

JULIAN'S PERSIAN EXPEDITION IN AMMIANUS AND ZOSIMUS

The nature of the bond connecting the work of Ammianus Marcellinus with the now fragmentary history of Eunapius of Sardis or with Zosimus' Νέα Ἱστορία is an old and intriguing problem rather more notable for the multiplicity than for the finality of its hypothetical solutions. The question arises out of the perception that Ammianus and Zosimus provide coincidental material in their accounts of Julian's Persian expedition.¹ Eunapius figures in the equation because, as we generally assume, it was he whom Zosimus followed.² Since all scholars but Dillemann³ are satisfied that these correspondences indubitably require some hypothesis of literary affiliation, all of the formal possibilities have one by one been tried. Sudhaus,⁴ whose investigation of the similarities proved influential,⁵ denied that Ammianus could have been used either by Zosimus or by his source (Eunapius); he affirmed instead that Ammianus and Eunapius must have been linked by their own use of a common source, namely, Oribasius, the physician of Julian and his companion on the Persian expedition.⁶ Mendelssohn, on the other hand, though he accepted Sudhaus' conclusion that the texts of Zosimus and Ammianus were related only indirectly, postulated a somewhat closer relationship tying them together. For he replaced Oribasius with Magnus of Carrhae, himself a participant in the campaign and the author of a history summarily described by John Malalas,⁷ and he also supposed that Zosimus followed Magnus directly in his account of the Persian Expedition. Subsequent writers generally have continued to speculate along these lines,⁸

¹ Jacoby, *FGrHist* 225 (Magnus of Carrhae), *Komm.* 633f., W. R. Chalmers, *CQ* x (1960), 152ff., L. Dillemann, *Syria* xxxviii (1961), 115-135, F. Paschoud, *Zosime* (Paris 1971) i pp.xlii-liv (cf. ii' [1979], xii-xix), and K. Rosen, *Ammianus Marcellinus* (Darmstadt 1982), 53, 66f., review the earlier work. Some scholars consider that the similarities have wider compass, e.g., T. D. Barnes, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta*, *Latomus* clv (Brussels 1978) 117ff., T. G. Elliott, *Ammianus Marcellinus and fourth century history* (Sarasota and Toronto 1983) 224ff., A. Baker, *Eunapius and Zosimus: problems of chronology and composition* (Diss. Providence 1987) 20f., n.5. I wish to thank an anonymous reader for this journal for his careful and thoughtful criticism.

² See below p.4.

³ *Syria* xxxviii (1961) 125-131.

⁴ *De ratione quae intercedat inter Zosimi et Ammiani de bello a Iuliano imperatore cum Persis gesto relationes* (Diss. Bonn 1870).

⁵ Sudhaus' demonstration of a literary affiliation between Zosimus and Ammianus was accepted by Ludwig Mendelssohn, *Zosimus* (Leipzig 1887), xxxix, though he explained it differently (see above). W. Klein, *Klio Beiheft* xiii (1914) 42, termed it an 'ausgezeichnete Vergleichung'; A. Klotz, *RhM* lxxi (1916) 461, took it for granted as self-evident. E. A. Thompson, *The historical work of Ammianus Marcellinus* (Cambridge 1947), though he emphasized disagreement between Ammianus and Zosimus (30), did not dispute the presence of the similarities (31,134,137) citing Mendelssohn. Subsequent writers mention Sudhaus or Mendels-

sohn singly or together, while Paschoud, who called Sudhaus' dissertation an 'étude . . . pleine de mérite' in 1971 (*Zosime* i, p.xlii) actually reverted to Sudhaus' own theory of the relationship eight years later in ii' xii-xix (see n.8 below). On Sudhaus, see further below nn.29, 39.

⁶ *PLRE* I 653f.

⁷ *Zosimus*, lii-xlvi; for Magnus, see Jacoby, *FGrHist* 225.

⁸ Jacoby (*Komm.* 634) followed Mendelssohn, Klein (with reservations) and Klotz. M. F. A. Brok, *De perzische Expeditie van Keizer Julianus volgens Ammianus Marcellinus* (Diss. Groningen 1959) 17, assumes a common source but is indefinite about its identity or nature. The major objection to Oribasius as the putative source of both Eunapius and Ammianus is the fact that Eunapius singled out Oribasius' memoir as a work specifically written for his private use (see below p.0). Paschoud (ii' xviii) seeks to evade the difficulty by suggesting that Ammianus and Oribasius met together (with Libanius) at Antioch in autumn 363, thus supplying an opportunity for Ammianus to consult 'the journal' of Oribasius, a journal which later, in 'amplified' form, was transmitted to Eunapius. But even if we believe that 'the journal' existed, it is arbitrary to assume (1) that its existence was a matter of common knowledge (so that others might wish to consult it); (2) that it had attained sufficient elaboration so as to serve Ammianus in the manner alleged (which turns on detail and alleged verbal reminiscences). Furthermore, even if we assume (against all likelihood) that Ammianus was already engaged in writing his own history of

although it is notable that in 1947 E. A. Thompson, who championed the principle that Ammianus wrote independently of the contemporaneous literary record, conceded the indirect use of Ammianus by Eunapius.⁹ However, by a bold stroke, this relationship has since been inverted (and simplified) by Chalmers and Barnes, followed by Bowersock, Blockley, Thompson himself, and, most recently, by Matthews.¹⁰ These scholars now assert the direct dependence of Ammianus on Eunapius. Dillemann is isolated in his opinion that the correspondences are accidental.

The plethora of alternatives should be disquieting.¹¹ If the evidence, *kothornos*-like, will accommodate any and all of these possibilities, its cogency may be doubted. Indeed, it is notable, especially in the most recent stage of discussion initiated by Chalmers, that the nature of the 'similarities' is of less interest than the question of the date of the first instalment, or instalments, of Eunapius' history, and the possibility that Eunapius might have published the relevant portion of his work considerably earlier than is usually supposed.¹² For by process of elimination, *faute de mieux*, since current opinion now takes against the view that Eunapius consulted Ammianus, nothing remains but to assume that it was Ammianus who consulted Eunapius.¹³ Such solutions are facile, and require demonstration from the texts themselves, which may admit one hierarchy but not another. When Sudhaus inferred an indirect connection between Ammianus and Eunapius, he at least followed the implications of the evidence, the peculiar mixture of difference and similarity which joins and separates Zosimus and Ammianus. The inconsistent evidence made it desirable that Sudhaus postulate the (idiosyncratic) use by Ammianus of a source indirectly consulted by Zosimus, for otherwise the assumption of literary relationship was hard to rationalize. Moreover, if both Ammianus and Eunapius could be supposed to divagate from an Urtext, the need for methodical explanation sensibly diminished. Differences between Ammianus and Zosimus could be minimized with less apparent strain; those in Ammianus, especially, could be attributed to accidents of memory or artistic elaboration superimposed, as it were, on the primitive and jejune record, while the similarities could be identified as vestiges of the 'original source' still embedded in his account. The difficulties inherent in this view¹⁴ should have suggested

that expedition, we have no warrant further to assume that he enjoyed access to Oribasius and could have persuaded the man he never names, much less thanks, to share his memoranda with him. Above all, Eunapius' words about Oribasius imply his unique possession of a work written for him alone (see below n.18), and the assumption that Ammianus enjoyed access to another work, similar but different, written by the very man lauded by Eunapius for his special gift to himself, undercuts Eunapius' claim. But these are subsidiary matters; the main question, surely, is whether or not the evidence of the texts compels the conclusion, as Sudhaus supposed, that Ammianus and Eunapius had recourse to the same literary work, not whether some means can be devised to account for Ammianus' special access to Oribasius' alleged notebook, as if it were a certainty that Ammianus consulted it.

⁹ Thompson (n.5) 31, 137; he altered his views in *Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey (New York 1966) 152ff.

¹⁰ Chalmers, CQ x (1960), 152ff.; Barnes is cited above in n.1; G. W. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* (Cambridge, Mass. 1978) 7, R. C. Blockley, *The fragmentary classicising historians of the later Roman*

Empire (Liverpool 1983) ii p.vii, J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (London 1989) 175. Matthews, more than the others, insists on a comparatively limited use of Eunapius by Ammianus.

¹¹ Dependent theories which draw the elusive Nicomachus Flavianus and the *Epitome de Caesaribus* into the hypothetical web need not concern us here; for these see Paschoud, *Zosime* i, p.lv and Rosen (n.1 above).

¹² The conventional date for the publication of Ammianus' history is 391/2; until recently, Eunapius was supposed to have ended his history in 395; the new date, after 378 (see the literature cited in note 10), would therefore make it theoretically possible for Ammianus to have read and used Eunapius.

¹³ See, e.g., Chalmers, CQ x (1960) 156. See below p.3.

¹⁴ We should expect harmony as to the essential components of the story, e.g., the itinerary followed by the expedition. The serious disagreements which divide Ammianus and Zosimus in this respect, however, undermine the notion of literary dependency because they make this 'dependency' inescapably capricious. But a capricious theory is a contradiction in terms. See below pp.7-10.

reevaluation of its premise; Mendelssohn sought the key instead in another relationship, mechanically substituting Magnus of Carrhae for Oribasius (in Eunapius), a full-blown history for *hypomnemata*. But the direct use by Ammianus of a work of comparable scope with his own is even harder to justify than was his alleged use of a diary, for now we not only run into (and must explain) the fundamental divergencies in each account but, in addition, the unmistakable and often profound differences in narrative elaboration.¹⁵ If it is difficult to isolate a satisfactory rationale governing Ammianus' utilization of a diary, it is essentially impossible to explain what principles, if any, dictated Ammianus' alleged use of a finished historical monograph. It is therefore all the more curious to observe that, while Mendelssohn's hypothesis is today regarded as exploded, it has managed, in all but name, to make its reappearance in the last twenty years. For Chalmers and Barnes have in effect adopted Mendelssohn's position *re non verbis* by replacing Magnus with Eunapius. The substitution of one name for another does not alter the fact that what is now postulated is the same relationship as that envisaged by Mendelssohn—though it carries with it, in addition, a very hypothetical repudiation of well-founded views of the time in which Eunapius published his work. Sudhaus' theory, as renewed by Paschoud, with all its difficulties, seems preferable. But the relative merits of either view aside, it is my intention here to argue the case against all such theories on the sufficient ground that they offer no credible explanation of source dependency other than that it must have been sporadic, unprincipled and unpredictable. If that is so, these theories cannot be considered cogent or necessary or useful, and should therefore be read out of the intellectual history of the fourth century. Hence this reexamination of the old problem or, rather, of the underlying premise of literary contact from which it takes its departure.

It will be expedient, first, to consider one or two preliminary points. One concerns the source, or sources, of Eunapius, who was about fifteen years of age (*VSoph.x* 1.2, x 8.3)¹⁶ during the time of the expedition and who therefore needed to rely on the information of others at whatever time he undertook the writing of this portion of his history. On this subject we are well informed, for Eunapius himself asserts that Oribasius was his chief authority for Julian's entire career:

τὸ δὲ ἑξαιρέτον καὶ ὃ τι περ ἦν ἐν παιδείᾳ γνωριμώτατον, οὐδὲ ἀφιέντα ἠφίεσαν, ἀλλ' ἐνέκειντο παραθαρσύνοντες ὡς συνεπιληψόμενοι τοῦ πόνου. ὁ δὲ ἐς τὰ μάλιστα γεγωνῶς αὐτῷ γνώριμος, ὁ Περγαμηνὸς ἀνὴρ Ὀριβάσιος, ἐκ φυσικῆς φιλοσοφίας ἰατρικὴν ἐπιπτάειν ἄριστος καὶ δρᾶν ἔτι θεϊότερος, καὶ ἀσεβήσειν ἐβόα περιφανῶς, εἰ μὴ συγγράφοιμι· καὶ τῶν γε πράξεων (πάσας δὲ ἠπίστατο παρῶν ἀπάσαις) μάλα ἀκριβῶς ὑπόμνημα συνετέλει πρὸς τὴν γραφήν· ὥστε οὐκ ἦν ἀναβολὴ καὶ βουλομένῳ ῥαθυμεῖν. (F 8 Mueller, F 15 Blockley).¹⁷

Eunapius' language is conclusive. His express acknowledgement of Oribasius' contribution of a memorandum (written specifically for him: συνετέλει πρὸς τὴν γραφήν) containing an account of *all* the *res gestae* (πάσας ἠπίστατο παρῶν ἀπάσαις) in precise detail (μάλα ἀκριβῶς) requires us to suppose that Oribasius' sketch established the

¹⁵ Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* vii 437, convinced as he was of a bond between the two writers, kept, with better judgement, to the idea of a common source.

¹⁶ According to the calculations of R. Goulet, *JHS* c (1980) 60ff., Eunapius reached his fifteenth birthday between 26 Sept. 363 and 25 Sept. 364 (64). See Fornara, *CQ* xxxix (1989) 517-523 for an emendation of the critical passage VS x.8.3.

¹⁷ Cf. F 1 *ad fin.*: ἐγὼ δὲ κατὰ τὸ πιστεύειν ἑμαυτῷ γράφω, ἀνδράσι ἐπόμενος οἱ τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς βίου μακρῶι προεῖχον κατὰ παιδείαν καὶ διατεταμένως ἐνήγον μὴ σιωπᾶν τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ἔργων... ἐγένετο δὲ ἐκείνοις τε κάμοι κοινὸν τὸ ἔργον τόδε, καὶ πάντα γε ἐς τὸν Ἰουλιανὸν ἀναφέρειν ἐδόκει... .

framework of Eunapius' history.¹⁸ Since the procedure had the sanction of old usage¹⁹ and is not intrinsically questionable, skepticism about the relationship is as unwarranted as doubts about its value.²⁰ It does not follow, to be sure, that Oribasius must have been Eunapius' sole informant, but whether Eunapius also consulted other writers, e.g. Libanius, Magnus, Eutychianus or Ammianus, in order to supplement his main source, can neither be affirmed nor denied on the basis of this *testimonium* or with reference to the extant fragments.²¹ But one can assert with confidence that his use of the others will have been secondary.

A second point concerns Zosimus. That this historian, who wrote early in the sixth century,²² followed Eunapius for the Persian expedition is also beyond reasonable doubt, as most modern critics now agree and Photius affirms in a general but all-inclusive statement:

εἴποι δ' ἂν τις οὐ γράψαι αὐτὸν (τὸν Ζώσιμον) ἱστορίαν, ἀλλὰ μεταγράψαι τὴν Ἑυναπίου, τῶι συντόμῳ μόνον διαφέρουσιν, καὶ ὅτι οὐχ, ὥσπερ ἐκείνος, οὕτω καὶ οὗτος Στελίχωνα διασύρει· τὰ δ' ἄλλα κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν σχεδὸν τι ὁ αὐτός, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν ταῖς τῶν εὐσεβῶν βασιλέων διαβολαῖς . . . σαφῆς δὲ μᾶλλον οὗτος καὶ συντομώτερος, ὥσπερ ἔφημεν, Ἑυναπίου, καὶ ταῖς τροπαῖς, εἰ μὴ σπάνιον, οὐ κεχημένος. (Codex 98 Henry 84b. 27-38).

Mendelssohn's denial of the affiliation therefore need not detain us, though it should be emphasised that his perception of the similarities between Magnus and Zosimus deserves attention, for the rejection of his hypothesis about Magnus as Zosimus' source does not invalidate his observation of significant correspondences.²³ But the relevant fact for us now is that the affiliation between Eunapius and Zosimus is presumably direct.

That Zosimus' reliance on Eunapius was also *exclusive* admits of less certainty, for Photius' characterization of the relationship would apply even if Zosimus studied his account with additions taken from other sources. General probability suggests that if in fact any supplements were added by Zosimus out of his independent knowledge, they are too negligible to 'contaminate' his work. He is, after all, an abbreviator, not a historian of the old style painting a broad canvas by introducing a wealth of data from a

¹⁸ The concluding words of the fragment (ὥστε οὐκ ἦν ἀναβολὴ κτλ.) also deserve attention, for they, taken with *συντελεῖ*, inevitably suggest that Oribasius had attempted no memoir about Julian until this special occasion arose—for otherwise Eunapius could hardly have felt (as he states) the necessity for instant compliance. See also nn.8 and 20.

¹⁹ Fornara, *The nature of history* (Berkeley 1983) 181.

²⁰ For the recent rehabilitation of Oribasius see Chalmers, *CQ* x (1960) 155. Whether Oribasius had kept a diary which he used to refresh his memory of the circumstantial and technical details is unknown. As Seeck inferred, *Hermes* xli (1906), 531, the memorandum presented to Eunapius was evidently composed long after the expedition. Chalmers, *CQ* x (1960) 156, doubts Seeck's dating of the memorandum (which Seeck presented without argument) because 'there is . . . no real evidence to substantiate it.' The evidence is real enough. Eunapius did not attain his thirtieth birthday until the year of Adrianople, 378. This was no Praxagoras (Jacoby, *FGrHist* 219 T 1.9), exulting in

his youthful prowess, but a man who, as the fragment quoted above proves, had acquired sufficient reputation to be importuned by distinguished people to write his history; the date cannot be close in time to the expedition.

²¹ For an assessment of the fragments see Thompson (n.5) 136, Chalmers, *CQ* x (1960) 155f., Blockley (n.8) i 7ff.

²² He is placed by Paschoud, *Zosime* i p.xvii, between 498 and 518. Identification of the historian with various homonyms (see Paschoud's discussion, pp.xvii-xx) proves too speculative to be useful. See further Paschoud's bibliographical appendix in iii² (1989) 8of.

²³ See p.9. The removal of Magnus from consideration as Zosimus' source follows from Mendelssohn's inability to show that Zosimus abandoned his *main* source, Eunapius. The objection to Eunapius' (systematic) use of Magnus flows from the assertion of Eunapius quoted above from F 8 Muell., 15 Bl. For Thompson's rejection of Magnus as the same person as the tribune who distinguished himself at Maiazamalcha, see the Appendix.

variety of source. However, several possible objections to this view exist and need to be considered. The first arises from Norman's identification of a quotation in the Suda, s.v. ἀνασχοῦσα (α 2094 Adler) as a fragment of Eunapius;²⁴ the second arises from the putative meaning of Zosimus iii.2.4.

The unattributed fragment in the Suda reads as follows: ὁ δὲ πρῶτος ἀνασχῶν ἐκ τοῦ ορύγματος ἦν Μάγνος, ἀνδρώδης τε καὶ διαφερόντως τολμητής. It is a clear reference to the exploit at Maiazamalcha bringing renown to the first three men who emerged from a tunnel built into the besieged city. The same incident is reported in a different fashion by Ammianus and Zosimus:

quibus ita, ut convenerat, ordinatis et occupatis prohibitoribus patefactisque latebris evolat Exsuperius, de Victorum numero miles, post quem Magnus tribunus et Jovianus notarius, quos audax multitudo secuta his prius confossis, quos in aede, per quam in lucem prodierant, invenerunt, suspensis gradibus procedentes obtruncarunt vigiles omnes ex usu moris gentici iustitiam felicitatemque regis sui canoris vocibus extollentes (xxiv.4.23).

τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ φρουρίου τοίνυν ἀπάντων εἰς τὸ τὴν μηχανὴν ἀποκρούσασθαι συστραφέντων, διορύξαντες τὸν ὑπόνομον οἱ ταύτηι ταχθέντες, εἶτα τὴν ἐπικειμένην ἄχρι τῆς ἐπιφανείας γῆν διατρήσαντες, ἐφάνησαν οἰκίας ἐν μέσῳ καθ' ἣν ἔτυχε τις ἀλετρις γυνὴ νυκτὸς οὔσης ἔτι βαθείας σῆτον ἄλευρα εἶναι ἐργαζομένη. ταύτην μὲν οὖν ὁ πρῶτος ἀναδύς ἐκβοᾶν μέλλουσαν παίσας ἀνείλεν· ἦν δὲ Σουπεράντιος, ἐν τῷ λόχῳ τῶν βικτόρων οὐκ ἄσημος, ἐπὶ τούτῳ δὲ Μάγνος, καὶ τρίτος ὁ Ἰοβιανὸς ὁ τοῦ τάγματος τῶν ὑπογραφέων προτεταγμένος, ἔπειτα δὲ πλείους. (iii.22.4).

Now Norman assumed, first, that the Suda fragment is a quotation from Eunapius; second, that it is a full quotation; third, that the fragment therefore proves that Eunapius had no knowledge of Ammianus; fourth, that the state of our knowledge renders inexplicable the agreement between Zosimus and Ammianus.²⁵ But even if the first two assumptions were correct,²⁶ the third would not follow, while the fourth depends on the absolute soundness of the preceding three. Certainly the hypothesis that Eunapius might have used the work of Ammianus is not invalidated by their disagreement (if disagreement there was) on this or any other subject. Norman seems to assume that Eunapius would himself have shared our current assessment of the relative merits of Ammianus and Oribasius, so that he would naturally have preferred the former to the latter in a point of difference between them. But the fragment, if from Eunapius, proves nothing about the possible use of Ammianus by Eunapius. Like innumerable other differences which emerge from comparison of Zosimus and Ammianus, this disagreement about the order of precedence of the three men at Maiazamalcha, if it were genuine, would simply corroborate what we already know—viz. that each writer followed an independent tradition. Furthermore, unless we suppose that the fragment has been torn from a context in which Eunapius registered the primacy of Magnus as a variant which Zosimus ignored, the admittedly uncertain identification with Eunapius

²⁴ CQ vii (1957) 129ff.

²⁵ See pp.130–133. A. D. E. Cameron, CQ xiii (1963) 235, suggests other candidates. Norman concludes (132f.) that Zosimus may have gotten the version we also find in Ammianus from some other source unknown to us. 'If, on the other hand, Ammianus is to be relied upon [as accurate] and Zosimus had access to the information found in him, Zosimus' conduct is almost inexplicable, since he but half corrects a point of detail and leaves so much undone.'

²⁶ It is conceivable that the Suda quoted an allusion by Eunapius to a variant making Magnus the first of the three, and it is also conceivable that the author of this variant was Magnus himself. Norman (129) is doubtless right that Magnus would not have described himself as 'brave and extraordinarily daring,' but he might well have written of his exploit in such a grandiloquent way as to enable Eunapius to accuse him of braggadocio by the use of this expression.

should be abandoned. For we can legitimately replace Norman's chain of assumptions with another which at least argues from the known to the unknown, not from the unknown to the inexplicable. If Zosimus follows Eunapius and the fragment *sub iudice* reports a variant tradition, the fragment (in this form) cannot derive from Eunapius. For an assertion about the order of precedence of the first three men out of the tunnel is a salient detail categorically the same as any other factual representation. If Zosimus corrected Eunapius in such a matter, his procedure was not merely to *supplement* Eunapius but to *override* him on points of detail. The contradictory implications of *that* hypothesis are obvious.

Zosimus iii.2.4 is a much discussed passage. Some have held that it provides a reason to suppose that Zosimus ranged widely in an effort to supplement and expand (*not* correct) the historical work provided him by Eunapius. Indeed, though the passage does not occur in this context, but serves as a *preface* to the rehearsal of Julian's activities when appointed as Caesar, Mendelssohn used it in corroboration of his view that Zosimus turned from Eunapius to Magnus when he came to describe Julian's expedition.²⁷ Zosimus' words are as follows:

τὰ μὲν οὖν ἐντεῦθεν ἄχρι παντὸς τοῦ βίου Ἰουλιανῶι πραχθέντα συγγραφεῦσι καὶ ποιηταῖς ἐν πολυστίχοις γέγραπται βίβλοις, εἰ καὶ μηδεὶς τῶν συγγεγραφότων τῆς ἀξίας τῶν ἔργων ἐφίκετο· πάρεστι δὲ τῶι βουλομένωι συλλαβεῖν ἅπαντα τοῖς λόγοις ἐντυγχάνοντι τοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, ἀφ' ὧν ἔνεστι μάλιστα τὰ κατὰ πάσαν αὐτῶι πεπραγμένα τὴν οἰκουμένην περιλαβεῖν. ἐπεὶ δὲ προσήκει τὴν τάξιν ἡμᾶς μὴ διασπάσαι τῆς ἱστορίας, εἰρήσεται καὶ ἡμῖν συντόμως ἕκαστα κατὰ τοὺς οἰκείους καιροὺς, καὶ μάλιστα ὅσα τοῖς ἄλλοις παραλελείφθαι δοκεῖ.

Now if anything is clear from this passage, it is that Zosimus disavows any intent to supplement his own brief account by quotation from Julian or by the use of any other source, in prose or poetry. If he can accomplish this and simultaneously provide his reader with a succinct account containing unfamiliar material (καὶ μάλιστα ὅσα τοῖς ἄλλοις παραλελείφθαι δοκεῖ), the explanation must be that Zosimus believed his own source to be original in its treatment of the deeds of Julian. Chalmers' inference that Zosimus has adapted a remark made by Eunapius himself (F 9 Mueller, F 17 Blockley) is sensible and probably correct.²⁸ But whether or not Zosimus adapted Eunapius' own boast does not alter the point of his remark. The language implies, not that Zosimus is supplementing Eunapius, but that Eunapius, even in abbreviation, will supplement preexisting knowledge. For it is the *epitome* of which the greater part will contain material ignored by others. That is not the same as to say that one's chief authority will be supplemented or abandoned by recourse to more exotic material, nor is it easy to see how one can engage in the systematic supplementation of the writer (whoever it may be) who is being abbreviated. The proper inference is that Eunapius' history had dropped from circulation, and that Zosimus, in reviving it, rightly or wrongly imagined that it contained fresh material.

With this background we are now in a position to assess the similarities between Ammianus and Zosimus which, according to the general view, require a hypothesis of literary contact, and our first task must be to distinguish meaningful correspondences in two accounts already essentially similar because they both repeat in its natural and

²⁷ Zosimus, p.xlv.

²⁸ CQ x (1960) 154. Paschoud explains, *Zosime* ii' n.6, that the new material consists primarily of 'anecdotes aréalogiques'. But Zosimus' words (in the final sentence quoted above) imply that what is

new is substantive, for the qualifying clause (καὶ μάλιστα ὅσα...) connects with the preceding words, εἰρήσεται καὶ ἡμῖν συντόμως ἕκαστα, while these apparently refer to the historical data.

conventional order the same set of transactions. One does not willingly belabor the obvious, but it is rendered necessary by the indiscriminate manner in which Sudhaus listed 'similarities' of every sort in his attempt to build a merely cumulative argument.²⁹ For it was Sudhaus, with his lax methodology, who framed the debate for Mendelssohn and with him established the current consensus which takes for granted the existence of some kind of literary dependency.³⁰

The *structure* of these narratives, i.e. the arrangement of the sequence of events, is a straightforward linear arrangement dictated by the *itinerary*. That the itineraries used by Zosimus and Ammianus are very similar, especially for the first part of the journey, should not, under the circumstances (the autopsy of Ammianus and Oribasius), occasion surprise, for the road from Antioch to Dura was not *terra incognita* and the landmarks were clear-cut, as were the events associated with them. We must take these itineraries as a whole, recognizing that the obvious test of their affiliation or their independence is the exactitude of the parallelism. If the same places occur in the same sequence, especially as progress is made into unfamiliar territory, the case for identity is strengthened; if there is variation in the names of the places, the stages of the journey or the sequence in which they are set, the case for the interdependency of the two itineraries is endangered.

The place-names are often different, sometimes decidedly. Compare Zaitha (Amm.)/Zautha (Zos.), Anathan/Phathousas,³¹ Diacira/Dacira, Macepracta/Phissenia (see below), Pirisabora/Besabora, Ozagardana/Zaragardia, Sumere/Souma.³² To this we should add those place-names in Zosimus we do not find in Ammianus: Sitha, Megia, Bithra, Besouchis, Abouzatha, Noorda, the river Douros. Klotz asserted that Sitha and Megia were dropped by Ammianus 'without harm to the historical narrative', Chalmers that the places were 'unimportant'.³³ This is not the proper position to take when one is considering the itinerary of an invasion described by a contemporary historian whose intention it was to establish the record. The historian who included, as Zosimus did not, Achaiachala, Baraxmalcha and the deserted Jewish town of xxiv 4.1 had no motive to suppress, and every reason to register, other landmarks of the journey, if he remembered

²⁹ Sudhaus (n.5 above) simply assumed (3 with 89) that similarities (of any and every sort) proved literary affiliation, and was therefore primarily concerned to harmonize the two texts, sometimes urging emendation, e.g., Zos. iii 12.2 (Edessa), 13.2 (a fleet number), the names Loukianos and Konstantios (iii 13.3 with Amm. xxiii 3.9), sometimes merely stating that disagreement is *parvi momenti* (a much used phrase), especially when numbers are in question. Occasionally he contended that apparent disagreement must be illusory since Ammianus and Zosimus are so often in agreement (e.g. 33,40). Sometimes Sudhaus submerged disagreement by discussion of the 'historical question' (e.g. 73,74). Substantive differences are often ignored (e.g. 41,43), as well as sequential aberrations (e.g. 50). On one occasion, Sudhaus explains a disagreement (Amm. xxiv 4.4; Zos. iii 20.2) by postulating 'confusion' engendered in the various participants by the rush of events, as if this naturally explained the textual disagreement. Klein (n.5 above) used Sudhaus's material for his attempt to isolate the 'fragments of Magnus'; Klotz differs chiefly to the extent that he took some of the more illusory

'parallels' as evidence for Ammianus' use of a *second* source. See *RhM* lxxi (1916) 488,505. (Borries' paper, *Hermes* xxvii (1892) 170-209, contributes little. A specimen (174): 'In Ammians Darstellung der Feldzüge Julians finden sich also Widersprüche und Incohärenzen. Daraus ergibt sich, dass Ammian für die Schilderung der Thätigkeit Julians zwei Quellen—nichts berechtigt uns, mehr zu anzunehmen—in einander verflochten hat, und zwar in recht wenig geschickter Weise.')

³⁰ Even Barnes (n.1 above) 117, treats the matter as if it were unproblematical and routine: 'Parts of Ammianus' narrative show a strong similarity to Zosimus' account of the period, in the selection of facts, in their arrangement, sometimes in apparent error, and even sometimes in verbal expression, especially when narrating Julian's Persian expedition (Ammianus, xxiii 2.6 ff.; Zosimus, iii 12 ff.). A literary relationship must be inferred.'

³¹ See below, pp.11-12.

³² Among others, Klotz, *RhM* lxxi (1916) 467,483,486,489, attributes these differences to the *librarii*.

³³ *RhM* lxxi (1916) 467; *CQ* x (1960) 159.

them (or found them registered in some other source).³⁴ In any case, the argument is invalidated by the presence of these places in the summary of Zosimus. Finally: *sequence*. Dillemann's identification of Macepracta (Amm. xxiv 2.6-7), near to the Naarmalcha canal, with Phissenia (Zos. iii 19.3-4) is very hard to doubt,³⁵ and the difference in the nomenclature, though it is significant, is less important than is the different location of the rubric within the sequence of events. The presence of this major dislocation, moreover, gives clear significance to two other more trivial but indubitable examples: the location of Gordian's tomb, near Zaitha in Amm. xxiii 5.8, near (or at) Dura in Zos. iii 14.2; and the opposite order given by each writer for Julian's arrival at a Roman-style palace and royal park (Amm. xxiv 5.1-2; Zos. iii.23.1). The basic itineraries, therefore, are independent of each other. The pattern is of two itineraries which are in *comparative* agreement³⁶ for the well-known route from Antioch to Dura but which diverge from each other in nomenclature and otherwise as progress was made into enemy territory, where the landmarks became unfamiliar.³⁷

The inadmissibility of the assumption that an identical (literary) itinerary underlies the narratives of Ammianus and Zosimus carries with it the impropriety of any theory postulating the use by Ammianus and Zosimus of a common source, Oribasius, Magnus, or anyone else.³⁸ But it also has a bearing on theories directly relating Ammianus and Eunapius, because arguments asserting this relationship explicitly or implicitly appeal to the same evidence, i.e. the occasionally parallel structure, as if they were substantiated by it. But if the contention is not cogent that the itineraries presuppose a common source, how can structural correspondences in the itineraries be explained as a borrowing *unless* it also be supposed that the borrower had discovered that his own text was incomplete and needed supplementation? Such an inference could be pressed, surely, only in the case of minor, relatively unimportant, events—some *σταθμός*, for example, notable only as a place of bivouac or skirmish; this possibility we shall consider presently. But are we to suppose that Ammianus needed to consult

³⁴ The presence of the aforesaid details in Ammianus' narrative should be enough to meet the possible objection that Ammianus might casually have ignored comparable material because he considered it neither historically important nor worthwhile artistically, for in that case these details too should have been omitted. To suppose that he might have mentioned one detail while intentionally omitting another of the same type is tantamount to the belief that he proceeded without any clear rationale for the inclusion or exclusion of material. But in that case the purpose motivating his alleged use of Eunapius is undercut.

³⁵ *Syria* xxxviii (1961), 156. Paschoud, *Zosime* ii' n.50 (142) objects on the grounds that the two places are not *absolutely* identical; he supposes, instead, that Ammianus left Phissenia out of his narrative. That argument, needless to state, presupposes a settled view of the source-relationship.

³⁶ Apart from the notice about Edessa, a significant discrepancy appears at the very beginning of the journey (Amm. xxiii 2.2-3, Zos. iii 12.1). Klotz, *Rhm* lxxi (1916) 469, judged it an 'arbitrary change' made by Zosimus. Above all, the events framed by Circesium and Dura fundamentally differ, as Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* vii 427, rightly insisted, though subsequent writers continue in their efforts to harmonize the two accounts. I discuss this episode in a forthcoming issue of *AJAH*.

³⁷ Substantial disagreement commences with the location of Gordian's tomb. Of the road between Thilutha and Diacira (Amm. xxiv 2.2-3; Zos. iii 15.2) Zosimus states generally that a number of forts followed the example of Thilutha, opting for neutrality; Ammianus knows of only one such city, Achaiachala, and adds that Julian burned a set of deserted forts; he also brings the army to Diacira by way of the place Baraxmalcha. Sitha and Megia apparently were not on Ammianus' itinerary-list; Amm. xxiv 2.7-8 gives a radically different picture from Zos. iii 16 (see below p.10). We have already noticed the divergency with regard to the Roman-style palace and royal park (Amm. xxiv.5.1-2; Zos. iii.23.1). The arrival at the 'Naarmalcha' in Ammianus follows on the destruction of a *munimentum* (xxiv.5.7-12) ignored by Zosimus, who links it to the the first disappointing *ἐλάττωμα* experienced by the troops (3.24.1). From this point it becomes increasingly difficult to align the two texts, which describe the same route with a different system of names, e.g., Abouzatha and Noorda in Zosimus iii.26.1,3. Klotz, *Rhm* lxxi (1916), 505, supposed that Ammianus changed sources after xxv.7.3, chiefly because of the different description of the provinces surrendered to Persia in xxv.7.9 (*cf.* Zos. iii 31.1).

³⁸ I.e., those of Sudhaus-Paschoud on the one hand, and Mendelssohn and his followers on the other.

someone else for the two roads at Carrhae, the marching order of the army, the siege of Anathan, the crossing of the Naarmalcha, the attack on Pirisabora, etc. etc? Sudhaus supposed so, and thus failed to observe that in all these cases Ammianus' representation of the (divergent) *marginal detail* proves what in any case is self-evident, that his grasp of the factual record of the journey was firm.³⁹ If Ammianus (as some hypothesize) had resort to Eunapius, it was not to inform himself about the epochal events. If his purpose was to 'improve' his narrative, then we must wonder why he so often failed to benefit from the possibilities Eunapius offered.

The alignment of these texts, therefore, is an argument for their veracity, not their interdependence. The similarity is not surprising, particularly since it mainly occurs in the first stage of the itinerary, from Antioch to Trajan's canal (Amm. xxiv 6.1; Zos. iii 24.2), where the events were rather clear-cut and information easily compartmentalized. Libanius, for instance, could have sketched a more detailed picture of this sequence than he has done. It is significant that he referred to the division of the army at Carrhae (xviii.214), and that he numbered the detachment at 20,000 men (Magnus gave 16,000, Zosimus 18,000, Ammianus 30,000), for it permits us to appreciate what was generally known. More important is the evidence from Magnus of Carrhae. The rejection of Magnus as a source of Ammianus and Zosimus obviously does not remove him from the scene as a representative of the contemporary historiography, and unless we make Magnus the source of Eunapius, which we can hardly do, it becomes apparent that *three* substantially similar accounts of the same sequence of events existed side-by-side. A comparison of Malalas' summary with Zosimus reveals congruence of a high order, again, for precisely this stage of the journey. The meaning of these correspondences is unambiguous. As long as Julian's army kept to the left bank of the Euphrates it was possible to remember the events clearly and distinctly; no historian or other participant in the expedition was in serious danger of misremembering the more important events associated with each of the landmarks.

The case for the utilization of Eunapius or Ammianus by the other of them must therefore sustain itself by a demonstration that one or the other was consulted for *ancillary* detail. For if neither used the other for the bare itinerary, 'use' must have been inspired for the sake of the data, and will be reflected in secondary correspondences. The contrary is demonstrable. Ammianus preferred his set of names to those preserved by Eunapius, specifically, Mamersides for Mamoseiros, Exsuperius for Superantius, Nabdates for Anabdates, Pigranes for Pigraxes, Narses for Anareos, Maximus for Maximianus. The usual expedient (Klotz) is to blame the manuscripts, but that is *petitio principii*.⁴⁰ Ammianus also preferred his own numbers, whether for the contingent assigned to Sebastianus and Procopius (Amm. xxiii 3.5; Zos. iii 12.5), or a capitulating garrison (Amm. xxiv 2.22; Zos. iii 18.4) or casualty-lists,⁴¹ nor does he even give (as

³⁹ Consider, for example, the first four correspondences with which Sudhaus began his study, namely (6), the description of Batnae: *municipium Osdroenae* (xxiii.2.6), πολίχνιον τι τῆς Ὀσδροηνῆς (Zos. iii 12.2); (9) the disturbance caused by news of a Persian raid (xxiii 3.4-5; iii 12.4); (10) the commission bestowed on Procopius and Sebastianus (xxiii 3.5; iii 12.5). Careful comparison will reveal (*cf.* Paschoud, *Zosime* ii' n.33) that (1) the roads are defined differently, (2) the effect of the raid is not presented from the same perspective, Eunapius having apparently described a panic in the army, (3) the motivation ascribed to Julian differs, and (4) the numbers (and instructions) given Procopius and Sebastianus do not tally. An

author who can 'correct' another (or insist on the superiority of his own recollection) does not need a 'source' for his knowledge of the outline of events.

⁴⁰ See n.32. Klotz here follows Sudhaus. Corruption is likely in Zos. iii 13.3, since Lukianos, named here with Antonios (Antoninus in Ammianus), is correctly written elsewhere as Loukillianos.

⁴¹ 'Wenn schliesslich Zosim. iii 25,7 von 75 Toten auf römischer Seite spricht, Ammian hingegen nur 70 zählt, so wird das an sich kaum jemand aus einer Verschiedenheit der Quellen erklären wollen, *um so weniger* (my italics), als sie in den 2500 gefallenen Feinden übereinstimmen' (Klotz, *RhM* lxxi (1916) 494). See Thompson (n.5) 30f.

does Zosimus in iii 13.1) a total for the entire army, something it is safe to conclude he would have provided had he been reminded of the missing datum by noting its presence in his alleged source. Nor is it a sign of affiliation that Amm. xxiv 6.5 records that *five* ships caught fire from the enemy when they were sent by Julian to secure the left bank of the Tigris (Zos. iii 24.4 gives the number as two) or that Ammianus (xxiv 7.4-5) disagrees with Zosimus (iii 26.3) about the figures given for the boats remaining to Julian after he consigned the most of them to the flames in an episode also *described* differently. In this context, the notice of the command entrusted to Hierius in Zosimus iii 12.1 but absent in Ammianus is pertinent. If Ammianus consulted Eunapius but ignores properly supplementary material, the logic driving the conventional hypothesis collapses and the argument reduces itself to special pleading in extenuation of the failures of the theory.

For the plea that Ammianus may have behaved erratically by ignoring his alleged 'source' should be disallowed. It reverses the rules of evidence by assuming the truth of a conjecture which it then uses to explain away the counter-indications, instead of using the sum of the evidence to test the validity of the conjecture. For instance, Ammianus describes the crossing of the Naarmalcha at Macepracta (xxiv 2.7-8) in wholly different fashion from Zosimus iii 16, who tells us of an elaborate stratagem of Julian's required by the presence of the enemy on the opposite bank. Ammianus knows nothing of this; moreover, he describes the crossing itself quite otherwise. Yet Chalmers would explain the latter divergency (he ignores the former) by purely arbitrary postulates. He separates Ammianus from the main army, places him among the cavalry, assumes that conditions were different for the main army (= Zosimus) than for the cavalry (= Ammianus) and then suggests that Ammianus 'may not have been impressed by Eunapius' description of the difficulties encountered by the infantry.'⁴² Less contrived, though no more valid, is Chalmers' explanation of Ammianus' refusal to correct the notorious error involved in his confusion of the Naarmalcha with Trajan's canal (xxiv 6.1). 'On occasions Ammianus himself may have been in error, but has not changed his mind after reading Eunapius.'⁴³ The implication, if it is intended, that Ammianus persisted in a judgement arising from a careful but mistaken evaluation of the canal system of Assyria is not warranted by the nature of the error; and it seems indubitable that had Ammianus been reminded of it from perusal of Eunapius, he would have corrected it at once or have done so eventually, after making the appropriate inquiries.

Thus, by the process of exhaustion, we perceive that two of the props supporting the conventional view are unreliable. The case for interrelationship cannot be sustained either by the general similarity of these texts or by the assumption of the methodical use of one writer by the other for the sake of material information. We should add that neither writer owes the other an obvious debt for the *description* of most of the events treated in parallel, whether adventures on the journey,⁴⁴ Julian's own actions,⁴⁵ or even

⁴² CQ x (1960) 158f.

⁴³ *Ibid.* 158.

⁴⁴ See above nn.36, 37.

⁴⁵ At Carrhae Julian formally reviews his army of 65,000 (Zos. iii 13.1); for the events attached to Circesium see n.36 above. Note the omission by Zosimus of the significant detail given by Ammianus in xxiv 1.11-15. Julian's initiative in Zos. iii 16.2 finds no counterpart in Ammianus, nor, for that matter (assuming the use of Ammianus by Eunapius) does Julian's exploit

recorded by Ammianus in xxiv 2.14-15 appear in Zosimus. The speech delivered by Julian after Pirsabora takes a different turn in each writer (Amm. xxiv 3.2-9, Zos. iii 18.6) and the sequence of events varies (Amm. xxiii 3.1 with Zos. iii 19.1; xxiv 3.2 with iii 18.6). At Maiazamalcha (unnamed by Zos.) Julian's assailants in the surprise attack number *two* in Amm. xxiv 4.4, *one* in Zos. iii 20.3. Julian's near escape near Ctesiphon was unknown to Zosimus. The pattern continues for the rest of the expedition.

(excepting one series discussed below) the battles and sieges.⁴⁶ It appears, in fact, that proponents of the theory of literary contact postulate a relationship of a most peculiar type, though the peculiarity has been masked by the use of conventional language normally appropriate to *Quellenkritik*, whereby the term 'source' implies either primary or secondary dependency. But Ammianus and Eunapius (through Oribasius) owe their *primary* knowledge of these events to their own experience, while the record of their differences excludes, as has been argued here, the assumption of methodical supplementation or correction, the conventional criteria for determining secondary dependency. On examination, therefore, the hypothesis of literary contact is actually an assertion of the extraordinary proposition that Ammianus relied on Eunapius (or Eunapius on Ammianus)⁴⁷ for nothing but the similarities that suggested the hypothesis in the first place. It is a novel view of source-relationship.

Since the 'striking similarities'⁴⁸ tend to be discussed (after Sudhaus) with little argument or specification,⁴⁹ compiling a list is a subjective business. But such a list should on any view include the note about the deer at Dura (Amm. xxiv 1.5, Zos. iii 14.2), the reduction of the fortress of Anathan (Amm. xxiv 1.6-10, Zos. iii 14.2-3), the description of Diacira, including the mention of the bituminous spring (Amm. xxiv 2.3, Zos. iii 15.3), the account of the palm grove (Amm. xxiv 3.12-13) interlaced with the vine (Zos. iii 20.1), the Roman-style palace and royal park (Amm. xxiv 5.1-2; Zos. iii 23.1-2, in reverse order).⁵⁰ It should be noted that these events or factual observations occur in the first segment of the journey into hostile territory, where confusion in the recollections of observers was least likely to arise. In any event, the most remarkable coincidence which appears within this segment is probably the description by Ammianus and Zosimus of the attack carried out against Anathan.

Of the capture of Anathan Chalmers wrote that 'the details given and the *order* (my italics) in which they are set down in each author are so similar that we can rule out any idea that the resemblance is due solely to the fact that both were describing the same events. There must be some link between the two narratives, and the one notable discrepancy gives an indication of what that link may be. In Ammianus the name of the fortress is confidently given as Anathan, while Zosimus clearly did not know its name and was merely able to record that it lay opposite Φαθούσας. If Zosimus had known the work of Ammianus he would surely have given the name of the fortress instead of

⁴⁶ Eunapius must have described an attack delivered against Thilutha (προσβαλῶν in iii.15.1); Ammianus did not (xxiv 2.1-2). Zos.iii 16.2-17.2 stands alone; for Pirisabora see Chalmers, CQ x (1960), 159, but add the difference in the numbers of the capitulating garrison (2500 in Amm. xxiv 2.22, 5000 in Zos. iii 18.4). Subtle but nonetheless real variation occurs in respect to Maiazamalcha (Amm. xxiv 4.10-31 with Zos. iii 21-22.7). Note the differing indications of *time*; the contrasting sketch of the emergence of the three men from the tunnel (Amm. xxiv 4.23; Zos. iii 22.5); and the competing versions of the manner in which Nabdates/Anabdates was captured (xxiv 4.26 with iii 22.6). Disagreement about the identity of the corpses found at the place named by Zosimus as Meinas-Sabatha (Amm. xxiv 5.3; Zos. iii 23.3-4) reflects a wider difference between the two writers in regard to this *deserted* city (Amm.) which in Zosimus is taken by storm. Just afterwards, an attack is directed against the Romans by a *cuneus*

which either slipped out of a city (Amm. xxiv 5.5) or (Zos. iii 24.1) slipped into it. The divergencies intensify thereafter; one should compare, for example, the entire sequence culminating in the battle before Ctesiphon (Amm. xxiv 6ff. with Zos. iii 25ff.).

⁴⁷ For the rejection of the hypothesis of the 'common source' see above p.8.

⁴⁸ The phrase is Thompson's (Thompson [n.5] 31, 136).

⁴⁹ Thompson (n.5) 28-32 concentrated on the discrepancies; Chalmers' discussion, CQ x (1960) 156ff., stands alone as a serious attempt to supply a rationale for a hypothesis of literary contact; T. R. Ridley, *Historia* xxii (1973) 317-330, is not useful.

⁵⁰ We may dispense, surely, with discussion of the historical note about Diocletian's fortification of Circesium, and the existence of 'Trajan's tribunal' at Ozagardana/Zaragardia. These items were part of a city's identity, the predicate of its name, the common knowledge of every visitant.

simply giving an indication of its whereabouts.⁵¹ By this logic it follows therefore, that if Zosimus did not reproduce Ammianus, Ammianus must have copied Eunapius, contributing on his own account the place-name Anathan. But can the premise of this argument be regarded as sufficiently conclusive to permit the question to be settled by algebra? The least we must expect is a plausible explanation of the procedure in this case ascribed to Ammianus. Now, the explanation, according to Chalmers, is that 'Ammianus had perhaps noted that a fortress called Anathan was captured, but could not remember the details. Eunapius could supply the details, but not the name. Oribasius may well have noted that the fortress [which he did not name] was opposite Phathousas, which may well have been where Julian's Headquarters halted.'⁵²

Chalmers' hypothesis gives the appearance of having been devised for the sake of the premise. Why should Ammianus not have remembered these details? How does one remember the precise name of a place only memorable because of what happened to it? Surely, the capture of the *first fortress* to be assailed by Julian was not likely to be forgotten; indeed, Chalmers has reversed elementary probabilities. Any person, not merely an incipient historian, will remember events (correctly or incorrectly) long after he has forgotten unfamiliar nomenclature. That Ammianus remembered a name he apparently could not have borrowed from Eunapius is evidence *prima facie* that he stood in no need of help from others. In the case of Anathan (and Diacira as well) it is pertinent to observe that the similarity between Zosimus and Ammianus is purely factual, just as the order of each transaction is purely linear. Ammianus' succinct exposition in logical order of the simple stages by which a fortress capitulated is not compelling evidence of literary contact between him and Eunapius, who also, we must suppose, described the affair in the way it happened. Certainly, when we consider Chalmers' alternative without *parti pris*, it is preferable to assume a coincidence which, since it concerns a set of details devoid of embellishment and not inherently complex, seems neither problematical nor miraculous.

In sum, we may well ask what is the value of a hypothesis linking Ammianus with Eunapius when we discover that neither one used the other for the itinerary, the deliberations and actions of Julian, the account of battles and sieges or even Assyrian geography. That neither writer is indebted to the other for the numbers and other matters of detail is perhaps the best indication of all that they proceeded independently. The assumption of literary contact implies the purposeful use of one writer by another in accordance with a rationale reflected in the borrowings. In the present case, the rationale is the 'borrowings' minus any rationale—the deer at Dura, the bituminous spring, the mating of the palm and vine, and the Roman palace and animal park, *isdem fere verbis*, as Sudhaus so liked to say. How, one may ask, could it be otherwise when it is a question of simple factual description?⁵³ But if the impression of general similarity

⁵¹ CQ x (1960) 156f.

⁵² CQ x (1960) 158. Cf. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*, 171f.

⁵³ As to the deer: ἔνθα καὶ πλῆθος ἐλάφων φανέν οἱ στρατιῶται κατατοξεύσαντες ἄλις ἐχρήσατο τῆι τούτων τροφῆι (iii.14.2) [≈] in quo loco greges cervorum plures inventi sunt, quorum alii confisi missilibus, alii ponderibus illisi remorum ad satietatem omnes paverunt; pars maxima natatu assueta veloci alveo penetrato incohibili cursu evasit ad solitudines notas (xxiv.1.5). Far less impressive are the parallel passages about the palm grove (iii.20.1 [≈] xxiv.3.12), for, among other things, the fundamental observation made by each

writer is not the same: ἄλλος δὲ ἐκ φοινίκων πεποιημένον, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἄμπελοι παραπεφύκεσαν ἄχρι τῶν φοινίκων κώμης τοῖς κλήμασιν ἀνατρέχουσαι, παρέχουσαι τε ὄραν τὸν ἐκ τῶν φοινίκων καρπὸν ἀναμεμιγμένον τοῖς βότρυσιν ≈ in his regionibus agri sunt plures consiti vineis varioque pomorum genere, ubi oriri arbores assuetae palmorum per spatia ampla adusque Messenen et mare pertinent magnum instar ingentium nemorum. et quaquā incesserit quisquam termites et spadica cernit assidua, quorum ex fructu mellis et vini conficitur abundantia. et maritari palmae ipsae dicuntur etc.

seems buttressed by these correspondences, the negative evidence should make us hesitate. Inferences from similarity which might appear sound when applied to historians working well after the event and necessarily dependent on some prior literary source (apparently the operative model here) will not serve equally when the material derives from the autopsy of contemporary witnesses, in this case Ammianus and Oribasius.

All the same, the presence in Zosimus and Ammianus of very similar material, especially about the deer herds, the bituminous spring, and the palm groves may well inspire a feeling of unease, as if coincidence in these peripheral observations implies the operation of something more than accident. Indeed, it is probably the case that our perception of these trivial correspondences, precisely because they seem gratuitous, have exerted disproportionate influence upon us. If so, we should reflect on the fact that these items are categorical similars with a set place in the historical literature. Deer herds and bituminous springs are no more *idiosyncratic* 'historical' observations than sieges and battles, and whenever these phenomena presented themselves to our observers, they should have been noted and remembered as part of the story. It would therefore not be peculiar if men with formal education, like Oribasius and Ammianus, kept a record of the ethnographic *notabilia* if they also were keeping notes about the *res gestae*; the parallel of their march with Xenophon's was as obvious to them as it was to Gibbon, and the *Anabasis*, as well as the subsequent literature of this class, including the expeditions of previous emperors, dictated the assimilation of precisely this sort of material.

To conclude: it is easier to believe that the similar but often divergent accounts in Ammianus and Zosimus ultimately derive from the autopsy of the two eyewitnesses, Ammianus and Oribasius, than from any literary interdependency between Ammianus and Eunapius. Literary affiliation is excluded by sets of differences which *ex hypothesi* should have been reduced, if not eliminated, while the structural and specific similarities are explicable on the assumption that Ammianus and Oribasius accurately observed the events unfolding before them. This conclusion, moreover, is corroborated by the significant pattern of increasing divergency we note in the two accounts as they progress from Circensium to Ctesiphon and back again to Roman frontiers. As has been remarked, Ammianus and Zosimus (and Magnus) agree most closely in their record and articulation of the first stages of the campaign, when Julian's decisions were obvious and the topography was familiar. But events are recorded ever more differently as Julian's army advanced into the interior of a sporadically populated area intersected by morasses, ditches and canals the exact location of which it was difficult to ascertain. Hence also the variation we find in some of the foreign place-names. Even those which are similar (but not identical) best suit the assumption of literary independence and militate against the competing hypothesis. Such minor differences as these are best explained as denoting what Ammianus and Oribasius had heard pronounced but had not read. But above all, in judging of this matter, we must bear in mind that a hypothesis of literary dependency ordinarily implies the existence of systematic indications that one writer used the other to correct or to amplify his own account. In the present case, the hypothesis 'explains' some coincidences at the cost of invoking the 'independence' or persistence in error of either writer in order to 'explain' commensurate disagreements. We do not usually indulge in uneconomic assumptions when it is unnecessary to do so, much less when they necessitate further and highly problematic ramifications.⁵⁴

CHARLES W. FORNARA

Brown University

⁵⁴ It is a privilege and a pleasure to record my deep gratitude to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation for the generosity which has enabled me to devote myself fully to scholarship during the academic year 1988-1989.

Magnus of Carrhae at Maiazamalcha?

Thompson's broadside at Magnus of Carrhae¹ not only demolished the view expressed by Mendelssohn and others² who made Magnus the source of Zosimus, but also sank the theory that Magnus the historian was the same man as that Magnus who distinguished himself in the tunnel-operation at Maiazamalcha.³ Norman affirmed of Thompson that he 'has convincingly shown that it is impossible to accept the theory that Magnus is to be identified with the historian Magnus of Carrhae';⁴ Chalmers asserted that 'this identification and the whole theory that Magnus is the source used by Ammianus and Zosimus have been effectively disproved by Prof. E. A. Thompson';⁵ and A. D. E. Cameron, who was less categorical, found it 'hardly likely that the Magnus who came out of the tunnel second—or first?—is Magnus of Carrhae,'⁶ though he found no difficulty in the assumption that the historian Magnus might willingly have recorded 'the deeds of a homonym'.

Thompson's argument, on examination, does not appear to be conclusive. His purpose was to refute the idea that Magnus was the common source of Ammianus and Zosimus. He observed, following Laqueur,⁷ that the summary of Magnus given by Malalas is in agreement with Ammianus and Zosimus only for the first stage of the expedition;⁸ he also pointed to evidence that Ammianus and Zosimus did not in fact follow a common source.⁹ However, to both these arguments, with which we agree entirely, Thompson added a final consideration which concerns us here. He asserted that 'even if we granted that Ammianus and Zosimus were following a common source, that source could not be Magnus,' the chief reason being that Mendelssohn and others were wrong to identify the historian Magnus with the *tribunus* also named Magnus who distinguished himself at Maiazamalcha. The reason is invalid. The inference of Mendelssohn that the two men were identical no more proved that Magnus was the 'common source' than the converse inference, Thompson's, proves that he was not. Mendelssohn's assumption merely provided a plausible motive for Magnus' desire to write a history, a literary enterprise which is not in doubt; Thompson's contrary assumption might remove the motive but leaves the work in place and is irrelevant to the question of its use by Ammianus and Zosimus.

What, in any case, is Thompson's reason for denying that the tribune and the writer are the same man? Surprisingly enough (in view of the influence exerted by his refutation of Mendelssohn), it is the mere assertion that 'there is no evidence whatsoever for the identification.'¹⁰ Neither is there evidence against it. Thompson, however, reports with approval Laqueur's allegation that 'the verb *συνεῖναι* in Malalas implies that Magnus was on the general staff and was not serving on the front line' and further agrees with Laqueur that a substantial contrast with Magnus is indicated in 'Malalas' description of the *miles* and *vicarius* Eutygianus, *παρῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ*, who was certainly engaged in the actual fighting. Hence [continues Thompson], it is not likely that the historian Magnus burrowed his way underground into Maiazamalcha.¹¹ But *συνεῖναι* carries no such weight; it merely indicates that Magnus participated in the expedition. Laqueur and Thompson have artificially sundered two men whom

¹ *The historical work of Ammianus Marcellinus*, 29f.

² See above n.4 to main text.

³ See above p.5.

⁴ *CQ* vii (1957) 129.

⁵ *CQ* x (1960) 153.

⁶ *CQ* xiii (1963) 234f., n.3.

⁷ *RE* Magnus no.27, 493.

⁸ p.32; cf. p.9 above.

⁹ Pp.28-31.

¹⁰ p.31.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

Malalas united as warrior-writers, for the *καὶ* in *παρῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ* implies that (as far as Malalas knew) Magnus, like Eutychianus, served actively ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ. Therefore, if the *miles* and *vicarius* Eutychianus 'was certainly engaged in the actual fighting,' we may assume the like of Magnus. Assuredly, since we do not even know what kind of *tribunus* Magnus was, it is arbitrary to relegate him to the 'general staff,' whatever that means: Julian and his chief officers engaged in battle; the operation at Maiazamalcha was crucial, and officers of high rank are not out of place as its leaders.¹²

Thompson has shown only that the inference identifying the two men is not *mandatory*. Yet we often make assumptions based on even less evidence. The name is the same, the exploit could well have induced the tribune to render an account of the expedition; something quite similar, after all, probably motivated Ammianus himself. The reference to Carrhae in Zos. iii 34.2, to be sure, proves nothing (though it is suggestive). But something positive may be indicated in Zos. iii 22.4, where Magnus is the only one of the three heroes to lack an identifying tag, Souperantios being named as one of the *Victores*, Jovian as a *notarius*. Thompson attributed the omission to Zosimus' 'innate perversity,'¹³ Norman was satisfied that Zosimus has, 'reasonably enough, reserved his commendations for the first man up,'¹⁴ Cameron considers the omission insignificant.¹⁵ But the presence of two identifying tags (for the first man and the third in order of precedence) makes the missing identification a notable exception. Every writer would instinctively feel the need for harmony in such a passage as this. It is, therefore, an anomaly requiring explanation. If so, there can be one reason only for the omission: Zosimus considered specification superfluous because the identity of this figure was well-established.

It happens often enough that writers assume knowledge in readers of details which were better stated explicitly. If Eunapius himself consulted Magnus and, as Suda s.v. ἀνασχοῦσα may attest, cited him disparagingly,¹⁶ Zosimus' own familiarity with this figure could have led him to abbreviate here on a point of detail which he assumed to be common knowledge. It may be pertinent that Magnus' history was still in circulation, for Malalas' summary proves its availability in the sixth century, in an already epitomized version, at the very least (though there is no reason to assume that Malalas supplies an epitome of an epitome).

The preceding explanation, though conjectural, will at least account for an anomaly implausibly trivialized by Thompson, Norman and others. If so, Magnus was indeed the hero at Maiazamalcha; and although it certainly does not follow that Magnus was the 'common source' of Ammianus and Zosimus, it leaves open the possibility that Magnus published prior to Eunapius and was occasionally cited by that writer, perhaps in fierce disagreement, as, for example, on the numbers (Zos. iii 12.5 with *FGrHist* 225 F 1.2), as well as on the role played by Magnus himself at Maiazamalcha.

¹² For examples of the military involvement of tribunes see Ammianus xv.3.10. xix.92, xxv.1.9, xxv.6.3 and, especially, xviii.2.11.

¹³ p.32.

¹⁴ CQ vii (1957) 129f.

¹⁵ CQ xiii (1963) 233.

¹⁶ See above n.25 to main text.