AN ALLEGED DOUBLET IN AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS

It has been widely held that Ammianus Marcellinus has, in XXIII, 5, 7—25 and XXIV, 1, 1—5 given two accounts of Julian's march from Cercusium down the Euphrates towards Dura. Mendelssohn, in the introduction to his edition of Zosimus [1]), suggested that this was because Ammianus was using Magnus of Carrhae as his source, and that his digression on the subject of Persia and the Persians caused him at the beginning of Book XXIV to give a second version of events which he had already narrated. Klein [2]) maintained that in the earlier version Ammianus relied on his own memory, and that in the second he used Magnus and forgot about his earlier zealous individualism. Klotz [3]) held that the earlier version was derived from his so-called Source A, while the later one was based on Magnus. Mommsen [4]) held that Ammianus had in Book XXIII altered the order of events in order to be able to insert in Julian's speech a reference to Gordian's tomb. Bidez [5]) also believed that Ammianus inverted the order of events. Professor E. A. Thompson [6]) suggests that Ammianus here became confused in his notes and repeated himself without noticing. I believe that this is partially correct in that Ammianus is relying mainly on his own memory and records, and that he has not given as clear an account as one would wish, but I hope to show that, in fact, he is guilty neither of repetition nor of inversion, but is recording events in their chronological order.

We are told in XXIII, 5, 1, that Julian arrived at Cercusium *principio mensis Aprilis*, and that (5, 4) while waiting

1) Leipzig, 1887, p. xlv.

2) Studien zu Ammianus Marcellinus, *Klio*, Beiheft XIII, 1914, p. 43. This theory is also adopted by Cumont in *Fouilles de Doura Europos* (1922—23) — Texte, Paris, 1926, pp. lxvi-lxvii.

3) Die Quellen Ammians in der Darstellung von Julians Perserzug, *Rheinisches Museum*, 71 (1916), pp. 477—8.

4) *Ges. Schr.* VII, p. 427. Mommsen maintains that the passage containing the speech of Julian (XXIII, 5, 15—25) follows naturally after the events of 5, 5, and before those of 5, 6—14. Then, he believes, XXIII, 5, 8 links up with XXIV, 1, 1.

5) *La Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, Paris, 1930, p. 322 and p. 406, n. 21.

6) *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Cambridge, 1947, pp. 29—30.

there for his army to cross the Abora, he received a discouraging letter from Sallustius, the praetorian prefect of Gaul. This letter did not deter him from his project, but on the contrary, (5, 5) *fidentius ultra tendebat, quoniam nulla uis humana uel uirtus meruisse unquam potuit, ut quod praescripsit fatalis ordo non fiat. statimque transgressus, pontem auelli praecepit, nequi militum ab agminibus propriis reuertendi fiducia remaneret.* This passage implies that Julian changed his plans and crossed the Abora without waiting until all his troops had crossed. Presumably his orders about the destruction of the bridge of boats were only to be carried out when the army's crossing had been completed. It is, of course, impossible to calculate how much time elapsed between Julian's crossing and the destruction of the bridge, but there are indications that there must in any case have been some delay, on the South bank of the river. Both in Zosimus (III, 13), and in Ammianus himself (XXIV, 1, 2), the order of march is recorded after the crossing of the Abora, which suggests that some fairly considerable re-grouping took place on the South bank. It would be most natural and prudent for a commander in such circumstances to move his troops into a forming-up area and then, on the basis of intelligence reports, to decide upon his order of march. It would also be sound generalship to send out reconnaissance patrols, and I would suggest that Julian did in fact do this, and that 5, 7—14 relate to this phase of operations.

At the beginning of 5, 7, we are told that *profecti exinde Zaithan uenimus locum, qui olea arbor interpretatur.* Who are the 'we' who form the subject of *uenimus?* If we examine Ammianus' practice in the rest of his work, apart from his account of the Persian expedition, it is clear that, with a single exception, he uses the first person plural of verbs in narrative passages only when he himself took part in the action described. The exception occurs in XXVIII, 2, 6, where the subject of *tenebamus* must be 'we, the Romans', as the passage refers to Valentinian's actions on the Rhine frontier in 369 in which Ammianus does not seem likely to have been involved. This instance, it should be noted, occurs in a part of the work published at a later date than Books I—XXV[7]), when Ammianus may have been less rigid in his practice. Throughout the work Ammianus does, of course, frequently use *nos* to mean the Romans as a nation, and *nostri* to mean Roman soldiers, but this does not affect our

7) Thompson, op. cit. pp. 18—19.

problem. From Book XIV — XIX, 8, 12, he uses verbs in the first person plural fairly frequently to describe his own actions on the staff of Ursicinus, and during and after the siege of Amida. The subject implied is 'I, and those with me', and when he wishes to stress that some action was performed by himself alone, as for example in his escape from Amida, he tends to use the first person singular. We cannot, of course, always estimate with accuracy the composition of the group 'I and those with me', but it is fairly clear that Ammianus only used the first person plural when he had good reason to remember his own participation in events. Although he does not use the first person singular in his account of the Persian expedition, I can see no reason for thinking that Ammianus here departed from his normal practice. It is interesting to note that the last instance of the first person plural in the context of the Persian expedition occurs in XXV, 10, 1 *Antiochiam uenimus*. This is a close parallel to the last instance of its use in the Amida narrative, *Antiochiam reuisimus insperati* (XIX, 8, 12). It seems probable that on each occasion Ammianus contrived to obtain leave to remain in his native city. Mommsen's doubts[8]) about Ammianus' being present with Julian in Persia do not appear to have been based on a detailed examination of the evidence, and have not been generally shared.

The subject of *uenimus* in XXIII, 5, 7, is therefore 'I and those with me', and this may obviously refer to a group smaller in composition than the whole army. Ammianus tells us (XIX, 8, 5) that he possessed *squalentum peritia locorum*, which presumably means that he had special experience of desert conditions. Moreover, as Thompson points out[9]), the first person is not employed before the departure from Cercusium, and so Ammianus may well have been stationed there before the expedition began. If so, he would have been enabled to acquire special knowledge of the local terrain. I believe, then, that the word *uenimus* refers to a 'high-level' reconnaissance group led by Julian himself in which Ammianus was included in consideration of his knowledge and experience. Julian's presence is, of course, attested by the third person singular to which Ammianus rather abruptly switches in 5,8. The incident of the lion-killing in this passage corroborates my theory that only a reconnaissance group, and not the whole army was involved. We

8) *Ges. Schr.* VII, p. 428. *cf.* Thompson, op. cit. pp. 10—11.
9) op. cit. p. 10.

are told that Julian, *procul militarem cuneum conspicatus, stetit inmobilis.* If the whole army was on the march, it would be difficult to account for Julian reacting in this way to the sight of a military detachment. It would also be very unusual for a whole unit, of whatever strength, to leave its station on the march for the purpose of transporting a dead lion to the Emperor. The most reasonable explanation is that Julian and his reconnaissance group were here met by one of the patrols which must have been sent out both to cover the river-crossing and to prepare for the march South.

The reconnaissance party reached Zaitha and presumably visited Gordian's tomb as Julian offered prayers to the shade of Gordian. Eutropius tells us[10]) that this *tumulus,* which was actually a cenotaph as Gordian's remains had been removed to Rome, was 20 miles South of Cercusium, but we cannot say how far Julian and his party went. They went *ad Duram,* which must mean 'in the direction of Dura'. They certainly did not go to Dura, as Dura was on the other side of the Euphrates[11]). It is probable that Julian returned to the army after encountering the lion-killers, and I am tempted to think that the MS. reading *cedebat* (5, 8) might stand, with the meaning 'began to return'. Julian's journey, if made, as one would expect, on horse-back, need not have taken more than one day.

It is interesting to note that in 5, 12, Ammianus introduces the story of the soldier Jovian being struck by lightning with the words *secuto itidem die, qui erat septimum idus Aprilis.* This date may have remained in his memory as the last day spent in the forming-up area. In 5, 13, the *interpretes .... etiam id uetare procinctum fidentius affirmabant.* The use of *uetare* — 'to forbid' would be most natural if the enterprise was not fully under way.

In 5, 15 we are told that *fracto igitur (ut ante dictum est) ponte, cunctisque transgressis, imperator antiquissimum omnium ratus est militem adloqui, sui rectorisque fiducia properantem*

10) IX, 2.

11) Dura is incorrectly sited in several works relating to Julian's expedition, *e. g.* in the map in J. B. Bury's edition of Gibbon, vol. II, facing p. 491, and in the map in R. Andreotti, L'Impresa di Giuliano in Oriente, *Historia* IV (1930), facing p. 250. Its position is correctly shown in Cumont, op. cit. Atlas, Pl. I. Piganiol *(L'Empire Chrétien (325—395), Histoire Romaine t. IV, 2; Paris, 1947),* p. 142, n. 111, remarks that Ammianus in XXIII, 5, 8, "ne dit pas que Doura soit déjà atteinte".

intrepide. (I here reproduce Clark's text[12]) which adopts Mommsen's *fracto* for the MS. *praetor. Peracto* and *perfecto* have also been suggested, but Ammianus does not elsewhere refer to the making of the bridge, and indeed the phrase *per naualem Aborae pontem* (5, 4) suggests that the bridge was already in existence. *Cunctisque* is preferable to Mommsen's *cunctis.* The phrase does not necessarily involve a tautology as some troops might have made the crossing by boat.) This speech marks the immediate prelude to the army's advance. In it, Julian (5, 17) says of Gordian '*cuius monumentum nunc uidimus honorate*'. This remark helps to establish the place where the speech was made. The tomb was, as we have seen, 20 miles South of Cercusium, but was, as Ammianus tells us (5, 7), visible from as far away as Zaitha which was, according to Zosimus (III, 14), about 8 miles from Cercusium. The speech could therefore have been made at some point between Zaitha and Gordian's tomb. Other statements by Ammianus confirm this. In XXIV, 1, 5, we are told that the army reached the vicinity of Dura *emenso itaque itinere bidui* from the place where the speech was made. In XXIV, 2, 3, we find that the army covered 25 miles in two days[13]), and according to Cumont's map, Dura is about 45 miles from Cercusium. If the army moved at the same speed North of Dura, it must therefore have set out from a point about 20 miles South of Cercusium, *i. e.* from the vicinity of Gordian's tomb. Even if it moved more swiftly here it could still have set out from a place from which the tomb was visible. Quite probably the tomb marked the southern boundary of the bridge-head and forming-up areas.

After recording the favourable reception by the troops of Julian's harangue, Ammianus gives his disquisition on Persia which occupies the rest of Book XXIII. He then begins Book XXIV with the words *Post exploratam alacritatem exercitus,* which give the clearest possible indication that he is referring back to XXIII, 5, 24—25. It is surely inconceivable that he could have taken such care to link the narrative together and at the same time have failed to notice that he was duplicating part of it. The phrase *Assyrios fines ingressus* (1, 1) might at

12) *Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestarum Libri qui supersunt,* Berlin 1910—15.

13) *Cf.* Sudhaus, *De ratione quae intercedat inter Zosimi et Ammiani de bello a Iuliano imperatore cum Persis gesto relationes,* Bonn, 1870, pp. 28—9.

first sight appear to present some difficulty, as one might have expected the Abora to form the frontier. Quite probably, however, the Romans looked on the forming-up area as being theirs. This would be particularly likely if its area extended as far as a monument to one of their own Emperors. In any case, it was the departure from the forming-up area which marked the real beginning of the march into hostile territory. Julian is here represented as riding with his troops. In Zosimus (III, 13), and Malalas' version of Magnus of Carrhae (p. 328)[14]), he is said to have embarked on the river. Both versions may be partially correct. It would be natural for Julian to accompany his marching troops at least part of the way on the first day. Thereafter he may have found it convenient to continue by river, and he may even have wished to visit Dura *cognoscendae antiquitatis*. This would account for Zosimus' statement that he visited Dura. Unfortunately, Zosimus gives a rather confused account of events just after the army reached Cercusium. He makes Julian's embarcation precede his address to the troops, and then apparently puts the Romans on the wrong bank of the river. His statement that Gordian's tomb was visible from Dura seems at least improbable, and in general, Zosimus cannot contribute greatly to the problem under discussion.

Ammianus' phrase *ipse uero medios pedites regens* in the order of march in XXIV, 1, 2, means, I suggest, that Julian's Headquarters moved with the *medii pedites*. We need not assume that Julian was always there in person. Ammianus' careful choice of words in 1, 5, should be noted. He there states *prope ciuitatem uenimus Duram*, which of course means that he and those with him reached the vicinity of Dura, although not the town itself.

It is at this point that the 'second version' of the alleged doublet stops. I think that we are justified in concluding that, although Ammianus' account is not quite as explicit as it might be, it is nevertheless coherent and consecutive. From it the following sequence of events emerges. Julian crossed the Abora from Cercusium before his army had completed its crossing. He then moved forward with a small party which included Ammianus on reconnaissance, and on this short expedition saw and

14) In Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. iv, p. 5; Dindorf, *Historici Graeci Minores*, vol. i, p. 367, and F. Jacoby, *F. Gr. Hist.* vol. iiB, p. 952 sec. 5.

probably visited Gordian's tomb. He then returned to his army which formed up probably between Zaitha and Gordian's tomb. After Julian had addressed it, the army moved down the Euphrates towards Dura. Such defects as there are in Ammianus' account are attributable, I would suggest, to the fact that he was personally involved in the actions which he describes, and was consequently less conscious than he might otherwise have been of an occasional lack of clarity.

University of Nottingham

Walter R. Chalmers

MISZELLEN

LAT. *ADASIA*

Zu der Aufhellung dieses etymologisch dunklen Wortes[1]), das ausschließlich bei Lexikographen belegt ist, kann ich leider nichts Neues beibringen, aber ein Überblick über die Weitertradierung dieses seltenen und interessanten Wortes in der Lexikographie dürfte vielleicht nicht ganz ohne Wert sein.

Der älteste Gewährsmann ist Sextus Pompeius Festus (3. Jahrh. n. Chr.), der Epitomator des nicht mehr erhaltenen römischen Antiquars Verrius Flaccus, jedoch nur in der Epitome des Langobarden Paulus Diaconus (8./9. Jahrh. n. Chr.): *adasia, ovis vetula recentis partus,* Sexti Pompei Festi de verborum significatu etc. ed. C. O. Müller (1839) 12,13; ed. A. Thewrewk de Ponor (1889) 9; ed. W. M. Lindsay (1913) 11,23 (Neue Ausgabe Paris 1930 in: Glossaria Latina IV); R. Klotz, Handwörterbuch der lat. Sprache I[3] (1861, 6. Abdr. 1879) 118 b und Thesaurus Ling. Lat. I (1900) Sp. 571.

Auf Paulus Diaconus gehen wohl letzten Endes alle späteren Belege entweder direkt oder indirekt zurück. Chronologisch folgen wohl zunächst 3 Glossen im Corp. Gloss. Lat., die im Thesaurus Ling. Lat. I (1900), Sp. 571 verzeichnet sind: Gloss. V 436,30 *adasia. ovis maior, quae peperit;* Gloss. IV 404, 25 *adasia. ovis maior natu;* Gloss. II 564,18 *adasa. pro* (*prae* Löwe) *senectute sterelis [= sterilis].* Aus dem Anfang des XV. Jahrh. stammt ein Englisch-Lateinisches Vokabular des Codex Harleianus, in dem S. 558 die Glosse: *hec adacia [= haec adasia] a geldowe* steht, H. Varnhagen, Festschrift Wil-

1) Vgl. A. Walde, Lat. etym. Wb.[2] (1910) 11; A. Walde — J. B. Hofmann, Lat. etym. Wb. I[3] (1938) 12, wo die Deutung von A. Zimmermann, KZ 50, 149 als „Mutterschaf" zu **ada* „Mutter" abgelehnt wird. Verfehlt auch Fr. Müller Izn, Altitalisches Wb. (Göttingen 1926) 48 s. v. *assis* „Schaf".