceronian influence in phrasing.

Ammianus borrowed literary techniques from Cicero also. Especially noteworthy is his use of theatrical metaphor in characterization. Ammianus often applies images and metaphors drawn from the stage to ridicule those of whom he disapproves. At 16.6.3 he describes a palace conspiracy as if it were a mime. This same device is used to an even greater extent at 26.6.15 to mock the usurper Procopius. Ammianus
presents the coronation of this man as if he were describing a farce. This method of characterization is not terribly common in Latin literature, but it is used frequently by Cicero. In the *pro Caelio*, for example, he portrays the case of the prosecution as being a mime. Cicero uses much the same tone and imagery in these passages (*Cael. 61-69*) as Ammianus does in the instances noted above.

The most important influence of Cicero on Ammianus is in the areas of moral and political theory and judgements. Passages containing this sort of material are full of Ciceronian reminiscences. Indeed, this is where we find many of the acknowledged quotations from Cicero. Such is the case at Ammianus 27.11.4, where he criticizes the behavior of Petronius Probus:

> quod vitium reprehendens iam pronuntiat
> Cicero: "Quid enim interest inter suasorem facti et probatorem? aut quid refert, utrum voluerim fieri an gaudeam factum.

Ammianus uses this quotation from the *Second Philippic* (39) to bolster his own negative assessment of Probus.

The imperial obituaries which Ammianus inserts at appropriate points in the *Res Gestae* are also full of moralizing remarks taken from Cicero. The discussion of the four cardinal virtues in connection with Julian (25.4.1) is an example of this. The material in Ammianus is based on Cicero's discussion of these virtues in *de officiis* (1.15 ff.).

Further examples of Ammianus' use of Cicero as a source
of moral auctoritas occur in his criticism of adulatio. He condemns this widespread vice at several points in the Res Gestae (15.5.38, 20.8.11 and 28.4.12, 26). In each of these there is obvious verbal borrowing from de amicitia: Ammianus 28.4.26 quotes directly from it. This use of a single work of Cicero at several widely separated passages of similar content and purpose shows how pervasively Cicero influenced Ammianus' moral judgements.

Ammianus also makes heavy use of Cicero in propounding political theory. Ammianus often speaks of the duties of the emperor and his officials. Often he reinforces his comments and observations with precepts and exempla from the writings of Cicero. He shows an inordinately strong belief in the effectiveness of such exempla (e.g. Amm. 29.5.24 agebat autem haec Tullianum illud advertens). Most of these politically oriented reminiscences and quotations occur in three contexts: speeches which Ammianus attributes to the emperors, imperial obituaries, and accounts of treason trials (he considers the administration of justice an important part of statecraft). While Ammianus draws on a wide range of Ciceronian works in these passages, most of the allusions are to a few works: de officiis, de amicitia, and ad Quintum fratrem 1.1. Ammianus seems to have made especially great use of the letter to Quintus Cicero. He continually borrows from it precepts and exempla concerning the art of ruling.

One final use of Cicero remains. Ammianus often uses him as a source of information in certain subjects, such as
philosophy, science, and literary history. Ammianus' digres-
sions on eclipses (20.3) and divination (21.1.7-4) include
material from the various philosophical treatises of Cicero.
We have already seen that Ammianus' knowledge of Ennius and
Lucilius was owed to Cicero. Ammianus also seems to have
derived much of his material on the history of forensic
oratory (in the digression on this subject at 30.4) from
Cicero's rhetorical works.

Ammianus' knowledge and use of Republican Latin liter-
ature is extensive, but limited in scope. He made very
little use of Republican poetry. On the other hand, certain
prose authors, namely Caesar, Sallust, and Cicero, are freq-
ently the object of allusion and reminiscence. Sallust
and Cicero are the most important. The influence of Sallust
is primarily stylistic and is most pronounced in geographical
digressions and narrative passages (especially battles and
sieges).

Cicero had greater impact than any other author on
Ammianus. Much of this influence is stylistic, but Cicero
also had a powerful effect on Ammianus' moral and political
views. Ammianus considered Cicero to be the prime source of
moral and political auctoritas. Despite the vastly changed
circumstances of his own day, Ammianus judged his contempo-
raries and their actions by Ciceronian criteria. This gives
a peculiar (and occasionally unrealistic) bias to his pre-
sentation of late Roman history, which must be taken into
account when evaluating the historical accuracy of the
Res Gestae.
1 Barnard (1966) 89 wrongly attributes direct knowledge of Lucilius to Ammianus.

2 Cf. Nonius Marcellus 84.5 L.

3 Vergil is identified by name at 17.4.5 and by epithet alone at 15.9.1, 19.9.7, and 31.4.6. In each case there is a quotation or close paraphrase from his works.
Appendix

THE NAMING OF NAMES

It is noteworthy that in the course of the Res Gestae Ammianus refers to a large number of literary figures by name. This appendix will examine the contexts and purposes of these references and their distribution throughout the work. A complete list of names is given in Table A. Absolute consistency in compiling such a list is not possible. I have omitted many quasi-literary figures, such as contemporary philosophers and orators who are referred to strictly for their roles in contemporary history and not as literary figures. I have omitted also Cornelius Nepos who is mentioned twice (21.16.13 and 26.1.2) but only when Ammianus provides references for quotations from Cicero's letters to him. On the other hand, I have included all references to Julius Caesar, although many of them may be taken as strictly historical in nature. At 25.2.3 Ammianus has Caesar's literary activities in mind; possibly other references also are intended to recall his dual role as a man both of action and letters. For the convenience of the reader a list of those omitted is given in Table B.

I have divided the contexts in which literary name-dropping occurs into four broad categories: digressions, imperial obituaries, trials for treason and magic, and other (mainly in narrative passages).
## Table A

**AUTHORS MENTIONED BY AMMIANUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (No. of Occ.)</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeschines (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesop (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonius Saccas (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaxagoras (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaxarchus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaximander (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andocides (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiphon (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Antonius (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonius of Tyana (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aratus (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archimedes (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristarchus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchylides (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Caesar (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callisthenes (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato Maior (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Gallus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Licinius Crassus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democritus (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>No. of Occ.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demosthenes</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didymus Chalcenterus</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinarchus</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epicurus</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eratosthenes</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser. Sulpicius Galba</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorgias</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hecataeus</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclitus</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermes Termaximus</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelius Herodianus</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Hesiod] Ascraeus</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hipparchus</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippias Eleus</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer/Homericus</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperides</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isocrates</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenal</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucilius</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcianus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marius Maximus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menander (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meton (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Marcius Philippus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrynichus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plotinus (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polybius (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protagoras (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl. Ptolemaeus (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Rutilius Rufus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythagoras (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallust (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucii Scaevolae (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Aemilis Scaurus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonides lyr. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socrates (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solon (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophocles (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stesichorus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (No. of Occ.)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theognis (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theopompus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timagenes (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisias (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trebatius (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero/Tullianus (24)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergil (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Vergil] (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeno Stoicus (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (150)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A (cont.)
Table B
AUTHORS OMITTED FROM TABLE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfenus</td>
<td>30.4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andronicus, decurio Hermopolitanus</td>
<td>19.12.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apunculus, orator Gallus</td>
<td>22.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asclepiades, phil.</td>
<td>22.13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanasius</td>
<td>15.7.7,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassellius</td>
<td>30.4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeranius, phil.</td>
<td>29.2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attius Delphidius Tiro, orator Gallus</td>
<td>18.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrius Cythras, phil.</td>
<td>19.12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epigonus, phil.</td>
<td>14.7.18 (bis); 14.9.4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius Pittacus, orator</td>
<td>14.7.8; 14.9.4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustathius, orator et phil.</td>
<td>17.5.15,14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutropius (historicus?)</td>
<td>29.1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridentius Festus (historicus?)</td>
<td>29.2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virius Nicomachus Flavianus</td>
<td>28.6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus, phil.</td>
<td>22.7.3,25; 25.3.23; 29.1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrodorus, phil.</td>
<td>25.4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Nepos</td>
<td>21.16.13; 26.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasiphilus, phil.</td>
<td>29.1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrinus Proteus, phil.</td>
<td>29.1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priscus, phil.</td>
<td>25.3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonides, phil.</td>
<td>29.1.37,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Aurelius Victor</td>
<td>21.10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a) By far the largest number occur in digressions, some 102 of the 150 instances (68%) of literary name-dropping. I will deal with this category first.

Amm. 14.6 comprises the first of two digressions on the city of Rome. Both are critical of the moral degeneration of the contemporary Romans. In 14.6.7-8 there are references to Simonides, Ascræus (Hesiod)\(^3\) and Cato Maior. Allusions accompany the names of the first two, while there is a direct quotation from Cato.\(^4\) All three are intended as moral exemplars. It is worth noting that often names are found in clusters within digressions, as is the case here. There is also an allusion to Homer at 14.6.21, where the Roman nobles of Ammianus' time are compared to the Lotus-eaters in Homer.

The second digression (15.9-12) is on Gaul. It opens with a reference to Vergil and a slightly rearranged quotation of Aeneid 7.44-45.\(^5\) This provides an epic note for Ammianus' account of Julian's exploits in Gaul. The following are named as sources: Timagenes (9.2), Pythagoras (9.8), Cicero (12.4) and Sallust (12.6). This naming of sources is a common feature in the ethnographic digressions: even where he might be presumed to draw on personal experiences, Ammianus often cites literary authorities as sources. In this section he also quotes a bon mot of Cato just before citing Cicero's Pro Fonteio on the drunkenness of the Gauls. Julius Caesar is referred to by name twice (12.4 and 12.6) in an historical context. However the first reference immediately follows a close paraphrase of Bellum Gallicum 1.1.
The account of Julian’s virtues in 16.5 can be classed as a digression, although its content is also somewhat akin to that of the imperial obituaries. Several instances of name-dropping occur here. In 16.5.1 Democritus is mentioned as the source of a proverb, "ambitiosam mensam fortuna, parcam virtus apponit." A similar sententia, "Magna cura cibi, magna virtutis incuria" is ascribed to Cato Maior in the next section (5.2). Further on in this chapter Ammianus uses Simonides and Hippias of Elea since they were famous for their powers of memory, a quality in which Julian also excelled. At 5.10 we find mention of Plato, although here it is supposedly an exclamation of Julian’s:

vetus illud proverbium "clitellae bovi sunt impositae; plane non est nostrum onus" Platonem crebro nominans exclamabat.

In spite of Ammianus’ explicit references to these five literary figures, there is no reason to suppose any direct knowledge of their works. Such proverbial phrases and exempla reek of the handbook and anthology.

At 17.4 Ammianus digresses once again, here giving an account of an obelisk which was erected in Rome during the prefecture of Orfitus. In the course of this he happens to refer to Cornelius Gallus, the famous prefect of Egypt. He mentions in passing that this man was also a poet:

is est, si recte existimo Gallus poeta, quem flens quodam modo in postrema Bucolicorum parte Vergilius carmine leni decantat.
Ammianus' knowledge of Gallus is clearly second hand and constitutes a gratuitous display of his "erudition."

A discussion of earthquakes appears at 17.7.9 ff. In 17.7.11-12 Aristotle, Anaxagoras and Anaximander are named. Here again, Ammianus seems to have no direct knowledge of the sources named. 8

In describing the plague at Amida (19.4) Ammianus begins with some general theories which he ascribes to "philosophi et illustres medici." 9 Two literary sources are also named, Thucydides (4.4) and Homer (4.6). Thucydides is of course referred to in conjunction with the plague at Athens. Homer is given as an authority on the effects of plagues on animals. These are clearly meant as literary adornment. It is perhaps worth noting that Ammianus names only the literary sources and not more technical works. This may be because Homer and Thucydides represent the two genres, epic and historical, with which Ammianus wishes the reader to associate his account of the siege of Amida.

Ammianus twice deals with omens of the impending death of Constantius, once in 21.1 and again in 21.14. Each of these inspires a digression. At 21.1.7 ff. Ammianus discusses the art of divination with numerous legendary and historical references (Tages, the Sybil, etc.). He names Aristotle as an authority for the reliability of dreams in 7.12. He also quotes directly Cicero (ND 2.12) on omens:
Here Aristotle and Cicero may be considered sources. Ammianus almost certainly used Cicero directly; as for Aristotle it is open to question. Once again Ammianus prefers to use men of literary reputation as authorities rather than resorting to mere technical writers. This is also the case in the digression at 21.14.3 which deals with the genius, which had abandoned Constantius shortly before his death. Ammianus alludes to anonymous technical authorities, "ferunt enim theologi," and then proceeds to quote Menander directly in Greek (Fr. 714.1-2 Körte). He also names Homer as an authority. A list of notables who had genii follows. In addition to such famous leaders as Scipio, Marius and Augustus, Ammianus names a number of literary figures (mainly philosophers): Pythagoras, Socrates, Hermes Termaximus, Apollonius of Tyana and Plotinus.

The next four digressions contain geographical and ethnographical material. Ammianus describes Thrace in 22.8. Here he provides much in the way of anecdotes, legends and local color. Most of the literary name-dropping falls into these categories. Protagoras and Democritus are mentioned, but only as famous residents of Abdera. Anaxagoras is mentioned in connection with Aegospotami, in quo loco lapides casuros ex caelo praedixit Anaxagoras. In 22.8.10 Ammianus names several authors as sources: ut Eratosthenes affirmat et Hecataeus et Ptolemaeus aliique huiusmodi cognitionum minutissimi scitatores.
Such a bare listing of names and the tone of the closing phrase suggests that Ammianus is drawing on some sort of compilation or merely mentioning the names of famous authorities and is not really familiar with their works. Another short digression is found in the next chapter (22.9). This is a travelogue dealing with the region covered by Julian's journey from Constantinople to Antioch. Ammianus uses the opportunity to give much mythological and legendary material on this area. At 9.7 he mentions Theopompus as an authority for some of his material.

22.15-16 comprises an extended description of Egypt. Numerous literary figures, especially Greek ones, are named. Homer is cited at 15.3 on the importance of the Nile, *quem Aegyptum Homerus appellat*, and again at 16.10 for an anecdote about the island of Pharos. It is remarkable how often Ammianus cites Homer as the authority for some bit of information. 10 Herodotus is named at 15.28 as Ammianus' source on the building of the pyramids. 11 At 16.16 there is a list of Alexandrian scholars:

Unde Aristarchus grammaticae rei dumis excel·lens et Herodianus artium minutissimus scisci·tator et Saccas Ammonius Plotini magister alique plurimi scriptores multorum in litteris nobilium studiorum, inter quos Chalcenterus eminuit Didymus multiplicis scientiae copia memorabilis, qui in illis sex libris, ubi nonnumquam imperfecte Tullium reprehendit, sillographos imitatus, scripto·res maledicos, iudicio doctarum aurium incusat·ur ut immania frementem leonem trepidulis vocibus canis catulus longius circumlatrans.

The first part of the list (through *nobilium studiorum*) is
little more than a list; the epithets attached to them do not imply that Ammianus had any special knowledge of their works. Only Didymus Chalcenterus receives detailed treatment, probably so that Ammianus can show his disagreement with Didymus’ criticisms of Cicero. Toward the close of his account of Egypt (16.21-22) Ammianus mentions some of the more famous Greek philosophers alleged to have visited Egypt.

Hac institutus prudentia Pythagoras colens secretius deos, quidquid dixit aut voluit, auctoritatem esse instituit ratem et femur suum aureum apud Olympiam saepe monstrabat et cum aquila colloquens subinde visebatur. hinc Anaxagoras lapides e caelo lapsuros et putealem limum contrectans tremores futuros praedixerat terrae. et Solon sententias adiutus Aegypti sacerdotum latis iusto moderamine legibus Romano quoque iuri maximum addidit firmamentum. ex his fontibus per sublimia gradiens sermonum amplitudine Iovis aemulus Platon visa Aegypto militavit sapientia gloriosa.

This material shows only that Ammianus had some familiarity with popular accounts of the philosophers such as that of Diogenes Laertius. Ammianus seems to enjoy adding an impression of wide learning through his name-dropping in various digressions. The most interesting feature of this digression is the insertion of references to Julius Caesar and Cicero amid so many Greek authors. Caesar is mentioned appropriately enough in conjunction with the burning of the Alexandrian library (at 16.13), but the references to Cicero are somewhat gratuitous. At 15.24 he is mentioned as having defended the
son of that Scaurus who first imported hippopotami from Egypt to Rome for public games. Then again at 16.16 (cited above) Cicero is referred to in connection with Didymus Chalcenterus. As noted above, the disproportionate treatment given to Didymus seems to be inspired mainly by a desire to drag in Cicero. It may merely be that Ammianus hated to pass up any opportunity to mention or allude to his favorite author.

In the Persian digression (23.6) Homer is once again the most frequently mentioned author. At 23.6.21 Homer is given as the authority for a bit of geographical nomenclature. Ammianus adds a decorative touch to his discussion of the Abii at 56 through a Homeric reference: quos, ut Homerus fabulosius canit, Iuppiter ab Idaeis montibus contuetur. Homer crops up again in 62 where Ammianus quotes (in Greek) Iliad 13.6 and identifies the author as vates Homerus. Again the reference is decorative but relevant since it occurs in the discussion of the Galactophagi who are mentioned in the verse. Plato is named as a source of information at 32, as is Thucydides at 75. Apollonius of Tyana is mentioned in passing at 19 in connection with his patria. While not irrelevant, many of the instances are decorative here.

In opening the second part of his work Ammianus provides a brief preface at 26.1.1-2. This might be classed as a brief digression de historia scribenda. Ammianus cites Cicero in this connection:

Haec quidam veterum formidantes cognitiones actuum variorum stilis uberibus explicatas
Ammianus regards Cicero as an all-purpose authority. He gives no indication of knowing of Nepos except as a correspondent of Cicero.

Another digression occurs in this same chapter, in sections 8-14. This deals with the bissextile day. Ammianus lists some "sources" in section 8:

Spatium anni vertentis id esse periti mundani motus et siderum definiunt vteres, inter quos Meton et Euctemon et Hipparchus et Archimedes excellunt, cum sol perenni rerum sublimium...

The list of names without further elaboration suggests that Ammianus is likely drawing on a handbook and rattling off authorities whom he found there. It is a priori unlikely that Ammianus would either have had access to or have read the works of all these men.

A brief description of Thrace is given at 27.4. Much legendary and mythological material is provided. Homer is mentioned as the source for one item at 27.4.3:

Has terras immensa quondam camporum placidate aggerumque altitudine fuisse porrectas Homeri perennis auctoritas docet aquilonem et Zephyrum ventos exinde flare fingentis, quod aut fabulosum est aut tractus antehac diffusi latissime destinatique nationibus feris cuncti Thraciarum vocabulo censebantur.

Not only does this add to the many references to Homer in Ammianus, it also shows the great veneration which he had for
Homer. This is shown both by the phrase *perennis auctoritas* and by the attempt to rationalize and explain a Homeric statement which is in conflict with empirical observation. Other literary name-dropping occurs in section 8. Euripides is named because his tomb is in Thrace, Aristotle because his birthplace was at Stagira. These are little more than notes for tourists; one might look to a *periegesis* as a likely source. More noteworthy is the mention of Cicero, which is almost purely gratuitous:

Stagira, ubi Aristotelen, ut Tullius ait, fundentem aureum flumen accipimus natum.

While not totally irrelevant, the epithet is not necessary nor is the ascription (Ammianus quotes a phrase from *Academicks* 2.119). As in the Egyptian digression, here again Ammianus seems to seek out any opportunities he can find to mention Cicero.

Ammianus has a second Roman Digression at 28.4. A number of writers are mentioned in 28.4.14-15 where Ammianus discusses Roman reading habits:

Quidam detestantes ut venena doctrinas Iuvenalem et Marium Maximum curatiore studio legunt, nulla volumina praeter haec in profundo otio contrectantes, quam ob causam non iudicioli est nostri, cum multa et varia pro amplitudine gloriarum et generum lectitare deberent audientes destinatum poenae Socraten coniectumque in carcerem rogasse quendam scit lyrici carmen Stesichori modulantem, ut doceretur id agere, dum liceret, interro- ganteque musico, quid ei poterit hoc prodes-se morituro postridie, respondisse, ut ali-
Here, as he often does, Ammianus bases moral judgements on education and/or reading habits. In this the Romans of his time are found wanting. Ammianus here disapproves of "popular authors" in favor of what he would consider serious literature. In section 18 reference is made to Julius Caesar (together with Alexander the Great) who is contrasted to the contemporary Romans. Later, in section 26 Ammianus quotes Cicero, de amicitia 79:

> ut Tullius ait: "nec in rebus humanis quidquam bonum norunt nisi quod fructuosum sit; amicos tamquam pecudes eos potissimum diligunt, ex quibus sperant maximum fructum esse capturos."

Since the passage immediately preceding this quotation is extremely lacunose it is difficult to fix the context exactly, but Ammianus seems to be criticizing captatores.

The last digression is that on the legal profession at 30.4. Here Ammianus is eager to show off his knowledge of rhetoric and oratory so he drops names on a large scale. In sections 3-4 he gives some famous definitions of oratory, mentioning Plato, Epicurus, Tisias and Gorgias. These may come from reading the authors themselves, a handbook or a combination of the two. A handbook is the most likely source. Ammianus gives a brief history of Greek oratory in 5 and of Roman in 6. Demosthenes and Callistratus are given a somewhat fuller notice, others are merely listed:
Florebant elegantiae prisciæ patrocinii tribunalia, cum oratores concitae facundiae attenti studiis doctrinarum ingenio, fide, copiosis ornamentisque dicendi pluribus eminēbant ut Demosthenes, quo dicturo concursus audiendi causa ex tota Graecia fieri solitos monumentis Atticis continetur, et Callistratus, quem nobilem illam super Oropo causa, qui locus in Euboia est, perorantem idem Demosthenes Academia cum Platone relicta sectatus est, ut Hyperides et Aeschines et Andocides et Dinarchus et Antiphon ille Rhamnusius, quem ob defensam negotium omnium primum antiquitas prodidit accepisse mercedem. nec minus apud Romanos Rutilii et Galbae et Scauri vita moribus frugalitateque spectati et postea per varias aevi sequentis aetates censorii et consulares multi et triumphales, Crassi et Antonii et cum Philippis Scaevolae alique numerosi, post exercitus prosperime duc tus, post victorias et tropaeae civilibus stipendiorum officiis floruerunt laureasque fori speciosis certaminibus occupantes summis gloriae honoribus fruebantur. post quos excellentissimus omnium Cicero, orationis imperiosae fulminibus saepe depressos aliquos iudiciorum eripiens flammas, "non defendi homines sine vituperatione fortasse posse, neglegenter defendi sine scelere non posse" firmabat.

The anecdote about Demosthenes and Callistratus is found in Plutarch Demosthenes 5 and moralia 844b. Aulus Gellius, who may well be Ammianus' source here, also tells this story (Noct. Att. 3.13). The other orators, except for Antiphon, who is said to have been first to take a fee, are merely named.

Whatever the state of Ammianus' knowledge of Greek oratory, this account is anecdotal and superficial. His discussion of Roman oratory is much the same. He tells us nothing which cannot be found in the Orator and Brutus of Cicero. These may well have been his sources; at any rate he is unlikely to have had access to texts of the older orators. Again
Cicero receives the most attention, including a quotation which is apparently from one of his lost works. It is especially interesting that Ammianus actually quotes Cicero while merely telling an anecdote about Demosthenes since they are placed at the beginning and end of the list respectively. Perhaps Ammianus' knowledge of Demosthenes was mainly second hand. The two are alluded to again at 30.4.19 by reference to two speeches: Cluentianae vel pro Ctesiphonte orationum. Various other literary figures are named in passing: Trebatius as a jurist (along with Cascellius and Alfenus), the orator Marcianus, Aesop, and Cato (more as a moral exemplum).

From the foregoing it is clear that Ammianus is fond of literary name-dropping in digressions. It is probable that the people he mentions are little more than names to him and are likely drawn from some intermediary. Others such as Homer and Cicero are used with great frequency. Ammianus sometimes cites these authors as sources of material but more often than not their presence is merely decorative; Ammianus likes to show off his learning. Cicero is used most often to make a moral point, frequently through direct quotation. Still, even he is sometimes brought in quite gratuitously.

(b) The next category is that of imperial obituaries. This includes 12 of the 150 instances (8%) of the name-dropping. As one might expect, almost all of these references are
intended as moral exempla. The first is that for Constantius in Book 21. In condemning the cruelty of Constantius Ammianus quotes from a letter of Cicero (to Nepos) which criticizes the cruelty of Julius Caesar. This is at 21.16.13. In the next section Ammianus also cites Heraclitus (apparently a paraphrase) on the behavior of the powerful.

The second obituary, that of Julian at 25.4, has the largest amount of name-dropping in this category. Most of it is concentrated at 25.4.2-3:

Et primum ita inviolata castitate enituit, ut post amissam coniugem nihil umquam venerium taugis lares illud advertens, quod apud Platonem legitur Sophoclen, tragoediarum scriptorem, aetate grandaevum interrogatum, ecquid adhuc feminis miscetur, negantem id adieisse, quod gauderet harum rerum amorem ut rabiosum quendam effugisse dominum et crudelem. item ut hoc propositum validius confirmaret, recollebat saepe dictum lyrici Bacchylidis, quem legebat iucunde, id asserentis, quod ut egregius pictor vultum speciosum effingit, ita pudicitia celsius consurgentem vitam exornat.

The anecdote about Sophocles is a famous one; it is found both in Plato's Republic I 329b-c and Cicero's de senectute 49. Since Ammianus refers to Plato we can probably assume that he is the source here. The saying of Bacchylides is said to be a favorite of Julian. How Ammianus would have known this is open to question. One has the impression that Ammianus is eager to show pagan literary precedents for what, in his time, was usually regarded as a peculiarly Christian virtue: chastity. The other literary allusion in this chapter is in
section 19. Here Julian's justice is under discussion and reference is made to Aratus: 18

Verum tamen cum haec essent, aestimari poterat, ut ipse aiebat, vetus illa Iustitia, quam of-fensam vitis hominum Aratus extollit in caelum, eo imperante redisse rursus ad terras, ni quae-dam ad arbitrium agens interdum ostenderet se dissimilem sui.

Aratus is also referred to in almost the same words at 22.10.6, where Ammianus discusses Julian's administration of justice in Gaul.

Two other obituaries contain literary name-dropping. One is that of the pretender Procopius, who is ridiculed through allusion to Lucilius and Cicero (Amm. 26.9.11):

perque morum tristium latebras illius similis Crassi, quem in vita semel risisse Lucilius affirmat et Tullius.

This is actually merely a reference to Cicero who mentions Lucilius. 19 Also in the obituary for Valentinian at 30.8 we find two authors named. In discussing the harshness of Valentinian Ammianus cites a saying of Isocrates and quotes from a speech (no longer extant) of Cicero:

Poenas per ignes augebat et gladios, quod ultimum in adversis rebus remedium pietas repperit animorum, ut Isocratis memorat pulchritudo; cuius vox est perpetua docen-tis ignoscì debere interdum armis superato rectori iustum quid sit ignoranti. unde motum existimo Tullium praecclare pronuntiasse, cum defenderet Oppium; "et enim multum posse ad salutem alterius honorì multís, parum potuisse ad exitium probro nemini umquam fuit."
Trials for treason and magic comprise the third category, with 11 of the 150 instances (6%). Once again the majority are exempla with a moral purpose and Cicero is referred to most frequently (4 times). The first trial scene in which an author is mentioned is at 14.9.6 where Gallus is conducting treason trials. One of his victims.

\[\text{imitatus Zenonem, illud veterum Stoicum, qui, ut mentiretur quaedam, laceratus diutius avulsam sedibus linguam suam cum cruente-to sputamine in oculos interrogantis Cyprii regis impedit.}\]

Here Ammianus seems merely to borrow an anecdote from the doxographical tradition. It is partly moral and partly decorative.

Cicero is mentioned in trial scenes at 19.12.18 and 26.10.12, both times as an advocate of judicial moderation and leniency. The first reference includes what is either a paraphrase drawn from known works or a direct quotation of a lost work. The second seems to be a direct quotation of a work no longer extant. Cato is also mentioned at 26.10.10 as an example of a stern and upright judge.

Several instances of literary name-dropping occur in 28.1. Phrynichus and his play The Capture of Miletus are mentioned in section 4. Ammianus is reflecting on the possible ill-will which he might incur by dwelling on these trials for magic and adultery. He refers to the case of Phrynichus as an example of what might happen to himself. The story is probably based on Herodotus 6.21 and does not
reflect a knowledge of the works of Phrynichus. Cato is mentioned in section 39 as a moral exemplar. In the next Cicero is mentioned and there is a direct quotation of Ofr 1.1.39, a text dealing with severity and leniency in judges. In 54 Homer is named and there is an allusion to Iliad 17.645 ff. which is mainly for decorative effect.

Three further instances are found in descriptions of trials in Book 29. At 29.1.11 there is a reference to flosculos Tullianos, which is placed in the mouth of a court flatterer but perhaps is Ammianus’ own jest at the uncouthness of Valens. Theognis is mentioned at 1.21 to underscore the cruelty of the trials:

\[
\text{inde factum est, ut clementiae specie penatibus multi protruderentur insontes praeceps in exsilium acti, quorum in aerario bona coacta et ipse ad quaestus proprios redigebat, utdamnati cibo precario victarent angustiis formidandae paupertatis attriti, cuius metu vel in mare nos ire praecipites suadet Theognis poeta vetus et prudens.}
\]

And again at 29.2.18 there is mention of a literary (and historical) figure, Julius Caesar, in a context of this type: ut Caesar dictator aiebat, miserum esse instrumentum senectuti recordationem crudelitatis. This phrase is not elsewhere assigned to Caesar; it seems somewhat proverbial in character.

(d) The remaining 25 instances (17%) occur for the most part in narrative passages. Here again many are moral in
intent. Eight of the references are to Cicero. At 14.2.2 Ammianus quotes a phrase from Pro Cluentio 67 in characterizing some barbarians as animals. An unknown work is apparently quoted at 15.5.23 on the subject of fortuna in men's lives. Ammianus quotes Pro Archia 26 at 22.7.3-4 where he criticizes the behavior of philosophers. At 16.1.5 a rather free quotation of Orator 147, identified by the tag ut Tulliana docet auctoritas, is used in characterizing Julian. Ammianus refers to Cicero in his account of Praetextatus' prefecture, and he uses a near quotation of Orator 34 in praising the prefect's virtues. At 27.9.10 Cicero is mentioned (with quotation of Phil. 2.29) in a critical account of Probus' prefecture. Cicero is named at 29.5.24 and quoted (ad Brut. 1.2.5) in Ammianus' praise of Theodosius. One last reference to Cicero is made at 31.14.8 on Mount Mimas. Here he is mentioned in connection with Homer.

The next largest group of references is to Homer. Including the one mentioned above there are six in this category. At 15.8.17 Ammianus uses a reference to Homer to help characterize Julian:

\begin{align*}
\text{susceptus denique ad consessum vehiculi} \\
\text{receptusque in regiam hunc versum ex Hомерico carmine susurrabat: έλλαξε πορφύρος}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταίη.}
\end{align*}

Several times Homer is mentioned in what is merely a passing allusion for decorative purposes: 18.5.7 (allusion to Od. 13.1-2): 22.14.3 (allusion to Od. 11.307 ff.); 24.6.9 (Il.
Homer is also cited at 27.8.4 as an authority for not repeating material.

The only other author to be mentioned twice in this category is Vergil. At 19.9.7 there is a passing reference to Vergil: a partial citation of Aeneid 5.320 which is identified by the tag ut ait poeta praeclarus. In view of Vergil's tremendous popularity this is as good as using his name. The other use of Vergil is rather odd. At 31.4.6 Ammianus quotes the Georgics (2.105-6) applying Vergil's description of the multitude of types of vine to express the number of the hordes of barbarians. This is also identified obliquely: ut eminentissimus memorat vates.

Other references in this category can be summarized briefly. Democritus and Anaxarchus are mentioned at 15.1.4 in an anecdote about Alexander the Great who is contrasted to Constantius (to the disadvantage of Constantius). At 15.5.37 Solon is named (cf. Herodotus 1.33) in discussing the flatterers of Constantius. A moral dictum of Aristotle which was originally addressed to Callisthenes is used to point up the failings of Barbatio, a treacherous magister peditum. The mention of Aratus at 22.10.6 adds a literary flourish to the discussion of Julian's justness. At 24.2.16 occurs the only reference to Polybius in the extant work of Ammianus. Described as historiarum conditore, he accompanies Scipio Aemilianus on an exploit at Carthage which Ammianus cites as a precedent for an operation of Julian on the Persian campaign. The reference to Julius Caesar at 25.2.3 also is
used to characterize Julian, who is said to follow the example of Caesar by writing in his tent at night while on campaign. Finally, Demosthenes is named at 30.1.23 in connection with a moral precept.

It is clear that Ammianus usually restricts his literary name-dropping to specific contexts. The bulk falls in the digressions and the imperial obituaries which are digressive in nature; these comprise 76% of the instances. With an additional 7% concentrated in the specific context of treason trials, only 17% is left to normal narrative passages. Other interesting statistics emerge as well. Some 72 authors are named by Ammianus. Of these 60 are only mentioned once each. The digression category has the majority of these once-named authors, 41 (77%). Imperial obituaries follow with 5 (10%). Trial scenes and other each have 3, approximately 6% each. This follows the overall distribution. Of the 12 authors named more than once, all but five of them are referred to by name less than four times. Cicero and Homer, with 24 and 16 references respectively, account for 27% of the total instances of literary name-dropping. Caesar is mentioned 8 times. Only these three occur at least once in each of the four categories. Cato is mentioned 6 times, only in digressions and treason trials. Plato is named five times in the digressions and the imperial obituaries.
As for Ammianus' purpose in introducing these names, ostentatious display of learning comes to mind first. Many of the references serve little purpose beyond decoration. Some of the references (frequently those to Homer) are given as sources for specific bits of information. A large number of references, especially those to Cicero and Cato are introduced to make moral points; these are often accompanied by direct quotation.

The last aspect of literary name-dropping which I would like to examine in this appendix is that of quotations identified by the author's name. It is clear from the body of this dissertation and from numerous earlier studies that Ammianus has many close paraphrases and sometimes direct quotations in his work which are not identified by references in the text. I will deal here only with direct quotations (in the case of Greek authors only those quoted in Greek) which are identified. A general scheme of their distribution is provided in Table C.

Once again Cicero leads the pack with 16 such quotations. The other three authors whose quotations are identified have only 6 between them. In this group the division into categories is somewhat different (Table D). It is obvious that a substantial number of these quotations are in the narrative passages, as was not the case with the overall statistics on name-dropping. However, it should be noted that almost all of these Ciceronian quotations are moral sententiae rather than mere decorative flourishes. Ammianus views history as a form of moral
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (No. of Occ.)</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cato (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero (16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menander (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals 22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C
DIRECT QUOTATIONS IDENTIFIED BY AUTHOR
# Table D
## DIRECT QUOTATIONS FROM CICERO

### DIGRESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.12.4</td>
<td>Pro Fonteio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1.14</td>
<td>Natura Deorum 2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.4.8</td>
<td>Acad. 2.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.4.26</td>
<td>Amic. 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.4.7</td>
<td>incert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.4.10</td>
<td>Rep. 5.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OBITUARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.8.7</td>
<td>Pro Oppio?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.1.40</td>
<td>Qfr. 1.1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.2.2</td>
<td>Pro Cluentio 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5.3</td>
<td>incert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1.5</td>
<td>Orator 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.7.4</td>
<td>Pro Archia 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.9.10</td>
<td>Orator 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.11.4</td>
<td>Phil. 2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.5.24</td>
<td>Ep. ad Brut. 1.2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
instruction so that it is not surprising to find these in the narrative as well as in the digressions.

Of the other authors, only one appears with a quotation in a narrative passage, namely Homer. At 15.8.17 *Iliad* 5.83 is quoted by Julian on his accession as Caesar. The other citation of Homer by name is in a digression (23.6.62). Cato is quoted three times; all are moral *sententiae* and all occur within digressions: 14.6.8; 15.12.4; 16.5.2. Menander is quoted once in a digression on the *genius* at 21.14.4.

For the sake of completeness one might include the quotations from Vergil which are introduced by oblique yet unmistakeable references:

15.9.1 *ut Mantuanus vates praedixit*  
**Aen.** 7.44-45

19.9.7 *ut ait poeta praeclarus*  
**Aen.** 5.320

31.4.6 *ut eminentissimus memorat vates*  
**Geo.** 2.105-6

Of these the first is in a digression, the others narrative passages.

2. The imperial obituarists, which really only constitute a special kind of digression, are a much discussed feature of Ammianus. The fullest treatment of them is Field (1968).

3. Ammianus is fond of using oblique references to authors rather than naming them outright. This is a common practice in late antiquity; cf. Hagendahl (1958) 303-306 for the similar practices of Jerome. I have included such references in this appendix only if they are quite obvious, e.g. Mantuanus for Vergil. See note 5 below.

4. The allusion to Simonides is quite vague and may be a misattribution on the part of Ammianus; cf. de Jonge, Commentary ad loc. and Budé 1.206 n. 46. The Hesiodic reference is presumably to WD 289 ff. For the citations of Cato the Elder here and elsewhere in the Res Gestae see chapter III above.

5. Cf. de Jonge, Commentary ad loc. for the common use of Mantuanus for Vergil in late antiquity.

6. Simonides and Hippias are mentioned in similar contexts in Quintilian; cf. Budé 1.270 n. 295.

7. See Otto (1890) 57 s.v. bos for the proverb which Ammianus ascribes to Julian here.

8. Cf. de Jonge, Commentary ad loc.

9. Grimm (1965) 83 ff. suggests that Ammianus is probably drawing on handbooks in many of his digressions.


Presumably this is from his polemic against Cicero's *de republica*, although this work is sometimes ascribed to Claudius Didymus rather than to Chalcenterus.

One might note especially the closing formula ad residua narranda pergamus which is similar to those listed by Emmett (1981) 21-25.

For the popularity of Juvenal at this time see Cameron (1964b).

For Ammianus' knowledge of these works see Michael (1874) 19-20 and Fletcher (1937) 377-381.

On *exempla* in Ammianus see Blockley (1975) 157-167.

A large number of authors recount this anecdote; cf. Sophocles T80 Radt.


See Chapter II for a discussion of this passage.

Cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 4.56.1, where this anecdote is told concerning Zeno of Elea.

Budé 2.223 n. 307.


Cf. the practice of Jerome, who frequently makes such oblique references to Vergil; see Hagendahl (1958) 303-306.

Cichocka (1974) has drawn somewhat similar general conclusions about Ammianus' use of Greek and Latin literature. However she seems to have used a collection of references based upon no rational principles: she merely enumerates a rag-bag of literary names, quotations acknowledged by Ammianus, and a very few of the many unacknowledged reminiscences.

See especially Owens (1958).
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