

CROSS-REFERENCES TO THE LOST BOOKS OF AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS

R. M. FRAKES

THE NATURE OF THE LOST BOOKS of the *Res Gestae* of Ammianus Marcellinus is one of the best-known problems in late Roman historiography.¹ His lost first thirteen books discussed events from the principate of Nerva (A.D. 96–98) up through the middle of the reign of Constantius II (A.D. 353).² With the exception of a possible letter from Libanius and one citation by Priscian,³ all knowledge of the text of the lost books of Ammianus comes

I would like to thank David L. Toye and the anonymous referees of *Phoenix* for their comments on earlier drafts of this article.

The following works are cited by author's name only or in abbreviated form: Hugo Michael, *Die Verlorenen Bücher des Ammianus Marcellinus* (Breslau 1880); L. Jeep, "Die verlorenen Bücher des Ammianus Marcellinus," *RhM* 43 (1888) 60–72; Jean Gimazane, *Ammien Marcellin, sa vie et son oeuvre* (Toulouse 1889); H. T. Rowell, *Ammianus Marcellinus: Soldier-Historian of the Late Empire* (Cincinnati 1964); Helena Cichoka, "O Powtorzeniach W 'Res Gestae' Ammiana Marcellina," *Eos* 64 (1976) 203–222 (with Latin summary, 221–222); Alanna Emmett, "The Digressions in the Lost Books of Ammianus Marcellinus," in Brian Croke and Alanna Emmett (eds.), *History and Historians in Late Antiquity* (Sydney 1983) 42–53; John Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (London 1989) 27–30; Raymond Starr, "Cross-References in Roman Prose," *AJP* 102 (1981) 431–437; Victor Gardthausen (ed.), *Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestarum Libri Qui Supersunt* (Leipzig 1874–75); C. U. Clark (ed.), *Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestarum Libri Qui Supersunt* (Berlin 1910–15); John C. Rolfe (tr.), *Ammianus Marcellinus* (Cambridge, Mass. 1950; reprinted 1982: Loeb Classical Library); Wolfgang Seyfarth (tr.), *Ammianus Marcellinus: Römische Geschichte* (Berlin 1968–71). Translations of passages from the *Res Gestae* in this article are, unless otherwise noted, slightly adapted from Rolfe.

¹Important early work includes Michael, Jeep, and Gimazane. More recent work has been done by Rowell; Ronald Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford 1968); J. F. Gilliam, "Ammianus and the Historia Augusta: The Lost Books and the Period 117–284," *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1970* (Bonn 1972) 125–147; Cichoka; Emmett; and Matthews; most recently, see Charles Fornara, "The Prefaces of Ammianus Marcellinus," in Mark Griffith and Donald J. Mastronarde (eds.), *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer* (Atlanta 1990) 163–172.

²31.16.9 describes the scope of Ammianus' work. On the dating of events in the first extant book, see T. D. Barnes, "Structure and Chronology in Ammianus, Book 14," *HSCP* 92 (1989) 413–422.

³Traditionally, Libanius *Ep.* 1063 has been thought to show the composition process of the *Res Gestae*, as well as providing other background information on Ammianus. However, for a recent study which argues against the Antiochene origin of Ammianus as well as the import of the letter for the composition of the *Res Gestae*, see Charles Fornara, "Studies in Ammianus Marcellinus 1: The Letter of Libanius and Ammianus'

from the cross-references in his extant books (14–31).⁴ While many of the cross-references are clearly assured, this article will take issue with several passages which have been cited by various scholars as ostensible cross-references to the lost first thirteen books.⁵ The issue of cross-references is more important for Ammianus than it is for many other ancient historians since so much of his work (thirteen out of thirty-one books) has been lost and so little external information about his work exists.⁶

Connection with Antioch," *Historia* 41 (1992) 328–344. See also the commentary and first English translation of the letter in A. F. Norman, *Libanius: Autobiography and Selected Letters* (Cambridge, Mass. 1992, Loeb Classical Library) 2.428–433. And further, T. D. Barnes, "Ammianus Marcellinus and His World," *CP* 88 (1993) 55–70, at 57–61. For analysis of the evidence of Priscian 11.51 see Matthews 6 and 477, n. 7.

⁴This article defines cross-references as verbs and clauses in the extant books of Ammianus' *Res Gestae* which refer to other parts, either earlier or later, of his narrative. For a standard study of the use of cross-references in Latin literature from ca 100 B.C. to A.D. 100, see Starr. For a detailed study of cross-reference verbs in the *Res Gestae* of Ammianus, see Cichoka.

⁵While many of these possible cross-references come from Emmett 52, n. 32 (which presents a table of assured, assumed, and possible cross-references), she is not alone in misconstruing historical allusions in the *Res Gestae*. Several of these supposed cross-references to the lost books of Ammianus are also identified by Michael, Gardthausen, Jeep, Gimazane, and Cichoka. Also important for this study are I. B. Pighi, *Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestarum Capita Selecta* (Neuchâtel 1948); Seyfarth; E. Galletier and J. Fontaine (eds.), *Ammien Marcellin: Histoire 1: Livres 14–16* (Paris 1968); G. Sabbah (ed.), 2: *Livres 17–19* (Paris 1970); J. Fontaine (ed.), 4: *Livres 23–25* (Paris 1977); Wolfgang Seyfarth (ed.), *Rerum Gestarum Libri Qui Supersunt* (Leipzig 1978); Pieter De Jonge, *Sprachlicher und historischer Kommentar zu Ammianus Marcellinus 14.1–7; 14.7–11* (Groningen 1935) and *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus 15–19* (Groningen 1948–1982); J. Den Boeft, D. Den Hengst, and H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus 20* (Groningen 1987); J. Den Boeft, D. Den Hengst, and H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus Book 21* (Groningen 1991). Aside from the identifications of cross-references examined here, Emmett's work is an important contribution to scholarship on the lost books of Ammianus in her analysis of the length of the coverage of digressions in the lost books.

⁶For much of this century historians have argued on the basis of the implications of his cross-references over whether Ammianus actually wrote one or two works. Regarding these disputes see Michael, Jeep, Rowell, Emmett, and Matthews. See also Alan Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford 1970) 359, n. 2. There certainly are lost parts of the works of other ancient historians such as Tacitus, Livy, Diodorus Siculus, and others. For recent studies of the use of cross-references in another ancient historian, see C. Rubincam, "The Organization and Composition of Diodoros' *Bibliothēke*," *EMC/CV* NS 6 (1987) 313–328; and her "Cross-References in the *Bibliothēke Historike* of Diodoros," *Phoenix* 43 (1989) 39–61; as well as Kenneth Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton 1990) 83–93. However, often external references, such as fragments in other authors or epitomes, can serve as guides to the make-up of the lost portion of the narrative of an ancient historian; see P. A. Brunt, "On Historical Fragments and Epitomes," *CQ* NS 30 (1980) 485–487; Wesley Thompson, "Fragments of the Preserved Historians—Especially Polybius," in

The method used in this article to establish the value of the supposed cross-references is close re-reading of the relevant passages. Special attention is given to the verbs and phrases of cross-reference used both in the relevant passages and throughout the *Res Gestae*. Latin prose authors regularly used several verbs of cross-reference in their narratives, including forms of *dico*, *refero*, *doceo*, and *memoro*.⁷ Ammianus followed in this tradition, although he also made use occasionally of forms of *narro*, *monstro*, *praedico*, *digero*, and a few other verbs.⁸ Ammianus is usually quite explicit in his cross-references to different parts (both lost and extant) of his history.⁹ Careful re-reading shows that scholars have often wrongly identified as cross-references what are either historical allusions or cross-references to passages not in the lost books.¹⁰ These allusions would fulfill such different purposes in the narrative as refreshing the memory of the audience about a person, place, or event; comparing and contrasting people; or simply giving further historical commentary. Because Ammianus' lost books covered over 250 years, various scholars could not resist the temptation of grasping at any historical allusion to an event in that period as a firm cross-reference to that part of the *Res Gestae*. Re-examination of all the supposed cross-references to the lost books will show which ones are misidentified. Such analysis will make it possible to isolate a list of the valid cross-references to the lost books of Ammianus as well as providing a basis for some thoughts on how to deal with cross-references in ancient historians.

I. HISTORICAL ALLUSIONS MISIDENTIFIED AS CROSS-REFERENCES

The majority of questionable cross-reference passages are in fact historical allusions. While a full list of misidentified cross-references is given in the appendix to this article, this section will focus on a few examples.

The Greek Historians, Literature and History: Papers presented to A. E. Raubitschek (Saratoga, Calif. 1985) 119–139; and Mark Toher, "On the Use of Nicolaus' Historical Fragments," *CA* 8 (1989) 159–172.

⁷Starr 431–437.

⁸Cichoka 203–222.

⁹See especially the tables in Cichoka (203–222). For the forms of cross-reference see Part III, below.

¹⁰For an interesting recent study which confuses "allusion" with "cross-reference," see Harry C. Avery, "A Lost Episode in Caesar's *Civil War*," *Hermes* 121 (1993) 452–469 (esp. 457–458), which starts from the basis of *BC* 3.67.5 (*cuius opera proditum C. Antoni demonstravimus*). However, Avery uses the term allusion for this cross-reference as he does for *BC* 3.4.2 and 3.10.4–5 which actually are allusions to this lost description of Gaius Antonius' forces. Avery's argument that a fair-sized part of Book 2 of the *BC* is missing could be clarified if he adopted Starr's identification of *demonstrare* as a cross-reference verb. Caesar used *demonstravimus* in a similar way at *BC* 3.10.1 (and over 40 other times in this work).

Re-reading of all these examples, when keeping in mind Ammianus' use of cross-reference verbs, demonstrates the unfortunate tendency of scholars to treat historical allusions as indications of the lost books of this great historian's work.

A) 14.11.20:¹¹

And now the affair was no longer carried on in the shadows of intrigue, but Barbatio surrounded with armed men the section of the palace which stood outside the walls. Entering when the light was now dim, he removed the imperial robes of the Caesar [Gallus], and put upon him a tunic and a common soldier's cloak, assuring him with frequent oaths, as if by the emperor's orders, that he would suffer no further harm. Then he said to him: "Get up immediately," and having unexpectedly placed him in a private carriage, he took him to Histria, near the town of Pola, where in former times, as I am informed, Constantine's son Crispus was killed.¹²

Here one can see the confusion between a historical example and a reference to a lost book. In recalling Crispus' execution of 326,¹³ Ammianus uses the verb *accipimus*.¹⁴ While the translation of this verb might be "accept," "learn," or even "understand," could it reflect an earlier passage in the *Res Gestae*?¹⁵ To answer this question, it is important to look at Ammianus' other uses of the same verb. In 25.4.17, Ammianus discusses the over-zealousness of Julian's sacrifices, speculating that there might have been a scarcity of cattle if that emperor had returned from Persia alive. In this regard, Ammianus explains that Julian was similar to Marcus Aurelius, of whom, "as we learn" (*accipimus*), a Greek distich was written which described in poetic form how his victories and consequential sacrifices might lead to a shortage of white sacramental cattle.¹⁶

¹¹Interpreted as reference to a lost book by Gardthausen 1.2; Gimazane (407, n. 1) includes this passage as a cross-reference but notes that the description mentioned here (along with those at 18.5.7; 19.2.8; 19.9.9; 20.7.1; 21.8.1; 21.16.10; 25.8.13; 31.11.3) was probably in the lost books: "il est probable qu'il les avait racontés." For more on these allusions, except 21.8.1, see the appendix to this article. Emmett (52, n. 32) also includes 14.11.20 as a possible cross-reference (but adds a question mark).

¹²*Iamque non umbratis fallacis res agebatur, sed qua palatium est extra muros, armatis Barbatio omne circumdedit. Ingressusque obscuro iam die, ablatiis regiis indumentis, Caesarem tunica textit et paludamento communi, eum post haec nihil passurum, velut mandato principis iurandi crebritate confirmans, et "Statim" inquit "exsurge," et inopinum carpento privato impositum, ad Histriam duxit, prope oppidum Polam, ubi quondam peremptum Constantini filium accipimus Crispum.*

¹³For the dating of the execution, see Hans Pohlsander, "Crispus Caesar: Brilliant Career and Tragic End," *Historia* 33 (1984) 76-106, esp. 99.

¹⁴See textual problems in Clark (34).

¹⁵See OLD (Oxford 1990) s.v. "*accipio*." Cichoka (213-218) does not list *accipimus* as a cross-reference verb.

¹⁶25.4.17: *ut aestimaretur (si revertisset de Parthis), boves iam defutores, Marci illius similis Caesaris, in quem id accipimus dictum* [the Greek distich follows].

17.5.2 yields another example of Ammianus' use of the same verb, this time in its perfect form of *accepimus*. In 357, Sapor and Constantius exchanged communiqués. In introducing Sapor's letter Ammianus states, "we have learned [*accepimus*] that the substance of the letter was as follows."¹⁷ Another use of this verb occurs at 26.3.5 in an historical example, this time from republican days, for instilling virtue: "just as we have heard [*accepimus*] of Duillius of old."¹⁸ This is clearly a reference to the famous naval victory of C. Duillius (cos. 260 B.C.) during the First Punic War, which fell long before the starting point of the *Res Gestae* in the reign of Nerva in A.D. 96 (possibly drawn from Cicero *De senectute* 13.44 or from Valerius Maximus 3.6.4). At 27.4.8, in a geographical digression, Ammianus points out Stagira, "where we hear Aristotle was born."¹⁹ Thus, again Ammianus uses a form of *accipio* for relating common knowledge or acceptance of fact—and again for an event long before the starting point of Ammianus' narrative.

At 31.13.13 Ammianus uses *accepimus* to introduce a description of the death of the third-century emperor Decius.²⁰ Although this event would have fallen within the chronological limits of Ammianus' narrative, there is no evidence to suggest that Ammianus is using this description as anything more than a historical example for comparison to the death of Valens at Adrianople. Indeed, no scholar has suggested that 31.13.13 is a reference to a lost book. The distich (25.4.17) is a very similar case to 14.11.20 in terms of usage of *accipimus* and yet no scholar has ever identified it as a cross-reference to a lost book either. Indeed, the actual quotation of the distich would have been unnecessary a second time. So, there is no reason to think that Ammianus had given details such as the text of the distich before. Thus, *accipimus* in Ammianus' usage would be closer in English to "we learn" than to "we have stated above." Since the example of Sapor's letter (17.5.2) refers to a document which was written contemporaneously with the events of the extant work, that occurrence cannot possibly refer to a lost book. Likewise, because the anecdote about Duillius alluded to by Ammianus (at 26.3.5) dates to long before the starting point of the *Res Gestae*, it further confirms the argument that Ammianus used different forms of *accipio* for the processes of learning and accepting knowledge and

¹⁷17.5.2: *litteras ad Constantium dedit nusquam a genuino fastu declinans, quarum hunc fuisse accepimus sensum.*

¹⁸26.3.5: *ut Duillium accepimus veterem, post gloriosa illa navalis rei certamina, id sibi sumpsisse ut tibicine, lenius praecinente rediret ad sua post cenam.*

¹⁹27.4.8: *cui proxima Arethusa cursualis est statio, in qua visitur Euripidis sepulchrum, tragoediarum sublimitate conspicui, et Stagira, ubi Aristotelem (ut Tullius ait), fundentem aureum flumen, accipimus natum.*

²⁰31.13.13: *Simili clade Caesarem accepimus Decium, dimicantem cum barbaris acriter, equi lapsu prostratum, quem ferventem retinere non valuit, abiectumque in paludem, nec emergere potuisse nec inveniri.*

not for referring to earlier parts of his narrative. Thus, all these examples demand a reading of forms of *accipimus* as something other than "we said before." Therefore, it is unlikely that 14.11.20 is a cross-reference to a lost passage.²¹

B) 15.5.33:²²

For although he [Silvanus] held Constantius under obligation through gratitude for his timely desertion with his soldiers before the battle of Mursa, yet he was regarded as variable and uncertain, although he could point also to the valiant deeds of his father Bonitus, a Frank it is true, but one who in the civil war often fought fiercely on the side of Constantine against the supporters of Licinius.²³

Silvanus was obviously involved at the battle of Mursa (September 351).²⁴ Since this conflict was an important defeat of the usurper Magnentius by Constantius II it is quite likely that Ammianus would have mentioned the battle.²⁵ Yet it is important to question whether this passage means that Ammianus had discussed Silvanus' actions there. For that matter, is it necessarily certain that Ammianus described the deeds of Bonitus fighting for Constantine against Licinius in the lost books either? There is no clear stylistic reason for assuming either person to have been discussed earlier in the *Res Gestae* since there is no verb or description of cross-reference in the passage.²⁶ The conclusion must be that there is no evidence for Silvanus' actions before the battle of Mursa having been in the lost books. The case of Bonitus being included in the lost narrative of Constantine is correspondingly weak. Since Ammianus attributes no rank to Bonitus, it is likely that he was not a military leader under Constantine, but simply

²¹ On the death of Crispus, see Patrick Guthrie, "The Execution of Crispus," *Phoenix* 20 (1966) 325-331; and, more recently, Pohlsander (above, n. 13).

²² As a reference to a lost book, see Michael 7; Emmett 52, n. 32. Michael even states that it is obvious that Ammianus is referring here to his own earlier explanations.

²³ *Licet enim ob tempestivam illam cum armaturis prodicionem ante Mursense proelium obligatum gratia retineret Constantium, ut dubium tamen et mutabilem verebatur, licet patris quoque Boniti praetenderet fortia facta, Franci quidem sed pro Constantini partibus in bello civili acriter contra Licinianos saepe versati.*

²⁴ W. Den Boer, "The Emperor Silvanus and His Army," *Acta Classica* 3 (1960) 105-109, at 106.

²⁵ In many places, Ammianus gives us a great deal of information on the history of Magnentius without any indication of which part of it, if any, were included in the lost book (or books) which examined that usurper's deeds. Moreover, those passages that mention Magnentius (14.5.6; 16.10.1; 21.13.11; 22.14.4; and 30.7.3) which are not phrased as cross-references have not been identified by scholars as cross-references to the lost books. A similar situation exists at 31.11.3 where Ammianus, in describing the effects of the capture of the general Acacius by Magnentius' forces, is clearly providing historical commentary, not providing a cross-reference to the lost books.

²⁶ "*Licet enim . . . retineret*" and "*praetenderet*" are clearly not cross-reference constructions.

a loyal infantryman.²⁷ As in the case of Silvanus at Mursa, there is no stylistic evidence to justify attributing the Bonitus reference to a lost book either.

C) 19.2.8:²⁸

No less was the grief and no fewer the deaths in the city, since a thick cloud of arrows in compact mass darkened the sky, while the artillery which the Persians had acquired from the plunder of Singara inflicted still more wounds.²⁹

Ammianus' historiographical interests and plan would have demanded that he discuss the battle of Singara (which occurred in 348).³⁰ There are even some clear cross-references to that battle at 18.9.3 and 20.6.5. The identification of this passage as a reference to a lost book is another case of confusing historical commentary with a cross-reference to a lost passage. Ammianus certainly discussed the battle of Singara in his lost books (perhaps even as recently as Book 12 or 13).³¹ However, it is difficult to ascertain whether he actually had described the Persians capturing artillery there. There is no way of telling from the wording of this passage, since there is no cross-reference form present, nor is there any need for this description to be anything more than what it obviously is—a case of Ammianus supplying some historical background to explain contemporary foreign tactics more clearly.

There are two other supposed cross-references to the Battle of Singara (18.5.7; 19.9.9). There are also three ostensibly similar discussions of the sieges of Nisibis (19.9.9; 20.7.1; 25.8.13). All five of these passages, which also lack cross-reference verbs and phrases, are also more rightly seen as historical allusions.³²

²⁷ A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* 1 (Cambridge 1971) 163 describes Bonitus (1) as possibly a general of Constantine, but lists this passage from Ammianus as its major source. Since 15.5.33 gives no rank for Bonitus, and since there is no other clear ancient testimony, there is at present no reason to suspect he held the rank of general.

²⁸ As a reference to a lost book, see Emmett 52, n. 32.

²⁹ *Nec minores in civitate luctus aut mortes, sagittarum creberrima nube auras spissa multitudo obumbrante, tormentorumque machinis, quae direpta Singara possederant Persae, vulnera inferentibus plura.*

³⁰ For detailed treatments of Ammianus' coverage of military events, see Norman Austin, *Ammianus on Warfare* (Brussels 1979) and Michael Crump, *Ammianus Marcellinus as a Military Historian* (Wiesbaden 1975).

³¹ For instance, 20.6.5: *Et pugnabatur eventu ancipiti diebus aliquot, hinc inde multis amissis et vulneratis: postremo fervente certaminis mole, et propinquantem iam vesperam, inter machinas plures admotus aries robustissimus, orbiculatam turrem feriebat ictibus densis, unde reseratam urbem obsidio superiore docuimus.*

³² For identification of 18.5.7, 19.9.9, 20.7.1, and 25.8.13 as assumed cross-references to the lost books of Ammianus, see Emmett 52, n. 32; see also Gimazane 406–407, n. 1. For these examples, as well as 29.1.17 (Commodus and Septimius Severus) and 31.11.3

D) 21.16.10.³³

For he [see below for identification] was the object of many genuine plots of traitors, such as Aureolus, Postumus, Ingenuus, Valens surnamed Thessalonicus, and several others. However, he often showed leniency in punishing crimes which would bring death to the victim; but also tried to make false or doubtful cases appear well-founded by excessively violent tortures.³⁴

Rolfe implies that the *ille* ("he") in this sentence, which appears following a description of Gallienus in the obituary of Constantius II, refers to Constantius II. Ammianus had stated immediately before this passage that Constantius was so ruthless an interrogator that he tried to prolong the tortures of prisoners and therefore was even more brutal than the ill-famed third-century emperor Gallienus, during whose reign there were many attempted usurpations.³⁵ However, Stertz has now argued convincingly that *ille* in this sentence refers to Gallienus.³⁶ Whether or not Ammianus discussed one or more of these plots against Gallienus earlier in the lost books of his history, this passage contains none of the expressions of cross-reference commonly used elsewhere.³⁷ Indeed, Ammianus at several other places in his narrative makes allusions to Gallienus and none of these passages have been cited by modern scholars as cross-references to the lost books.³⁸ The references to plots under Gallienus are more probably used in this case

(Magnentius and Acacius), which represent similar cases, see the appendix at the end of the article.

³³As a reference to a lost book, see Gardthausen 1.2; Emmett 52, n. 32. Gimazane (406) also includes this passage as a cross-reference to an earlier passage in the lost books of the *Res Gestae* but concedes in a note that Ammianus' text does not positively state this fact (see above, n. 11).

³⁴*Ille enim perduellionum crebris verisque appetitus insidiis, Aureoli et Postumi et Ingenui et Valentis, cognomento Thessalonici, aliorumque plurium, mortem factura crimina aliquotiens lenius vindicabat: hic etiam ficta vel dubia, adigebat videri certissima, vi nimia tormentorum.*

³⁵21.16.9: *Addebatur miserorum aerumnis, qui rei maiestatis imminutae vel laesae deferebantur, acerbitas eius et iracundia suspicionesque in huius modi cuncta distentae. Et siquid tale increpuisset, in quaestiones acrius exurgens quam civiliter, spectatores apponebat his litibus truces, mortemque longius in puniendis quibusdam, si natura permitteret, conabatur extendi, in eius modi controversiarum partibus etiam Gallieno ferocior.*

³⁶S. A. Stertz, "Ammianus Marcellinus on the Emperor Gallienus: His Sources," *AncW* 2 (1979) 69–71.

³⁷See Part III of this article for cross-references to the lost books. For cross-references to material within the extant books, see Cichoka 213–218.

³⁸14.1.9 (Gallienus roamed the streets at night with weapons); 18.6.3 (a Persian invasion in the Roman East during the reign of Gallienus); 23.5.3 (a Persian attack on Antioch); and 30.8.8 (Gallienus drained the imperial treasury). Gilliam ([above, n. 1] 140–141), who is careful not to mix allusions with cross-references, cites 21.16.10 as an indication of Ammianus' knowledge of the third century in contrast to the *Historia Augusta*.

as historical examples to compare and contrast Constantius' virtues and vices.

II. CROSS-REFERENCES MISTAKENLY CONNECTED TO THE LOST BOOKS

In addition to historical allusions, such as those discussed above, there are three other passages in the *Res Gestae* whose identification as cross-references to the lost books is open to question. Closer examination of the style of Ammianus' cross-references and of the content of the extant books of his history shows these passages to be either cross-references to matters in the extant books or unfulfilled cross-references to later extant books.

A) 14.8.7:³⁹

And first after Osröene, which I have omitted from this description, as has been said, gradually rises Commagene (now called Euphratensis); it is famous for the great cities of Hierapolis (the ancient Ninus) and Samosata.⁴⁰

The construction *ut dictum est* is often used by Ammianus in cross-references.⁴¹ However, a recent article has shown that this passage, rather than being a cross-reference to a description in the lost books, more rightly refers to 14.7.21 where Ammianus states that he will avoid reviewing Mesopotamia because he had already described it in his (now lost) account of the Parthian wars. Since Osröene was at various points in Roman history part of Mesopotamia, Ammianus probably included it in his lost digression on Mesopotamia which most likely occurred in the context of the third-century struggles between Rome and Persia. Therefore, Ammianus refers to a lost passage in 14.7.21 but not in 14.8.7.⁴²

B) 22.8.35:⁴³

In this Tauric country is the island of Leuce, entirely uninhabited and dedicated to Achilles. If any happen to be carried to that island, after looking at the ancient remains, the temple, and the gifts consecrated to that hero, they return at evening to their ships. For it is said that no one can pass the night there except at the risk of his life. At that place there are also springs and white birds

³⁹As reference to a lost book, see Emmett 52, n. 32.

⁴⁰*Et prima post Osdroenam quam (ut dictum est) ab hac descriptione discrevimus, Commagena (nunc Euphratensis) clementer assurgit, Hierapoli (vetere Nino) et Samosata civitatibus amplius illustris.*

⁴¹Cichoka (213–214) shows that Ammianus used this form fourteen times for cross-references, including this example (14.8.7; 17.13.8, 13.9; 18.7.6, 8.4; 19.11.4; 22.15.11; 23.5.15; 25.4.12, 10.4; 29.1.25, 2.9; 30.2.12, 4.20).

⁴²For a recent study of 14.7.21 and 14.8.7 which includes an attempt to date the lost digression on Mesopotamia, see R. M. Frakes, "Ammianus Marcellinus and Osröene," *AHB* 7 (1993) 143–147.

⁴³As a reference to a lost book, see Gardthausen 1.4; Gimazane 409; Cichoka 218; Emmett 52, n. 32.

which resemble halcyons, whose origin and battles in the Hellespont I will discuss at the appropriate time.⁴⁴

This passage, which appears in a long digressive chapter on Thrace and the Black Sea and its environs, bridges the narrative between 22.7 (Julian in Constantinople) and 22.9 (Julian in Antioch). If the form of *disseremus* (future tense) in the alleged cross-reference at 22.8.35 is correct, then Ammianus wrote more about this subject in a future passage which has been lost, or he failed to carry this promise through since no mention of the halcyons' origin and battles can be found anywhere else in the extant books of the *Res Gestae*.⁴⁵ In the late nineteenth century Victor Gardthausen suggested a textual emendation of the future tense *disseremus* to the imperfect form *disserebamus*. This solution dealt with the problem of how to explain the loss of material later in the extant books of the *Res Gestae* (after 22.8.35).⁴⁶ This hypothesis of Gardthausen then placed the cross-reference to the birds somewhere earlier than 22.8.35 and thus in the lost books, by implication, since it is nowhere in the extant narrative up to this point (14–22). However, C. U. Clark's later edition keeps the MS reading *disseremus*, and is followed in this regard by the more recent Teubner text of Wolfgang Seyfarth.⁴⁷ This reading, which is probably accurate, does not necessarily mean that there is a lost description of this myth in the *Res Gestae* after 22.8.35, as some have argued.⁴⁸ Instead of positing a lost past or future reference, the safest view may be that Ammianus simply forgot to follow through on this promised description of a mythological tale in his narrative.⁴⁹ This unfulfilled cross-reference would not be unique in the *Res Gestae*. At 28.1.57, Ammianus also makes a promise to discuss something

⁴⁴*In hac Taurica insula Leuce sine habitatoribus ullis Achilli est dedicata. In quam si fuerint quidam forte delati, visis antiquitatis vestigiis temploque et donariis eidem heroi consecratis, vesperi repetunt naves: aiunt enim non sine discrimine vitae illic quemquam pernoctare. Ibi et aquae sunt, et candidae aves nascuntur, alcyonibus similes, super quarum origine et Hellespontiacis proeliis tempore disseremus.*

⁴⁵Rolfe (2.233–235) lays out the textual arguments, but keeps the cross-reference verb as *disseremus* and thus in the future instead of the imperfect.

⁴⁶Gardthausen 1.281. This emendation is adopted as correct also by Cichoka 218 (as well as by Michael and Gimazane among others), who then lists *disserebamus* as a miscellaneous cross-reference to the lost books of the *Res Gestae*. She goes on to list it as fragment 25 of the lost books. Even if the imperfect form was correct, there is no internal evidence as to where in the lost books it would have come.

⁴⁷Clark 268; Seyfarth (above, n. 5) 1.267.

⁴⁸Michael (17) believed that the halcyon bird story appeared, together with the account of the death of Maximinus (28.1.57), in a future lost book that stood between the extant books 30 and 31. There is no other evidence for such a lost book and no scholar has since developed this part of Michael's thesis.

⁴⁹Ammianus stresses that the information in this chapter (22.8) came from his own observation and reading (22.8.1). The clearest extant ancient description of the origin of the halcyon birds comes from Ovid *Met.* 11.346–748, which describes the tragic marriage

later in his text (the death of Maximinus) which he does not fulfill.⁵⁰ Of course, Ammianus is not unique in ancient historiography in making unfulfilled cross-references and should be allowed to make a mistake without having it covered up as a cross-reference to a lost part of his narrative.⁵¹

C) 28.4.6:⁵²

And first, as often, according to the quantity of topics, I shall give an account of the delinquencies of the nobles and then of the common people, condensing the events in a rapid digression.⁵³ (Translation taken directly from Rolfe.)

This passage is very complex. The first problem is the confusion of Rolfe's translation. It probably should more clearly be translated: "and as I have done several times in proportion to the amount of space, I shall discuss first the faults of the nobles and then those of the people, condensing the incidents to a quick digression." This sentence is a description of the methodology Ammianus goes on to use in the following section discussing virtue and vice in the city of Rome. The sentence certainly is a cross-reference, but probably not to the lost books.⁵⁴ It more rightly refers back to the famous earlier digression of 14.6 where Ammianus starts with the rich and the Senate (14.6.1-24) and then goes on to the lower-class (14.6.24-26).⁵⁵ While Ammianus' use of *aliquotiens* does imply that he followed this pattern more than once, there is unfortunately little evidence that he is here referring to something in the lost books. He certainly did discuss different

of Alcione and Ceyx and how they were transformed into birds. Seyfarth (3.208, n. 114) places the island of Leuce in the mouth of the Dnieper (in modern Ukraine).

⁵⁰28.1.57: *Sed vigilarunt ultimae dirae caesorum. Namque ut postea tempestive diceretur, et idem Maximinus sub Gratiano intoleranter se efferens, damnatorio iugulatus est ferro, et Simplicius in Illyrico truncatus, et Doryphorianum pronuntiatum capitis reum, trusumque in carcerem Tullianum, matris consilio, princeps exinde rapuit, reversumque ad lares per cruciatus oppressit immensos.*

⁵¹For instance, famous examples from Herodotus include 1.106 (on how the Medes took Nineveh); 1.184 (the account of many kings of Babylon in his account of Assyria); 7.213 (on the murder of Ephialtes, the traitor of Thermopylae). Diodorus Siculus also made unfulfilled cross-references: e.g., at 3.38.3 and 5.21.2 (following Rubincam, "Organization and Composition" [above, n. 6] 319, n. 11). For further treatment of unfulfilled cross-references in ancient historiography, see Sacks (above, n. 6) 90.

⁵²As a reference to a lost book, see Gimazane 409; Emmett 52, n. 32. See also Jeep (62-63), who takes this example and its similarity to 14.6.3 together with the firm cross-reference to the lost books at 14.4.2 as evidence for Ammianus having written one work as opposed to Michael's thesis of two works.

⁵³*Et primo nobilitatis, ut aliquotiens pro locorum copia fecimus, dein plebis digeremus errata, incidentia veloci constringentes excessu.*

⁵⁴Cichoka (213-218) does not list this passage as a cross-reference although it would certainly appear to be one.

⁵⁵See Roger Pack, "The Roman Digressions of Ammianus Marcellinus," *TAPA* 84 (1953) 181-189.

groups in other cities in the extant books at varying levels of complexity (e.g., Antioch in 14.7.1–9).

III. DEFINITE CROSS-REFERENCES AND CONCLUSION

Thus by exercising this kind of care, restraint, and knowledge of Ammianus' style when re-reading alleged cross-reference passages, one can disqualify eleven of a total of forty-nine supposed cross-references as historical allusions while in three other cases it can be suggested that scholars have misinterpreted undoubted cross-references. Ammianus also has two unfulfilled cross-references (22.8.35 and 28.1.57) to future parts of the *Res Gestae*. These failures, when combined with the fact that he has no known unfulfilled cross-references to earlier extant parts of his narrative, suggest that it is likely that Ammianus, like some other ancient authors, would occasionally plan to address something later and then forget his plan by the time he had gotten to that stage of his work. This situation would, of course, be exacerbated by the methods of composition and lack of reference aids used in antiquity. These unfulfilled cross-references would more likely be to items later in the work than to items already written earlier in the narrative.

While fourteen passages have been questioned, there still remain thirty-five firm cross-references to the lost part of the *Res Gestae*. Some of these passages actually refer to more than one part of the lost books, while others may refer to the same passage. These examples can provide some fruitful information for historical inquiries into the period between 98 and 353:

- 14.1.8 Lost description of the wife of the Emperor Maximinus in the history of the Gordians [*ut in Gordianorum actibus . . . rettulimus*]
- 14.4.2 The Saracens were described in his account of Marcus Aurelius (and possibly later in the lost books as well) [*in actibus principis Marci, et postea aliquotiens memini retulisse*]
- 14.7.7 Serenianus' inefficiency (as *Dux*) led to the plunder of Celse in Phoenicia [*ante rettulimus*]
- 14.7.21 A lost digression on Mesopotamia in connection with the Parthian Wars [*iam digesta cum bella Parthica narrarentur*]
- 14.10.2 Hermogenes (*Magister Equitum*) was torn apart by a mob in Constantinople [*ut supra retulimus*]
- 15.5.16 Laniogaisus (while *Candidatus*) was the only witness to Constans' death [*supra rettulimus*]
- 15.6.4 Poemenius defended Trier against Decentius (brother of the usurper Magnentius) [*ut supra rettulimus*]
- 16.6.2 Dorus was a centurion under Magnentius [*retulimus*]

- 16.10.12 Lost description of Constantius II's conduct [*praetereo, memor ea me rettulisse cum incidissent*]
- 16.10.16 Lost account of the departure of Ormisda from Persian territory [*supra monstravimus*]
- 18.9.3 Aelianus (as *Protector*) led a sally of the *praeventores* from Singara and killed a great number of sleeping Persians [*retulimus*]
- 19.2.3 A lost description of war elephants (probably given more than once in the lost books) [*ut rettulimus saepe*]
- 20.1.1 Constans went to Britain to protect its inhabitants [*ut rettulimus ante*]
- 20.6.5 A lost description of how the breach of Singara's wall occurred at a round tower [*docuimus*]
- 20.11.32 Constantius II sometimes had military success against the Persians because of the abilities of his generals [*quod aliquotiens meminimus contigisse*]
- 21.8.1 Jovius (later a *Comes*) was described in the account of the actions of Magnentius [*in actibus Magnenti meminimus*]⁵⁶
- 21.16.7 A lost description of Constantius II's conduct which included his abstention from fruit [*ut dicta saepius*]
- 22.9.6 A lost digression in the account of Commodus which described the transportation of the image of the "Great Mother" to Rome [*in actibus Commodi principis digessimus per excessum*]
- 22.13.3 The philosopher Asclepiades was mentioned in the account of Magnentius [*cuius in actibus Magnenti meminimus*]
- 22.15.1 Two lost lengthy digressions on Egypt. One given during the account of Hadrian and the other in the account of Septimius Severus [*in actibus Hadriani et Severi principum digessimus late, visa pleraque narrantes*]
- 23.5.7 Lost account of the early childhood, successful campaigns, and treacherous murder of Gordian III [*digessimus tempore competenti*]
- 23.6.2 Lost description of the reasons why the kingdom of Persia has been known by various names (probably given more than once in the lost books) [*ob causis saepe rettulimus*]
- 23.6.24 The city of Seleucia was stormed by generals of Verus Caesar [*ut ante rettulimus*]
- 23.6.50 A lost explanation of the devices by which tigers and wild beasts are caught [*dudum nos meminimus rettulisse*]

⁵⁶Gimazane (406–407, n. 1) includes this passage as one not positively phrased as a cross-reference, although 22.13.3 provides an exact parallel.

- 23.6.83 A lost description of Persian military training (given more than once in the lost books) [*quam saepe formavimus*]
- 25.4.23 The effect of the lies of Metrodorus on Constantine in the genesis of the war with Persia [*ut dudum rettulimus plene*]
- 25.8.5 Lost descriptions of how Trajan and Septimius Severus attempted to destroy Hatra several times but were defeated [*ut in eorum actibus has quoque digessimus partes*]
- 27.8.4 The ebb and flow of Ocean and the situation in Britain were described during the lost account of Constans [*cum Constantis principis actus componerem*]
- 28.3.8 The *arcani* (secret service officials) were described in the account of Constans [*in actibus Constantis rettulimus*]
- 29.5.16 A lost description of the founders of the city of Icosium [*cuius supra docuimus*]
- 29.5.18 A lost digression on the topography of Africa, which included the origins of Caesaria [*cuius itidem origenem in Africae situ digessimus plene*]
- 29.6.1 A lost description of the reign of Marcus Aurelius [*quem ante docuimus*]
- 30.7.1 Many of Ammianus' obituaries of Roman emperors in the lost books followed the same format as those in the extant books [*ut aliquotiens fecimus*]
- 31.16.5 The origin and customs of the Saracens were often described in the lost books (see 14.4.2 above in this list) [*diversis in locis rettulimus plura*]
- 31.16.9 The *Res Gestae* started with the reign of the Emperor Nerva [*a principatu Caesaris Nervae exorsus, ad usque Valentis interitum, pro virium explicavi mensura*]⁵⁷

While earlier studies presented more pieces to the puzzle of the lost books of Ammianus by identifying more cross-references, in reality many of the pieces do not fit because of confusion between historical allusions and cross-references. Since other previous work regarding the nature of the lost books took the cross-references as starting points for such issues as Ammianus' historiographic scope and style, it is possible that some studies may have been mistaken in their premises. Future studies of Ammianus must start from the firm total of thirty-five cross-references and attempt to work from these references, as well as from comparison and contrast with sources possibly connected to Ammianus, in order to understand the nature

⁵⁷While not usually listed as a cross-reference to the lost books, this description in the concluding paragraph of the *Res Gestae* is really the most important information Ammianus gives concerning Books 1-13 since the passage supplies the starting point of the work.

of the lost books of the *Res Gestae*.⁵⁸ This approach of close re-reading of cross-references, which is useful for Ammianus' work, might also lead to similar clarifications in the reading of other ancient historians whose narratives have not survived intact.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
CLARION UNIVERSITY
CLARION, PENNSYLVANIA 16214

APPENDIX: LIST OF MISIDENTIFIED CROSS-REFERENCES

14.8.7	description of earlier cross-reference	refers to 14.7.21
14.11.20	death of Crispus	historical allusion
15.5.33	actions of Silvanus and Bonitus	historical allusion
18.5.7	battle of Singara	historical allusion
19.2.8	battle of Singara	historical allusion
19.9.9	battles of Singara and Nisibis	historical allusions
20.7.1	battle of Nisibis	historical allusion
21.16.10	plots under Gallienus	historical allusions
22.8.35	halcyon birds	unfulfilled cross-reference in extant books
25.8.13	battle of Nisibis	historical allusion
28.1.1	death of Nepotian	historical allusion
28.4.6	methodological description	could simply refer to 14.6.1–26 and 14.7.1–9
29.1.17	Commodus and Septimius Severus	historical allusions
31.11.3	Acacius and Magnentius	historical allusion

⁵⁸Gordon S. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian* (Montreal 1991) 29–30 in his analysis of a much earlier historian clearly describes the proper methodology for examining fragmentary historians. Such a method could be explored in a profitable manner for the lost books of Ammianus, although the cautionary words of Brunt (above, n. 6) are still of use when dealing with parts of a lost work for which no references to book numbers exist.