Beginning and End

From Ammianus Marcellinus to Eusebius of Caesarea

Álvaro Sánchez-Ostiz (ed.)

Universidad de Huelva

exemplaria
CLASSICA

Journal of Classical Philology
Revista de Filología Clásica

ANEJO VII

2016

BEGINNING AND END
FROM AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS TO EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA

ÁLVARO SÁNCHEZ-OSTIZ
(ED.)

ISBN: 978-84-16872-02-2
eISBN: 978-84-17288-05-1

Universidad de Huelva

Contents

Acknowledgements 5

Notes on contributors 9

Abstracts and keywords / Resúmenes y palabras clave 15

Abbreviations 31

Álvaro Sánchez-Ostiz, José B. Torres Guerra
Ammianus, Eusebius and 4th-century Historiography: From Dusk to Dawn? 35

Andrew Louth
Eusebius as Apologist and Church Historian 47

José B. Torres Guerra
Documents, Letters and Canons in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Ecclesiastical History* 61

Jan R. Stenger
Palestine as a Palimpsest: Eusebius' Construction of Memorial Space in the *Onomasticon* 83

Pablo M. Edo
Citing or Doctoring the Sources? Serapion and the *Gospel of Peter* in Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica* 107

Jerónimo Leal
Las listas de obispos de Roma y Antioquía en la Historia Eclesiástica de Eusebio 123

Fernando López Sánchez
'Under this Sign you shall be the Ruler!' Eusebius, the Chi-Rho Letters and the *archē* of Constantine 137

Carmen Castillo
Historia, *physiognomía* y encomio: la figura de Graciano en Amiano Marcelino 159

David Woods
Constantius, Julian, and the Fall of Sirmium 175

Matilde Caltabiano
The *adventus* of the Emperor Julian in Ammianus Marcellinus's *Res gestae* 193

Álvaro Sánchez-Ostiz
Ammianus on Eastern Lawyers (30.4): Literary Allusions and the Decline of Forensic Oratory 207
Alberto J. Quiroga Puertas
Dicta et *visa*: Rhetorical Strategies in Ammianus's *Res Gestae* 225
Francisco J. Alonso
Parody and Inversion of Literary Genres in Ammianus Marcellinus 243
Bibliography 261
General Index 283
Index of Passages Discussed 301

Acknowledgements

The edition of this book has profited from the help and support of several institutions. Of special recognition is the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, which in 2011 approved and sponsored our research project "Linguistic and Cultural Alterity in the Roman Empire (third and fourth centuries AD): Historiography and Related Genres" (FFI2010-15402 FILO). We must additionally thank the University of Navarra for its trust and continuous help in developing this project, especially between 2011 and 2013. What can be said about the University of Navarra in general is of course also true in its School of Humanities and Department of Philology. From this project's beginning to its end, we are singularly indebted to all those, *sine quibus non*, who attended the workshop "Beginning and End. From Ammianus Marcellinus to Eusebius of Caesarea", in Pamplona on December 2013. Without their contributions, discussions and suggestions, this volume would have been a very different work. Particular thanks are also owed to Alan N. Stout for revising most of the non-native English parts of this volume.

Notes on contributors

Francisco José Alonso graduated from the Complutense University of Madrid, Spain, in Classical Philology and he is now a doctoral student at the Pontificia Universidad Católica of Chile. He taught Latin in the University of Navarra, Spain, Latin and Greek in the Catholic University of La Plata, Argentina, and Latin and Greek Literatures in Chile. His doctoral studies focus on the points of view in the narrative of Ammianus Marcellinus's historical work.

Matilde Caltabiano is emeritus Professor of Roman History at the State University of Milan. Her research has tackled various problems and main characters from the 4th century AD based on analyses of historiographical sources. She is the author of several contributions about the emperor Julian, and translations of Ammianus' *Res* gestae and Julian's *Epistolary*, as well as of the monograph *Litterarum Lumen* (Rome 1996), on the literary and book culture of Late Antiquity.

Carmen Castillo is emeritus Professor of Latin Philology at the University of Navarra. Her main research fields have been Roman Prosopography of Hispania, as well as Latin epigraphy. In recent years she has focused her research on the 4th century AD, combining literary and historical approaches, and paying particular attention to the historiographical work of Ammianus Marcellinus.

Pablo M. Edo is Assistant Lecturer of New Testament at the University of Navarra since 2007. His current research interests are the Gospels, Petrine Literature and Early Christianity, with a specific focus on the apocryphal writings, as well as the definition and formation of the canon. He has recently edited and commented the *Gospel of Peter: El Evangelio de Pedro (Fragmento de Akhmîn). Introducción, texto bilingüe y comentario* (Salamanca 2015).

Jerónimo Leal is Professor of Patrology at the University of the Holy Cross of Rome and is visiting Professor at the Patristic Institute "Augustinia-

num" of Rome. His main research fields are pre-Nicene patristics, Tertullian, and the *Acts of the martyrs*. He has published an edition of the Latin-African Acts of the martyrs, and several books and papers on Tertullian. He is part of the research group "The interdisciplinary 'Anceps Project'", that focuses on the automation of Latin metrical analysis.

Fernando López-Sánchez's dissertation on Late Roman coins and Late Roman armies was defended in 2002. He conducted post-doctoral research in Oxford University and was later awarded by the Spanish Ministry of Education with the Juan de la Cierva (2005-2008, University of Zaragoza) and Ramón y Cajal (2009-2013, University of Castellón) research positions. The main focus of his research is on the auxiliary military forces of the Roman Republic and the Roman Empire from Numidia to Scandinavia, with an especial approach to coins and coinage. Fernando is now member of the Wolfson College at the University of Oxford.

Andrew Louth is Professor Emeritus of Patristic and Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, and Honorary Fellow of the Faculty of Theology attached to the Amsterdam Centre of Eastern Orthodox Theology (ACEOT), Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, 2010–14. His most recent books are *Introducing Eastern Orthodox Theology and Modern Orthodox Thinkers: from the Philokalia to the Present* (SPCK, 2013, 2015).

Alberto J. Quiroga Puertas is Profesor Contratado Doctor at the Ancient Greek Department at the University of Granada. His main research interests are late antique rhetoric - more specifically, rhetorical deliveries - and Imperial Greek literature, with especial attention to the works by Libanius of Antioch, Themistius and the emperor Julian. He is the author of a number of papers dealing with these topics, and has edited the volume *The Purposes of Rhetoric in Late Antiquity. From Exegesis to Performance* (Tübingen 2013).

Álvaro Sánchez-Ostiz is Lecturer in Latin at the University of Navarra. His main research fields are late Latin historiography and poetry, as well as social and literary bilingualism in the Roman world. He has published an edition of the *Anonymus de rebus bellicis* with commentary, and several papers on Ammianus and Claudian. He is part of the research group GRAECAPTA, which examines the interrelations between Latin and Greek literature and culture.

Jan R. Stenger is Douglas MacDowell Professor of Greek at the University of Glasgow and also member of the Cluster of Excellence Topoi, Berlin. His main fields of research are Greek lyric poetry, especially choral lyric,

and the Greek literature of late antiquity. He is especially interested in the relationship between Christianity and classical culture in the fourth century and in sixth-century Gaza. Stenger's publications include monographs on the Greek poet Bacchylides and on identity construction in late antiquity (*Hellenische Identität in der Spätantike*, Berlin 2009), as well as articles on Libanius, John Chrysostom and Choricius of Gaza.

José B. Torres Guerra is Professor of Ancient Greek at the University of Navarra. He wrote his doctoral thesis on the Homeric *Thebaid* as source of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* at the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. He has afterwards explored the narrative characteristics of Greek Hymnic Poetry. Since 2003 he has been working on Intercultural Relations in the Imperial Period, a topic which has led him to pay special attention to Late Antique authors such as Eusebius during the past four years.

David Woods is the Head of the Department of Classics at University College Cork, Ireland. He has had over 140 papers published in international peer-reviewed journals. His main research interests lie in the political and military history of the Julio-Claudian dynasty (AD 14-68), the Constantinian dynasty (AD 306-63), and the Heraclian dynasty (AD 610-711), with particular emphasis on the reigns of Caligula, Constantine the Great, Julian the Apostate, and Heraclius.

Abstracts and keywords / Resúmenes y palabras clave

Eusebius as Apologist and Church Historian

Andrew Louth

Abstract

This article argues for the coherence of Eusebius' scholarly activity, demonstrating that the several aspects of this multi-faceted scholar – exegete, apologist, theological controversialist, local historian chronographer, imperial encomiast, and church historian – all complement one another and are in danger of being misunderstood if taken in isolation.

Keywords

Eusebius. *Church History*. Apologetic. Exegesis. Chronography.

Resumen

Este artículo defiende la coherencia de la actividad literaria de Eusebio, demostrando que sus variados aspectos como autor -exégeta, apologista, teólogo polemista, cronógrafo de historia local, encomiasta imperial e historiador de la Iglesia- se complementan entre sí y corren el peligro de ser malentendidos si se consideran aisladamente.

Palabras clave

Eusebio. *Historia eclesiástica*. Apologética. Exégesis. Cronografía.

Documents, Letters and Canons in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Ecclesiastical History*

José B. Torres Guerra

Summary

This article studies the role played by epistles in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius of Caesarea. It is important to note that this history avoids attributing discourses to the persons it features and instead relies on citing documents of various types, epistles among them. Having noted that the epistle is a special type of *sermo,* I discount the theory that the reason for the inclusion of the letters in the *Ecclesiastical History* was the desire to introduce stylistic variation. I emphasize that certain terms that recur in the introductions to the letters throw light on the question: εἰς ἐπίδειξιν, κατὰ λέξιν, μαρτύριον, ἀντίγραφον; an analysis of these words shows that Eusebius was very conscious of the importance that the copies of the texts that he cites as documents (letters, among others) be faithful to the literality of the originals. I propose as a hypothesis that this emphasis on the fidelity and literality of the documents is related to the scripture-related category of canonicity first attested in Eusebius's work.

Keywords

Canon. Embedded letters. Eusebius. Historiography. Christian historiography.

Resumen

Este trabajo estudia el papel concedido a las cartas en la *Historia Eclesiástica* de Eusebio de Cesarea: se ha de destacar que esta obra renuncia a los discursos de sus personajes y propone, en su lugar, documentos de tipo diverso, epístolas entre ellos. Tras recordar que la epístola es un tipo especial de *sermo,* se descarta que la razón de la inclusión de las cartas en la *Historia Eclesiástica* haya sido el deseo de introducir variación estilística. El autor destaca la luz que arrojan sobre la cuestión ciertos términos que recurren en las introducciones a las cartas: εἰς ἐπίδειξιν, κατὰ λέξιν, μαρτύριον, ἀντίγραφον; el análisis de estas voces permite advertir que Eusebio era muy consciente de la necesidad de que las copias de los textos que cita como documentos (cartas, entre otros) se atengan a la literalidad de los originales. Se propone como hipótesis que este énfasis en la fiabilidad y literalidad de los documentos guarda relación con la categoría escriturística de canon que Eusebio acredita por vez primera.

Palabras clave

Canon. Cartas intercaladas. Eusebio. Historiografía. Historiografía cristiana.

Palestine as a Palimpsest: Eusebius' Construction of Memorial Space in the *Onomasticon*

Jan R. Stenger

Abstract

Eusebius of Caesarea's *Onomasticon*, an encyclopaedic compilation of Biblical place names, is believed to have been intended as an instrument for the exegesis of Scripture. The list, however, incorporates a large amount of information that relates to late antique reality and does not contribute to illuminating the meaning of the Biblical text. The Church Father has blended together two chronological layers, that of the Biblical past and that of his own times, to bring the events of sacred history into the present and reconfigure Palestine as a Christian memorial landscape. This technique feeds into his apologetic agenda, that is, to claim the Jewish past and the Holy Land for Christianity. Yet Palestine had already been inscribed with many historical events and various memories by different rulers and ethnic and religious groups. Thus the aim of the *Onomasticon* was to wipe out all these memories anchored in geographical space and replace them with the Christian view of history. The result is that Palestine is transformed, as it were, into a palimpsest, a semiotic landscape that is constantly revised and rewritten.

Keywords

Eusebius. Onomasticon. Palestine. Exegesis. Apologetic.

Resumen

Se cree que el *Onomasticon* de Eusebio de Cesarea, un compendio de topónimos bíblicos, fue proyectado como instrumento de exégesis de la Escritura. Sin embargo, la lista de topónimos incorpora una cantidad considerable de información referida a la realidad tardoantigua y no contribuye a esclarecer el significado del texto bíblico. Este Padre de la Iglesia fusionó dos estratos cronológicos, el del pasado bíblico y el de su propio tiempo, para ubicar los sucesos de la historia sagrada en el presente y convertir Palestina en un paisaje que conmemora el Cristianismo. Esta técnica coopera a su plan apologético, es decir, reivindicar el pasado judío y la Tierra Santa para el Cristianismo. No obstante, Palestina ya había sido inscrita con numerosos sucesos históricos y diversas memorias por parte de diferentes gobernantes y grupos étnicos y religiosos. Por tanto, el propósito del *Onomasticon* fue borrar todas esas memorias ancladas en el espacio geográfico y reemplazarlas con la visión cristiana de la historia. El resultado es que Palestina queda transformada como tal en un palimpsesto, un paisaje semiótico que es revisado y reescrito constantemente.

Palabras clave

Eusebio. *Onomasticon*. Palestina. Exégesis. Apologética.

Citing or Doctoring the Sources? Serapion and the *Gospel of Peter* in Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica*

Pablo M. Edo

Abstract

This paper examines a quotation from the treatise of Bishop Serapion of Antioch's work *About the so-called Gospel according to Peter*, that Eusebius of Caesarea commented on in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* (4.12). The text of Serapion is ambiguous and allows various interpretations, leading some scholars to suggest that Eusebius manipulated his sources on account of his specific quotations. This paper offers a translation and interpretation of the passage in attempts to verify whether Eusebius did in fact distort Serapion's meaning. The research also deals with descriptions of the *Gospel of Peter*, as known by Serapion in the 2nd century and corresponding to the Akhmîm Fragment, presumably our only extant evidence of that Gospel.

Keywords

Eusebius. Historical Reliability. *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Serapion. *Gospel of Peter*.

Resumen

Este estudio analiza una cita del tratado *Acerca del así llamado Evangelio según Pedro* compuesto por el obispo Serapión que Eusebio de Cesarea incluyó con un comentario introductorio en el capítulo 12 del libro IV de su *Historia Ecclesiastica*. El texto de Serapión es ambiguo y se presta a varias lecturas. Se ofrece por tanto aquí una traducción e interpretación del pasaje. Así será posible verificar en qué medida Eusebio de Cesarea pudo tergiversar las fuentes que empleaba, como algún autor ha afirmado tomando la cita de Serapión como ejemplo. Otras investigaciones posteriores podrán revisar también si las descripciones del *Evangelio de Pedro* que conoció Serapión en el siglo II se corresponden con el Fragmento de Akhmîm, probablemente nuestro único testimonio conservado de dicho evangelio.

Palabras clave

Eusebio. Fiabilidad histórica. *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Serapión. *Evangelio de Pedro*.

Las listas de obispos de Roma y Antioquía en la *Historia Eclesiástica* de Eusebio

Jerónimo Leal

Abstract

Episcopal lists attested to in the *Ecclesiastical History* have been repeatedly discussed within the Eusebian bibliography. Some scholars have appreciated the difficulties of interpreting the Eusebian texts on account of the terminology employed by Eusebius and the unequal duration of the alleged episcopates. This contribution analyses the validity of previous approaches through a careful discussion of the terminology employed and its consistency. The possibility that six bishops of Rome may correspond to three of Antioch is discussed in detail; different Eusebian texts must be analysed in detail in order to clarify the question; succession lists of bishops and emperors are also compared. The analysis throws light on evidence not taken into account until now and allows a reassessment of some viewpoints traditionally assumed by scholars.

Keywords

Apostles. Episcopal lists in Antioch. Episcopal lists in Rome. Saint Ignatius. Saint Peter.

Resumen

Un tema recurrente en los estudios eusebianos es el de las listas episcopales de la *Historia Eclesiástica*. Algunos críticos perciben diversas dificultades en la interpretación de los textos eusebianos, basándose en la terminología empleada por el autor de la *Historia Eclesiástica* y la duración desigual de los episcopados. En este estudio se analiza la validez de estas tesis a través de la coherencia terminológica, así como la posibilidad de una correspondencia entre los seis obispos de Roma con los tres de Antioquía, comparando entre sí los distintos textos de Eusebio y las listas de sucesiones de emperadores con las de obispos. De este análisis emergen algunas evidencias, no tenidas en cuenta hasta ahora, que permiten corregir las perspectivas de la crítica tradicional.

Palabras clave

Apóstoles. Listas episcopales en Antioquía. Listas episcopales en Roma. San Ignacio. San Pedro.

'Under this Sign you shall be the Ruler!' Eusebius, the *Chi-Rho* Letters and the *archē* of Constantine

Fernando López Sánchez

Abstract

According to the Christian Eusebius, Constantine saw a sign in the sky in the form of a cross shortly before the battle of the Milvian Bridge on October 28 of AD 312, and thanks to this he defeated his enemy Maxentius. According to Lactantius, also a Christian, what Constantine actually saw in the sky were the letters Chi-Rho, and not the form of a cross. This article aims to show that the Chi-Rho monogram should be understood as a contraction of the Greek words *archē* ("origin" and "sovereignity") or *archōn* ("chief" and "commander"). Constantine's vision of the Chi-Rho monogram in the sky may be related to earlier visions in both the Macedonian world and Rome, according to which Jupiter would recognise, after a number of solar interventions, the primacy of the favoured sovereigns over their competitors. The article also argues that the Bosphorus city of Constantinople, the favourite of Constantine as well as that of his legacy and his descendants, was also the city of the *archē* of Constantine. A study covering both the Hellenistic education of Eusebius and a number of Hellenistic and Roman coin series attempts to demonstrate that the vision at the Milvian Bridge recounted in the *Vita Constantini* was modelled on Hellenistic and Roman precedents well known to the author.

Keywords

Chi-Rho. Constantine. Dialogue with God(s). Army. Eusebius. Jupiter. Medallion. Coin.

Resumen

Según el cristiano Eusebio, Constantino vio una señal en el cielo en forma de cruz poco antes de la batalla del Puente Milvio el 28 de octubre del año 312, y gracias a ella derrotó a su enemigo Majencio. Según Lactancio, también cristiano, lo que realmente vio Constantino en el cielo fueron las letras *Chi-Rho* y no la forma de una cruz. Este artículo pretende mostrar que el monograma *Chi-Rho* debe ser entendido como una contracción de las palabras griegas *archē* ("origen" y "soberanía") o *archōn* ("jefe" y "comandante"). La visión de Constantino del monograma *Chi-Rho* en el cielo puede estar relacionado con visiones anteriores en el mundo macedonio y en Roma, según las cuales Júpiter reconocería, después de una serie de intervenciones solares, la primacía de determinados soberanos favorecidos por delante de sus competidores. El artículo también discute que la ciudad de Constantinopla en el Bósforo, la favorita de Constantino, así como de su herencia y de sus descendientes, fue también la ciudad de

la *archē* de Constantino. Un análisis tanto de la educación helenística de Eusebio, como de varias series de monedas helenísticas y romanas intenta demostrar que la visión del Puente Milvio relatada en la *Vita Constantini* estaba modelada según precedentes romanos y helenísticos bien conocidos por el autor.

Palabras clave
Chi-Rho. Constantino. Diálogo con la divinidad. Ejército. Eusebio. Júpiter. Medallón. Monedas.

Historia, *physiognomía* y encomio: la figura de Graciano en Amiano Marcelino

Carmen Castillo

Abstract

This article aims to highlight the influence of physiognomy and epideictic rhetoric in Ammianus' presentation of characters. Roman literary culture in the 4th century led to interactions and amalgamations between rhetorical and philosophical traditions that modelled the character of Roman historiography of the time, in which the biographical perspective possessed a special significance. While Ammianus differs from his contemporaries in so far as his literary project is of greater extension and scope, the presentation of his characters follows the principles of physiognomic writings, epidictic rhetoric and biography. After briefly describing the essential points of those traditions, the particular case of Gratian's portrait is analysed.

Keywords

Physiognomy. Biography. Encomium. Gratian. Character Portrayal.

Resumen

Este artículo se propone destacar la influencia combinada de la *physiognomía* y del encomio en la presentación de los personajes de Amiano Marcelino. La cultura literaria romana del siglo IV propició la interacción y amalgama de tradiciones retóricas y filosóficas que influyeron en el carácter de la historiografía romana del tiempo, en la que la perspectiva biográfica cobró una importancia esencial. Amiano Marcelino se diferencia respecto a sus contemporáneos en la medida en que compone unas *Res gestae* de mayor extensión y alcance; sin embargo, la presentación de sus personajes sigue los patrones de los escritos fisiognómicos, la retórica epidíctica y la biografía. Después de describir brevemente los puntos esenciales de estas tradiciones, se propone el caso concreto del retrato del emperador Graciano.

Palabras clave

Fisiognomía. Biografía. Encomio. Graciano. Caracterización de personajes.

Constantius, Julian, and the Fall of Sirmium

David Woods

Abstract

When Julian captured Sirmium in 361, he took captive Lucillianus, normally identified as the *magister equitum per Illyricum*, and two legions described only as *legiones Constantiacae*. I argue that these units are identifiable as the *Lancearii* and *Mattiarii* which Constantius II had sent to Illyricum under his *magister equitum praesentalis* Arbitio ahead of his own arrival there, that the Lucillianus who was captured with these units in 361 is identifiable as the Lucillianus who commanded them again on the Persian expedition in 363, and that he was a *comes rei militaris* under Arbitio when captured in 361. The *magister equitum per Illyricum* during this period is perhaps best identified as Iovinus, and his role explained as a senior defector whose support allowed Julian to advance as fast down the Danube as he did. Finally, the *magister equitum* whom Julian's forces famously captured sleeping at Sirmium in 361 is probably identifiable as Arbitio rather than Lucillianus.

Keywords

Julian. Sirmium. Lucillianus. Arbitio. Jovinus. Ammianus' sources.

Resumen

Cuando Juliano conquista Sirmio en el 361, toma prisionero a Luciliano, normalmente identificado como el *magister equitum per Illyricum*, y dos legiones descritas tan solo como *legiones Constantiacae*. Esas unidades son identificables con los *Lancearii* y *Mattiarii* que Constancio II había enviado al Ilírico bajo su *magister equitum prasentalis* Arbición con antelación a su propia llegada allí; que el Luciliano que fue capturado con estas unidades en el 361 se puede identificar con el Luciliano que las comandó de nuevo en la campaña persa del 363; y que éste era un *comes rei militaris* bajo Arbición cuando fue capturado en el 361. Lo más probable es que el *magister equitum per Illyricum* durante este periodo sea identificable con Jovino, importante traidor cuyo apoyo permitió a Juliano avanzar río abajo por el Danubio con tanta rapidez. Por último, el conocido *magister equitum* al que las fuerzas de Juliano capturaron dormido en Sirmio en el 361 es identificable probablemente con Arbición más que con Luciliano.

Palabras clave

Juliano. Sirmio. Luciliano. Arbición. Jovino. Fuentes de Amiano.

The *adventus* of the Emperor Julian in Ammianus Marcellinus's *Res gestae*

Matilde Caltabiano

Abstract

This article discusses in detail the Ammianus's narrations of Julian's imperial *adventus* in Vienne, Sirmium and Constantinople. The historian highlights the dynastic and religious significance of the entrance in Vienne. In the case of Sirmium, Ammianus avoids any detail that could suggest that the entrance implied the city's surrender in the context of a civil war. Finally, Julian's *adventus* in Constantinople alludes to Constantius's *adventus* in Rome. The examination shows that the historian progressively builds Julian's image, underlining the different nuances of legitimacy that the three occasions respectively convey: dynastic continuity, divine sanction and universal consensus.

Keywords

Imperial *adventus*. Julian. Imperial Image. Legitimacy.

Resumen

Este artículo analiza en detalle el relato que Amiano hace de los respectivos *adventus* imperiales de Juliano en Vienne, Sirmio y Constantinopla. En la entrada en Vienne, se subraya la significación dinástica y religiosa. Por su parte, Amiano evita cualquier detalle que sugiera que la entrada en Sirmio fue una rendición de la ciudad en el contexto de una guerra civil. Por último, el *adventus* de Juliano en Constantinopla alude al que tuvo Constancio en Roma. El examen permite observar que el historiador construye progresivamente la imagen de Juliano, subrayando los diversos matices de legitimidad, la continuidad dinástica, la sanción divina y el consenso universal, que tienen cada una de las tres ocasiones.

Palabras clave

Adventus imperial. Juliano. Imagen imperial. Legitimidad.

Ammianus on Eastern Lawyers (30.4): Literary Allusions and the Decline of Forensic Oratory

Álvaro Sánchez-Ostiz

Abstract

In the so-called "excursus on Eastern lawyers" (30.4), Ammianus includes a picturesque description of the lawyers in the Eastern Empire. This has traditionally been considered a chaotic accumulation of satiric motives, and it has been used as proof that the historian had problems with law professionals at Antioch. However, a detailed analysis of allusions to previous authors, especially Cicero, Gellius and Horace, emphasizes that the author was following an articulate plan and excludes any autobiographical value. Its purpose was to vividly highlight the decline of forensic oratory, precisely in the context of ignorance in Valens' reign that prevented Roman rulers from understanding the lessons from the past in a time of crisis.

Keywords

Allusions. Autobiographical comments. Historical explanation. Rhetoric. Decadence. *Exempla*.

Resumen

En 30.4, pasaje conocido como el "excurso de los abogados", Amiano incluye una pintoresca descripción de los abogados del Este del Imperio. Este capítulo de los últimos libros se ha considerado tradicionalmente un cúmulo caótico de motivos satíricos, y se ha usado asimismo como testimonio autobiográfico de que el historiador tuvo problemas con los abogados en Antioquía. Sin embargo, un análisis detallado de las alusiones a autores anteriores, especialmente a Cicerón, Aulo Gelio y Horacio, pone de relieve que el autor siguió un plan coherente y excluye que el pasaje tenga valor autobiográfico. Su propósito era subrayar de manera vívida la decadencia de la oratoria forense, precisamente en el contexto de incultura de Valente. El pasaje resulta, por tanto, paradigmático de la técnica historiográfica de Amiano, en la medida en que subraya cómo la ignorancia impidió a los gobernantes posteriores a Juliano leer las lecciones del pasado en un momento de crisis.

Palabras clave

Alusiones. Comentarios autobiográficos. Explicación histórica. Retórica. Decadencia. *Exempla*.

Dicta et visa: Rhetorical Strategies in Ammianus's *Res Gestae*
Alberto J. Quiroga Puertas

Abstract
This paper aims to explore the use of different rhetorical strategies in Ammianus Marcellinus's *Res Gestae*. Particular attention is paid to those strategies intended to provide the readers with detailed narrations and descriptions of historical events and of the oral interventions of the characters of his work. This approach sheds light on the literary and historiographical reasons for the use of these rhetorical strategies by Ammianus.

Keywords
Enargeia. *Ekphrasis*. *Actio*. Character Portrayal.

Resumen
Este estudio tiene como finalidad examinar el uso de diferentes estrategias retóricas en las *Res Gestae* de Amiano Marcelino. Se presta especial atención a aquellas estrategias destinadas a proporcionar a los lectores narraciones y descripciones detalladas de los sucesos históricos, así como de las intervenciones orales de los personajes de su obra. Con todo ello se espera esclarecer las intenciones literarias e historiográficas del uso de algunas estrategias por parte de Amiano.

Palabras clave
Enargeia. *Ekphrasis*. *Actio*. Caracterización de personajes.

Parody and Inversion of Literary Genres in Ammianus Marcellinus

Francisco J. Alonso

Abstract

The intertextuality present in the *Res Gestae* of Ammianus Marcellinus has received considerable attention; nonetheless, the use that the historian makes of literary genres and forms has not been the focus of attention in the secondary literature. This paper looks closely into how Ammianus deals with the different genres, with the purpose of emphasising his ability to build an historical discourse in a symbolic and dramatic form. Specifically, three cases (14.7, 14.11 and 26.6-10) are analysed, in which the historian inverts or parodies the forms of the rhetorical *adlocutio* and the tragedy. This examination provides an opportunity to delve into how Ammianus depicts his characters, thereby getting a glimpse of part of the author's historiographical *Weltanschauung* and his vision of the political situation.

Keywords

Intertextuality. Generic Inversion. *Adlocutio*. Tragedy. Parody. Character Portrayal.

Resumen

La intertextualidad en las *Res gestae* de Amiano Marcelino ha recibido considerable atención y, a pesar de ello, el uso que el historiador hace de los géneros y formas literarias no ha acaparado especial interés en la literatura especializada. Este trabajo dirige una mirada atenta a la forma en que Amiano trata los distintos géneros, con el fin de poner de relieve su habilidad para construir el significado del discurso histórico de manera simbólica y dramática. De forma específica, el análisis de tres casos (14.7, 14.11 y 26.6-10) en los que el historiador invierte o parodia las formas de la *adlocutio* retórica y la tragedia abre la posibilidad de profundizar en la forma en que caracteriza a sus personajes y, además, deja entrever parte de la cosmovisión historiográfica del autor y su visión de la coyuntura política.

Palabras clave

Intertextualidad. Inversión genérica. *Adlocutio*. Tragedia. Parodia. Caracterización de personajes.

Abreviations

AE	*L'Année épigraphique.*
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.*
BMC	*British Museum Catalogue.*
CAH	*The Cambridge Ancient History.*
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.*
FGrHist	F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin 1923-.
ILS	H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae.*
LSJ	H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart Jones (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1940[9].
NDPAC	A. Di Berardino (ed.), *Nuovo Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane*, Genoa-Milan 2006-2010.
PG	J.P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Patrologia Graeca*, Paris, 1857-1866.
PL	J.P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Patrologia Latina*, Paris, 1844-1855.
PLRE	A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale, J. Morris (eds.), *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire I (AD 260-395)*, Cambridge 1971.
RE	*Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.*
RIC	H. Mattingly, E.A. Sydenham, C.H.V Sutherland, R.A.G Carson, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, London 1923-1994.
SCh	*Sources Chrétiennes*, Paris, 1941-.

AMMIANUS, EUSEBIUS AND 4TH-CENTURY HISTORIOGRAPHY: FROM DUSK TO DAWN?

Álvaro Sánchez-Ostiz
asostiz@unav.es
José B. Torres Guerra
jtorres@unav.es
Universidad de Navarra

Greek and Latin historiography from the 4th century is mapped by two prominent figures, who wrote respectively at the beginning and end of that period: Eusebius of Caesarea and Ammianus Marcellinus. However, their history is anything but a progression from dusk to dawn i.e., it is not a linear development from the end of the classical tradition, seemingly concluded by Ammianus's *Res gestae* in Latin, to the genre of Christian historiography, inaugurated in Greek by Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica*.[1] In fact, Ammianus is not an epigone, but rather an isolated figure, for there is no evidence of Latin authors undertaking any extensive literary projects similar to that of *the Res gestae* during either the 3rd or 4th centuries.[2] On the other hand, Christian historiographers writing in Greek coexist with pagan authors who continued composing the history of the Roman Empire in the classical manner at least until Zosimus.

This volume is based on the assumption that collating particular studies on the literary technique and interpretation of Eusebius and Ammianus could help delve into the general traits of continuity and discontinuity of historiography in the literary culture of Late Antiquity. Drawing a direct comparison between Eusebius and Ammianus has to cope with non-minor methodological difficulties. Their works were composed during the broad lapse of the 4th century, but they did not interrelate with each other: the original version of Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica* is datable to the first years of that century, although its final version is from 325;[3] for his part,

[1] Following Eusebius's work Socrates Scholasticus, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius wrote also *Historiae Ecclesiasticae*: G. F. Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories*, Macon 1986[2]; H. Leppin, *Von Constantin dem Großen zu Theodosius II.: Das christliche Kaisertum bei den Kirchenhistorikern Socrates, Sozomenus und Theodoret*, Göttingen 1996; Id., "The Church Historians (I): Socrates, Sozomenus, and Theodoretus", in G. Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, Leiden 2003, 219-54.

[2] Moreover, while the most cultivated Latin historical genres of the 4th century, especially epitomes and biographies, are not comparable to Ammianus's work, had an impact on it: see Castillo's contribution in this volume.

[3] There is not a wide consensus on the date of the first edition (Books 1-7): see R. W.

Ammianus completed his *Res gestae* in about 390.[4] In addition, both historians' backgrounds are definitely diverse: Eusebius was a Christian bishop in Palestine between the 3rd and the 4th centuries and he lived during the last persecutions against the Christians as well as when they were recognized and elevated by Constantine, a figure that the historian held in the highest esteem.[5] Contrastingly, Ammianus was a pagan author of Greek origin who composed an ambitious historical work in Latin in the second half of the 4th century. Unlike Eusebius, he witnessed the frustrated attempt to restore the old religion by his favourite hero, Julian.

Another important difference between them is the extent of their preserved work: Eusebius'[6] corpus also comprises the *Onomasticon*, the *Chronicon*, the *Vita Constantini*, the apologetic writings *Praeparatio* and *Demonstratio Evangelica* that shed light on his main purposes and method of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, as well as other exegetical and theological writings.[7] By contrast, the thirty-one books of Ammianus's *Res gestae* seemingly dealt with the history of Rome over 250 years, from the end of the 1st Century up to his time (96-353). However, since the first thirteen books are lost, his work only covers the 25 years of Constantius II's, Julian's, Valentinian's and Valens's reigns (353-378).[8] The fact that the preserved parts of the *Histories* are our only source of information about Ammianus's life reinforces the renowned idea of loneliness attributed to him.[9]

Burgess, "The Dates and Editions of Eusebius's 'Chronici Canones' and 'Historia Ecclesiastica'", *JThS* 48, 1997, 471-504, O. Andrei, "Canons chronologiques et Histoire ecclésiastique", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 33-82, V. Neri, "Les éditions de l'Histoire ecclésiastique (livres VIII-IX) : bilan critique et perspectives de la recherche", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 151-83, M.-Y. Perrin, M. Cassin, M. Debie, "La question des éditions de l'Histoire ecclésiastique et le livre X", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012.

[4] According to the traditional view, Books 14–25 would be datable c. 390 and Books 26–31 later in the 390s. However, there is no compelling argument for supposing a different date for each part: see M. Kulikowski, "Coded Polemic in Ammianus Book 31 and the Date and Place of its Composition", *JRS* 102, 2012, 79-102 with reference to previous bibliography.

[5] Up-to-date bibliography on Eusebius can be found in S. Morlet, "Eusèbe de Césarée : biographie, chronologie, profil intellectual", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 1-31.

[6] A. P. Johnson, "Eusebius's Polemic against Porphyry: A Reassessment", in S. Inowlocki, C. Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius*, Leiden 2011, 119-50, underscores even the pedagogical dimension of some of Eusebius's writings.

[7] Without a doubt, his *Vita Constantini* is also apologetical, at least in its origin: T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge 1981, 267-71.

[8] With a remarkable unevenness in favour of Julian.

[9] The label "lonely historian" attributed to Ammianus first by Momigliano (A. Momigliano, "The Lonely Historian Ammianus Marcellinus", *ASNP* 3, 1974, 1393-407) has become standard

Due to these divergences, a *synkrisis* of both historians runs the risk of merely verifying how much Eusebius and Ammianus's works differed in terms of language and style, in self-imposed aims and scale, as well as in method and scope. However, both authors remarkably coincide in their awareness of being respectively pioneering and concluding a literary tradition. Eusebius's bold statements in the "opening of the beginning", i.e. the first chapter of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, make this clear (1.1):

> Τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχὰς σὺν καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς διηνυσμένοις χρόνοις, ὅσα τε καὶ πηλίκα πραγματευθῆναι κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἱστορίαν λέγεται, (…) γραφῇ παραδοῦναι προηρημένος, οὐδ' ἄλλοθεν ἢ ἀπὸ πρώτης ἄρξομαι τῆς κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκονομίας. ἀλλά μοι συγγνώμην εὐγνωμόνων ἐντεῦθεν ὁ λόγος αἰτεῖ, μείζονα ἢ καθ' ἡμετέραν δύναμιν ὁμολογῶν εἶναι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἐντελῆ καὶ ἀπαράλειπτον ὑποσχεῖν, ἐπεὶ καὶ πρῶτοι νῦν τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἐπιβάντες οἷά τινα ἐρήμην καὶ ἀτριβῆ ἰέναι ὁδὸν ἐγχειροῦμεν…
>
> Since it is my purpose to hand down a written account of the successions of the holy Apostles as well as of the times extending from our Saviour to ourselves; the number and nature of the events which are said to have been treated in ecclesiastical history (…) I shall begin with the first dispensation of God in our Saviour and Lord, Jesus Christ. But at this point my account asks for the indulgence of the reasonable, for I confess that it is beyond my power to fulfil the promise completely and perfectly, since we are the first to enter upon the undertaking, attempting, as it were, to travel a deserted and untrodden road…[10]

One prominent novelty in Eusebius's work is his focus on the legitimacy of the Church until his day. The Bishop does not feel compelled to explain facts, but to attest that the baton has not been dropped along the relay race, from the "first dispensation of God in our Saviour and Lord" until his own days. This new emphasis explains why his narration quotes testimonies and written documents with a frequency never seen before in Greco-Roman historiography.[11]

---

expression alluding to the historian's isolation in the literary and textual tradition: the text of the *Res gestae* basically relies on the *Codex Fuldensis*, single copy of the fragmentary *Hersfeldensis*: C. U. Clark, *The Text Tradition of Ammianus Marcellinus*, New Haven 1904; W. Seyfarth, *Ammianus Marcellinus. Römische Geschichte. Lateinisch und deutsch mit einem Kommentar*, Darmstadt 1968, 40-46; L. D. Reynolds, "Ammianus Marcellinus", in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission*, Oxford 1983, 6-8.

[10] Translation by R. J. Deferrari, *Eusebius Pamphili. Ecclesiastical History, Books 1–5*, Washington 1953.

[11] See papers by Louth and Torres in this volume.

Contrastingly, in the "closing of the end", as the *sphragis* of the *Res gestae* can be categorized, Ammianus *claims* to have explained the events and deeds from Nerva's principate to Valens' death according to generic expectations that connected his work, via Tacitus, with a historiographical tradition that went back to Herodotus (31.16.9):[12]

> Haec, ut miles quondam et Graecus, a principatu Caesaris Neruae exorsus ad usque Valentis interitum, pro uirium explicaui mensura, opus ueritatem professum numquam, ut arbitror, sciens silentio ausus corrumpere uel mendacio. Scribant reliqua potiores aetate, doctrinis florentes. Quos id, si libuerit, adgressuros, procudere linguas ad maiores moneo stilos.
>
> These events, from the principate of the emperor Nerva to the death of Valens, I, a former soldier and a Greek, have set forth to the measure of my ability, without ever (I believe) consciously venturing to debase through silence or through falsehood a work whose aim was the truth. The rest may be written by abler men, who are in the prime of life and learning. But if they chose to undertake such a task, I advise them to forge their tongues to the loftier style.[13]

It might be discussed whether the "loftier styles" necessarily refer to the panegyric modes, more appropriate to the new era, or to another literary genre. However, it seems clear that the historian feels that he has completed their stories at a crucial moment and is envisaging an uncertain future.

Notwithstanding these nonconformities, the idea of taking Eusebius and Ammianus as representative figures of the 4th century and contrasting their works arose as a natural result of the studies carried out by the research group GRAECAPTA[14] that since 2004 has gathered philologists interested in the interactions between the Greek and Latin languages and literatures[15]. In this context, the group specifically devoted three years (2011-2013) to the project entitled "Linguistic and Cultural Otherness in the Roman Empire (3rd – 5th centuries): Historiography and Related Genres".

[12] On Ammianus's *sphragis* see G. Kelly, "The Sphragis and Closure of the Res gestae", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 219-41; Id., *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian*, Cambridge 2008, 318-21.

[13] Translation by J. C. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus with an English Translation*, London 2006 (=1939).

[14] See http://www.unav.edu/centro/graecapta/.

[15] So far, the research group has coordinated three projects funded by Spain's Ministry of Education: in a first phase their research analysed (2004-2007) how some Latin texts could have acted as hypotexts for some Greek literary creations, and later (2008-2010) focused on the literary and social bilingualism.

The main purpose of that enquiry became the analysis of a delimited corpus or representative authors (historians and panegyrists, pagans and Christians, Latin and Greek)[16] from the perspective of three pivotal questions: their awareness of the linguistic dissimilarity as a cultural difference; the social bilingualism of prominent historical figures; and the perception of bilingualism, interpretation and translation of the languages of the Empire. The project on linguistic and cultural otherness in the Roman Empire concentrated on two genres, historiography and panegyrics that were often akin by their contents as evidenced by the Latin panegyrics, and in a particular way, Eusebius's *Life of Constantine*, a work of complex generic assignment.[17] In this last phase of research, multiculturalism has been considered not only from the point of view of the Latin-Greek and East-West oppositions, but also from the pagan-Christian dichotomy. This proved to be crucial for an accurate understanding of the changing literary and cultural world of the 4th century.

In line with these objectives, the group organized an international workshop "Beginning and End: From Ammianus Marcellinus to Eusebius of Caesarea", held at the University of Navarra in Pamplona, December 12-13, 2013. This workshop aimed to contrast those two fundamental historiographical works that coincide in loose terms in the 4th century and that embody two different, though interwoven, religious, linguistic and literary worlds. Twelve speakers working at different universities in Spain (Granada, Navarra) and elsewhere in Europe (Cork, Durham, Glasgow, Milan, Rome), as well as in the British Museum in London were invited to the meeting. Two of them delivered keynote papers: Andrew Louth (Durham University) spoke on "Eusebius as Apologist and Church Historian", and Carmen Castillo (University of Navarra) dealt with the relation of rhetoric, character portrayal and historiography in her lecture "Historia y encomio: la figura de Graciano en Amiano Marcelino".

The papers contained in this volume are mainly revised versions of contributions delivered on that occasion. However, these pages are not merely the proceedings of that workshop. Some of the debated texts have not been integrated, and the paper of one member of the GRAECAPTA group who could not attend the sessions has been included. On the other hand, some papers discussed at those sessions have only presented a particular aspect of

[16] The corpus included Ammianus (pagan Latin historiography), Eusebius (Christian Greek historiography), the pagan *Panegyrici Latini* and Claudian's poetry. For their part, Eunapius's and Zosimus's works (Greek pagan historians), Jerome's *De viris illustribus* (Christian Latin biography), Julian's and Libanius's (Greek pagan encomiastic writings) and Eusebius's *Vita Constantini* (Christian encomiastic biography in Greek) have been taken as contrasting points.

[17] Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 255; Id., "Panegyric, History and Hagiography in Eusebius's *Life of Constantine*", in R. Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, Cambridge 1989, 94-123.

a broader research, and some of the final contributions only developed a particular point of the original presentation. All in all, the most relevant differences are due to the fact that interventions were treated as work-in-progress papers whose common discussion would later enrich the final text.

The volume, as now presented, is structured according to a strictly chronological principle, and begins therefore with collaborations on Eusebius:

- Andrew Louth highlights in his article a central aspect for a fully understanding of the agenda of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*: this historiographical work cannot be detached from the other aspects of the Bishop's personality and writings. Thus Eusebius, author also of an exegetical, theological and apologetic work, remains an exegete, a theologian and, above all, an apologist in his *Historia*. Louth highlights several passages of this text, in particular in its introductory chapters, and comments in detail.

- José B. Torres' collaboration poses another major question: Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica* drastically reduces the role of the speeches, in contrast to previous historiographical works in which those were a constant component. The historian replaced them with documents and, among these, by another type of *sermones*, written letters that, compared to the speeches which could not be recorded in antiquity as today, have the advantage of being verifiable and, therefore, faithful and authentic testimony, despite the risks of manipulation that they were exposed to.

- Jan R. Stenger's paper ("Eusebius's Onomasticon of Biblical Place Names: The Historical Dimension of Space") introduces an apparent dodge in the book, focusing on the *Onomasticon*. Interestingly, as indicated in the subtitle, Eusebius was capable of using his list of biblical toponyms to introduce historical information through the description of space, that is to say, to describe the space of Palestine in historical terms, presenting it as a Christian territory from the Old Testament's days.

- Pablo M. Edo returns in his contribution to the *Historia Ecclesiastica* closely evaluating what Eusebius transmitted and declared in *HE* 1.6.12 in relation to a work by Serapion entitled *About the So-Called Gospel according to Peter*. This lost work offered information about that text and discussed whether it was an apocryphal or a canonical Gospel. Edo's analysis deals with the important issue of Eusebius's view of the canon and the accuracy with which he handled his sources.

- For his part, Jerónimo Leal confronts the succession of bishops in their sees from times of the Apostles, a point that Eusebius considered a key argument from the beginning of his *Historia Ecclesiastica* (1.1). His examination zooms in on the information about Rome and Antioch, as a traditional line of interpretation has considered chronologically incompatible the testimonies of the Bishop of Caesarea and Ignatius about these

two sees. However, Leal proposes that an accurate analysis of the texts allows one to solve the alleged discrepancies.

- The following paper by Fernando López-Sánchez's acts as the volume's equator. It is, indeed, a particular study in which the Eusebian thematic seems to have been put aside. However, this collaboration discusses the origin and first meaning of the so-called Christian anagram used by Constantine after the battle at the Milvian Bridge. Still, the vision of the Emperor, the invention of the Labarum and their Christian interpretation became for obvious reasons a central matter for Eusebius's *Life of Constantine* (*VC* 1.28.2).[18]

- Carmen Castillo opens the section dedicated to Ammianus, putting forward some observations about the historian's technique of character portrayal. She takes the particular case of Gratian's figure in the *Res gestae* to underscore the coincidences and differences between Ammianus's work and other Latin historians of the 4th century, highlighting especially the elements in common with the biography, panegyrics and the physiognomical writings. In this sense, she shows how the amalgamation of elements of different genre has a precise objective in the characters' rhetorical presentation.

- Woods closely revises Ammianus's narrative of the year 361 in 21.9.6-12.3, pointing out significant inconsistences probably due to an attempt by the historian to fit the events into his picture of Julian and Constantius. Particularly, the defection of the *magister equitum per Illyricum* could be interpreted in negative terms for Julian and would have put Constantius in a positive light. Thus, in this case, Ammianus's narrative is ambiguous, either because Ammianus did not get the course of events straight, or because he intentionally used vagueness to suit his propagandistic agenda.

- Moreover, Matilde Caltabiano also reviews the narrative of the year 361, focusing on how Ammianus presents Julian's *adventus* in Vienne, Sirmium and Constantinople. The selection of motifs, description of the details and the echoes between the three stories would have built up a progressive image of imperial legitimacy and gradually mythified the hero of the *Res gestae*.

- For his part, Álvaro Sánchez-Ostiz examines the passage known as "excursus on the lawyers" (Amm. 30.4) in which Ammianus claims that he would give account of the Eastern lawyers' *indignitas*, because he knew the problem at first hand (*quam in illis partibus agens expertus sum*, 30.4.4). A close analysis of the literary allusions in this chapter reveals that Ammianus careful and colourfully describes four stages in the decadence of oratory. Such decline, however, is a noteworthy constituent in the plan of the Res gestae, as it highlights the general ignorance of Va-

[18] See also *HE* 9.9.10-11.

lens' times, which made it impossible to discover appropriate remedies in History for the evils that were threatening the Empire.

- Alberto Quiroga's study connects Ammianus's use of *ekphrasis* and *enargeia* with the presentation of characters. Specifically, his contribution focuses on analysing the rhetorical performances described in the story that bring a vivid presentation of characters and events, as well as an ethical point of view about the narration.

- Alonso's paper closely investigates three particular cases of generic reversal, taken as a particular form of intertextuality. In 14.7 the historian caricatures an imperial *adlocutio*; whereas 14.11 and 26.6-10 blend comedy and tragedy. Such generic allusions are significant elements of the author's historical discourse, particularly regarding his portrayal of characters and approach to the events.

Certainly, this volume did not have the purpose of establishing a contrasting evaluation of merits, or even less a contest about literary fineness or historical reliability. It did not aspire to fully respond to each of the issues posed by the comparison between Eusebius and Ammianus either. Due to its own spirit, this collective work directs the spotlight on particular aspects of these two authors that illustrate general processes or trends, continuities and discontinuities in the Greek and Latin historical prose from the 4th century. However the works collected here do put forward some clues for a desirable more general *synkrisis*.

Indirectly Louth, Torres, Stenger, Castillo, and Alonso allude to the different conception that both authors have of time, which in turn marks their different ways of explaining history or of viewing Rome's role in History. Eusebius assumed that time had had a beginning and was directed to an end, and in addition a particular divine intervention had put a landmark in the course of centuries.[19] Instead Ammianus framed his narrative discourse in nonlinear time categories. This does not necessarily mean that he expected better times to follow the disastrous times that he lived in, but that in his narration what happens in the present repeats paradigms of the past and at the same time it unceasingly creates new paradigms for the future.

Such a conception reveals, on the one hand, the respective optimism and pessimism of both authors: for the historian from Caesarea, after "the first dispensation of God", even better times were yet to come until the full completion of this world (Torres, Stenger); by contrast, the *Res gestae* verified that after Constantine, Rome has only been able to understand and imitate the vices, not the virtues of earlier times (Castillo, Caltabiano, Sánchez-Ostiz).

[19] *HE* 1.1: ἀπὸ πρώτης… τῆς κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκονομίας.

Correspondingly, Eusebius and Ammianus's diverging views of time and history define their different ways of giving authority to historical discourse. The Bishop certified the uninterrupted succession of the Church by a plethora of documents, witnesses, quotations, chronology and topography (Louth, Torres, Stenger) and, therefore, an antiquity–based legitimacy of Christianity (Edo, Leal, López-Sánchez). For his part, Ammianus narrated and explained the history "by digestion": proverbs, literary allusions (Sánchez-Ostiz, Quiroga, Alonso), and *exempla* contribute to digest events and deeds (Woods, Caltabiano), arranging them in categories of historical and literary tradition in the way that volumes are placed in a vast library.

The title of this volume has maintained that of the workshop held at the University of Navarra. The reason to do so was to preserve the original sense of paradox. So the heading alludes to the beginning and end of two different historiographical trends that happened during the 4th century, but also to the various perceptions of epochal beginning and end, of dusk and dawn, in the literary culture of that period. It is the aspiration of this volume to serve as a beginning for further research, developing in more detail the comparison between the *Historia Ecclesiastica* in the context of Eusebius's entire corpus, and Ammianus's lonely *Histories*.

EUSEBIUS AS APOLOGIST AND CHURCH HISTORIAN

Andrew Louth
University of Durham
andrew.louth@durham.ac.uk

Eusebius was an enormously prolific scholar: he was an exegete, apologist, in the broad sense it bears in the early patristic tradition – not just defending Christianity against attacks on its truth or coherence, but also advancing learned arguments for its truth – , theological controversialist, local historian – topographer of the Holy Places, and recorder of the events in Palestine during the Great Persecution – , chronographer, imperial encomiast, and, of course, church historian. His fame and importance as a church historian have always been recognized – later historians continued where he left off, and never attempted to rework what he had done: implicit acknowledgment of his unique significance. And it may be that his indispensable role in recording the history of the Church led to other of his works being preserved that might otherwise have been lost to us, for his role in the history through which he lived was marred: no great confessor of the Faith, and, as a theologian, counted among those opposed to what came to be thought of as Nicene theology as promoted by St Athanasios, and largely followed by later historians and theologians as the true tradition of the Church. All these aspects of Eusebius the scholar are complementary: the apologist and the church historian are recognizably the same person, identical with the exegete, controversialist and encomiast. I want in this lecture to explore some of the ways in which these different aspects of Eusebius contribute to each other.

In most, maybe all, of these aspects of scholarship, Eusebius stands in an already existing tradition. As an exegete, through his association with Pamphilus, he stands in the tradition – or one of the traditions – of Origen's biblical scholarship, which included not just interpretation, in the form of both homily and commentary, but concern for the state of the text of the Scriptures and consciousness of variety in the textual tradition – a twofold process, both directed towards establishing a text to be copied, but also drawing on the various readings as a way of amplifying, as it were, the possible meanings and resonance of the text. Eusebius illustrates both these dimensions: the former in the tribute paid him by the Emperor in putting him in charge of providing codices of the Scriptures for the principal churches of the Empire; the latter in the way in which Eusebius himself draws on the differ-

ent translations of the Hebrew texts to draw out meaning not contained in the Septuagintal reading; both these concerns, I would argue, were Origen's own. As an apologist, Eusebius inherits a long tradition, going back to the second century with great names such as Justin Martyr and Theophilos of Antioch. With Eusebius, the tradition of engaging with ancient philosophy develops the more expansive mode found in such earlier writers as Hippolytos – develops it, maybe, to the point of absurdity with an over-abundance of citations from the philosophers, mostly, it seems, attempting to demonstrate the multitude of contradictions found in the Hellenic tradition, though beneath this wealth of citations, there can be discerned some traditional apologetic themes: the antiquity of the tradition found in Christianity, and the glimmerings of the truth present in the philosophical tradition, though only to be discerned from the perspective of the truth of the Gospel. So far as Eusebius as a chronographer is concerned, the links between Eusebius and Julius Africanus, who lived a century before him need to be explored, and I shall make something of an attempt later on.

I mention this evidence of Eusebius' entering into an already existing, and indeed lively, tradition, for in the case of *Church history*, Eusebius presents himself as "the first to venture on such a project and to set out on what is indeed a lonely and untrodden path" and, after seeking divine guidance, continues: "As for men, I have failed to find any clear footprints of those who have gone this way before me; only faint traces, by which in differing fashions they have left us partial accounts of their own lifetimes". Eusebius warms to this account of his lonely task, and remarks: "Raising their voices like warning lights far ahead and calling out as from a distant watch-tower perched on some hill, they make clear to me by what path I must walk and guide the course of my book": and he continues for several more lines his metaphor of a lonely wanderer.[1] There is certainly some truth in Eusebius' sense of the novelty of the task he has set himself in writing a history of the Church, but it is striking how he seems to qualify his claim by referring to others who, if not actually writing church history, mark out his path for him. The scholar's consciousness of the traditions of thought to which he is indebted seems to me to lie behind this extended metaphor, and suggests to me that he was fully aware of how he was constructing the notion of church history from other, more established, theological traditions, themselves interlocking. As his prologue continues, he asserts that his church history had found a kind of prelude in the *Chronici Canones*, or *Chronological Tables*, that he had earlier published.

[1] *HE* 1.1.3. I have used the translation of G.A. Williamson, lightly revised by myself, in G. A. Williamson, A. Louth, *Eusebius. The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine*, London 1969.

I want to pursue two lines of investigation: the first goes back to the *Chronici Canones*, behind which lie the *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus, which itself belongs to the historical dimension of the apologetic endeavour; my second line of investigation will concentrate on the first book of the *Church History*, in which we can discern the context in which Eusebius wanted his *History* to be read, and the principles in the light of which he was writing. Together, these lines of enquiry will enable us to see the nature of Eusebius' new endeavour and, furthermore, enable us to assess how new this endeavour really was.

In the very first sentence of the preface to the *Chronici Canones*, Eusebius remarks that the fact that Moses lived in the time of Inachus, who preceded the Trojan War by 700 years, has been demonstrated by "[M]en distinguished for their teaching, such as Clement, Africanus, and Tatian among the Christians and Josephus and Justus among the Jews".[2] Two of those names are particularly important: Africanus and Josephus. The importance of Josephus for Eusebius is well known: he makes extensive use of him in the *Church History*, and it seems clear that his notion of what he was doing in the *Church History* owes something to Josephus, not least its apologetic function, of which we shall have more to say later. With Africanus the case is somewhat different. His *Chronographiae* survive in citations scattered over many writers from the Byzantine period. Only recently, with Martin Wallraff"s completion of the edition begun by Heinrich Gelzer in the nineteenth century, but never published (or indeed completed), that we are able to form a just impression of this work, which dates from the early 220s. It was a substantial work, in five books. More than that, it was not just a compilation of sources; it was compiled, or written, to some purpose. It is worth quoting from Wallraff's introduction:

> The literary character of Africanus' chronology is equally difficult to determine [equal to the question of the precise dimensions of the work], particularly since the author did not adhere to any established genre. Indeed, his work is highly innovative in a number of ways, possessing varied and far-flung roots. The chronicle might be considered a rendition and re-adaptation of Hellenistic universal historiography, founded in a Christian theological framework, with a particular bias for Jewish history. As early as the second century, historical debates were becoming increasingly important within learned Christian circles. Such arguments not only concerned the history of Christianity itself (which was disappointingly new anyway) but also its older Jewish roots. In apologetic contexts, the truth of the Christian message

[2] I have quoted from the translation given as an appendix to R. W. Burgess, "The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' 'Chronici Canones' and 'Historia Ecclesiastica'", *JThS* 48, 1997, 471-504.

> depended above all on the age of its doctrine. As a consequence, the chronological relationship that existed between Moses and Plato, or of that between Moses and Homer, already attracted a certain level of interest. Theophilus of Antioch and Clement of Alexandria pushed the argument even further, affirming the existence of a historical continuum that went from creation right up to the present day. In such a way, Christian roots were traced back to the remotest possible point, beyond which no history could be conceived.[3]

As Martin Wallraff himself remarks, one needs to exercise some caution in drawing conclusions from the extant fragments, the nature of which varies very greatly.[4] Nevertheless, it is difficult to dissent from his characterization of the context within which Africanus worked, and the considerations behind his compilation of the *Chronographiae*. What he says about Africanus' purpose, including its innovative character, is very close to what many scholars would want to say about Eusebius, both in his *Chronology* and in his *Church History*. In both cases we have Hellenistic universal history conceived as a matrix for an essentially apologetic argument, which itself is dependent on, though in conflict with, Jewish attempts at the same kind of argument. It is clear from the passage from Eusebius' preface to the *Chronological Canons*, already quoted, that Eusebius knew Africanus. It is difficult to avoid the conviction that Eusebius knew Africanus very well, was inspired by him, and strove to excel him; this is borne out by the several places in which Eusebius quotes Africanus only to criticize him. Inspired by Africanus' achievement, he needed to demonstrate that his work not only amplified the work of his predecessor, but furthermore replaced it. Nevertheless, what we can now glean from Wallraff's edition makes it clear that Africanus' *Chronographiae* were more than a compilation, but part of the apologetic argument that had begun to evolve in the second century. Eusebius' "lonely and untrodden path" had already been marked out; Eusebius was not the first to explore it.

Maybe I am being too hard on Eusebius, for it is about his *History of the Church*, not his *Chronological Tables*, that Eusebius makes his claim to be a lonely pioneer. How does this alter the case? In book one of the *History of the Church*, Eusebius introduces his subject in two ways: first of all, he gives in outline the subjects that he is going to pursue in writing his *History of the Church*; secondly, he prepares the ground before embarking on the subjects he has just outlined, for it is only with book two that we embark on the history, as he had laid it down in the opening words of book one.

[3] M. Wallraff (ed.), *Iulius Africanus. Chronographiae: The Extant Fragments*, Berlin 2007, XX–XXI.

[4] See ibid., LV.

The *History of the Church* begins by stating the work's *hypothesis* – a literary term roughly corresponding to what we would call the "plot" of the work – which can be summarized under five headings (*HE* 1.1.1-2):

> Τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχὰς σὺν καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς διηνυσμένοις χρόνοις, ὅσα τε καὶ πηλίκα πραγματευθῆναι κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἱστορίαν λέγεται, καὶ ὅσοι ταύτης διαπρεπῶς ἐν ταῖς μάλιστα ἐπισημοτάταις παροικίαις ἡγήσαντό τε καὶ προέστησαν, ὅσοι τε κατὰ γενεὰν ἑκάστην ἀγράφως ἢ καὶ διὰ συγγραμμάτων τὸν θεῖον ἐπρέσβευσαν λόγον.
>
> The lines of succession from the holy apostles, and the periods that have elapsed from our Saviour's time to our own; the many important events recorded in the story of the Church; the outstanding leaders and heroes of that story in the most famous Christian communities; the men of each generation who by preaching or writing were ambassadors of the divine word.

> τίνες τε καὶ ὅσοι καὶ ὁπηνίκα νεωτεροποιίας ἱμέρῳ πλάνης εἰς ἔσχατον ἐλάσαντες, ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως εἰσηγητὰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀνακεκηρύχασιν, ἀφειδῶς οἷα λύκοι βαρεῖς τὴν Χριστοῦ ποίμνην ἐπεντρίβοντες.
>
> The names and dates of those who through a passion for innovation have wandered as far as possible from the truth, proclaiming themselves the founts of knowledge falsely so called while mercilessly, like savage wolves, making havoc of Christ's flock.

> πρὸς ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ τὰ παραυτίκα τῆς κατὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιβουλῆς τὸ πᾶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος περιελθόντα.
>
> The calamities that immediately after their conspiracy against our Saviour overwhelmed the entire Jewish race.

> ὅσα τε αὖ καὶ ὁποῖα καθ' οἵους τε χρόνους πρὸς τῶν ἐθνῶν ὁ θεῖος πεπολέμηται λόγος, καὶ πηλίκοι κατὰ καιροὺς τὸν δι' αἵματος καὶ βασάνων ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ διεξῆλθον ἀγῶνα.
>
> The widespread, bitter, and recurrent campaigns launched by unbelievers against the divine message, and the heroism with which, when occasion demanded, men faced torture and death to maintain the fight in its defence.

> τά τ' ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς μαρτύρια καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἵλεω καὶ εὐμενῆ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἀντίληψιν γραφῇ παραδοῦναι προηρημένος.

> The martyrdoms of later days down to my own time, and at the end of it all the kind and gracious deliverance accorded by our Saviour.

Before, however, embarking on this account, he says he will start from the beginning of the dispensation (οἰκονομία) of "our Saviour and Lord, Jesus the Christ of God". After his extended account of the "lonely and untrodden path" he has embarked on, he makes a start by exploring the beginning, a beginning – ἀρχή – found in Christ, who belongs both to the realm of the *oikonomia* and that of *theologia*. This takes us back beyond anything the human can conceive of, beyond anything belonging to human history, so that "by this means, both the antiquity and the divine character of Christian origins will be demonstrated to those who imagine them to be recent and outlandish, appearing yesterday for the first time" (*HE* 1.2.1).

So it is with Christ that he begins his *History of the Church*, Christ, already perceived as twofold, as he is the object of the discourses of both *oikonomia* and *theologia*. He continues by emphasizing the unknowability of Christ, giving a list of quotations from Scripture that make clear his ineffability, so that he is only known by the Father. He ends his citations from Scripture by quoting the opening words of the Fourth Gospel: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things came into being through Him, and apart from Him came into being not one thing" (Io. 1.1-3). The purpose of this is to locate Christ firmly within the realm of the Godhead, so that, starting with Christ, we are starting back beyond anything conceivable, back beyond anything belonging to the created order.

He then affirms that this is the teaching of "the great Moses, the earliest prophet of all, when by the Holy Spirit he described the coming into being and marshalling of the whole (τὴν τοῦ παντὸς οὐσίωσίν τε καὶ διακόσμησιν)", and goes on the remark that the "Maker of the cosmos and Fashioner" gave to Christ himself, "the divine and first-begotten Word", the "making of subordinate beings", and "discussed with him the creation of the human", taking the plural in "let us make man according to our image and likeness" as embracing the Word. One can't help noticing the allusions to Plato's *Timaeus*, and the way Eusebius is reading the creation story of Genesis in the light of the *Timaeus*, though with significant modifications. It would move too far from our purpose to pursue all this here, but it is interesting to note, in view of Eusebius' later support for Arius, how his reading of Plato is moving in the direction of blurring the notes of subordination, implicit in Plato's account (notably the subordination of the lesser gods to the Demiurge), so that the Word of God is drawn into the realm of God the Father. One additional hint of this immediately occurs, when he refers to the God of whom the Word is begotten, as "Father and Maker" (πατέρα καὶ ποιητήν), for, though he goes on to contrast the Father, who creates with a royal nod,

with the Word, who comes second and puts into effect his Father's commands, the use of πατέρα καὶ ποιητήν recalls the passage in the *Timaeus* where Plato says that "to discover the Maker and Father of the universe is a work indeed, and having discovered him to declare him to all something impossible" (*Tim.* 28C). Already, within the Christian tradition, Plato's remark has been intensified (by Clement, for instance), but what we find in Eusebius is a different move. Clement, and others, contrast the unknowable Father with the Word of God, whom we can know, but with Eusebius, as we have seen, it is the Word himself who is declared to be unknowable, and the mention of πατέρα καὶ ποιητήν here seems to me to draw attention to this assimilation of the Word to the unknown realms of the Godhead, to the μυστικὴ θεολογία – hidden (or secret) ascription of divinity – that applies to the Word, equally as to God. What Eusebius is doing here rather anticipates Athanasios than Arius. But this is not our point, rather our point is the way in which Eusebius is intensifying the apologetic theme that emphasized the antiquity of Christianity. The mention of Moses – and a few lines later, Abraham – makes this point in the usual apologetic way, by tracing back the doctrine of Christianity to the patriarchs, demonstrated in the *Chronologies*, whether of Africanus or Eusebius, to be more ancient than any of the philosophers of the Greeks. Already, in several of the apologists, the doctrine of Christianity had been located, not just in the Hebrew prophets, but in the very nature of the created order. In the very first chapter of the *Protreptikos*, Clement locates the "new song" of Christianity in the music of the spheres, and thus in the created order itself, than which nothing can be more ancient; Theophilos, too, demonstrates Christian doctrine through exegesis of Genesis; even earlier, Justin's reference to the *chi* the demiurge placed in the cosmos locates the cross, the symbol of Christianity, in Plato's account of the fashioning of the world (*1Apol.* 60). Eusebius seems to go even further than this in identifying Christianity with Christ, "whose name we are privileged to share" (*HE* 1.1.8), and Christ with the Word of God who belongs to the realm of "hidden theology", μυστικὴ θεολογία.

Eusebius goes on to introduce another theme from the apologists, though it belongs rather more neatly to the context of polemic against the Jews: and that is the theme of the theophanies of the Old Testament. In Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*, the discussion of these theophanies is primarily intended to show how the monotheism of the Old Testament accommodates one who can be called God, and yet must be distinguished from the unknowable God, whom no one can see face to face. Eusebius states Justin's argument briefly here: "Reason would never allow that the uncreated and immutable substance of Almighty God should be changed into the form of a man, or, alternatively, that by the illusion of any created thing it should deceive the eyes of the beholder, or that Scripture should falsely invent such a tale" (*HE* 1.2.8). So the one beheld in the theophanies must be ὁ προὼν λόγος, "the pre-

existent Word", or perhaps better "the Word before being". Eusebius draws several examples from the appearance of three men to Abraham at the Oak of Mamre, whom Abraham addresses in the singular as "Lord". Although Eusebius makes nothing of the Trinitarian allusions here (allusions that had been noticed already by Philo and interpreted in terms of different levels of contemplation of God[5]), he picks his way through the shifts from three (men entertained), to one (addressed by Abraham), to the two (angels, as they are called in Gen. 19.1, who went on to Sodom), and remains with the interpretation we find in Justin, for example, who interprets the three men as the Word of God accompanied by two angels. The Lord who wrestled with Jacob is also interpreted as the Word of God, of whom Jacob says, "For I saw God face to face, and my life was spared" (Gen. 32.30). Eusebius goes on the cite the *archistrátegos*, whom Jesus the son of Nave encountered; after accosting him Jesus is told to "take the sandals from his feet, for the place where you are standing is holy ground" (Josh. 5.15), and notes the same sentiment expressed to Moses at the Burning Bush: in both cases the "holy ground" before the presence of God, who again must be understood to be the Word of God.

For Eusebius the point is that these theophanies attest to the antiquity of the Word of God, whom Christians confess as incarnate in Jesus Christ. Christ may have appeared in recent times, but the one who thus appeared is of venerable antiquity. Indeed more than that, for Eusebius goes on quote from Wisdom's address in *Proverbs* 8: "The Lord created me in the beginning of His ways for His works; Before time he established me. In the beginning, before he made the earth… When he prepared the heavens, I was at his side…" (*Prov.* 8.22-24, 27). Again, we are led back before creation to the one proclaimed by the Christian Gospel.

These are themes from the apologetic tradition, and lend to the *History of the Church* an apologetic motive: his *History of the Church*, like his *Chronography* and his apologetic works, are intended, not just to recount historical events, but to demonstrate something about the nature of the Church – its divine origin, and the divinity of its teaching, which is not primarily a moral or philosophical doctrine, but a proclamation of Christ, the Incarnate Word, who in the beginning fashioned the world.

Eusebius now turns to address the question: if this teaching is ancient, why has it not been preached long ago? His response is to point out the fallen nature of human kind. How he does this is not untypical. It is not just a question of Adam's sin in the Garden of Eden: that is mentioned, but Eusebius dwells more on what followed – men and women "lived a nomadic life in the desert like wild and savage creatures; nature's gift of reason and the germs of thought and culture in the human soul were destroyed by the immensity of

[5] *Abr.* 121-123.

their deliberate wickedness" (*HE* 1.2.19). This, too, is an apologetic theme: part of the attack on the immorality of pagan religion. Eusebius gives an account of the history of human kind, in which gradually God draws back human kind to himself, signally by electing Israel and giving the Law through Moses: "[t]heir law became famous and like a fragrant breeze penetrated to every corner of the world" (*HE* 1.2.23). Finally, "[s]avage and cruel brutality changed to mildness, so that profound peace, friendship, and easy intercourse were enjoyed" (ibid.). This is the *Pax Romana*! Human beings were now "fitted to receive knowledge of the Father", so in these conditions the Incarnation could take place, an Incarnation that had been already foretold by the prophets, for which Eusebius refers us to his *Eclogae Propheticae*. Again this is an apologetic theme, for one of the most obvious charges Christians had to meet was that, as followers of one who was crucified by the Romans, they were bound to be a seditious movement.

Apologetic themes continue as Eusebius endeavours to demonstrate that the name Jesus Christ, though the name of one born about three hundred years earlier, is a name with ancient resonances: both Jesus and Christ (χριστός "Anointed") are names of ancient significance. *Christos*/anointed is associated with the priesthood; Jesus is the name born by Moses' successor as ruler of the Hebrew people, Jesus the son of Nave (Joshua the son of Nun, as he is more generally known in English usage). The name "Jesus Christ" sums up the royal and priestly functions that the Incarnate Word fulfilled. All this is intended as a further demonstration of the antiquity of the religion of Jesus Christ. He concludes: "Thus the practice of religion [εὐσεβείας: piety would be a better translation] as communicated to us by Christ's teaching is shown to be not modern and strange [νέαν καὶ ξένην] but, in all conscience, primitive, unique, and true [πρώτην καὶ μόνην καὶ ἀληθῆ]" (*HE* 1.4.15).

Eusebius' apologetic exordium is over; now follows his historical exordium. He begins by affirming the date of "the appearance of our Saviour in the flesh": the forty-second year of Augustus, twenty-eight years after the subjugation of Egypt and the deaths of Antony and Cleopatra, "the last of the Ptolemaic rulers of Egypt". For the registration under Quirinius, mentioned in St Luke's Gospel, Eusebius finds independent support in Josephus, whom he continues to use for the next few chapters. These are concerned with the demise of the Jews: ruled by judges from the time of Moses, then kings from Saul and David up to the Babylonian exile, on the return from exile by priests until Pompey's siege of Jerusalem and defiling of the Temple, after which Israel was ruled by the Herods, a non-Jewish dynasty, who ceased to appoint high priests from the traditional families. The Jews had, therefore, in Eusebius' eyes, ceased to be a sovereign nation by the time of the coming of Christ, the "expectation of the Gentiles". In establishing the fulfilment of prophecy about the demise of the Jewish people, Eusebius relies on Josephus. There follows a long digression about discrepancies in the

genealogies of Christ, in which Eusebius quotes at length from Africanus. Herod's massacre of the infants, after the birth of Christ, is related, and his own dreadful end, again drawn from Josephus. Still relying on Josephus, Eusebius sets in place the civil and religious rulers of Palestine, and discusses the evidence from Josephus about the Baptist and Christ. We are then introduced to the Saviour's disciples, among whom there are the apostles, both the Twelve and the Seventy. One of the seventy was named Thaddaios, which gives Eusebius the pretext for introducing the story of King Abgar of Edessa, who sent messengers to Jesus, begging him to visit him at Edessa. In reply, Jesus sends a letter, and after his death and resurrection, the apostle of the Seventy, Thaddaios, went to Edessa, sent by Thomas, one of the Twelve. Later the story was embellished, and the king received, not just a letter, but a cloth on which was imprinted the face of Christ: the Mandylion. It is not at all clear where Eusebius got this story from, nor why he included it (maybe because it was an event from the life of Christ, not elsewhere recorded?). It is, perhaps, not irrelevant to recall that Africanus spent some time at the court of King Abgar VIII of Edessa:[6] could the account have been included in Africanus' *Chronographies*?

I hope I have convinced you that a couple of main points emerge from the scene-setting in book one of Eusebius' *History of the Church*: the first is that the *History* is of a piece with his apologetic work,[7] and the second, emerging more clearly towards the end, is Eusebius' scholarly keenness to provide documentary evidence for what he maintains (this, too, could be regarded as part of the "apologetic" programme, in that it suggests a desire to demonstrate proof of what he has to say). How does this work out in relation to the five main points of his *hypothesis*? They are, let us remind ourselves: 1. the successions of the apostles, and the great teachers of the faith; 2. a history of heresy; 3. an account of the downfall of the Jewish race; 4. attacks on the Church leading to martyrdom; 5. the Great Persecution and the deliverance of the Church. Point 3 has already begun to be dealt with in book one, as we have seen, and the next three books trace, though episodically, the story through the destruction of the Temple in AD 70, to the final crushing of the Jewish revolt in 132–5, the expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem, which became a Roman city, renamed Aelia Capitolina. Points 4 and 5 are again richly documented: it looks as if Eusebius had gathered together authentic *Acta martyrum*, and his account of the *Martyrs of Palestine* is well known, nowadays, at least. The distinction between 1 and 2 – between the great teachers of the faith, that is, and the history of heresy – also fits with the mainlines of his apologetic programme – in two ways; first, there

[6] See Wallraff, *Chronographiae*, XIV.

[7] This is something scholars have recently disputed, but I am inclined to agree with Burgess over this: see the article cited above (cf. n. 2).

is no history of orthodox Christian doctrine, because it has been the same since the Garden of Eden, it is heresy that has a history, a history of the errors of human kind (a principle that will be worked out later in the century in Epiphanios' *Panarion*); and secondly, because tracing back heresy to the multifarious teaching of the Greek philosophers, which he alludes to throughout the *History of the Church*, was one of the methods of the apologists, notably Hippolytos. Eusebius is also inclined to accept the opinion of Hegesippos, that the Church remained free from heresy – uncorrupted, a virgin – until after the martyrdom of James the Lord's Brother (cf. *HE* 4.22). The successions of the apostles also fits in with the apologetic programme of the second century, though in this case as directed, not against Greeks or Jews, but against heretics: appeal to apostolic succession was one of the tests of orthodox doctrine suggested by Irenaeus, Tertullian and others. There is, however, something more to the way he presents the successions of the apostles in the principal sees of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem: they point to Eusebius' sense of the Church as a collection of communities, diverse yet united. They also reveal the way in which Eusebius views the Church from the perspective of his own times – something he could hardly have avoided – with the result that he projects his sense of the Church at the beginning of the fourth century into the history of the Church from the beginning. Writing about a decade before the Council of Nicaea, he assumes for the Church the structure envisaged in canons 6 (concerning the primacy of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch), and 7 (concerning the honour due to the Church of Aelia, that is, Jerusalem). For Eusebius, the Church has a structure embedded in the structure of the Roman Empire, safeguarded by the succession of bishops in these sees stretching back to the Apostles, which he is careful to detail. The Church, in some way, belongs to the Empire, just as the Empire belongs to the Church. Eusebius' Imperial ideology, as we find it in the *Vita Constantini*, has roots that go back before the emergence of a Christian Emperor, but this cuts two ways: his enthusiasm for the Emperor is no momentary turning of his head by favour of the Emperor, on the other hand, these roots are not simply an assimilation of the Church to the Empire, for the justification of the sees that aspire to ecumenical status lies in their apostolic credentials.

Eusebius the apologist and Eusebius the Church historian are, I have argued, two aspects of the same man, not to be separated, but to be understood in conjunction with each other, and in conjunction with the exegete and, as I have indicated in the way Eusebius develops his fundamental theology, the theologian.

DOCUMENTS, LETTERS AND CANONS IN EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA'S *ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY*

José B. Torres Guerra
Universidad de Navarra
jtorres@unav.es

1. An approach to the subject: history and discourses

The modern reader[1] who reads ancient historians is often surprised by the security with which the personages featured in these histories give discourses which, in principle, could not have been literally reproducible in Antiquity.[2] Thucydides explains the purpose of the discourses included in the *History of the Peloponnesian War* in a programmatic passage (1.22):[3]

> Καὶ ὅσα μὲν λόγῳ εἶπον ἕκαστοι ἢ μέλλοντες πολεμήσειν ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ ἤδη ὄντες, χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεχθέντων διαμνημονεῦσαι ἦν ἐμοί τε ὧν αὐτὸς ἤκουσα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοθέν ποθεν ἐμοὶ ἀπαγγέλλουσιν· ὡς δ' ἂν ἐδόκουν ἐμοὶ ἕκαστοι περὶ τῶν αἰεὶ παρόντων τὰ δέοντα μάλιστ' εἰπεῖν, ἐχομένῳ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων, οὕτως εἴρηται.

[1] This study forms part of the project "*Alteritas*: Alteridad lingüística y alteridad cultural en el imperio romano (SS. III-V): historiografía y géneros afines" [Linguistic and Cultural Alterity in the Roman Empire (3rd-5th centuries): Historiography and Related Genres] (FFI2010-15402 / FILO). I am grateful to D. DeVore (Ball State), A. Quiroga (Granada) and Á. Sánchez-Ostiz (Navarra) for their observations; I would also like to thank Prof. Caltabiano (Milan) for the comments she made after having heard an oral presentation of a prior version of this article.

[2] Nevertheless, the *Ecclesiastical History* (7.29) refers to people who gathered literal oral testimony in order to employ it with a documentary value: οὗτός γέ τοι ἐπισημειουμένων ταχυγράφων ζήτησιν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐνστησάμενος, ἣν καὶ εἰς δεῦρο φερομένην ἴσμεν…, "This man, having conducted a discussion with him, which was taken down by stenographers and which we know is still extant..." (translations of passages from the *HE* are taken, with slight adaptations, from A. C. McGiffert, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Second Series. Vol. 1. Eusebius. Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine*, Buffalo 1890; http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/2501.htm). In authors prior to Eusebius the term ταχυγράφος is documented in Aelius Herodianus (S. II AD). Concerning the *notae tironianae* and their use in the transcription of Cicero's discourses, Plu. *Cat.Min.* 23.3. See also n. 60.

[3] J. C. Iglesias Zoido, "Acercamiento a la polémica sobre Tucídides I, 22, 2", *AEF* 12, 1989, 125-32 proposes a succinct and accurate analysis of the passage. The translation is taken from R. Crawley, *Thucydides. The History of the Peloponnesian War*, Auckland 1874.

> With reference to the speeches in this history, some were delivered before the war began, others while it was going on; some I heard myself, others I got from various quarters; it was in all cases difficult to carry them word for word in one's memory, so my habit has been to make the speakers say what was in my opinion demanded of them by the various occasions, of course adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said.

The Attic historian was able to carry out his proposal with notable skill thanks to his rhetorical abilities. We do not know to what degree this ability is related to his public actions in the Athens of his day; what we do know is that the historian composed a work whose historiographical validity depends to a large degree on its discourses.[4] For his part, Eusebius does not employ discourses in the *Ecclesiastical History* [*HE*], in contrast to the practice of Thucydides, the *Acts of the Apostles* (the first example of a Christian work of history) and Flavius Josephus, who was his primary referent in many aspects.[5] We know that the rhetorical skills of the bishop of Caesarea must

[4] In contrast, his work is of great importance for the study of the rhetoric of his time; J. C. Iglesias Zoido, *La argumentación en los discursos deliberativos de Tucídides y su relación con la normativa retórica del siglo IV*, Cáceres 1995. Concerning the relationship between historiography and rhetoric in Late Antiquity, M. S. Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400-1500*, Manchester 2011; P. van Nuffelen, *Orosius and the Rhetoric of History*, Oxford 2012. It should be remembered that ancient historiography, because it emphasizes the capacity for public speaking, follows the pattern of the oratory of the period in which it was written, where the weight of the argument rests on the verisimilitude of its reasoning, while the testimony of the witnesses has only a subsidiary importance.

[5] Concerning Eusebius's use of Josephus as a reference, D. Timpe, "Che cos'è la storia della Chiesa? La *Historia Ecclesiastica* di Eusebio. Caratteristiche di un genere", in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, D. Lanza (eds.), *Lo Spazio Letterario della Grecia antica. II. La ricezione e l'attualizzazione del testo*, Roma 1995, 429-30; E. Prinzivalli, "Le genre historiographique de l'Histoire ecclésiastique", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 95. The exceptions to the norm of including discourses in historical works are scarce; there are no discourses in Book VIII of Thucydides (however, cf. 8.53.3), which is considered to be an indicator that the author himself did not manage to give the text a final revision; aside from brief interjections in direct style, there are also no discourses in the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. Concerning the absence of discourses in Eusebius and their substitution by documents, see the general evaluation proposed by A. Momigliano, "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.", in A. Momigliano (ed.), *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford 1963, 89-90: "Eusebius, like any other educated man, knew what proper history was. He knew that it was a rhetorical work with a maximum of invented speeches and a minimum of authentic documents. Since he chose to give plenty of documents and refrained from inventing speeches, he must have intended to produce something different from ordinary history. Did he then intend to produce a preparatory work to history, hypomnema? This is hardly credible. First of all, historical hypomnemata were normally confined to contemporary events. Secondly, Eusebius speaks as if he were writing history, and not collecting materials for a future history." See also Timpe, "Che cos'è la storia della Chiesa?", 420-1.

be different from, and very likely inferior to, those of Thucydides.[6] But the fact that Eusebius was not perhaps the best orator of his time is not sufficient to explain the absence of discourses in the *HE*. In fact, other historians less skilled in rhetorics did not hesitate to invent discourses for their own works, thinking that these were an obligatory feature of the genre. This article seeks to offer a new explanation for this peculiarity of the *HE,* a peculiarity which (it must be noted) represents an original contribution, and gives an indication of Eusebius's ideas about historiography; for this reason I will examine, first of all, the theoretical considerations that the author sets out at the beginning of the work (1.1).[7]

Eusebius presents the objective of his work as being a narration of the apostolic succession[8] of the different ecclesial communities (1.1.1) as well as the oppression suffered by the Church at the hands of the pagans (1.1.2). After defining his topic, the author develops a key idea in the central paragraphs of this chapter (1.1.3-5): the task he takes on is pioneering, since a work of this type had never been composed before, and as a result he requests the indulgence of the reader:[9]

> πρῶτοι νῦν τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἐπιβάντες οἷά τινα ἐρήμην καὶ ἀτριβῆ ἰέναι ὁδὸν ἐγχειροῦμεν (1.1.3).
>
> Since I am the first to enter upon the subject, I am attempting to traverse as it were a lonely and untrodden path (1.1.3).

> ἀνθρώπων γε μὴν οὐδαμῶς εὑρεῖν οἷοί τε ὄντες ἴχνη γυμνὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμῖν προωδευκότων (1.1.3).
>
> (...) since I am unable to find even the bare footsteps of those who have traveled the way before me (1.1.3).

[6] Concerning Eusebius's knowledge and practice of rhetoric, G. A. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*, Princeton 1983, 186-97; Id., *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, Chapel Hill 1999^2, 161-3; A. J. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, Leiden 2003, 137-8. Concerning the *Life of Constantine* as an example of an encomium, T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge 1981, 265-71; A. Cameron, S. G. Hall, *Eusebius. Life of Constantine*, Oxford 1999, 27-48; a close reading of this work – J. B. Torres, "Image and Word in Eusebius (*VC* 3,4-24): Constantine in Nicaea", in A. J. Quiroga Puertas (ed.), *Rhetorical and Literary Strategies in Imperial and Late Antique Literature*, (forthcoming) – may indicate that Eusebius's rhetorical skills were not so clumsy as so oft supposed (see Cameron, Hall, *Eusebius. Life of Constantine*, 27).

[7] Prinzivalli, "Le genre historiographique", 85-8.

[8] The syntagma with which the text opens is, in fact, Τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχάς, "the Apostolic successions". D. DeVore, "Genre and Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History: Toward a Focused Debate", in A. Johnson, J. Schott (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*, Washington 2013, 38-9.

[9] In regards to Eusebius's consciousness of his own originality, Prinzivalli, "Le genre historiographique", 87-8.

μηδένα πω εἰς δεῦρο τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραφέων διέγνων περὶ τοῦτο τῆς γραφῆς σπουδὴν πεποιημένον τὸ μέρος (1.1.5).

I know of no ecclesiastical writer who has devoted himself to this subject (1.1.5).

Eusebius's claim is only partly faithful to reality,[10] since he himself recognizes, in the same middle section of the first chapter, that his work is based on that of those precursors he employs. These predecessors preserved the memory of events that Eusebius himself wishes to present in the form of a historical exposition:[11]

σμικρὰς (…) προφάσεις, δι' ὧν ἄλλος ἄλλως ὧν διηνύκασι χρόνων μερικὰς ἡμῖν καταλελοίπασι διηγήσεις (1.1.3).

brief fragments (...) have transmitted to us particular accounts of the times in which they lived (1.1.3).

ἀναλεξάμενοι καὶ ὡς ἂν ἐκ λογικῶν λειμώνων τὰς ἐπιτηδείους αὐτῶν τῶν πάλαι συγγραφέων ἀπανθισάμενοι φωνάς, δι' ὑφηγήσεως ἱστορικῆς πειρασόμεθα σωματοποιῆσαι (1.1.4).

(...) having plucked like flowers from a meadow the appropriate passages from ancient writers, we shall endeavor to embody the whole in an historical narrative (1.1.4).

Eusebius recognizes expressly that the original, overall work that he presents is based on "the matters mentioned here and there by [my predecessors],"[12] i.e. on the imperfect testimonies of those who partially recorded the happenings of the past. Of course, in employing the testimony of previous sources Eusebius merely applied the procedure used, ever since Herodotus, by all historians in order to narrate the events that they themselves had not witnessed. The most important and novel issue is that Eusebius believes that the written testimony of all those he depends upon

[10] Eusebius's statement may not do justice, above all, to Julius Africanus; M. Wallraff, *Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronistik*, Berlin 2006; U. Roberto, *Le Chronographiae di Sesto Giulio Africano: storiografia, politica e cristianesimo nell´età dei Severi,* Soveria Mannelli 2011.

[11] Concerning the key place in history that Eusebius occupies as the originator of ecclesiastical historiography, Prinzivalli, "Le genre historiographique", 96-100; concerning this same issue, see also A. Louth, "Eusebios as Apologist and Church Historian", in this volume; concerning the place of the *HE* within the genre of historiography, DeVore, "Genre". As Timpe, "Che cos´è la storia della Chiesa?", 390, n. 2 mentions in passing, it is of key importance that Eusebius sees his predecessors as being nothing more than sources. His use of his precursors was also fundamental for Eusebius in the case of the *Chronicle*. Concerning the local historians he must have relied on, Carriker, *Library*, 139-54, 313.

[12] τῶν αὐτοῖς ἐκείνοις σποράδην μνημονευθέντων (*HE* 1.1.4).

is trustworthy and sufficient. In this way, the employment of discourses composed for a specific occasion by preceding historians is now seen to be unnecessary and dispensable.[13] Instead, Eusebius will use, as his documentary sources, quotations from other writers, edicts, rescripta and letters.[14]

2. The letters as *sermones*: an issue of style?

Nevertheless, the *HE* also includes a type of discourse or – employing the Latin term – a special form of the *sermo*. This is the so-called *sermo absentis ad absentem*, i.e. letters, which abound in a striking manner among the documents adduced in the *HE*.[15] In the work there are a total of fifty five documents that can be classified as letters.[16] In Book II he does not cite any epistles. In contrast, they represent a notably ample part of the text in Books V and VII. In Books VIII-X,[17] with only one exception (8.10.1-10),

[13] Notwithstanding this, and as DeVore reminds me, Eusebius quotes directly a brief deliberative speech in *HE* 7.32.9 (Anatolius speaks to the Alexandrian Senate); the panegyric about the building of churches cited in 10.4, addressed to Paulinus of Tyre and probably pronounced by Eusebius himself, must be also taken into account.

[14] All of the materials cited by Eusebius have been gathered (as being constituents of the author's library) in Carriker, *Library*. Concerning the abundant citations included in the work, see what Eusebius himself states in *PE* 10.9.28: διὸ καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς αὐτῶν ἠγησάμην δεῖν παραχωρῆσαι φωναῖς τὸν παρόντα λόγον, ὅπως ὁμοῦ τῶν οἰκείων μὴ ἀποστεροῖντο καρπῶν οἱ τῶν λόγων πατέρες καὶ διὰ πλειόνων μαρτύρων, ἀλλὰ μὴ δι' ἑνὸς ἐμοῦ, ἡ σύστασις τῆς ἀληθείας ἀναμφίλεκτον λάβοι τὴν ἐπικύρωσιν, "And for this reason especially I thought it right to give place in the present discussion to their own words, in order that the authors of the arguments might not be deprived of their due rewards, and at the same time the maintenance of the truth might receive indisputable confirmation not by one witness but by many". The translation is taken from E. H. Gifford, *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae praeparationis libri XV*, Oxford 1903; http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/eusebius_pe_10_book10.htm.

[15] The definition of letters as *sermones absentis ad absentem,* following Cicero's definition (Cic. *Phil.* 2.7: *litteras … amicorum colloquia absentium*), recurs in the rhetoric manuals of Humanism; J. R. Henderson, "Defining the Genre of the Letter: Juan Luis Vives' *De Conscribendis Epistolis*", *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* 19, 1983, 89-105; Id., "Humanism and the Humanities: Erasmus's Opus *de conscribendis epistolis* in Sixteenth-Century Schools", in C. Poster, L. C. Mitchell (eds.), *Letter-Writing Manuals from Antiquity to the Present: Historical and Bibliographic Studies*, Columbia 2007, 141-77. The letters used in the *HE* are listed in a table at the end of this article.

[16] At times the epistolary character of what Eusebius cites can be debated, as occurs in the case of doctrinal letters, due to the difficulty of distinguishing them from treatises (e.g. 4.8.3-5, 7; 5.20.4-8). This is an old problem that scholars have already confronted in the past; J. Sykutris, "Epistolographie", *RE Suppl.* 5, 1931, coll. 185-220. The official documents that took an epistolary form (imperial dispositions and *rescripta*; 4.8.8-9.1-3; 7.13; 9.1.3-6; 9.9a.1-9; 10.5.15-17) may also have a special status. In relation to that, it may be added that it has been argued (T. D. Barnes, *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire*, Chichester 2011, 93-7) that the text of the so-called 'Edict of Milan' (10.5.2-14) should be actually regarded as a rescript (an official letter) whose author would be not Constantine but Licinius.

[17] This datum must be related to the different editions of the *HE* published by Eusebius; T. D. Barnes, "The Editions of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History", *GRBS* 21, 1980, 191-201; A.

all of the texts that can be considered letters are official documents written by emperors (Galerius, Maximinus Daia, Constantine) or some high functionary close to the Augustus.[18]

The letters share their character of being *sermones* with discourses, absent in the *HE*. Therefore it seems that, if one reviews his case, it might be possible to advance in the clarification of why there are no discourses in Eusebius's work.[19] I will begin by discussing and refuting an initial explanation: that the inclusion of the epistles is due to the desire to introduce a stylistic *variatio*.

Letters are a discursive modality that previous Greek historians had employed, including Herodotus, Thucydides, Josephus and Luke himself in the *Acts of the Apostles*.[20] The possibility that epistles would appear in a historiographical work with the purpose of varying the narrative has also been discussed in relation to the letters inserted by some of these authors into their own texts.[21] It is true that the letters of Eusebius impart a certain dynamism to his account, especially in the case of missives where there is an interaction between sender and recipient, embodied in the alternation between the first and second grammatical person. A noteworthy example of this is found in the correspondence supposedly exchanged between King Abgar of Edessa and Jesus of Nazareth.[22] In the first book of the *HE*, Eusebius

---

Louth, "The Date of Eusebius's 'Historia Ecclesiastica'", *JThS* 41, 1990, 111-23; R. W. Burgess, "The Dates and Editions of Eusebius's 'Chronici Canones' and 'Historia Ecclesiastica'", *JThS* 48, 1997, 471-504; V. Neri, "Les éditions de l'Histoire ecclésiastique (livres VIII-IX): bilan critique et perspectives de la recherche", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 151-83; M.-Y. Perrin, M. Cassin, M. Debie, "La question des éditions de l'Histoire ecclésiastique et le livre X", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 185-207.

[18] The highly-ranked functionary is Sabinus: παρ' αὐτοῖς τῷ τῶν ἐξοχωτάτων ἐπάρχων ἀξιώματι τετιμημένος, "honored with the highest official rank among them" (*HE* 9.1.2); he was the person who sent the letter included in 9.1.3-6 to the governors of the provinces.

[19] In relation to Eusebius's letters there is another question which cannot be discussed here in detail: if there is any difference in the way Eusebius uses letters and other documents; as will be seen later (in relation to the terms ἐπίδειξις, μαρτύριον, or κατὰ λέξιν), a very similar terminology is used in the *HE* to introduce both kinds of quotations. A complete study of the letters in the *HE* should also discuss if all these documents play the same role or if there are any differences in the way Eusebius employs them.

[20] R. S. Coleman, *Embedded Letters in Acts and in Jewish and Hellenistic Literature*, Doct. Thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary 1994; P. A. Rosenmeyer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature*, Cambridge 2001; R. S. Olson, *Tragedy, Authority, and Trickery: The Poetics of Embedded Letters in Josephus*, Washington 2010.

[21] According to some scholars, the motive for Herodotus and Thucydides including letters in their works would be not only their strict documentary value, but also would respond to an interest in introducing *uariatio* into their works. Olson, *Tragedy, Authority, and Trickery*, 29-30.

[22] Concerning the legend of Abgar, J. W. Drijvers, "Abgarsage", in W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen. II. Apostolisches Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*, Tübingen 1987[5], 389-95; S. Brock, "Eusebius and Syriac Christianity", in H. W. Attridge,

introduces a copy of a letter from the king (1.13.6-8); he then includes the response that Jesus gave to this missive (1.13.10):

"Ἄβγαρος Οὐχαμα τοπάρχης Ἰησοῦ σωτῆρι ἀγαθῷ ἀναφανέντι ἐν τόπῳ Ἱεροσολύμων χαίρειν. ἤκουσταί μοι τὰ περὶ σοῦ καὶ τῶν σῶν ἰαμάτων, ὡς ἄνευ φαρμάκων καὶ βοτανῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ γινομένων. ὡς γὰρ λόγος, τυφλοὺς ἀναβλέπειν ποιεῖς, χωλοὺς περιπατεῖν, καὶ λεπροὺς καθαρίζεις, καὶ ἀκάθαρτα πνεύματα καὶ δαίμονας ἐκβάλλεις, καὶ τοὺς ἐν μακρονοσίᾳ βασανιζομένους θεραπεύεις, καὶ νεκροὺς ἐγείρεις. καὶ ταῦτα πάντα ἀκούσας περὶ σοῦ, κατὰ νοῦν ἐθέμην τὸ ἕτερον τῶν δύο, ἢ ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς καὶ καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ποιεῖς ταῦτα, ἢ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ ποιῶν ταῦτα. διὰ τοῦτο τοίνυν γράψας ἐδεήθην σου σκυλῆναι πρός με καὶ τὸ πάθος, ὃ ἔχω, θεραπεῦσαι. καὶ γὰρ ἤκουσα ὅτι καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι καταγογγύζουσί σου καὶ βούλονται κακῶσαί σε. πόλις δὲ μικροτάτη μοί ἐστι καὶ σεμνή, ἥτις ἐξαρκεῖ ἀμφοτέροις".

"Abgar, ruler of Edessa, to Jesus the excellent Savior who has appeared in the country of Jerusalem, greetings. I have heard the reports of you and of your cures as performed by you without medicines or herbs. For it is said that you make the blind to see and the lame to walk, that you clean lepers and cast out impure spirits and demons, and that you heal those afflicted with lingering disease, and raise the dead. And having heard all these things concerning you, I have concluded that one of two things must be true: either you are God, and having come down from heaven you do these things, or else you, who do these things, are the Son of God. I have therefore written to you to ask you that you would take the trouble to come to me and heal the disease which I have. For I have heard that the Jews are murmuring against you and are plotting to injure you. But I have a very small yet noble city which is great enough for us both."

"Μακάριος εἶ πιστεύσας ἐν ἐμοί, μὴ ἑορακώς με. γέγραπται γὰρ περὶ ἐμοῦ τοὺς ἑορακότας με μὴ πιστεύσειν ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ ἵνα οἱ μὴ ἑορακότες με αὐτοὶ πιστεύσωσι καὶ ζήσονται. περὶ δὲ οὗ ἔγραψάς μοι ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σέ, δέον ἐστὶ πάντα δι' ἃ ἀπεστάλην ἐνταῦθα, πληρῶσαι καὶ μετὰ τὸ πληρῶσαι οὕτως ἀναληφθῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. καὶ ἐπειδὰν ἀναληφθῶ, ἀποστελῶ σοί τινα τῶν μαθητῶν μου, ἵνα ἰάσηταί σου τὸ πάθος καὶ ζωήν σοι καὶ τοῖς σὺν σοὶ παράσχηται".

"Blessed are you who have believed in me without having seen me. For it is written concerning me, that they who have seen me will not

H. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Leiden 1992, 212-34; A. Mirkovic, *Prelude to Constantine: the Abgar Tradition in Early Christianity*, Frankfurt 2004.

> believe in me, and that they who have not seen me will believe and be saved. But in regard to what you have written me, that I should come to you, it is necessary for me to fulfill all things here for which I have been sent, and after I have fulfilled them thus to be taken up again to him that sent me. But after I have been taken up I will send to you one of my disciples, that he may heal your disease and give life to you and yours."

These texts make the narration of the first book of the *HE* more dynamic. From our perspective, the greatest novelty of the passage consists in the introduction of direct style and, with it, the inclusion of the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, words which are not in fact found in the Gospels or the New Testament as a whole. From the point of view of a fourth-century reader and of Eusebius himself, this fact could be relevant. But for him and for his readers the most important thing is perhaps not the discourse in direct style but rather the fact that this exchange of letters showed that a first-century monarch, such as the king of Edessa, had a favorable attitude towards Christianity, similar to that of Constantine, during whose reign the final version of the *HE*[23] can be situated. Therefore it does not seem likely that Eusebius would have included these two letters simply for reasons of style. In addition, the letters exchanged by Abgar and Jesus are unique in the entire *HE*. Furthermore, it does not seem very likely that anyone would consider the bishop of Caesarea to be a refined prose stylist; at least, this has never been the scholarly consensus.[24]

3. Putting the letters in context: demonstration, testimonies, literality

The reasons why Eusebius does not include discourses but does cite letters may be connected to the narrative contexts of the letters, in which certain recurring terms appear that need to be examined. In this regard, a significant passage of Book III can be seen as an initial example (3.36.6);[25] here the writer

[23] Concerning the chronology of the *HE,* Burgess, "Dates and Editions"; O. Andrei, "Canons chronologiques et Histoire ecclésiastique", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 33-82. Concerning the Abgar-Constantine analogy and its limits, Mirkovic, *Prelude to Constantine*.

[24] Concerning the lack of literary or rhetorical pretensions in the *HE,* Timpe, "Che cos´è la storia della Chiesa?", 401, 409. Concerning the analogous case of the *Vita Constantini,* Cameron, Hall, *Eusebius. Life of Constantine*, 27, 33.

[25] Previously the *HE* had cited letters in 1.7.2-16, 13.5-10; 3.31.3. Even though in these passages Eusebius has employed certain of the words that I will comment on later (αὐτοῖς … ῥήμασιν in 1.7.1, 13,5; ἐπιδείκνυται in 3.31.2 [ἀπόδειξις in 1.13.9]), the interest of 3.36.6 derives from the fact that here the two words appear together. Other nouns derived from the root of μαρτύριον (see infra) also appear in 1.13.5 (μαρτυρίαν), 3.31.3 (μάρτυς).

presents, as testimony that supports his previous affirmations, a fragment of a letter that Ignatius of Antioch sent to the church in Rome (3.36.7-9):[26]

> πρὸς ταύταις καὶ τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ γράφει, ἣ καὶ παράκλησιν προτείνει ὡς μὴ παραιτησάμενοι τοῦ μαρτυρίου τῆς ποθουμένης αὐτὸν ἀποστερήσαιεν ἐλπίδος· ἐξ ὧν καὶ βραχύτατα εἰς ἐπίδειξιν τῶν εἰρημένων παραθέσθαι ἄξιον. γράφει δὴ οὖν κατὰ λέξιν.
>
> In addition to these he wrote also to the Church of Rome, entreating them not to secure his release from martyrdom, and thus rob him of his earnest hope. In confirmation of what has been said it is proper to quote briefly from this epistle.

In this paragraph there are two terms that require analysis: εἰς ἐπίδειξιν, "as a demonstration," and κατὰ λέξιν, "literally." The cited paragraph also includes the word μαρτύριον, with the current meaning of martyrdom, "death or torments suffered for the cause of the Christian religion";[27] as I will show later, this word, employed under another of its possible meanings, has a key importance for my investigation.

The noun ἐπίδειξις and the verb ἐπιδείκνυμι are used in 3.36.6 and other places in the *HE*[28] in order to affirm that the texts that Eusebius adduces, or the writers of the epistles themselves, play an epideictic or demonstrative function; this same function is recognized in oratory as applicable to discourses of the same genre.[29] The bishop thus uses the verb ἐπιδείκνυμι in the eighth book (8.10.1), when he says that the demonstration of what he has just stated about Phileas of Thmuis is found in a letter of the martyr himself that Eusebius cites next:[30]

> Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν μαθημάτων ἕνεκα πολλοῦ λόγου ἄξιον γενέσθαι τὸν Φιλέαν ἔφαμεν, αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ παρίτω μάρτυς, ἅμα μὲν ἑαυτὸν ὅστις ποτ' ἦν, ἐπιδείξων ἅμα δὲ καὶ τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ συμβεβηκότα μαρτύρια ἀκριβέστερον μᾶλλον ἢ ἡμεῖς ἱστορήσων διὰ τούτων τῶν λέξεων.
>
> Since we have mentioned Phileas as having a high reputation for secular learning, let him be his own witness in the following extract, in which he shows us who he was, and at the same time describes more accurately than we can the martyrdoms which occurred in his time at Alexandria.

[26] Ign. *Rom.* 4.5.

[27] This is the first sense of the word contained in the *Dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy* (*Diccionario de la Real Academia Española,* s.v. "martirio.")

[28] 3.31.2; 8.10.1.

[29] Arist. *Rh.* 1358a36-b8.

[30] The letter of Phileas is cited in 8.10.2-10.

Obviously, ἐπίδειξις and ἐπιδείκνυμι do not refer only to the type of demonstration that the letters provide. Eusebius employs these words in order to allude to the testimony of another kind of writings. In 5.7.3 he introduces a quotation from the *Aduersus haereses* (2.31.2) of Irenaeus of Lyon, who cites the testimony of the prophetic books of the Old Testament in support of the thesis he wishes to demonstrate:[31]

> εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸν κύριον φαντασιωδῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα πεποιηκέναι φήσουσιν, ἐπὶ τὰ προφητικὰ ἀνάγοντες αὐτούς, ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπιδείξομεν πάντα οὕτως περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ προειρῆσθαι καὶ γεγονέναι βεβαίως καὶ αὐτὸν μόνον εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.
>
> If they will say that even the Lord did these things in mere appearance, we will refer them to the prophetic writings, and show from them that all things were beforehand spoken of him in this manner, and were strictly fulfilled; and that he alone is the Son of God.

It is even more habitual that Eusebius uses the verb ἐπιδείκνυμι in order to refer to a demonstration by works, as happens, for example, when he speaks of the martyrs of Gaul in 5.2.4,[32] the supposed Christianity of Philip the Arab in 6.34[33] or the proof value that the works of pagan citizens would have in 9.7.14,[34] in comparison with those of Christians in 9.8.14.[35]

The text of 3.36.6 also stands out due to its pretension to literality: γράφει δὴ οὖν κατὰ λέξιν, "So then, he writes literally". The key point is, doubtless, that Eusebius knows that an epistolary document adduced with an epideictic intention needs to be a faithful citation in order to fulfil its function. The aspiration to literality is, in fact, something that occurs in many other passages of the work, as well as in a great deal of the Christian literature of Antiquity.[36] Specifically, the group κατὰ λέξιν is attested in 24

[31] In Book V (5.26.1), Eusebius recalls that Irenaeus dedicated to his brother Marcian a work entitled *In Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching,* εἰς ἐπίδειξιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος.

[32] καὶ τὴν μὲν δύναμιν τῆς μαρτυρίας ἔργῳ ἐπεδείκνυντο, "They showed in their deeds the power of testimony."

[33] τὸ γνήσιον καὶ εὐλαβὲς τῆς περὶ τὸν θεῖον φόβον διαθέσεως ἔργοις ἐπιδεδειγμένον, "proving with his deeds the nobility and piety of his God-fearing disposition."

[34] τοῦ δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀξίων ἐπάθλων τετυχηκέναι παρὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας φιλαγαθίας ταύτης ὑμῶν ἕνεκεν τῆς τοῦ βίου προαιρέσεως υἱοῖς τε καὶ ἐκγόνοις ὑμετέροις ἐπιδειχθήσεται, "This (...) shall furnish for all time an evidence of reverent piety toward the immortal gods, and of the fact that you have obtained from our benevolence merited prizes for this choice of yours; and it shall be shown to your children and children's children."

[35] μόνοι γοῦν ἐν τηλικαύτῃ κακῶν περιστάσει τὸ συμπαθὲς καὶ φιλάνθρωπον ἔργοις αὐτοῖς ἐπιδεικνύμενοι, "For they alone in the midst of such ills showed their sympathy and humanity by their deeds."

[36] In contrast, in their handling of the Scriptures the Fathers considered those activities to be inadequate which they characterized with the terms λεπτολογία, "subtle expression," and

places in the *HE,* always in regards to the literality of the documents cited by Eusebius, whether they are letters or not.[37] The same concept is expressed in another 19 places via the group αὐτοῖς ῥήμασι or ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς.[38] The same thing occurs in the passage at the beginning of the work (1.7.1), where he introduces a quotation from a letter of Julius Africanus regarding the genealogy of Jesus:[39]

> (…) ἣν δι' ἐπιστολῆς Ἀριστείδῃ γράφων περὶ συμφωνίας τῆς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις γενεαλογίας ὁ μικρῷ πρόσθεν ἡμῖν δηλωθεὶς Ἀφρικανὸς ἐμνημόνευσεν, τὰς μὲν δὴ τῶν λοιπῶν δόξας ὡς ἂν βιαίους καὶ διεψευσμένας ἀπελέγξας, ἣν δ' αὐτὸς παρείληφεν ἱστορίαν, τούτοις αὐτοῖς ἐκτιθέμενος τοῖς ῥήμασιν.
>
> [Africanus] (…) in his epistle to Aristides, where he discusses the harmony of the gospel genealogies. After refuting the opinions of others as forced and deceptive, he gives the account which he had received from tradition in these words.

In addition to εἰς ἐπίδειξιν and κατὰ λέξιν, in 3.36.6 there appears, as I stated earlier, the noun μαρτύριον, a word of interest for this study, albeit not due to the meaning it carries in this *locus* ("martyrdom"). In general, μαρτύριον refers to any kind of testimony, not necessarily that of the Christian martyrs or "witnesses." The text of 8.10.1 already cited employs the word μάρτυς with this generic sense when it proposes that Phileas himself appear as a witness to what Eusebius had said about the martyrdoms (μαρτύρια) that occurred in Alexandria. The fundamental issue is that, when the μαρτύριον is a written text, the noun refers to the "documents" employed as a basis for the new kind of history that Eusebius wants to write. For example, the word μαρτύριον or μαρτυρία is used in this sense in the paragraph that Eusebius uses in order to introduce the citation of the letter that Abgar wrote to Jesus (1.13.5): ἔχεις καὶ τούτων ἀνάγραπτον

λεξιθηρέω, "searching carefully for an expression." For λεξιθηρέω, Epiph.Const. *Haer*. 1.366; 2.201, 308; 3.196, 209, 224, 445. See also A. J. Quiroga Puertas, "The Limits of Philology: Aulus Gellius, *NA* 2.9", *Ágora* 15, 2013, 95-112.

[37] *HE* 1.5.4, 8.5; 2.2.4, 5.2, 6.1, 11.1, 20.1, 26.1, 2; 3.1.3, 19, 23.3, 29.1, 31.5, 32.3, 36.6; 4.15.15; 5.8.10, 18.1, 28.2; 6.2.6, 11.3, 19.4, 25.1 (in 2.26.1 and 3.1.3 no literal citation is introduced, but rather a reference to a text). It is noteworthy that the group κατὰ λέξιν is not attested in Books VII through X, although in them Eusebius continues to quote from letters and documents.

[38] *HE* 1.2.7, 13, 4.12, 7.1, 13.5; 2.17.22, 20.1; 3.5.5, 9.5, 10.8, 36.13; 4.2.5; 5.2.1, 18.1, 24.11, 25.1, 28.7; 6.46.4; 9.9.10 (in 2.17.22, 3.5.5 and 4.2.5 he does not introduce a literal quotation). The syntagma αὐτοῖς ῥήμασιν (ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς) appears on one occasion only (9.9.10) between Books VII and X.

[39] The letter in question, whose addressee (Aristides) is unknown, is mentioned again in 6.31. See H. Merkel, *La pluralité des Evangiles comme problème théologique et exégétique dans l'Eglise ancienne*, Bern 1978, 50-7.

τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ἐκ τῶν κατὰ Ἔδεσσαν τὸ τηνικάδε βασιλευομένην πόλιν γραμματοφυλακείων ληφθεῖσαν, "You have written evidence of these things taken from the archives of Edessa, which was at that time a royal city."[40]

4. Original and copy

It is, at this point, important to refer to a fourth idea that Eusebius repeatedly relates to the letters and documents. I have indicated that he associates the literality of the citations of the testimonies with the fulfilling of their epideictic function. But the idea of literality implies the existence of a "copy" and presupposes that this copy must be authentic, trustworthy and, ultimately, able to be compared with an original version. This explains the fact that another recurring term in the *HE,* in the narrative portions that precede letters and documents, is the noun ἀντίγραφον, "copy."

This word also appears in the epistolary exchange between Abgar and Jesus. Eusebius introduces his citation of the letter of the king (1.13.5) by emphasizing that it comes from the royal archives (γραμματοφυλακείων, ἀρχείων) and that it is a trustworthy translation from Syriac (ἐπιστολῶν… αὐτοῖς ῥήμασιν ἐκ τῆς Σύρων φωνῆς μεταβληθεισῶν, "epistles... literally translated from the Syriac language").[41] The text of the letter is presented following this epigraph: ἀντίγραφον ἐπιστολῆς γραφείσης ὑπὸ Ἀβγάρου τοπάρχου τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ πεμφθείσης αὐτῷ δι' Ἀνανίου ταχυδρόμου εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, "copy of an epistle written by Abgar the ruler to Jesus, and sent to him at Jerusalem by Ananias the swift courier."[42]

Eusebius's historical work presents a series of relevant passages that exemplify the use of the word ἀντίγραφον.[43] For example, in 4.8.7 he cites Justin, who in a text of his *Apology* says that he is going to include a copy of a letter from Hadrian in order that it confirm what the author is saying:[44] ὑπετάξαμεν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς Ἀδριανοῦ τὸ ἀντίγραφον, ἵνα καὶ τοῦτο ἀληθεύειν ἡμᾶς γνωρίζητε, "And we have quoted the copy of Hadrian's epistle that you may know that we are speaking the truth in this matter also." In the fifth book (5.20.2), a citation of the letter that Irenaeus sent to Florinus (*About monarchy, or that God is not the author of evils*) stands out in particular for its insistence on the necessity that an ἀντίγραφον be trustworthy:

[40] In the Greek text τούτων refers to the story narrated earlier by Eusebius, that of the petition that Abgar made to Jesus on discovering he was ill; Christ promises that, after his Ascension, one of his disciples would come to him (Thaddeus, according to tradition, who was sent to Edessa by the apostle Thomas). See n. 22.

[41] J. B. Torres, "Traducción e interpretación en Eusebio de Cesarea, *Historia de la Iglesia*", in Á. Martínez, B. Ortega, H. Velasco, H. Zamora (eds.), *Ágalma. Ofrenda desde la Filología Clásica a Manuel García Teijeiro*, Valladolid 2014, 647-8.

[42] In the epigraph of Jesus's response there appears the passive participle of ἀντιγράφω, ἀντιγραφέντα, which here has the sense of "respond in writing."

[43] *HE* 1.7.14; 4.8.7; 5.8.5, 20.2, 25, 28.16, 18; 7.6, 30.3; 9.7.2, 9a, 10.6; 10.5.1, 15, 18, 21, 6.1, 7.1.

[44] These are measures that have to do with trials of Christians.

"ὁρκίζω σε τὸν μεταγραφόμενον τὸ βιβλίον τοῦτο κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ κατὰ τῆς ἐνδόξου παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, ἧς ἔρχεται κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ἵνα ἀντιβάλῃς ὃ μετεγράψω, καὶ κατορθώσῃς αὐτὸ πρὸς τὸ ἀντίγραφον τοῦτο ὅθεν μετεγράψω, ἐπιμελῶς· καὶ τὸν ὅρκον τοῦτον ὁμοίως μεταγράψεις καὶ θήσεις ἐν τῷ ἀντιγράφῳ."

"I adjure you who may copy this book, by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by his glorious advent when he comes to judge the living and the dead, to compare what you shall write, and correct it carefully by this manuscript, and also to write this adjuration, and place it in the copy."

It is noteworthy that Irenaeus would adjure the receiver of this text in such strong terms. That said, Irenaeus insists that the scribe who copies a work do his work scrupulously because, in the first centuries of the Church, modified copies of Christian texts circulated.[45] The authors themselves are conscious of this, as one can see in another letter transmitted by Eusebius (*HE* 4.23.12). The author, Dionysius of Corinth, speaks of manipulations that his own texts had suffered:

"ἐπιστολὰς γὰρ ἀδελφῶν ἀξιωσάντων με γράψαι ἔγραψα. καὶ ταύτας οἱ τοῦ διαβόλου ἀπόστολοι ζιζανίων γεγέμικαν, ἃ μὲν ἐξαιροῦντες, ἃ δὲ προστιθέντες· οἷς τὸ οὐαὶ κεῖται. οὐ θαυμαστὸν ἄρα εἰ καὶ τῶν κυριακῶν ῥᾳδιουργῆσαί τινες ἐπιβέβληνται γραφῶν, ὁπότε καὶ ταῖς οὐ τοιαύταις ἐπιβεβουλεύκασιν."

"As the brethren desired me to write epistles, I wrote. And these epistles the apostles of the devil have filled with tares, cutting out some things and adding others. For them a woe is reserved. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at if some have attempted to adulterate the Lord's writings also, since they have formed designs even against writings which are of less account."

As this passage of Dionysius also indicates, the texts that were modified without respect for the literality of the original did not just include contemporary letters but also texts from Holy Scripture. This is also shown by a passage from a work which Eusebius (5.28.1) believes to be by an anonymous author;[46] the passage is included at the end of the fifth book of the *HE* (5-

[45] Among Latin authors, Augustine shows a similar concern. See e.g. Aug. *Ep.* 59 (Augustine signs the letter with his seal in order to assure its authenticity), 72 and 73 (concerning a supposed exchange of letters between Augustine and Jerome, and the problem of the authenticity of the missives), 4* [274] (an individual named Justus travels to Hippo in order to compare a text of Augustine). I would like to thank Prof. Caltabiano for the references to the work of Augustine.

[46] Today we know that the work from which the citations of Eusebius derive is the *Little Labyrinth,* written against Artemon; it is possible that its author was Hippolytus of Rome (ca.

28.15): "ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς ἀφόβως ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας, λέγοντες αὐτὰς διωρθωκέναι", "Therefore they have laid their hands boldly upon the Divine Scriptures, alleging that they have corrected them." It is interesting that the anonymous writer not only raises the problem of untrustworthy copies but also, in the next line (5.28.16-17), offers certain philological indications about how to detect them via the comparison of manuscripts:

> "καὶ ὅτι τοῦτο μὴ καταψευδόμενος αὐτῶν λέγω, ὁ βουλόμενος δύναται μαθεῖν. εἰ γάρ τις θελήσει συγκομίσας αὐτῶν ἑκάστου τὰ ἀντίγραφα ἐξετάζειν πρὸς ἄλληλα, κατὰ πολὺ ἂν εὕροι διαφωνοῦντα. ἀσύμφωνα γοῦν ἔσται τὰ Ἀσκληπιάδου τοῖς Θεοδότου, πολλῶν δὲ ἔστιν εὐπορῆσαι διὰ τὸ φιλοτίμως ἐκγεγράφθαι τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτῶν τὰ ὑφ' ἑκάστου αὐτῶν, ὡς αὐτοὶ καλοῦσιν, κατωρθωμένα, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἠφανισμένα· πάλιν δὲ τούτοις τὰ Ἑρμοφίλου οὐ συνᾴδει. τὰ γὰρ Ἀπολλωνιάδου οὐδὲ αὐτὰ ἑαυτοῖς ἐστιν σύμφωνα· ἔνεστιν γὰρ συγκρῖναι τὰ πρότερον ὑπ' αὐτῶν κατασκευασθέντα τοῖς ὕστερον πάλιν ἐπιδιαστραφεῖσιν καὶ εὑρεῖν κατὰ πολὺ ἀπᾴδοντα".
>
> "That I am not speaking falsely of them in this matter, whoever wishes may learn. For if any one will collect their respective copies, and compare them one with another, he will find that they differ greatly. Those of Asclepiades, for example, do not agree with those of Theodotus. And many of these can be obtained, because their disciples have assiduously written the corrections, as they call them, that is the corruptions, of each of them. Again, those of Hermophilus do not agree with these, and those of Apollonides are not consistent with themselves. For you can compare those prepared by them at an earlier date with those which they corrupted later, and you will find them widely different."

The author cited by Eusebius in 5.28.18 all but states explicitly that those who manipulate the Scriptures in this way have committed what Jesus called the sin against the Holy Spirit.[47] In more philological terms, their error consists in having corrupted the received originals and having created, by their own hand (τῇ αὐτῶν χειρί), copies that are not in accordance with an original (δεῖξαι ἀντίγραφα ὅθεν αὐτὰ μετεγράψαντο, μὴ ἔχωσιν):

> "ὅσης δὲ τόλμης ἐστὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἁμάρτημα, εἰκὸς μηδὲ ἐκείνους ἀγνοεῖν. ἢ γὰρ οὐ πιστεύουσιν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι λελέχθαι τὰς θείας γραφάς, καί εἰσιν ἄπιστοι· ἢ ἑαυτοὺς ἡγοῦνται σοφωτέρους τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ὑπάρχειν, καὶ τί ἕτερον ἢ δαιμονῶσιν; οὐδὲ

170 -235). R. H. Connolly, "Eusebius H. E. V. 28", *JThS* 49, 1948, 73-9.

[47] Mc 3.29 and Mt 12.32; Lc 12.10.

γὰρ ἀρνήσασθαι δύνανται ἑαυτῶν εἶναι τὸ τόλμημα, ὁπόταν καὶ τῇ αὐτῶν χειρὶ ᾖ γεγραμμένα, καὶ παρ' ὧν κατηχήθησαν, μὴ τοιαύτας παρέλαβον τὰς γραφάς, καὶ δεῖξαι ἀντίγραφα ὅθεν αὐτὰ μετεγράψαντο, μὴ ἔχωσιν".

"But how daring this offense is, it is not likely that they themselves are ignorant. For either they do not believe that the Divine Scriptures were spoken by the Holy Spirit, and thus are unbelievers, or else they think themselves wiser than the Holy Spirit, and in that case what else are they than demoniacs? For they cannot deny the commission of the crime, since the copies have been written by their own hands. For they did not receive such Scriptures from their instructors, nor can they produce any copies from which they were transcribed."

A detailed reading of the *HE* permits one to appreciate that Eusebius is particularly sensitive to the need for the copies of the texts he cites (letters and other types of documents) to be trustworthy, that is, for them to hold closely to the originals that were transmitted. Another issue is that he himself might have distorted in one way or another the sources he relies upon.[48] Or that he claims that texts that are surely falsifications are in fact authentic, as occurs in the case of the letters exchanged between Jesus and Abgar.[49] The most important point is that Eusebius considers it to be vitally important to have trustworthy and contrastable copies of the texts cited as documents in support of his historical argumentation.

5. The reliability of the canon

It is possible that the new historiographical concept that enters into play here is that proper to a man of the fourth-century Church who is aware that neither all the texts in circulation, nor all of their copies, have the same importance. Or what amounts to the same thing: in dealing with written texts one has to distinguish between those which are canonical, sanctioned by the tradition, and those that do not fulfill this requirement. The term "canon" comes from the Greek noun κανών, a word which originally designated an "upright object," but came to mean "rule or measure that

[48] In the past, Gibbon (1737-1794) and Burckhardt (1818-1897) harshly criticized the trustworthiness of Eusebius as a historian, calling him (in the case of Burckhardt) "dishonest." Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 128 also criticized Eusebius, whose *HE* he presents as "a literary or philosophical history." In a positive sense (defending the position that Eusebius did not limit himself to passive citing, and that he is no mere compiler), see S. Morlet, "Eusèbe de Césarée: biographie, chronologie, profil intellectual", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 26.

[49] See n. 22.

acquires the status of a model."[50] In its application to literature, κανών was used, beginning in Hellenistic times, in order to refer to those authors that were considered exemplary, those that should be read and imitated.[51] Those who wrote about the Bible also used the term κανόνες in order to designate the books of Scripture that were considered to be divinely inspired. They did so after certain selective lists had already been compiled, such as the canon of Muratori.[52] The oldest example of this use of the word κανών is from the 4th century and, significantly, the person who first documents it is none other than Eusebius of Caesarea. It should be noted that the appearance of gnostic writings that became confused with those that were properly Christian led church authorities to fix, sometime in the second half of the 2nd century, the canon of the writings that should be considered revealed.[53]

Κανών[54] appears in 26 passages of the *HE,* five of them referring to the norm according to which the date of Easter is to be calculated.[55] In its most habitual use, the term alludes in ten places to the norms and rules of life observed in the Church.[56] But in the *HE* κανών is also attested, as I mentioned earlier, with a new sense, that which the word "canon" continues to have in ecclesiastical contexts: "Catalog of the books held by the Catholic Church or another religious confession to be authentically sacred."[57] This is what happens in 6.25.3, where it is mentioned that Origen did not recognize any other Gospels besides the four of the canon: ἐν δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον, τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάττων κανόνα, μόνα τέσσαρα εἰδέναι εὐαγγέλια μαρτύρεται, "In his first book on Matthew's Gospel, maintaining the Canon of the Church, he testifies that he knows only four Gospels." It may also be relevant that the noun κανών appears in Book V (5.28.13) with the sense of "norm," a little before a passage I have already cited in regards to those who made fraudulent copies of Scripture: "γραφὰς μὲν θείας ἀφόβως ῥεᾳδιουργήκασιν, πίστεώς τε ἀρχαίας κανόνα ἠθετήκασιν", "They have treated the Divine Scriptures recklessly and without fear. They have set aside the rule of ancient faith."

[50] *LSJ*, 875, P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque : Histoire des mots*, Paris 1983-1984[2], 493, J. B. Torres, "Literatura griega: las bases del canon", *Minerva* 25, 2012, 21-48.

[51] Ibid., 24.

[52] B. M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*, Oxford 1987.

[53] Torres, "Literatura griega: las bases del canon", 26.

[54] The corresponding adjective, κανονικός, is not attested to in the *HE*. In earlier literature, κανονικός is attested, for example, in Gal. 7.417.

[55] 5.24.6; 6.22.1; 7.Pin., 20.1, 32.13.

[56] 2.17.1; 3.32.7; 4.23.5; 5.28.13; 6.2.14, 13.3, 33.1, 43.15; 7.7.4, 30.6.

[57] According to the 23rd edition of the *Dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy,* s.v. "canon."

In this article I seek, in essence, to propose a hypothesis for discussion: perhaps the new advance of the historiographical genre introduced by the *HE* came about because its author applied to his work as a historian, in an implicit manner, a scripture-related category that he was the first to attest, i.e. "canon." Eusebius holds that only those documents and letters can be held to be trustworthy, i.e. as being "canonical," which are able to be compared with other copies.[58] It is only in this case that they can be assumed to transmit τὰ ὄντα, what really happened. In contrast, the discourses employed as testimony by earlier historians are not trustworthy, and can be put into the category of texts that are "non-canonical" because they are not literal, and, as a result of the limitations of human memory, cannot be compared.[59] Even more, the written testimony of documents makes the value as testimony of those discourses dubious (even supposing that they are literal)[60] and therefore an ecclesiastical historian like Eusebius prefers not to employ them.

Ultimately, the issue is that, from the point of view of the bishop of Palestine, the discourses used as testimony by Thucydides and Josephus do not transmit truth, τὰ ὄντα, the *ipsissima verba* of their protagonists. One can only presume these works to transmit, as the Athenian author stated, τὰ δέοντα, that which is opportune, what can be understood in a logical manner as that which might possibly have been stated (or not) in determined circumstances. One cannot assure, for obvious reasons, that their embedded discourses faithfully report what Pericles or Herod actually said.

[58] The point to be stressed is that Eusebius seems to regard the documents he cites as canonical, meaning just 'authentic': this does not mean that the bishop of Caesarea takes actually the documents quoted by him for a canon.

[59] This does not mean that, on occasion, they might be of some interest, just as Christian writings at times recognized non-canonical texts as being of interest, as is the case with the *Shepherd of Hermas*. Ath. Al. *Decr*. 18.3.1: ἐν δὲ τῷ Ποιμένι γέγραπται, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τοῦτο καίτοι μὴ ὂν ἐκ τοῦ κανόνος προφέρουσι, "It is written in the *Shepherd [of Hermas],* since they also adduce this work, even though it does not form part of the canon."

[60] They would be literal if they had been recorded by a professional stenographer. What is clear is that, despite the development of techniques for rapid writing in Antiquity (see n. 2), there is no evidence that these techniques had acquired a level of development such that they could guarantee the absolute literality of all the oral statements collected in writing in the Empire.

Letters included in the *HE*

Reference	Author	Addressee	Subject
1.7.2-16	Julius Africanus	Aristides	Genealogy of Jesus
1.13.5-8	Abgar	Jesus	Abgar invites Jesus
1.13.10	Jesus	Abgar	Jesus's reply
3.31.3	Polycrates	Victor I	Tombs of the apostles John and Philip
3.36.7-9	Ignatius of Antioch	Church of Rome	His own martyrdom
3.36.11	Ignatius of Antioch	Church of Smyrna	Resurrection of Christ
3.36.13-15	Polycarp	Church of Philippians	The example of Ignatius and other martyrs
4.8.3-7	Justin	Antoninus Pius	Apology of Justin
4.9.1-3	Hadrian	Minucius Fundanus	Rescript about persecutions
4.13	Antoninus Pius	Assembly of cities and countries of Asia	Edict concerning Christians
4.15.2-46	Church of Smyrna	Church of Philomelium	Martyrdom of Polycarp
4.23.10-11	Dionysius of Corinth	Church of Rome	Uses of the Church of Rome
4.23.12	Dionysius of Corinth	---	Characteristics of his letters
5.1.3-2.7	Churches of Lyon and Vienna	Churches of Asia and Phrygia	Martyrs of Gaul
5.4.1-2	Gaulish Martyrs	Eleutherius of Rome	Irenaeus
5.19	Serapion	Caricus and Pontius	Heresy of Montanus
5.20.4-8	Irenaeus	Florinus	Polycarp
5.24.1-8	Polycrates	Victor I	On Easter
5.24.12-17	Irenaeus	Victor I	On Easter
5.25	Bishops of Palestine	---	On Easter
6.11.3	Alexander of Jerusalem	Church of Antinoë	Narcissus
6.11.5-6	Alexander of Jerusalem	Church of Antioch	Asclepiades
6.14.8-9	Alexander of Jerusalem	Origen	Pantaenus and Clement
6.19.11-14	Origen	---	Pagan education of Origen

6.19.17-18	Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus	Demetrius	Origen
6.40	Dionysius of Alexandria	Germanus	Dionysius, persecuted
6.41-42	Dionysius of Alexandria	Fabius of Antioch	Martyrs of Alexandria
6.43.5-20	Cornelius	Fabius of Antioch	Novatian
6.44	Dionysius of Alexandria	Fabius of Antioch	Serapion
6.45	Dionysius of Alexandria	Novatian	Exhortation to unity
6.46,4	Dionysius of Alexandria	---	Alexander of Jerusalem
7.1	Dionysius of Alexandria	Hermammon	Gallus
7.5	Dionysius of Alexandria	Stephen I	Unity of the Churches of the East
7.5	Dionysius of Alexandria	Sixtus	On Baptism
7.6	Dionysius of Alexandria	Sixtus	Sabellius
7.7	Dionysius of Alexandria	Philemon	On Baptism
7.8	Dionysius of Alexandria	Dionysius of Rome	Novatian
7.9	Dionysius of Alexandria	Sixtus	On Baptism
7.10	Dionysius of Alexandria	Hermammon	Valerian
7.11.2-19	Dionysius of Alexandria	---	Defense against Germanus
7.11.20-25	Dionysius of Alexandria	Dometius and Didymus	Deportation of Dionysius
7.13	Gallienus	Christians	Rescript on tolerance of Christians
7.21	Dionysius of Alexandria	Hierax	Rebellion in Alexandria
7.22	Dionysius of Alexandria	Church of Egypt	The plague of Alexandria
7.23.1-4	Dionysius of Alexandria	Hermammon and the Church of Egypt	Gallienus
7.30.1-17	Council Fathers	Dionysius of Rome and Maximus of Alexandria	Paul of Samosata

8.10.1-10	Phileas	Thmuits	Martyrs of Alexandria
8.17.2-11	Galerius	Provinces of the Empire	End of the persecutions: edict of clemency
9.1.3-6	Sabinus	Governors	Freedom of worship for Christians
9.9a.1-9	Maximinus Daia	Sabinus	Freedom of worship for Christians
10.5.15-17	Constantine	Anilinus	Clarifications to the Edict of Milan
10.5.18-20	Constantine	Miltiades and Marcus	Solution to the Donatist schism
10.5.21-24	Constantine	Crestus	About the Donatist schism
10.6	Constantine	Caecilianus	The property of the Church
10.7.1	Constantine	Anilinus	The clergy and the fulfilling of the duties of public office

PALESTINE AS A PALIMPSEST: EUSEBIUS' CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIAL SPACE IN THE *ONOMASTICON*

Jan R. Stenger
University of Glasgow
Jan.Stenger@glasgow.ac.uk

Some cities never seem to stay the same, but are instead always being re-invented. We all have a personal picture of the urban space in our mind´s eye through which we imagine and design our image of a city. Within a single century, Heinrich Zille in his "milieu" paintings, Alfred Döblin in his novel *Berlin, Alexanderplatz,* Albert Speer in his megalomaniac architectural fantasy, "Germania", Leander Haussmann in *Sonnenallee* and the director Tom Tykwer in *Lola rennt* have each created a different city called Berlin. The differences between these several cities are not due simply to changes in the urban fabric over time, but rather to the desire in each case to capture a particular mental image of the city. Like a palimpsest in a scriptorium, the urban space is repeatedly rewritten and equipped with a new iconography.[1]

These textual and visual inventions and rewritings of a modern metropolis may seem far removed from a work, seemingly of a quite different type, in the corpus of the Church Father Eusebius of Caesarea, but this work, too, has as goal the textual representation of a geographical space. The so-called *Onomasticon* or *On the Place Names in Holy Scripture* is certainly not among this author's best known works, though it has had a very considerable *Nachleben*.[2] Unlike most of Eusebius' productions, the *Onomasticon* is not a text with much literary ambition, being a catalogue-like list of around

[1] On textual versions of mental images of a city, from antiquity to the present, see T. Fuhrer, F. Mundt, J. R. Stenger (eds.), *Cityscaping: Constructing and Modelling Images of the City*, Berlin 2015. For another modern example see A. Thomas, *Prague Palimpsest: Writing, Memory, and the City*, Chicago 2010, who argues that Prague is a multilayered text, or palimpsest, which has been constantly revised and rewritten from medieval to modern times.

[2] On the *Onomasticon* see above all the introductions and translations in G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville, R. L. Chapman III, J. E. Taylor, *The Onomasticon by Eusebius of Caesarea: Palestine in the Fourth Century A.D.*, Jerusalem 2003 and R. S. Notley, Z. Safrai, *Eusebius, Onomasticon: The Place Names of Divine Scripture*, Boston 2005, as well as J. R. Stenger, "Eusebios' Erfassung des Heiligen Landes: Die Evidenz des Raumes im Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen", in K. Geus, M. Rathmann (eds.), *Vermessung der Oikumene: Mapping the Oikumene*, Berlin 2013, 223-41, and Id., "Eusebius and the Representation of the Holy Land", in S. Bianchetti, M. R. Cataudella, H.-J. Gehrke (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Geography*, Leiden 2015, 381-393.

1000 alphabetically ordered entries giving toponyms from the Bible with brief commentaries. A short, representative extract gives a good impression of the character of this compilation:[3]

> Ἀπὸ τοῦ Δευτερονομίου.
> Θόφολ. τόπος τῆς ἐρήμου "πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου", ἔνθα τὸ Δευτερονόμιον γράφει Μωυσῆς, καταντικρὺ Ἱεριχοῦς.
> Θαάθ. σταθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.
> Θαρά. σταθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.
> Ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.
> Θαφφοῦ. πόλις ἣν ἐπολιόρκησεν Ἰησοῦς, τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῆς ἀνελών, ἣ γέγονε φυλῆς Ἰούδα. κεῖται καὶ ἀνωτέρω Βηθαφοῦ, ὅριον Παλαιστίνης καὶ Αἰγύπτου.
> Θανάκ. πόλις ἣν ἐπολιόρκησεν Ἰησοῦς, τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῆς ἀνελών, ἣ γέγονε φυλῆς Μανασσῆ, Λευίταις ἀφωρισμένη. καὶ νῦν ἐστιν ἀπὸ δ' σημείου τῆς Λεγεῶνος.
> Deuteronomy
> Tophel. A place in the wilderness "beyond the Jordan", opposite Jericho. There Moses wrote the Deuteronomy.
> Tahath. An encampment of the Israelites.
> Terah. An encampment of the Israelites.
> Joshua
> Tappuah. A city that Joshua besieged and killed its king. It was included in the tribe of Judah. It has been mentioned above as Beth-tappuah, a boundary between Palestine and Egypt.
> Tanaach. A city that Joshua besieged and killed its king. It was included in the tribe of Manasseh and was set apart for the Levites. It is now at the fourth mile from Legio.

Eusebius' practice here of excerpting place names from, especially, the historical books of Scripture, and arranging them in a list accompanied by biblical citations and information about Bible stories, fits neatly into our picture of his period, a time at which many Church Fathers were endeavouring to elucidate the Bible by means of commentaries or exegetic homilies. In a similar way to the exegetic writings of figures like Origen or Cyril of Alexandria, the *Onomasticon*, though with very much humbler ambitions, would have helped the late antique reader to gain a better understanding of the historical and factual side of the biblical text.[4] For that reason, it has of-

[3] Eus. *Onomast.* 98.1-12. The Greek text is that of E. Klostermann, *Eusebius Werke. 3.1: Das Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen*, Leipzig 1904. The English translations are adapted from Notley, Safrai, *Onomasticon*.

[4] Cf. the similar descriptions of places and discussions of toponyms in Orig. *Commentarii*

ten been supposed that Eusebius designed his list of place names as a tool for biblical exegesis, and the author himself, as it happens, seems to suggest this in the preface to the work, where he makes clear that his intended public is the reader of the Bible.[5]

But what is striking in reading the lexicon is how large a proportion of its information does not seem to offer anything for the exegesis of Scripture. What interest could a late antique Bible reader and exegete have had, for example, in finding out that in Eusebius' day date palms were cultivated in the fertile land of Bela?[6] Details like this have led some interpreters to see the *Onomasticon* as a kind of Baedeker for the Christian pilgrim of the fourth century. The particular reception of the work down to the modern period gave rise to the frequent assumption that Eusebius had intended his name-list primarily as a practical aid for pilgrimage, which was taking off in this period, or even that his inventorying of the Holy Land aimed to encourage pilgrimage.[7] Other late antique descriptions of Palestine can be securely tied to this rising practice,[8] so the *Onomasticon* seems to fit seamlessly into this tendency. However, the structure of the work alone, as described above, prompts caution: an alphabetically arranged lexicon can hardly have been much help to a pilgrim on the road. We may also wonder why Eusebius did not make the New Testament central to his work, and instead only throws in occasional observations about specifically Christian phenomena like the site of the Baptism of Christ on the Jordan. These would have been the key points of interest for a Christian pilgrim of the fourth century. Furthermore, in this author especially, whose work elsewhere so often treats church buildings and presents ecphrastic descriptions of them, we would expect attention to be paid to the first Christian sacred architecture in the Holy Land,[9] yet this too is absent from the *Onomasticon*.

Consequently, scholarship on the *Onomasticon* has for the most part backed off from the guidebook theory, regarding the work instead as a tool

in evangelium Joannis 6.41-2 (Bethabara and Bethany in John 1.28). See also Jerome's remarks in his preface to the Book of Chronicles (*PL* 29.423): "Whoever has seen Judaea with his own eyes and knows the memories of the ancient cities and the names of the sites, whether the same or changed, will gaze more clearly upon the Holy Scripture."

[5] Eus. *Onomast.* 2.18-20: ἐκθήσομαι δὲ κατὰ στοιχεῖον ἕκαστα εἰς εὐχερῆ κατάληψιν τῶν σποράδην ἐν τοῖς ἀναγνώσμασιν ὑποπιπτόντων ("I will present the single entries according to the alphabet, for convenient access to the facts that occur sporadically during reading.").

[6] See Eus. *Onomast.* 42.1-4.

[7] R. Klein, "Die Entwicklung der christlichen Palästinawallfahrt in konstantinischer Zeit", *RQ* 85, 1990, 145-81 speaks explicitly of a "Reiseführer", a travel guide, (188) for the anticipated crowds of pilgrims; A. Grafton, M. Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*, Cambridge 2006, 222.

[8] Relevant here are Jerome's *Letter to Eustochium* on Paula's journey (*Ep.* 108), the *Itinerarium Burdigalense* and Egeria's *Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta*.

[9] See e.g. Eus. *HE* 10.4; *VC* 3.26-40.

for scriptural exegesis.[10] Yet rejection of the older thesis does not require that the lexicon's only possible function is as an exegetical tool. Recent research on encyclopaedias and the ordering of knowledge has shown – and not only with regard to the ancient world – that these types of compilation, while designed to reflect and codify the current state of scholarship, nonetheless have other, in part implicit, functions, such as the cultural appropriation of a sphere of knowledge, or discursive control over a controversial subject.[11] So we should not exclude that all Eusebius' hard work may have also been serving other goals. In what follows the attempt will be made to trace such implicit intentions and to elucidate how and to what purposes this Church Father tried to mould the late antique image of the Holy Land.

First, however, a brief description of the *Onomasticon* is in order, especially as it is rarely read outside patristic research or biblical archaeology.[12] Eusebius' interest in the fabric of the Holy Land was not limited to this one work. As he explains in the preface, the compilation of the name-catalogue was part of a larger plan, viz. a geographical compendium on Palestine.[13] In addition to the *Onomasticon*, this comprised firstly a catalogue of the Hebrew names of peoples found in the Bible, translated into Greek, secondly a survey of ancient Judaea as found in the whole of Scripture and thirdly a graphic representation of the capital city Jerusalem, complete with the temple and the important memorial sites drawn in.[14] Nothing survives of these parerga of the *Onomasticon*, so we can only speculate on how exactly they appeared and how they worked together with the catalogue of names.

Eusebius had been urged to produce this compendium by Bishop Paulinus of Tyre, to whom it is dedicated. The dedication gives us a pointer to the dating, as we can roughly date Paulinus' episcopacy.[15] Together with remarks

[10] T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge 1981, 110; P. W. L. Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century*, Oxford 1990, 42-3; Freeman-Grenville, Chapman III, Taylor, *The Onomasticon*, 1-2, 5; B. Bitton-Ashkelony, *Encountering the Sacred: The Debate on Christian Pilgrimage in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley 2005, 20; J. A. Smith, "'My Lord's Native Land'. Mapping the Christian Holy Land", *ChHist* 76, 2007, 1-31.

[11] On encyclopaedic orders of knowledge in the ancient world see now J. König, T. Whitmarsh, "Ordering Knowledge", in J. König, T. Whitmarsh (eds.), *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge 2007, 3-39.

[12] More detailed surveys of the structure of the *Onomasticon* and Eusebius' working method are given by C. U. Wolf, "Eusebius of Caesarea and the Onomasticon", *The Biblical Archaeologist* 27, 1964, 66-96; Notley, Safrai, *Onomasticon*, XI–XXXVI.

[13] Eus. *Onomast.* 2.3-20.

[14] Eus. *Onomast.* 2.5-17.

[15] Paulinus probably held the see of Tyre from 313 to 326. Eusebius also dedicated to him book 10 of the *Church History*. A. Louth, "The Date of Eusebius' 'Historia Ecclesiastica'", *JThS* 41, 1990, 111-23; M. Vinzent, "Origenes als Subscriptum: Paulinus von Tyrus und die origenistische Diadoche", in W. A. Bienert, U. Kühneweg (eds.), *Origeniana Septima: Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Leuven 1999, 149-51. If

in the *Onomasticon* on contemporary features, the dedication indicates that the work was produced in the 320s, though a longer period of composition cannot be excluded.[16] An early dating to 300 or a little earlier has not met with a great deal of support.[17]

A helpful approach for the purposes of the present study is to begin from the *Onomasticon*'s literary and cultural physiognomy. It is not hard to see that the list of biblical place names is firmly anchored in the tradition of Hellenistic philology.[18] Eusebius' own intellectual background was in the school of Origen at Caesarea, under the direction of Pamphilus, where the focus was on the constitution of a reliable text of the Bible; this alone is proof that the author was thoroughly familiar with the approaches and methods of the philological scholarship inaugurated in Alexandria.[19] There, at the Museion, the scholars' efforts were directed not just towards textual criticism and scholarly editions: they also endeavoured to elucidate the great classics, primarily Homer's epics, with thoroughly researched commentaries. The fruit of these efforts was, among other things, countless observations about the geography of Homer's world; after all, the epic poet had drawn a panorama of the Greek cultural world, especially in his "Catalogue of Ships" in the *Iliad*. Some of the Hellenistic scholars seem to have made it their special ambition to compile from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* the most comprehensive and detailed geographical information possible and to provide the reader of the epics with further clarifications of it. The grammarian Demetrius of Scepsis in the second century BCE wrote a vast historical and geographical commentary on the catalogue of the Trojan forces in the second book of the

---

Eusebius had compiled the list of the *Onomasticon* in the 330s, one would expect to find mention of Constantine's churches in Jerusalem and Bethlehem or of Eutropia's and Helen's discoveries in Mamre and Golgotha. See Wolf, "Onomasticon", 73-4; A. J. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, Leiden 2003, 39; Taylor in Freeman-Grenville, Chapman III, Taylor, *The Onomasticon*, 3.

[16] P. Thomsen, *Palästina nach dem Onomasticon des Eusebius*, Doct. Thesis, Univ. Tübingen 1903, 4-5; Wolf, "Onomasticon", 73-4; Louth, "Date", 118-20; Klein, "Entwicklung", 191; Carriker, *Library*, 39 with n. 15; Freeman-Grenville, Chapman III, Taylor, *The Onomasticon*, 3-4; Grafton, Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book*, 135, 221.

[17] T. D. Barnes, "The Composition of Eusebius' 'Onomasticon'", *JThS* 26, 1975, 412-5 and Id., *Constantine and Eusebius*, 110-1 suggests a date before c. 300. However, that is clearly ruled out by the dedication to bishop Paulinus. Barnes is followed by D. E. Groh, "The Onomasticon of Eusebius and the Rise of Christian Palestine", *Studia Patristica* 18, 1985, 23-31, Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places?*, 406-7, and Smith, "'My Lord's Native Land'", 8.

[18] J. R. Stenger, "The Encounter with Christianity", in D. Schenker, M. Hose (eds.), *A Companion to Greek Literature*, Chichester 2015, 126-37, gives an overview of the Christian reception of classical learning.

[19] On Eusebius' relation to the tradition of Origen and his formation in the school of Caesarea, see A. Louth, "Eusebius and the Birth of Church History", in F. Young, L. Ayres, A. Louth (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, Cambridge 2004 and Grafton, Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book*.

Iliad. His contemporary Apollodorus of Athens devoted much effort to an extensive commentary on the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships, in which he drew up a picture of Homeric Greece and explained the place names in the epic catalogue.[20] Later, ancient writers in the field of geography published lexica, as did, for instance, Diogenianus in the second century CE; his encyclopaedia, as its title boasted, aimed to record the cities throughout the world.[21] As these writings document, geography was part and parcel of Homeric scholarship in the Hellenistic and imperial periods. Although it is not known whether Eusebius was actually familiar with such works, it is beyond doubt that he had immersed himself in the tradition of ancient philology and lexicography and knew how to apply their methods to his Biblical scholarship.[22]

This linkage between conscientious research into an authoritative textual corpus and an interest in geographical space has left unmistakable traces in Eusebius' catalogue of place names and will probably have reminded the educated reader of similar resources for the exegesis of Homer. The unambiguously scholarly manner of the *Onomasticon*, standing in the tradition of Hellenistic philology and lexicography, and the style of information provided – historical incidents and realia – fit seamlessly with the rest of Eusebius' engagement with Scripture, which is steeped in interest in history, geography and concrete reality.[23] For this kind of study the library of Origen in Caesarea will have provided him with an outstanding research resource.[24]

Nonetheless, it is no less unmistakable that in his design for the *Onomasticon* Eusebius was also pursuing aims all his own. The apparently redundant details that were mentioned above are hints that he planned to stray from the established paths of philological engagement with a foundational reference text. Clearly, the lexicon presupposes that the contemporary Christian user would have been able to use its information in some way or other. One basic common trait of most of the notices that Eusebius adds to the biblical toponyms is that they concern contemporary features or peculiarities of the towns of Palestine, and so in a sense bring biblical geography right up to

[20] D. Dueck, *Geography in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge 2012, 21-2 on Hellenistic research into Homeric geography.

[21] His work is mentioned in his entry in the lexicon Suda (δ 1140). This parallel is drawn by Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 109.

[22] It is at least obvious that Eusebius made considerable use of the works of the scholar Alexander Polyhistor (first century BCE), who was renowned for his geographical writings on nearly all countries of the ancient world. Cf. Carriker, *Library*, 139-41; W. Adler, "Alexander Polyhistor's 'Peri Ioudaiōn' and Literary Culture in Republican Rome", in S. Inowlocki, C. Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius*, Leiden 2011, 225-40.

[23] On Eusebius' historical approach to Christianity and the Bible, see Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places?*, 23-5, 41-9.

[24] On the library of Origen, Pamphilus and Eusebius see Carriker, *Library*, 1-36; Grafton, Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book*.

date. This is illustrated by even a cursory survey of the information included in the catalogue.

Eusebius had created the *Onomasticon* by excerpting around 1000 entries on 800 proper names from the books of Scripture and ordering them in a list arranged by the Greek alphabet from Ararat to Horonaim. Most of the names relate to the area of Palestine between Tyre and Dan in the north and Beer-sheba in the south, between the coast in the west and Amman in the east, but beyond this some individual places and sites in Egypt or Mesopotamia are included, if they have a role in the Bible.[25] A second ordering principle within the alphabet is the division into the individual books of the Bible, with Genesis at the head of the entries each time. Where a letter does not include a huge number of lemmata, Eusebius also gathers entries for several books into a group. However, as soon as one tries to use the lexicon, it at once becomes apparent that Eusebius has by no means drawn on the entire Bible.[26] The only books represented are the historical books of the Old Testament, from Genesis through the Prophets to Kings, and the New Testament Gospels.[27] As the passage cited above illustrates, things that Eusebius considered important were historical events, such as the conquest of a site by Joshua, or a change in a place's allotment to one of the Twelve Tribes; similarly, there are notices on individual historical figures, for example that Joshua observed the Passover in Gilgal, or that the grave of Miriam is in Kadesh-barnea.[28] There are some errors among the proper names, in that some biblical personal names have been mistaken for toponyms, but these slips were present already in the sources used by Eusebius.[29] As regards the structure of the lemmata themselves, the same categories of information appear, more or less regularly.[30] Besides the name, relevant quotations from the *Hexapla* are cited, the place is located in the territory of the Jewish tribes, and the biblical events associated with it are recorded in summary form; thereafter, authorities like Josephus are sometimes cited,[31] but more important is a localisation with the

[25] A still useful survey of the topographical information offered by the *Onomasticon* is provided by Thomsen, *Palästina*, 46-64. Wolf, "Onomasticon", and Notley, Safrai, *Onomasticon*, XI–XXXVI give more recent overviews of the main features.

[26] However, he tries to give this impression in the *praefatio*: ἀπὸ πάσης μὲν <οὖν> τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς ἀναλέξω τὰ ζητούμενα … (Eus. *Onomast.* 2.17-8, "from the whole of divinely inspired Scripture I will collect the names that are sought…").

[27] Eusebius' structural divisions are roughly as follows, though he does not keep to them strictly: 1) Genesis and Exodus, 2) Numbers and Deuteronomy, 3) Joshua, 4) Judges, 5) Kingdoms (i.e. 1-2 Samuel and 1-2 Kings) according to the division of the Septuagint, 6) the Gospels.

[28] See Eus. *Onomast.* 64.25-66.1 and 112.10-11.

[29] There are about 80 such errors: Notley, Safrai, *Onomasticon*, XII.

[30] Cf. Wolf, "Onomasticon", 76.

[31] See, for instance, the entry on Ararat in Eus. *Onomast.* 2.23-4.25 with verbatim quotations of Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* (*AJ* 1.90-5). Eusebius draws on Josephus' works also in other writings. See Carriker, *Library*, 157-61; S. Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish*

help of contemporary points of reference and information on late antique name forms and on other details, such as the place's current condition or its inhabitants. The content of the *Onomasticon* overall reveals that Eusebius' primary interest was in locating the sites of the long-distant biblical history by identifying them, where possible, with places from his own era, the fourth century. We can thus conclude that the author's principal concern is determined by the perspective of late antiquity.

The most important kind of information, which structures the entire *Onomasticon*, is the toponym. Eusebius catalogues the place names mentioned in the Bible, i.e. he assumes a user who wants to find out about the geography of Palestine via this category. Of special relevance are proper names that identify a place, not least because the author's most important tool for localising the scene of a biblical event is its identity or similarity with a late antique place name.[32] Often linked directly to the name, there are then notices that allow the user to class the site more precisely or to assess its importance. For example, Eusebius often notes whether the place is a city (for example Jericho and Beer-sheba) or a village (e.g. Hebron or Bethany, among others), as the following excerpts illustrate:[33]

> Ἀσηδώθ. ἄλλη αὕτη πόλις, ἣν ἐπολιόρκησεν Ἰησοῦς, τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῆς ἀνελών.[34]
>
> Ashdoth. This is another city that Joshua besieged and killed its king.

> Θερσιλά. ὅθεν ἦν Μαναείμ. καὶ νῦν ἐστι κώμη Σαμαρέων ἐν τῇ Βαταναίᾳ Θαρσιλὰ λεγομένη.[35]
>
> Tirzah. From whence came Menahem. Now it is a village of Samaritans in Batanaea called Tharsila.

Authors: His Citation Technique in an Apologetic Context, Leiden 2006.

[32] Eusebius' strong interest in proper names, and in the explanation of their meanings, is already made clear in the *praefatio*. See Notley, Safrai, *Onomasticon*, XXXIII–XXXVI. On the use of preserved toponyms and its limits in the historical geography of the Holy Land see Y. Elitsur, *Ancient Place Names in the Holy Land: Preservation and History*, Jerusalem 2004, whose work is based on Eusebius' *Onomasticon*.

[33] At times Eusebius differentiates these categories further, for example when he speaks of a large village or mentions differences in status from a diachronic point of view. Both are combined in the entry on Arba (Eus. *Onomast.* 6.8-9): Ἀρβώ. "αὕτη ἐστὶ Χεβρών", κώμη νῦν μεγίστη, μητρόπολις οὖσα τὸ παλαιὸν τῶν ἀλλοφύλων… ("Arba. 'This is Hebron.' Now a very large village, it once was a chief city of foreigners…"). Occasionally there is also mention of other settlements (πολίχνη) (20.19; 70.8; 106.20). Another such status difference is the fact that he identifies the priestly cities (e.g. 6.11).

[34] Eus. *Onomast.* 18.21-2.

[35] Eus. *Onomast.* 102.4-5.

However, the names of settlements are not the only onomastic tool for describing Palestine. The lemmata repeatedly introduce the names of other orientation points by referring to mountains like Ebal in Samaria (64.9) or the course of the stream Kidron near Jerusalem (118.11).[36] Further, the events of sacred history did not always take place in human settlements but in some cases at notable features of the landscape. Thus Eusebius several times mentions the terebinth or oak of Mamre, where Abraham built a well and God met him in the form of three men.[37] For Christians the point on the Jordan where John baptised Jesus was of course noteworthy.[38]

We have already remarked that the focus of Eusebius' attention throughout is to identify the biblical sites with places of his own times, a practice that implies historical continuity across the centuries and the preservation of the places' identity. He thus nudges the reader towards the assumption that the scenes of Scripture still exist and are relevant to people in late antiquity. The references to the author's contemporary world are not limited to such implicit hints. Just as the naming of cities' territories recurs to contemporary practices of ordering space, mentions of roads and milestones are references to the Roman penetration of the geographical region.[39] Eusebius includes in the *Onomasticon* thirty comments on twenty different roads of his own time in the provinces of Palestine, Arabia and Syria, using milestones to measure the distance to an orientation point or adopting the perspective of a traveller by naming the route between two places. Two examples may illustrate this technique of bringing the past into the present:[40]

> Βαάλ. "αὕτη ἐστὶ Καριαθιαρείμ, πόλις Ἰαρείμ", φυλῆς Ἰούδα. καὶ ἔστι κατιόντων ἀπὸ Αἰλίας εἰς Διόσπολιν κώμη Καριαθιαρεὶμ ὡς ἀπὸ σημείων ι'.
>
> Baal. "That is Kiriath-jearim, the city of Jearim," in the tribe of Judah. The village of Kiriath-jearim is about ten miles from Jerusalem (Aelia) on the descent to Diospolis.

[36] E.g., Eus. *Onomast.* 16.4 (Paneas springs); 46.18 (the 'place' Bounos); 116.23 (wadi Kishon); 136.18 (spring Nephtoah); 154.7 (Mount Shepher); 158.28 (Mount Zalmon).

[37] Eus. *Onomast.* 6.12-14; 68.21; 76.1-3; 94.21. See Gen 18.1-33. On this cf. *VC* 3.51-3.

[38] Eus. *Onomast.* 40.1-4; 58.18-20.

[39] On Eusebius' information about the Roman roads, see Thomsen, *Palästina*, 69-89; B. H. Isaac, "Eusebius and the Geography of Roman Provinces", in B. H. Isaac, *The Near East under Roman Rule: Selected Papers*, Leiden 1998, 293-6; Freeman-Grenville, Chapman III, Taylor, *The Onomasticon*, 175-84; Notley, Safrai, *Onomasticon*, XXIII.

[40] Eus. *Onomast.* 48.22-4. In 116.18-9 Eusebius also speaks once of a day's journey (though this is a conjectural supplement).

Ἰεθέρ. φυλῆς Ἰούδα, πόλις ἱερατική. καὶ ἔστι νῦν κώμη μεγίστη Ἰεθειρὰ ὡς ἀπὸ σημείων κ' Ἐλευθεροπόλεως, ὅλη Χριστιανῶν, ἐν τῷ ἔσω Δαρωμᾷ πλησίον Μαλαθῶν. κεῖται καὶ ἀνωτέρω.

Jattir. A priestly city in the tribe of Judah. Jethira is now a very large village about twenty miles from Eleutheropolis, entirely of Christians, in inner Daroma next to Malatha. It has also been mentioned above.[41]

These mentions of roads create relations between places and also have the advantage of communicating a sense of the distances involved. Eusebius is not aiming for exhaustiveness, as he does not consider all the roads that existed in his day. He evidently views roads not marked by milestones as irrelevant or not suitable for a precise localisation. The coverage of the Roman roads, especially, shows that Eusebius was not content merely to collect the facts from the long-distant biblical past, but, where it seemed useful, he has enriched them with observations on his own contemporary world.

The statements about the roads introduce an unmistakably Roman element into the biblical land of the *Onomasticon*, but this is all the more true of information about garrisons.[42] Although he does not identify the units stationed at each place, Eusebius mentions eleven military bases of the Roman regime.[43] He deploys these facts, it seems, as characteristic elements of an area that will be familiar to any reader and, further, as specific, recognisable features that distinguish the places in question from the mass of cities and villages. Together with these references to Roman administration, the *Onomasticon* also, for the purpose of localisation, takes account of places that did not exist in the time of the Old Testament or which had subsequently changed their names. Toponyms like Legio, mentioned in the passage cited earlier, or Eusebius' home town of Caesarea, relate to the contemporary settlement of Palestine without having any reference to the Bible.[44] It is also notable that Eusebius speaks of Jerusalem under the name Aelia, in use since the reign of Hadrian, and so presents the religious and cultural centre of the region to the reader as a Roman *civitas*.[45]

[41] Eus. *Onomast.* 108.1-4.

[42] See on this Isaac, "Eusebius and the Geography", 296; Notley, Safrai, *Onomasticon*, XIII.

[43] Eus. *Onomast.* 6.20 (Elam); 8.9 (Hazazon Tamar); 10.19-20 (Arnon); 24.10-1 (Adummim); 42.3-4 (Bela); 50.3 (Beer-sheba); 96.20-1 (Teman); 116.18 (Karkor); 118.7 (Carmel); 128.22 (Mephaath); 142.14 (Rehoboth); 172.21-2 (Carmel). Only for Elam is the military unit identified (the Xth Legion).

[44] On Moab Eusebius refers explicitly to its change of name to Aeropolis (124.15-6).

[45] The emperor Hadrian renamed Jerusalem as Colonia Aelia Capitolina and made it the capital city of the province Palestine. Cf. H. Sivan, *Palestine in Late Antiquity*, New York 2008, 192-4. On the Christian perception of Jerusalem in Eusebius' day, cp. his *Martyrs of Palestine* 11.9-11 and Chapter 5 of Sivan, *Palestine in Late Antiquity*.

If a Christian Bible reader were to pick up the *Onomasticon*, he would thus see the Holy Land not just as a historical region, but would also get the impression that it is a typical province of the late antique empire, with all the characteristic features that could be found all around the Mediterranean. This impression is reinforced by mentions of unusual features of the landscape or notable land-use practices, or mentions of the inhabitants. Not all this information is equally relevant in a religious context. An example of this is the lemma on Bela:[46]

> Βαλά. ἥ "ἐστι Σιγώρ", ἡ νῦν Ζοορὰ καλουμένη, μόνη διασωθεῖσα ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Σοδομιτῶν χώρας. ἣ καὶ εἰς ἔτι νῦν οἰκεῖται, τῇ νεκρᾷ παρακειμένη θαλάσσῃ, καὶ φρούριόν ἐστι στρατιωτῶν. καὶ φύεταί γε παρ' αὐτῇ τὸ βάλσαμον καὶ ὁ φοῖνιξ, δεῖγμα τῆς παλαιᾶς τῶν τόπων εὐφορίας.
>
> Bela. It "is Zoar". Now it is called Zo'ora, and it alone from the land of the Sodomites has survived. Even until this day it is inhabited, lying near the Dead Sea where there is a garrison of soldiers. Balsam and date palms are grown on the land near it, an example of the lushness of the place in earlier times.

This passage illustrates very well how Eusebius unites historical and contemporary elements into a single overall impression. It begins from a literal quotation from Genesis and refers to the ethnic affiliation of the place as mentioned in the Bible,[47] before then making a connection to Eusebius' own times. Bela does not just exist, then as now, and is inhabited, as Eusebius emphasises, but it is also the base of a Roman garrison and even the farming economy of the fourth century is linked seamlessly to the remarkable fertility of the region in earlier times. Similar to this are entries that, for example, draw attention to an area's use for viticulture, or the famous thermal springs of Gadara, which are mentioned several times.[48]

Although such information does not assist directly in identifying and localising the biblical sites, Eusebius considers it worthwhile, at least in some passages, to pass them on to the interested Christian. Insofar as they concern the practice of Christian pilgrimage, which was on the rise at that time, no further explanation is needed for the fact that he does not wish to withhold such phenomena from his readers. Thus he reports that at the site of the baptism of John, "brothers", i.e. Christians, take a bath in the River Jordan or that the Faithful, in the footsteps of Christ, pray in Gethsemane on the

[46] Eus. *Onomast.* 42.1-5.
[47] See Gen 14.2.
[48] Eus. *Onomast.* 22.26; 30.7; 32.15-7; 42.4-5; 44.22; 52.25.

Mount of Olives.[49] Similarly, one can well imagine that a religiously motivated user of the *Onomasticon* would have read with interest whether a village was inhabited predominantly by Jews or by Christians. Likewise a religious emphasis is created by lemmata that mention the tombs of biblical prophets, which were apparently still visible in the fourth century,[50] or refer to the cult practices of pagan inhabitants, such as the oak of Mamre or a temple in Hermon.[51] In addition, many sites of Christ's ministry remained present in the local cultural memory of the inhabitants and distinguished certain sites in Palestine in a special way. For Bethany, for example, Eusebius reports that still in his day one could visit the "place of Lazarus" where the Saviour had raised the dead man to life.[52]

Given the number of topographical details that derive from Eusebius' own period, the question arises of what effect they had on the ancient reader. While their lacunose and imprecise character means that they do not offer any decisive help in identifying a place and contribute nothing illuminating for understanding of the Bible passages, they do repeatedly create a link to the present day and to the area as a contemporary space. Details about Roman roads, garrisons, thermal baths or land use – around 200 of them in total – recur to the conditions of the fourth century and so create a bridge between the biblical era and the world experienced by late antique Christians. This is true also in cases where, to fix the location of a site, Eusebius mentions cities of the post-biblical period such as Caesarea, Legio, Neapolis or Aelia, the rechristened Jerusalem.[53] These details, which from a practical point of view serve only to help comprehend the geographic space, could be verified, perceived and experienced by Eusebius' contemporaries, as the features were physically, and in most cases permanently, situated in Palestine. Further, they were drawn largely from the everyday life of the inhabitants of the Roman Empire. No matter where in the empire a person lived he or she would be familiar with the Roman road system and the army, and so these details

[49] Eus. *Onomast.* 58.18-20 (Bethabara); 74.16-8 (Gethsemane); further remarks on specifically Christian traditions at 26.13-4 (Anim); 38.20-1 (Akeldama); 40.1-4 (Aenon); 52.1-5 (Beth-zur); 58.13-4 (Bethphage); 58.15-7 (Bethany); 74.13-5 (Gergesa); 74.19-21 (Golgotha). For three villages, Eusebius mentions Christian inhabitants: 26.13-4 (Anim); 108.2-3 (Jattir); 112.16-7 (Kiriathaim). On the information drawn from the Gospels, Notley, Safrai, *Onomasticon*, XXVII–XXX; S. Timm, *Eusebius und die Heilige Schrift: Die Schriftvorlagen des Onomastikons der biblischen Ortsnamen*, Berlin 2010, 504-32.

[50] See e.g. 70.19-21; 70.24-5; 82.13; 114.17-8. For Bethlehem the *Onomasticon* records the burial place of Jesse and David (42.11-12); it is not clear whether this is a Jewish or a Christian site. Cf. the commentary of Notley, Safrai, *Onomasticon*, 44-5.

[51] Eus. *Onomast.* 6.12-3; 20.11.

[52] Eus. *Onomast.* 58.15-7.

[53] The information given about the military headquarters Legio was admittedly no longer entirely up to date, as in the meantime Maximianopolis had been founded in its place (before the year 305). Notley, Safrai, *Onomasticon*, XIII.

would be anything but surprising, especially as they are mentioned rather incidentally. They meld the late antique reader's horizon of experience with the temporal horizon of biblical history. Without drawing any special attention to his technique, the author in a sense lays two different layers of time one over the other in his catalogue of place names – the distant epoch of biblical history from Moses to Christ, and the contemporary world of the Roman Empire. The lexicon of place names thus gains a historical depth, in addition to the spatial depth of the geographical region.

To make it possible for the historical tradition to be experienced as real, it was a good idea to meld past and present like this, that is, to bring history into the present. To this end, Eusebius repeatedly weaves in formulaic remarks that pique the reader's attention. In many of the lemmata, he adds the comment that a biblical site exists "now still" or is pointed out "still even now".[54] 67 times he uses the formula εἰς ἔτι νῦν μένει or a very similar phrase; a further 47 times the expression δείκνυται appears in this context, with a further four times as participle. Representative examples of this notable practice are found in a sequence of three entries dedicated to the Gospels of Matthew and John:[55]

> Βηθανία. κώμη ἐν δευτέρῳ Αἰλίας σημείῳ, ἐν κρημνῷ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν, ἔνθα ὁ Χριστὸς τὸν Λάζαρον ἤγειρεν. δείκνυται εἰς ἔτι καὶ νῦν ὁ Λαζάρου τόπος.
>
> Βηθααβαρά. "ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων", "πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου". καὶ δείκνυται ὁ τόπος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πλείους τῶν ἀδελφῶν εἰς ἔτι νῦν τὸ λουτρὸν φιλοτιμοῦνται λαμβάνειν.
>
> Βηζαθά. κολυμβήθρα ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἥτις ἐστὶν "ἡ προβατική", τὸ παλαιὸν ε' στοὰς ἔχουσα. καὶ νῦν δείκνυται ἐν ταῖς αὐτόθι λίμναις διδύμοις, ὧν ἑκατέρα μὲν ἐκ τῶν κατ' ἔτος ὑετῶν πληροῦται, θατέρα δὲ παραδόξως πεφοινιγμένον δείκνυσι τὸ ὕδωρ, ἴχνος, ὥς φασι, φέρουσα τῶν πάλαι καθαιρομένων ἐν αὐτῇ ἱερείων. παρ' ὃ καὶ προβατικὴ καλεῖται, διὰ τὰ θύματα.
>
> Bethany. A village at the second mile from Jerusalem (Aelia), on the slope of the Mount of Olives. Christ raised Lazarus there. Until today the place of Lazarus is shown.
>
> Bethabara. "Where John was baptising", "beyond the Jordan". The place is shown where even now many of the brothers are eager to receive a bath.

[54] Cf. the references to his own contemporary world in Eus. *Onomast.* 4.9; 6.2; 6.5; 6.8; 8.1; 8.9; 8.12; 8.19 and passim. Eusebius stressed continuity especially through the phrase, used repeatedly, (καὶ) εἰς ἔτι νῦν ("and even until now"), e.g. in 10.18; 12.3; 14.2; 14.23; 16.19; 18.2; 20.3. The same purpose is served by the use of the verb (δια)μένειν in 6.2; 12.5; 62.26; 76.14; 96.25; 124.20; 152.11; and also the expression σῴζεται in 84.12; 104.31.

[55] Eus. *Onomast.* 58.15-26.

> Beth-zatha. A reservoir in Jerusalem, which is also called "the Sheep Gate", previously having five porticoes. Now there is shown in the same place twin pools, one of which is filled from the annual rains, while remarkably the water of the other appears to be reddened, a trace, so they say, resulting from the earlier submerging of the sacrifices in it. Consequently, it is also called "the Sheep Gate", because of the sacrifices.

Three times in a row Eusebius draws the reader's attention to the fact that even after three hundred years he was still able to locate the sites of Christ's life in the Holy Land, both in Jerusalem and in the country. In the case of Bethabara he also mentions the contemporary practice of his brothers in faith, and so emphasises the significance of the place. In the third entry the main contribution made by the description of the two pools is to explain the place's biblical name, but it also has a secondary function of stressing once again that the specific character of the site has been preserved from the time of Christ into late antiquity. The Christian reader should therefore be able to feel sure that the significant place really exists and is a guarantee of continuity from the earliest times into late antiquity.[56] The recurring formula of "still even now", one could say, gives the *Onomasticon* its specific profile that distinguishes it from other encyclopaedias.

All the same, this procedure is not without precedents. Already in the travel literature of the imperial era we encounter the same formula when the cultured traveller to Greece is informed whether a sanctuary or work of art has survived through the centuries since the classical period. Pausanias in his *periegesis* repeatedly speaks of how the visitor to Greek settlements and temples in the second century AD can "still even now" find certain buildings, or he refers to the practice of local guides in his own day of pointing out a given monument.[57] On Ephesus, for example, he records that the inhabitants had erected a tomb monument to the Athenian king's son, Androclus, founder of the city, on the road that leads to the Magnesian Gate, where it was pointed out even in his own day (ἔνθα δείκνυται καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἔτι τὸ μνῆμα).[58] Pausanias is thus attempting to verify the historical tradition by reference to the continuing presence of the monument; in the other passages where he uses this expression, too, his aim is to bring the past into the present through such material "proofs". A further notable parallel to Eusebius is offered by the *Jewish Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus, whose works were well known to Eusebius. In the first book of this work, Josephus recounts in

[56] On continuity and discontinuity in memorial spaces see A. Assmann, *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*, Munich 1999, 308-14.

[57] See Paus. 1.4.5; 1.19.5; 1.30.4; 1.35.3; 2.15.2, etc.

[58] Paus. 7.2.9.

detail what the Greeks call the regions and towns of Palestine in their own language. In this context he mentions that Amathus, the son of Chananaeus, had founded the city of the same name, which "still even today" is called Amathe by the local inhabitants.[59] The parallels to the *Onomasticon* could hardly be more striking: just as Eusebius tries to identify historical sites in the Holy Land and in doing so takes continuity in nomenclature as his principal evidence, the Jewish historian uses a place name from his own times to verify the historical tradition. Eusebius has demonstrably drawn on the *Jewish Antiquities* for his catalogue of place names, which suggests that his use of this technique may well have been inspired by Josephus.

By setting himself in the tradition of the *periegesis* and of historiography, Eusebius makes clear his interest in linking a past epoch with his own present-day world, in order to give the impression of historical continuity. In addition, like Pausanias, he uses this visibility and material presence for his own purposes; because built structures or long-standing practices can be perceived through the senses or even touched, they guarantee the reliability of the biblical tradition: they function as documentary evidence. Eusebius' powerful interest in spatial, physical evidence is revealed in countless references that a given site or location is "pointed out".[60] The material presence can thus be experienced through the senses.[61] In precisely this spirit, the lemma on Jericho reports very vividly that the "traces" of two settlement phases of the city were still "preserved."[62] Here one should bear in mind that Eusebius in other works – in his *Chronicle* and the innovative *Ecclesiastical History* – became the advocate of a model of history that on the one hand claimed historical priority by coopting the Jewish tradition for Christianity, and on the other hand teleologically linked the past to his own time by making Christian history culminate in the person of Constantine.[63] For this

[59] Joseph. *AJ* 1.138: Ἀμαθοῦς δὲ Ἀμάθουν κατῴκισεν, ἥτις ἔστι καὶ νῦν ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν ἐπιχωρίων Ἀμάθη καλουμένη. See further the same expression in 1.35.2; 1.92.6; 1.125.4; 1.131.2, etc.

[60] Eus. *Onomast.* 10.17; 12.7; 38.2; 38.21; 42.12; 46.20 and frequently. In the detailed citation of Josephus in the lemma on Ararat, a central function is to prove the truth by indicating material remains. Elsewhere Eusebius' discussion of pagan myths of the gods in the *Praeparatio evangelica* reveals that in this discourse the indication of material remains acquires the function of proof: *PE* 1.10.29; 2.2.48; 3.10.21.

[61] Jerome displays a very similar attitude to that of Eusebius' when he remarks that the personal inspection of sites, but also knowledge of their names, assists in understanding Scripture (*Praefatio in librum Paralipomenon, PL* 29.401a).

[62] Eus. *Onomast.* 104.30-1: εἰς ἔτι νῦν τὰ ἴχνη σῴζεται. Josephus displays the same interest in the persistence of 'traces' and memories, e.g. in *AJ* 1.203.7, where he says that the pillar of salt into which Lot's wife had been transformed was still standing at Sodom in his days and that he had seen it (ἔτι γὰρ καὶ νῦν διαμένει).

[63] The match between the *Onomasticon* on the one hand and the *Chronicle* and *Ecclesiastical History* on the other is stressed also by Groh, "The Onomasticon", 29; Barnes, "Composition", 110-1; Grafton, Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book*, 223.

goal it was necessary to appropriate the earliest history of Palestine through explicit references.

With his technique of inscribing memorials onto the geographical space and bringing history into the present, Eusebius' *Onomasticon* can be understood as an early stage in the process that led to the construction of Palestine as a memorial landscape. Already in 1941 Maurice Halbwachs had shown through the reports of late antique pilgrims how the collective memory of the Christians, i.e. a (re)constructed past, latched on to the material reality of the places in Palestine.[64] The true achievement of Eusebius' catalogue consists, however, in the fact that it links the historical tradition to the geographical space. The events of sacred history in the Bible are situated in space, but they occur only as individual sites; in contrast, the synoptic collection of them draws attention more strongly to their anchoring in space and at the same time evokes a picture of a whole geographical region suffused by biblical history. The places and sites of the Holy Land are in this way raised to the level of signs which refer to the events of sacred history. Through this the physical space takes on a semiotic character, becomes readable for the late antique Christian and constantly refers beyond itself to the immaterial, the transcendent. A web of mnemotopes, of sites of memory, is cast over Palestine, so that it functions as a store of memory. A precondition for this is to accept that space, on account of its materiality, has an extraordinary permanence that can stay the transience of memory. The procedure of anchoring memory in space so that it can be visualised and easily memorised was well established, not least, in ancient mnemotechniques,[65] procedures that will have been entirely familiar to an educated person like Eusebius.[66]

Admittedly, Eusebius and his Christian contemporaries were not the first to decide to disseminate their religious vision of the Holy Land. With respect to Palestine Halbwachs details how every group, and every religious community, fixes their collective memory in space, each in their own way.[67] The region had undergone a number of historical ruptures since the time of the Old Testament, all of which left their traces on it. Both the ethnic and the religious

[64] M. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, transl. and ed. by L.A. Coser, Chicago 1992. Cf. J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich 1992, 34-48, 59-60. On memorial spaces (*Erinnerungsräume*) see also Assmann, *Erinnerungsräume*, esp. 298-339.

[65] Cf. Cic. *Fin.* 5.2: *tanta vis admonitionis inest in locis ut non sine causa ex iis memoriae ducta sit disciplina* ("Such is the power of memory in these sites that with good cause mnemotechnique is derived from them.").

[66] In the *praefatio* Eusebius gives at least a hint in this direction, in that he remarks that he has added to his graphic representation of Jerusalem on the individual places the *hypomnemata*, i.e. remarks, mentions or recollections: *Onomast.* 2.11-2: … τὴν εἰκόνα διαχαράξας μετὰ παραθέσεως τῶν εἰς τοὺς τόπους ὑπομνημάτων… ("… etching the image with the citation of the memories attached to the places…").

[67] Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, in particular 204-5 and 219.

map of Palestine in the fourth century was thus anything but homogeneous.[68] Every community shaped the space and its sites with their presence and their cultural and religious practices. Palestine was no *tabula rasa* that Eusebius could fill up at will with his Christian tradition; rather, it was home to an abundance of diverging practices, experiences, memories and their associated memorial sites. The Church Father himself was under no illusions about the nature of this conflicting mixture, for he frequently notes in various works the ethnic groups and religious communities that lived in the region and the places where they possessed sites of religious worship. For example, he notes that at the oak of Mamre the pagans practised their cult.[69] When he collected in the *Onomasticon* the sites relevant to biblical history, his task thus also included that of, in a sense, over-writing existing memories and mental maps with the Christian tradition, including its Old Testament inheritance.

Through this, the encyclopaedic list of names is revealed as a part of Eusebius' apologetic agenda. In his apologetic writings he lays claim to the Jewish past for the Christian Church, but through the *Onomasticon*, if only between the lines, he was also taking possession of the Holy Land for the community of the Christians.[70] The two dimensions, time and space, become linked in his catalogue of biblical toponyms, and so they assert the ancient dignity of Christianity relative to rival religions while also supporting it through its evident presence. The religious identity of the entire group is based on the authority of the Bible, and Eusebius helped the Christians to experience their history in physical space, or at least to imagine that they could experience them on the spot.[71] It is not by chance that he concentrates on the earliest period, the Jewish tradition; that is, his aim was to foreground the origins of the community and to lay claim to them in the face of competition from Judaism.[72] In this religious debate history was adduced as an argument, not least as proof of ancient standing. And if a case was to be based on the historical tradition, its credibility had to be beyond reproach.

[68] See Sivan, *Palestine in Late Antiquity*.

[69] Eus. *Onomast.* 6.12-3; *VC* 3.53.

[70] Cf. Sivan, *Palestine in Late Antiquity*, 250-5, who argues that with the *Onomasticon* Eusebius took possession of the Holy Land for Christianity.

[71] Cf. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, 39: "Jede Gruppe, die sich als solche konsolidieren will, ist bestrebt, sich Orte zu schaffen und zu sichern, die nicht nur Schauplätze ihrer Interaktionsformen abgeben, sondern Symbole ihrer Identität und Anhaltspunkte ihrer Erinnerung. Das Gedächtnis braucht Orte, tendiert zur Verräumlichung." ('Every group that wants to consolidate itself as such strives to create and control places that yield not just scenes for their forms of interaction but symbols of their identity and points of reference for their memory. Memory needs places; it tends to become spatial.').

[72] On Eusebius' response to Jewish claims and queries see J. Ulrich, *Euseb von Caesarea und die Juden: Studien zur Rolle der Juden in der Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*, Berlin 1999; A. P. Johnson, *Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius' Praeparatio Evangelica*, Oxford 2006, 94-125.

The emperor Constantine, and with him his biographer Eusebius, quickly grasped that it was possible to pursue religious conflicts through space, by occupying and rewriting pagan places of worship with Christian churches. From then on Palestine was designed by the Christians as Holy Land.[73] Eusebius played a decisive part in this process of turning towards space.[74] In his *Vita Constantini* he draws the attention of Christians to the religious and theological significance of space, and even speaks of the site of the resurrection explicitly as a "holy place" (ἱερὸς τόπος).[75] In the present context it is significant that he ascribes to space the character of a sign. In his view, elements within earthly space function as signs (γνώρισμα) by which the truth of the story of Jesus can be recognised. The site of the church of the Holy Sepulchre is for him an image of Christ's return to life; indeed, it even brings to light proof (πίστις) of the Saviour's passion.[76]

Consequently the *Onomasticon*, which at first sight seemed to be of use solely for biblical exegesis, can be understood within the late antique competition between memorial landcapes. Although it is not a work of history in the strict sense, its constant recourse to past and present reveals it as a historically directed project. Against the background of other mental designs on the space, it creates Palestine as a Christian memorial landscape and provides for the Bible reader a mental map of the territory with a historical dimension. To gain an adequate understanding of this attempt, I would like to draw on a concept that Gerard Genette has brought to some prominence in literary studies.[77] The map that the *Onomasticon* spreads out before the mind can be regarded as a palimpsest. Genette characterises this concept as follows:

> That duplicity of the object, in the sphere of textual relations, can be represented by the old analogy of the *palimpsest*: on the same parchment, one text can become superimposed upon another, which

[73] On the Christian 'invention' of the Holy Land in the 4th and 5th centuries, see R. L. Wilken, *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought*, New Haven 1992; R. A. Markus, "How on Earth Could Places Become Holy? Origins of the Christian Idea of Holy Places", *JECS* 2, 1994, 257-72; Smith, "'My Lord's Native Land'".

[74] See Wilken, *The Land Called Holy*, 88-91; Id., "Eusebius and the Christian Holy Land", in H. W. Attridge, G. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Leiden 1992, 736-60. A different view is taken in Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places?*, 108-16, namely that Eusebius' very distanced attitude to the physical space and to holy places had not essentially changed despite what were for Christian Palestine dramatic events in 324/5. Markus, "Origins", 258-9, to the contrary, stresses Eusebius' development from initial reserve toward the concept of the holy place through to accommodating himself to this idea under the influence of Constantine's commitment to the Holy Land.

[75] Eus. *VC* 3.30.4 (in a letter of Constantine). Similarly, it is said there that the place is ἅγιος.

[76] Eus. *VC* 3.28; 3.30.1; 3.30.4; *LC* 18.3.

[77] G. Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, transl. by C. Newman and C. Doubinsky, Lincoln 1997.

> it does not quite conceal but allows to show through… The hypertext invites us to engage in a relational reading, the flavor of which, however perverse, may well be condensed in an adjective recently coined by Philippe Lejeune: a *palimpsestuous* reading.[78]

The *Onomasticon* would in this sense be a hypertext, i.e. a text that exists against the background of other texts and writes over them. On the one hand it is superimposed on the hypotext of Scripture, cites it, re-arranges it and transforms it; on the other hand it imposes a new idea of space in the place of memorial landscapes that already exist. What makes the concept of the palimpsest so apt for the project of the *Onomasticon* is that in his *Vita Constantini* Eusebius demonstrates that he is fully aware of this practice, even if he does not have a particular term for it. In the third book of this panegyrical biography he describes in detail how Constantine, as it were, re-invents significant places in Palestine, such as Bethlehem or the site of the Resurrection, by developing them as built places of Christian worship.[79] With remarkable clarity, Eusebius comprehends the far-reaching consequences of these imperial building measures:[80]

> ἄνδρες μὲν γάρ ποτε δυσσεβεῖς, μᾶλλον δὲ πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνων διὰ τούτων γένος, σπουδὴν ἔθεντο σκότῳ καὶ λήθῃ παραδοῦναι τὸ θεσπέσιον ἐκεῖνο τῆς ἀθανασίας μνῆμα, παρ' ᾧ φῶς ἐξαστράπτων ὁ καταβὰς οὐρανόθεν ἄγγελος ἀπεκύλισε τὸν λίθον τῶν τὰς διανοίας λελιθωμένων καὶ τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν ἔθ' ὑπάρχειν ὑπειληφότων… τοῦτο μὲν οὖν τὸ σωτήριον ἄντρον ἄθεοί τινες καὶ δυσσεβεῖς ἀφανὲς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ποιήσασθαι διανενόηντο, ἄφρονι λογισμῷ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ταύτῃ πη κρύψαι λογισάμενοι.
>
> Once upon a time wicked men – or rather the whole tribe of demons through them – had striven to consign to darkness and oblivion that divine monument to immortality, at which, brilliant with light, the angel who had descended from heaven had rolled away the stone of those whose minds were set like stone in their assumption that the Living One was still with the dead… It was this very cave of the Saviour that some godless and wicked people had planned to make invisible to mankind, thinking in their stupidity that they could in this way hide the truth.

[78] Ibid., 398-9.

[79] Eus. *VC* 3.25-53 and on the removal of pagan temples 3.54-8. Cf. the detailed commentary of A. Cameron, S. G. Hall, *Eusebius. Life of Constantine*, Oxford 1999, 273-305.

[80] Eus. *VC* 3.26 (translation by A. Cameron, S. G. Hall).

The "godless" or pagans mentioned by Eusebius make every effort to obliterate from the earth the material memory of the Saviour by erecting a sanctuary of Aphrodite at the holy site. According to Eusebius they were eager to "to bury the Saviour's cave under such foul pollutions."[81] None other than the Christian emperor Constantine, with God on his side, undertook the task of purifying the place and now in turn removing the pagan sanctuary and building over the site with the church of the Holy Sepulchre, after he had brought back to light the traces of Jesus. It was only through these measures that the grotto once again became a material testimony to the resurrection of Christ, one that, as the biographer concludes with satisfaction, speaks louder than any voice.[82] Constantine's building programme and the supporting ideological account by Eusebius go hand in hand, in order to give a new identity to this central site of sacred history and to highlight the triumph of Christianity.[83] When Eusebius in this passage uses the expressions *martyrion* and *gnorisma* of the holy sites he sends an unmistakable signal that a physical place can be read and can serve as evidence in the same way as a written text.

By rewriting Palestine in the *Onomasticon* Eusebius completes what his revered Christian emperor had urged on Bishop Macarius and other bishops of Palestine in his letter, namely to keep the sites of the Holy Land free from pagan defilement and to preserve them for the worship of God.[84] In a very similar way to the *Chronicle* and the *Vita Constantini*, the *Onomasticon* thus also pursues the intention of clearing the way for a revision of history. For centuries Hellenistic kings and then Roman emperors had left their stamp on Palestine and so added new chapters to the history-book of the region. As the renaming of Jerusalem as Aelia had vividly demonstrated, the Romans had integrated Palestine into their empire and made it

[81] Eus. *VC* 3.26.3.

[82] Eus. *VC* 3.28. The same practice of recreating a holy place that had been disfigured by pagan cult by over-writing it with Christian buildings is described by Eusebius in 3.51-3, where Constantine had the location of the oak of Mamre purified and built over. That the emperor was here pursuing a conscious memorial policy is confirmed by further destructions of pagan sanctuaries (3.54-8; see also *LC* 8).

[83] See Eus. *VC* 3.33. Cf. Sivan, *Palestine in Late Antiquity*, 194-200, who aptly summarises that "the first Constantinian building in Jerusalem, the church of the Holy Sepulchre (335), ushered in a rhetoric that aspired to highlight the futility of Judaism, a religion that had lost its sacred centre. Contrasting the 'old' or Jewish Jerusalem with the 'new' or the Christian city, Eusebius, bishop of the Palestinian capital Caesarea, depicted the imperial endeavour as an affirmation of the city's new identity." (194) On Constantine's church buildings see also E. D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire AD 312-460*, Oxford 1982, 6-27 and Wilken, "Eusebius and the Christian Holy Land", 741-5.

[84] Constantine's letter in *VC* 3.53.4: "In these circumstances it is right, so it seems to me, that by our provision this site [Mamre] should be both kept clear of every defilement and restored to its ancient holy state, so that no other activity goes on there except the performance of the cult appropriate to God the Almighty, our Saviour and the Lord of the Universe."

a Roman province. Eusebius, however, wants to reverse this historical process and to replace the image of Palestine that has meanwhile become established with his own conception of a biblical land. In the context of his conception of history, the geographical space becomes a three-dimensional palimpsest, a mental map, which can be repeatedly erased and redrawn, charged with new meaning and used for new purposes. Later, writers like Jerome and the authors of the pilgrimage reports, but also the artist of the Madaba mosaic, would continue to draw upon this palimpsest-map.[85]

[85] On the famous sixth-century Madaba map and its relation to the *Onomasticon* see L. Di Segni, "The 'Onomasticon' of Eusebius and the Madaba Map", in M. Piccirillo, E. Alliata (eds.), *The Madaba Map Centenary 1897–1997: Travelling Through the Byzantine Umayyad Period*, Jerusalem 1999, 115-20.

CITING OR DOCTORING THE SOURCES? SERAPION AND THE *GOSPEL OF PETER* IN EUSEBIUS'S *HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA*

PABLO M. EDO
Universidad de Navarra
pel@unav.es

1. Introduction[1]

The numerous recent monographs, collective works,[2] and detailed analyses on Eusebius of Caesarea have confirmed a growing scholarly interest in the character, works and thought of this author. One of the most debated issues has been to what extent the ecclesiastical historian knew and managed previous literary works.[3] A careful analysis of Eusebius's method of citing and which fragments he selected could help us more precisely define the contour of his apologetic approach and his reliability as an historian.[4] In this sense, the *Historia Ecclesiastica* (ca. 313-326 AD) reveals itself as paradigmatic of Eusebius's approach insofar as it contains more than 40 literal quotations from works that he might have used first hand[5] and also provides valuable information about several ancient authors.[6]

This paper focuses on one of these "first hand" quotations: a passage attributed to Bishop Serapion of Antioch by Eusebius, who had written in

[1] I would like to thank Á. Sánchez-Ostiz and J. B. Torres for their kind invitation to the *Workshop: Beginning and End*, as well as for their suggestions, philological remarks, and bibliographic recommendations.

[2] See for example, A. J. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, Leiden 2003; S. Inowlocki, C. Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius: Collected Papers on Literary, Historical, and Theological Issues*, Leiden 2011; S. Morlet, L. Perrone, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012; A. P. Johnson, "Eusebius's Polemic against Porphyry: A Reassessment", in S. Inowlocki, C. Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius*, Leiden, 119-50. An up to date and extensive bibliography can be found in Inowlocki, Zamagni, *Reconsidering Eusebius: Collected Papers on Literary, Historical, and Theological Issues*, viii and n. 7.

[3] The study of Carriker, *Library* offers a comprehensive elenchus of Eusebius's sources, especially, pp. 37-74, chapter entitled "Eusebius's use of Sources".

[4] A. J. Droge, "The Apologetic Dimensions of the Ecclesiastical History", in H. W. Attridge, G. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Detroit 1992, 492-509; Inowlocki, Zamagni, *Reconsidering Eusebius: Collected Papers on Literary, Historical, and Theological Issues*, vii-x; Morlet, Perrone, *Eusèbe de Césarée : Histoire ecclésiastique : commentaire. I*, 22f.

[5] Carriker, *Library*, 57-9.

[6] D. DeVore, "Genre and Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History: Toward a Focused Debate", in A. Johnson, J. Schott (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*, Washington 2013, 19.

the 2nd century a treatise *About the so-called Gospel according to Peter*. This citation deserves a close analysis for several reasons. On the one hand, this passage has great intrinsic value as it is the only remaining citation of Serapion's treatise. It is also the most important mention of the *Gospel of Peter*, an apocryphal work that has motivated a great deal of research in recent decades and has triggered an interesting debate.[7] On the other hand, it is not easy to determine what Serapion's words exactly denote, since the passage is ambiguous and requires more than one reading. As a result, it is necessary to evaluate carefully Eusebius's initial comments on the passage in order to arrive at what Serapion could have meant. More generally, this case may serve as a representative example of the historian's ἀκρίβεια towards his sources.

Some scholars postulate that the apologetic attitude of Eusebius, who wanted to investigate the life and works "of the ambassadors of the divine word" (*HE* 1.1.1), overstepped a more historical interpretation of Bishop Serapion, and, in turn, coloured subsequent research on the apocryphal *Gospel of Peter*.[8] However, this criticism of Eusebius could be overstated. Certainly, the *HE* tries to counterweight pagan reproaches and Christian heretical deviations, which makes it difficult to determine the literary genre of this work as a whole.[9] Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica* incorporates a considerable number of documents and texts from other authors on account of their doctrinal or persuasive value.[10] This incorporation identifies the genre of the work as an "apologetic history." However, this "apologetic point of view" does not challenge *ipso facto* the historiographical reliability of the work. Moreover, as DeVore has recently pointed out,[11] Eusebius worked according to the historical mentality of his time and to the criteria employed by other reputable historians.

[7] See for example P. Foster, *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary*, Leiden 2010, 7-39; P. M. Edo, *El Evangelio de Pedro. Fragmento de Akhmîm. Introducción, texto bilingüe y notas*, Salamanca 2015, 52-9.

[8] See for example R. M. Grant, *Eusebius as a Church Historian*, Oxford 1980; T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge 1981, 134; F. W. Norris, "Eusebius on Jesus as Deceiver and Sorcerer", in H. W. Attridge, G. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Detroit 1992, 523-42.

[9] S. Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors: His Citation Technique in an Apologetic Context*, Leiden 2006; A. Petersen, "The Diversity of Apologetics: From Genre to a Mode of Thinking", in A. C. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, D. Brakke (eds.), *Critique and Apologetics: Jews, Christians, and Pagans in Antiquity*, Frankfurt 2006, 15-42; S. Morlet, "L'introduction de l'*Historie ecclésiastique* d'Eusèbe de Césarée (HE I, ii-iv) : Étude génetique, littéraire et rhétorique", *REA* 52, 2006, 167-98; M. Verdoner, "Transgeneric Crosses: Apologetics in the Church History of Eusebius", in A. C. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich (eds.), *Three Greek Apologists: Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius*, Frankfurt 2007, 75-92.

[10] Ibid., 75.

[11] DeVore, "Genre".

Nevertheless, Eusebius's historical reliability still remains an open question. And in this debate, the quotation of Serapion's treatise has been adduced as a paradigmatic case. For example, Norris, who deems Eusebius to be biased because of his apologetic concern, also states: "Eusebius's perspectives sometimes distort his presentation of material".[12] Norris mentions the citation from Serapion as an example of such distortions: this would be because Eusebius does not include the inventory of doctrinal errors of the *Gospel of Peter* that the Bishop of Antioch had detailed in his treatise.

Therefore, this paper contextualizes in the first section the quotation from Serapion and explains its importance for studies on the *Gospel of Peter*. Second, it offers a translation of the passage from Serapion in the significant context of Eusebius's commentary. A third section closely analyses the citation, pointing out difficulties of interpretation and offering a possible solution. Final conclusions present an appraisal of Eusebius's comments and locate the particular discussion of the historian's method of citing in the broader context of his management of sources.

2. Eusebius, Serapion and the Gospel of Peter

Book VI of the *HE* presents the history of the Church in the first half of the 3rd century. Eusebius pays special attention to prominent figures, especially writers that had defended the faith against different heresies in the past. Within this general framework, at the beginning of Chapter 12 of the sixth book Eusebius brings into question the works written by Serapion, a Bishop who at the end of the 2nd century succeeded Maximinus in the Antiochian see and ruled there until the beginning of the 3rd century.[13] For Eusebius, Serapion is a clear case of both a defender of the Christian faith against heresy and a shepherd that left several written works. Among the works of Serapion that the historian mentions are the following: an Epistle *To Domninus*, who had fallen "in certain Jewish superstition";[14] another two letters *To Pontius and Caricus*, which are intended to refute the doctrines of Apollinaris and the Phrygians (cf. *HE* 5.19); several not detailed letters, and, finally, a treatise entitled *About the so-called Gospel according to Peter*. Eusebius lends considerable space to this last work of Serapion, and

[12] Norris, "Eusebius on Jesus", 523.

[13] *HE* 5.19; 6.18 and H. B. Swete, *The Akhmîm Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter*, London 1893, x. For Serapion's life, see N. Sims-Williams, "Christian Sogdian Texts from the Nachlass of Olaf Hansen I: Fragments of the Life of Serapion", *BSOAS* 58, 1995, 50-68 and Fr. José de Santa Teresa, *Flores del Carmelo. Vidas de los santos de Nuestra Señora del Carmen*, A. Gonçalez de Reyes editor, Madrid 1678, 526-530.

[14] The Paris National Library version, 1430 and the Laurentianus 70.7 offer *Domninon* instead of the most usual reading *Domno*. Eusebius wrote that this man shifted to the "Jewish superstition" in time of persecution. Such superstition can be understood as a Judaizer heresy or a Gnostic sect: see *SCh*, 41, 102, n. 2.

describes it by adding some remarks and even a literal quotation to underline how the Bishop of Antioch defended the faith in open opposition to this apocryphal Gospel and to some heretics of docetic inspiration.

In this context, it is relevant to briefly describe the value of the quote against the background of biblical studies. According to Eusebius, as well as to some other Fathers,[15] a so-called Gospel of Peter (*Gospel of Peter*) circulated in some Christian circles at the end of the 2nd century. However, there was no material vestige of this apocryphal writing for centuries, until the winter of 1886, when the French Archaeological Campaign found a codex containing several sheets of Papyrus in a Christian Tomb of the necropolis of Akhmîm, located in Northern Egypt.[16] Among other fragments of various works, the manuscript comprised a piece of an unpublished account of Christ's passion, written in a careless Greek, which was dated to near the 9th century.[17] This singular narration claimed to be composed by one of its protagonists: "Simon Peter" himself (14.60). In the opinion of several scholars, this copy found at Akhmîm might be a vestige of the missing *Gospel of Peter*.[18]

The main argument adduced by the first scholars to identify the manuscript of Akhmîm with the *Gospel of Peter* was precisely its relation to Serapion's quotation included in Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica*. In that passage Serapion describes some features of the Gospel that circulated in the 2nd century attributed to Peter. Therefore, if similar traits were to be found in the Fragment of Akhmîm, it would be quite likely identified with the *Gospel of Peter*. However, scholarly consensus about the intention of Serapion's words is far from being reached. Moreover, some authors consider

[15] In addition to the quotations examined here, see Orig. *Com.in Mt.* 10.17; Eus. *HE* 3.3.2; 25.6; Jer. *De vir. ill.* 1 and 41; Philipp Sid. *Fr.* 4.4; *Decretum Gelasianum*; Thdt. *Haer.* 2.2; *In Eccl.* 1.6-8, attributed to Didymus the Blind.

[16] U. Bouriant,"Fragments du texte grec du livre d´Énoch et de quelques écrits attribués à saint Pierre", *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire, IX, fasc. 1*, Paris 1892; A. Lods, "L´Évangile et l´Apocalypse de Pierre publiés pour la première fois d´après les photographies du manuscript de Gizéh", *Mémories publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire, IX, fasc. 3*, Paris 1893; O. L. von Gebhardt, *Das Evangelium und die Apokalypse des Petrus: Die neuentdeckten Bruchstücke nach einer Photographie der Handschrift zu Gizeh in Lichtdruck herausgegeben*, Leipzig 1893.

[17] Foster, *Gospel of Peter*, 55-56; T. J. Kraus, T. Nicklas, *Das Petrusevangelium und die Petrusapokalypse: Die griechischen Fragmente mit deutscher und englischer Übersetzung*, Berlin 2004.

[18] Other likely papyrological evidence of the *Gospel of Peter* has been given, in particular, by *P. Oxy.* 2949; *P. Oxy.* 4009; *P. Vindob.* (G) 2325; *P. Egerton* 2; and the *ostrakon Van Haelst* Nr. 741. Among them stands out the couple of fragments P. Oxy. 2949 (circa 200 AD), which coincides in part with *Gospel of Peter* 2.3-5. For a detailed study of these supposed testimonies, cf. Foster, *Gospel of Peter*, 57-91, in intense debate with D. Lührmann. Foster rebuts Lührmann´s opinion that *Gospel of Peter* and those texts are witnesses of the same textual archetype.

that Eusebius's preliminary comments on the quotation has biased its reading and interpretation.

Therefore, it is worthwhile to clarify, as far as the limited evidence of a quotation will allow us, what Serapion's meaning exactly was. More specifically, it is essential to determine what opinion he had about the *Gospel of Peter* that circulated in the 2nd century. Only after elucidating these points can the two issues relevant to the argument be properly argued: the possible relationship of this text with the Fragment of Akhmîm, found in the 19th century, and above all the value of Eusebius's interpretation of the words from Serapion.

3. Eusebius's comment and Serapion's quotation revisited

Eusebius refers to the treatise composed by Serapion in the following terms (*HE* 6.12.2):

> ἕτερός τε συντεταγμένος αὐτῷ λόγος Περὶ τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου, ὃν πεποίηται ἀπελέγχων τὰ ψευδῶς ἐν αὐτῷ εἰρημένα διά τινας ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ῥωσσὸν παροικίᾳ προφάσει τῆς εἰρημένης γραφῆς εἰς ἑτεροδόξους διδασκαλίας ἀποκείλαντας· ἀφ'οὗ εὔλογον βραχείας παραθέσθαι λέξεις, δι' ὧν ἣν εἶχεν περὶ τοῦ βιβλίου γνώμην προτίθησιν, οὕτω γράφων…
>
> And another treatise that he composed *About the so-called Gospel according to Peter*, he wrote it refuting the falsities that are said in it, because of some from the church of Rhossos who, with the excuse of the aforementioned writing, had strayed towards heterodox teachings. Brief words in that he presents his opinion about that book, [Serapion] writes so…

The town of Rhossos was situated at to the coast, in the Bay of Issos, on a promontory at the far end of Taurus and a few kilometres northwest of Syrian Antioch.[19] It seems plausible that at the end of the 2nd century AD there was a Christian community without its own episcopal see, and that, according to the passage, it depended on the Bishop of Antioch. Eusebius states that the *Gospel of Peter* contains falsehoods, and that these were refuted by Serapion in a writing, formally a letter, entitled *About the so-called Gospel of Peter*. Furthermore, some of the church of Rhossos had deviated from true Christian doctrine on account of using this Gospel.

[19] This town is also known as *Cephalorion* in the 2nd century AD. For the history of this toponym of Hebrew roots (*rosh*, "head"), see D. E. Gershenson, "Coryphaion, Cephalorion, and Rhosos", *JQR* 89, 1998, 127-30. It is remarkable that a gospel attributed to Peter had come to light precisely in a place whose name meant "head" in Phoenician, Hebrew and Greek.

In order to demonstrate his judgment, Eusebius quotes the following excerpt from Serapion's work (*HE* 4.12.3-6):

> 3. ἡμεῖς γάρ, ἀδελφοί, καὶ Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀποστόλους ἀποδεχόμεθα ὡς Χριστόν, τὰ δὲ ὀνόματι αὐτῶν ψευδεπίγραφα ὡς ἔμπειροι παραιτούμεθα, γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐ παρελάβομεν. 4. ἐγὼ γὰρ γενόμενος παρ' ὑμῖν, ὑπενόουν τοὺς πάντας ὀρθῇ πίστει προσφέρεσθαι, καὶ μὴ διελθὼν τὸ ὑπ' αὐτῶν προφερόμενον ὀνόματι Πέτρου εὐαγγέλιον, εἶπον ὅτι εἰ τοῦτό ἐστιν μόνον τὸ δοκοῦν ὑμῖν παρέχειν μικροψυχίαν, ἀναγινωσκέσθω· νῦν δὲ μαθὼν ὅτι αἱρέσει τινὶ ὁ νοῦς αὐτῶν ἐφώλευεν, ἐκ τῶν λεχθέντων μοι, σπουδάσω πάλιν γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὥστε, ἀδελφοί, προσδοκᾶτέ με ἐν τάχει. 5. ἡμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, καταλαβόμενοι ὁποίας ἦν αἱρέσεως ὁ Μαρκιανός, καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἐναντιοῦτο, μὴ νοῶν ἃ ἐλάλει, ἃ μαθήσεσθε ἐξ ὧν ὑμῖν ἐγράφη, 6. ἐδυνήθημεν γὰρ παρ' ἄλλων τῶν ἀσκησάντων αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν παρὰ τῶν διαδόχων τῶν καταρξαμένων αὐτοῦ, οὓς Δοκητὰς καλοῦμεν (τὰ γὰρ πλείονα φρονήματα ἐκείνων ἐστὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας), χρησάμενοι παρ' αὐτῶν διελθεῖν καὶ εὑρεῖν τὰ μὲν πλείονα τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου τοῦ σωτῆρος, τινὰ δὲ προσδιεσταλμένα, ἃ καὶ ὑπετάξαμεν ὑμῖν. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τὰ Σεραπίωνος.[20]

The following translation includes comments to some Greek terms in footnotes:

> 3. For we also, brethren, accept Peter and the other apostles as Christ; but, as men of experience, we reject the pseudoepigraphic (ψευδεπίγραφα)[21] writings attributed to their names, conscious that such have not been transmitted to us. 4. For I, when being among you, assumed that all of you held the right faith, and, not having read thoroughly (μὴ διελθὼν)[22] the Gospel presented by them under the name of Peter, I said: "If just this causes concern to you (ὑμῖν παρέχειν μικροψυχίαν),[23] let it be read". But now after I have come to realize,

[20] *SCh* 41, 102-103.

[21] Serapion calls those writings ψευδεπίγραφα; this is the first evidence of the concept of pseudoepigraphy in a Christian milieu: E. Junod, "'Pseudépigraphe' (ψευδεπίγραφος) chez Denys D'Halicarnasse et Sérapion D'Antioche : Les premiers emplois d'un terme rare", *WST* 20, 2007, 177-84; Y. Leroy, "L'Evangile de Pierre et la notion d"hétérodoxie' : Sérapion d'Antioche, Eusèbe de Césarée et les autres", *RBi* 114, 2007, 80-98. In Eusebius's citation, the term appears with a clearly pejorative sense in order to refer to false or rejected books.

[22] The aorist participle διελθών does not necessarily imply that Serapion had not had the book in his hands, but that he did not "*go through in detail*" (cf. *LSJ*, 426). The Bishop employs the aorist infinitive of the same verb in point 6 of this quotations to explain that, after the incident of Rhossos, he did have the opportunity to go through (διελθεῖν) the book attributed to Peter.

[23] The substantive μικροψυχία literally means "littleness of soul", or "meanness of spirit"

> from what has been told me, that their mind fell into some trap of heresy, I will hurry up to be with you again. So, brethren, expect me soon. 5. For our part, we, brethren, knowing what kind of sect was Marcianus,[24] who contradicted himself not understanding what he was talking about, as you will learn from what has been written to you, 6 we had the opportunity, thanks to others who practiced this same Gospel, that is to say, thanks to the successors of those who began it, whom we call Docetists[25] (for most of the ideas belong to that teaching), and were allowed by them to study it in detail and found that most agreed with the right doctrine of the Saviour, but some added parts (προσδιεσταλμένα),[26] and that I attached below (ὑπετάξαμεν ὑμῖν).[27] This is what Serapion writes.[28]

(LSJ, 1134). Other contemporary usages of the term can be found in Longin. 4; Bas. Ep. 204. Some modern scholars translate μικροψυχία as "dissension" or "dispute". In fact, Rufinus wrote in his Latin translation of the HE (ca. 400 AD.): si hoc est solum quid inter vos simultatem videtur inferre legatur codex, (if this is only what cause you rivalry, let the codex be read).

[24] The identity of this Marcianus and his relationship with the *Gospel of Peter* and the Rhossian group are far from clear (see for example, L. Vaganay, *L'Evangile de Pierre*, Paris 1930, 2-3, and Foster, *Gospel of Peter*, 106-7). Some scholars venture that he might be the well-known heresiarch Marcion († 160 AD). In fact, this name appears on the Armenian version of the *HE*. Theophilus, second predecessor of Serapion in the Antiochian see, had already written a treatise *Against Marcion*, highly esteemed by Eusebius (*HE* 4.24). Furthermore, Marcion's successors were called Marcians (Μαρκιανοί: Jus. *Dial*. 35.6), which is in accord with Serapion's expression: ὁ Μαρκιανός. The issue will be further developed.

[25] In early Christianity, the Docetism was more like a trend shared by various groups rather than a well-defined doctrinal corpus. In Serapion's times all those who somehow denied that Christ could actually have the experiences of historical human beings would be called "docetists" (M. Slusser, "Docetism: A Historical Definition", *SCent* 1, 1981, 163-72, 172; "Docetism", in *ODCC*, 496 and Foster, *Gospel of Peter*, 157-65). Docetism primarily argued that Christ's humanity and earthly sufferings were merely appearences.

[26] The term προσδιεσταλμένα has been translated in various ways: "new rules" (Vaganay), "supplements" (Bardy); "things that are distinguished" (Velasco-Delgado), "added things" (Foster). Ultimately, particle δὲ seems to introduce a clause of exception to the preceding sentence: "If most things contained in the book are in accordance with the Saviour's doctrine, however (δὲ) others are not". I have opted for the term "added", taking into account that προσδιεσταλμένα means in this context, i.e. that added parts do not seem to be in accordance with the Saviour's doctrine and therefore are underscored.

[27] Serapion uses ὑπετάξαμεν ὑμῖν. This expression has been usually understood in two ways: that Serapion leaves those parts of the book to the discretion of his recipients, or that he specifies those parts for them. This second option seems more in line with the context of a Bishop who is addressing his faithful to instruct them. Coincidentally, Eusebius himself uses this second sense in other passages of his work (cf. *HE* 4.8.7; 7.30.3). However, I have opted here for a spatial sense, referred to the letter's of the letter: after his explanation Serapion would have attached the list of elements conflicting the Saviour's doctrine that are present in the Gospel he examined.

[28] See also the translation of A. Velasco-Delgado, *Eusebio de Cesarea. Historia Eclesiástica*, Madrid 1997, 370-371.

4. Interpretative difficulties

The exegetical problems that Serapion's words present are mainly due to two causes: first, the intricate syntax of the quotation, in which deictic elements lack unambiguous references; and second, the reading pact with his immediate audience of the 2nd century, which makes the data and references provided to be unintelligible for readers outside of that context. Nonetheless, at least a third cause is also possible to venture: Eusebius might have included extracts from different parts of Serapion's treatise in a single text, which would explain a possible misunderstanding.[29] However, this hypothesis deserves special caution, since Eusebius tends to be spotless in his quotations, and separates passages from different works when he includes several of them consecutively.[30]

After a succinct introduction (3), which will be discussed later, Serapion addresses the Christian community of Rhossos, where he has recently been (4). It can be inferred from his words that someone presented a book attributed to Peter in that city. However, it is not easy to determine to whom he is referring, when using a rather generic "them". This seems to be a particular group within the community; therefore, Serapion would speak first of "all (you)" and then mention "them". In any event, the book presented by that group caused embarrassment or strife in Rhossos. However, the Bishop downplays the issue and, although he has not reviewed the writing, allows it to be read.

The apparent disinterest of Serapion for researching a book attributed to the Apostle Peter is striking, regardless of the content it might have had. The bishop merely states that he had trusted the orthodox faith of all within the community and implies that his trust had been disappointed. This point raises a further inquiry on Serapion's *mens canonica*. In fact, if Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were already widespread and consolidated in the churches, why had Serapion allowed the reading of a Gospel now attributed to Peter?[31]

[29] E. Junod, "Eusèbe de Césarée, Sérapion d'Antioche et l'Évangile de Pierre : D'un évangile à un pseudépigraphe", *RSLR*, 1988, 3-16, for instance, takes it for granted and establishes a clear division between numbers 3-4 and 5-6.

[30] The question comes down to how the Eusebian expression βραχείας λέξεις is to be translated, literally: "brief dictions" or "words". It seems that in other uses of the term λέξεις Eusebius gives to understand that he is quoting a single passage from a work and not several at the same time (cf. for example, *HE* 2.17.17; 3.7.3). The case of 5.8.1 where the word λέξεις refers to a single paragraph of Irenaeus is very clear. And although in 5.16.20-22 λέξεις introduces two paragraphs, Eusebius however differentiates them clearly by means of an transitional commentary that anticipates the beginning of the second quotations.

[31] For the formation of the New Testament canon and the selection of the four canonical Gospels: S. Guijarro Oporto, *Los cuatro Evangelios*, Salamanca 2012, 34-44; L. M. McDonald, *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority*, Peabody 2007, 250-265 and 401-421; C. Horton (ed.), *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the*

When Serapion leaves Rhossos, someone – he does not mention who – informs the bishop that the group that taught him the Gospel communes with certain heresies. Serapion then changes his mind and announces to Rhossians that he will visit them again soon.

For a reader foreign to the immediate context it is perplexing that immediately after his pledge to return (5) Serapion talks of a certain Marcianus, branded as a charlatan. Seemingly the immediate recipients did not need more context. The Bishop takes for granted that this Marcianus is well known and refers to a letter that clearly refutes his doctrines. The expression used by Serapion, "you will learn it by what is has been written to you", could refer to the same letter that he was directing to them, or might be implying that the Rhossian community was already in possession of some work refuting Marcianus. Serapion makes a comparison to the Docetists, but it is far from clear whether he (Marcianus) was the leader of the Rhossian group. One reason for this may be that Serapion would presumably have been more cautious when he was in that city, since Marcianus was a notorious figure there. Based on quotations from the Fathers, the hypothesis can be formulated that this heretic was precisely Marcion. This fits into the context of the letter, as someone largely known, who had already been the target of some refuting work composed in Antioch, and whose thought comprised docetic viewpoints.[32] Despite these coincidences, however, this previously mentioned Marcianus might have been a character different from Marcion and even a follower of him.

After mentioning this figure, Serapion explains that he has had the opportunity to study in detail (διελθεῖν) the Gospel attributed to Peter (n. 6). An important fact that can be deduced from the quotation is that several copies of the book were circulating, since Serapion had access to a copy provided by a group other than the Christians in Rhossos: "others, who practiced this same Gospel". With respect to the groups mentioned in the quotation, Serapion must be referring to at least three besides the faithful in Rhossos: a particular group within the local community (i.e. "them"); a group outside Rhossos that provides a copy of the Gospel to Serapion for scrutiny (i.e., "other"); and another group that put the Gospel into circulation, and from which the second group originated. Serapion calls one of these groups "Docetists". It is not quite clear whether the bishop means those who put the book into circulation or only to their successors.

Neither is it evident what Serapion meant in n. 6 when he applies the term προσδιεσταλμένα to specific parts of the Gospel of Peter. Its content mostly agrees with the doctrine of the Saviour; but some parts of it had been "added"

Earliest Christian Gospels – The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel P45, London 2004.

[32] *PG* 379.

(προσδιεσταλμένα). Everything in the context of the quotation suggests that these additions diverge from what Serapion considered to be the orthodox doctrine of the Saviour. This is what Rufinus must have understood when he wrote *alia vero aliter* in his Latin translation of Eusebius's *HE*.

From this point, different paths of interpretation emerge:

a) The path traced by Eusebius, who understands that the falsehoods contained in the book attributed to Peter, since it would have led to its rejection. Because of this book some of Rhossos had fallen into heresy. It has to be deduced from Serapion's citation that the heresy was of docetic type.

b) Another plausible interpretation is that an early version of the Gospel attributed to Peter had some parts that were "added" by a docetic group; this group had later adopted it. Due to those additions, Serapion would have decided to reject the work.

c) It has also been suggested that the content of the *Gospel of Peter* was relatively innocuous, but it was proscribed not owing to its doctrinal points of view, but simply because it was restricted to a limited use in a docetic milieu.[33]

d) Another hypothesis is that Serapion considered the so-called Gospel of Peter to be a copy of the Gospel of Mark, sometimes attributed to Peter, since it contained his memoirs.[34] Irenaeus (*Haer*. 3.11.8) asserts that the Docetists were using Mark; and Serapion precisely connects the Docetists with those who were using the *Gospel of Peter*. Serapion would have rejected this new version of Mark.

e) Finally, Serapion's judgement could be an example of a canonical mind different from Irenaeus's (*Haer*. 1.9.4; 2.26.1-2; 3.1.1). Serapion would have no problem in accepting a Gospel attributed to an apostle, although this is not one of the canonical four.

Some of these hypotheses face a serious obstacle: it does not make much sense that Serapion would have banned the reading of a work containing traditions linked directly to the Apostle Peter merely because some did not interpret it well. Many Fathers of the Church complained that the heretics had forced the a particular reading of the canonical four but these Gospels of Apostolic origin were not rejected for that reason.

It is more likely that the Gospel attributed to Peter underwent significant modifications when being copied, as did other works of early Christianity.[35]

[33] Junod, "Eusèbe de Césarée, Sérapion d'Antioche et l'Évangile de Pierre : D'un évangile à un pseudépigraphe", 14-16.

[34] Jus. *Dial*. 106.3, who quotes Mark when he refers to the memoires of Peter; Iren. *Haer*. 3.1.1: "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter transmitted us in writing what had been preached by Peter"; see also *HE* 2.15; and Papias' quotation in *HE* 3.39.

[35] L. W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*, Grand Rapids 2003, 427ff.

A first version, fully in accord with the doctrine of the Saviour, could have experienced docetic additions by some group that copied it. Due to these supplements, Serapion would have decided to prohibit the work.

This hypothesis, however, presents an important difficulty found in Serapion's quotation itself. The Bishop seems to suggest that the copy he later received from Rhossos was the same work that was initially presented to him in that city. Therefore, it seems that merely copies and not different versions of the same text were circulating.

In any case, the first words of Serapion cited by Eusebius (n. 3) decisively determine the reading and interpretation of the whole quote. Serapion sustains that Peter and the other Apostles are received as Christ, but "the pseudepigrapha put under their names are rejected by us, as men of experience, knowing that those of that class have not been transmitted to us." If indeed there had been a written and legitimate Petrine tradition, which was modified with docetic additions or at least which the Docetists had liked, that tradition would have been preserved once amendments had been made.

Marcion, for instance, published a particular, modified version of the Gospel of Luke. This version was roundly criticized and rejected by the Fathers; but, it did not drag down with it the authentic Gospel of Luke, which lasted because of its apostolic origin. In contrast, the book attributed to Peter in the 2nd century was rejected by the Church.[36]

5. A new proposal

Taking into account the aforementioned difficulties and previous opinions, I advance a proposal for interpreting this troublesome quotation in Eusebius, which can be summarized in the following points:

a) In the 2nd century there were several copies of one same work attributed to Peter; Serapion suggests this when he says that, once he had left Rhossos, he examined "the same Gospel" (τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) which he had encountered in this city.

b) Most of the Gospel which Serapion studied in detail outside Rhossos agreed with the right doctrine of the Saviour. However, it contained some additional elements that disagreed with this doctrine (τινὰ δὲ προσδιεσταλμένα). For that reason Serapion would have taken the trouble to point out all those elements exhaustively in a treatise *About the so-called Gospel according to Peter*. The work as a whole potentially invited a docetic interpretation.

[36] Nevertheless, a detailed analysis of possible influences of *Gospel of Peter* on other early works can be found in Vaganay, *L'Evangile de Pierre*, 163-76. In any event, this scholar ends his study with the following words: "arrivé au terme de cette enquête, il est facile de constater que l'*Évangile de Pierre* n'a jamais été très répandu".

c) From Serapion's quotation it can be deduced that the bishop rectified his previous opinion publicly before the church of Rhossos. Therefore, he acknowledges that he had been wrong in trusting the good faith of the Christians in this city and in allowing the reading of a work that he had not previously reviewed.

d) In any case, the initial permission of bishop Serapion to read a Gospel attributed to Peter at the end of the 2nd century could be a testimony that the four Gospels attributed to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John had not yet consolidated in all churches as the only canonical gospels, at least not for Serapion. It is also possible that Serapion initially confused the Gospel attributed to Peter with a copy of Mark. But this last suggestion cannot be verified by means of Serapion's words.

6. The question of Eusebius's reliability

After offering a translation and interpretation of Serapion's quotation, a last question can be addressed: how Eusebius's initial comment influences later readings of the quotation and how the historian manages the original sources that he cites.

Eusebius declares that Serapion wrote the treatise *About the so-called Gospel according to Peter* to rebut the falsehoods contained in it. At this point Eusebius does not seem to diverge from the position of Serapion himself. Indeed, the Bishop of Antioch takes trouble in locating and enumerating every passage added by the *Gospel of Peter* in order to arrive at the correct teaching of the Saviour: pointing them out in his treatise was a way of refuting.

On the other hand, Eusebius adds that some from Rhossos "had strayed towards heterodox teachings" because of the *Gospel of Peter*. At this point Eusebius agrees again with the account of Serapion, who called those related to the Gospel that he has studied Docetists.

However, it is regrettable that Eusebius decided not to include more passages from Serapion's treatise, particularly the list of additions to the doctrine of the Saviour. If that were the case, it would be possible to have the original texts of this Gospel of the 2nd century and assess what Serapion estimated to be unorthodox. Yet, at this precise point Eusebius resolves to interrupt the quotation. Some scholars have understood this move as a biased attitude and a conscious distortion of sources.

Based on the analysis presented in these pages it is possible to qualify these judgments. It is certain that Eusebius does not include the list of added elements because it does not cause him concern. But this fact does not necessarily compromise Eusebius's position and his editorial plan. It can be assumed that an author intending to compose a history of the Church of the first centuries would not show special interest in including long lists of doctrinal errors contained in the works he handles. Among other reasons this

is because Eusebius was unable to guess which books among those he used would endure to be known and consulted by others and which books would not be preserved. Serapion's quote interested Eusebius not only because it showed the opinion that the Bishop had about the *Gospel of Peter*, but also because it emphasized how this bishop had defended the faith against one of the heretical outbreaks that several Fathers of the Church described and fought against.

If Eusebius had tried to include all the doctrinal errors contained in the works that he managed, he would not have been able to bring his *HE* to an end, or it would have become simply another heresiological treatise, such as those of Irenaeus, Hippolytus and Epiphanius. On the other hand, the defence of the Christian faith against numerous heterodox outbreaks often dominated the history the Church in the first centuries, as the New Testament demonstrates. The fact that this defence of the faith was a permanent feature in the history of the early Church can explain Eusebius's interest in recording authors, works and heretical currents that were being fought against at particular moments.

Despite all previous remarks, it seems that at least at one point Eusebius could have in fact diverted his audience's attention, specifically the reading and reception of Serapion's quotation. Eusebius declares in his introductory comment that the *Gospel of Peter* was rejected because it contained falsehoods. However, what can be deduced from Serapion's words is that the *Gospel of Peter* was rejected primarily because it had been illegitimately attributed to Peter by the group that introduced it. For the Bishop of Antioch this fact justified the rejection of the whole Gospel, even though most of the book was in accordance with the right doctrine of the Saviour.

7. Conclusions

As the translation and interpretation that have been offered in this paper show, it is not necessary to suppose that Eusebius of Caesarea misrepresented the treatise of Bishop Serapion's *About the so-called Gospel according to Peter* when he partially quoted it in his *HE*. Moreover, Eusebius does not necessarily lose historiographical credibility because of the apologetic intention that moves him. However, his introductory comment on the quotation can divert the attention of the reader at one point: in fact, the Bishop Serapion did not reject the *Gospel of Peter* mainly because it contained doctrinal errors, as Eusebius says, but because it had been illegitimately attributed to the Apostle Peter. The translation and interpretation that I have offered here can also help clarify in future studies to what extent the Fragment of Akhmîm, dated around the 9th century, corresponds to the *Gospel of Peter* from the 2nd century that Serapion read.

LAS LISTAS DE OBISPOS DE ROMA Y ANTIOQUÍA EN LA *HISTORIA ECLESIÁSTICA* DE EUSEBIO

Jerónimo Leal
Pontificia Università della Santa Croce
jleal@pusc.it

1. Introducción

Con la *Historia Ecclesiastica*[1] Eusebio de Cesarea no sólo compone la primera historia de la Iglesia, sino que asimismo inaugura un género historiográfico que habrá de influir de manera determinante en siglos posteriores[2]. Esta obra, además, constituye una piedra miliar y un punto de referencia insoslayable en los estudios sobre el cristianismo primitivo[3], tal como pone de manifiesto la abundante discusión y producción bibliográfica sobre este autor en los últimos años, que sin duda han ayudado a esclarecer un buen número de puntos oscuros, así como a poner el acento sobre nuevas cuestiones controvertidas.

Entre éstas, el valor histórico y la fiabilidad de las listas episcopales contenidas en la *HE* es un punto ciertamente recurrente. Es quizá de los estudios de Harnack[4] de donde nace el especial interés por este argumento. Su método consistió en analizar y comparar esas listas con las que aparecen en la *Crónica* y en otros escritos de autores antiguos. Probablemente el interés cronológico fue el predominante en este estudio: desde ese punto de vista hizo cuanto era posible en comparación con los pocos datos, a veces aparentemente contradictorios, con que podía contar. La tesis de Harnack pasaba por la

[1] A partir de aquí se empleará la sigla *HE* para hacer mención de esta obra. Las traducciones de la *HE* que acompañan al texto griego son las de A. Velasco-Delgado, *Eusebio de Cesarea. Historia Eclesiástica*, Madrid 1997.

[2] H. C. Brennecke, "Die Kirche als διαδοχαὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων: Das Programm der ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία des Euseb von Caesarea (Eus., h.e. I 1)", in O. Wischmeyer, E. M. Becker (eds.), *Was ist ein Text?*, Tübingen 2001, 92; vid. asimismo el trabajo de Torres Guerra en este mismo volumen.

[3] En este sentido no se puede dejar de citar una obra en vías de elaboración que con seguridad llegará a ser un instrumento imprescindible para quien quiera adentrarse en el terreno de la crítica historiográfica eusebiana. Nos referimos al comentario de la *HE* a cargo de Sebastien Morlet y Lorenzo Perrone, cuyos estudios de introducción, que comprenden el primer volumen, recogen ya una amplísima bibliografía cuidadosamente ordenada por temas y capítulos: S. Morlet, L. Perrone, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012.

[4] A. von Harnack, *Die Zeit des Ignatius und die Chronologie der antiochenischen Bischöfe bis Tyrannus nach Julius Africanus und den Späteren Historikern*, Leipzig 1878.

aceptación de la *Crónica* de Julio Africano y de Hegesipo como fuentes de Eusebio y señalaba las dificultades inherentes a los sistemas de datación completamente diferentes que Eusebio se vio obligado a hacer compatibles, pues en la *Crónica* éste usó tres sistemas cronológicos diferentes[5]: los años desde el nacimiento de Abraham, las Olimpiadas, y los años de los reinados de emperadores, faraones y reyes. Pero los diversos sistemas fueron coordinados en un único sistema por Eusebio, igualando cada año con el correspondiente civil Siro-Macedonio de Cesarea, y haciéndolos comenzar el mismo día. Como puede suponerse, tal armonización no está exenta de problemas de exactitud cronológica.

El argumento postulado por Harnack presenta no pocas dificultades, comenzando por el hecho de que la *Crónica* de Eusebio no se conserva más que en traducción armenia, en la parcial traducción latina de Jerónimo y en escasos fragmentos. De hecho, su hipótesis despertará dudas y polémicas, especialmente por su intención de demostrar que las listas episcopales han sido construidas artificialmente para hacer remontar cada iglesia a un origen apostólico[6]. A ello se suman también cuestiones metodológicas que restan validez a las tesis de Harnack y dificultan su aceptación.

Entre las opiniones críticas con la tesis de Harnack, hay que destacar en primer término a Javierre[7], quien afirma que, habiéndose perdido el texto de Hegesipo, el investigador alemán se ve obligado a trabajar sobre conjeturas. De una manera parecida, pero desde el otro extremo del panorama doctrinal, se manifiesta Kemler[8]: el autor debate la cuestión de si la lista que ofrece Eusebio en *HE* 4.22.2-3[9] es verdaderamente de Hegesipo o ha sido retocada a partir de la noticia de Ireneo. Sigue este autor a Harnack y Caspar, al que después volveremos. Eusebio, en su opinión, tiene un gran interés en la lista, pero éste se debe a su lucha contra los gnósticos, lo que le lleva a corregir a Hegesipo[10].

Por su parte Caspar, en su estudio sobre las antiguas listas de obispos de Roma[11], es de la opinión de que la teoría de que el pontificado de Pedro

[5] R. W. Burgess, W. Witakowski, *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*, Stuttgart 1999, 28-9.

[6] Harnack, *Die Zeit des Ignatius*, 70. La afirmación de que un pontificado de dieciocho a diecinueve años es muy prolongado no se sostiene.

[7] A. M. Javierre, "El 'Diadochen Epoiesamen' de Hegesipo y la primera lista papal", *Salesianum* 21, 1959, 237-53.

[8] H. Kemler, "Hegesipps römische Bischofsliste", *VChr* 25, 1971, 182-96.

[9] Γενόμενος δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ, διαδοχὴν ἐποιησάμην μέχρις Ἀνικήτου· οὗ διάκονος ἦν Ἐλεύθερος, καὶ παρὰ Ἀνικήτου διαδέχεται Σωτήρ, μεθ' ὃν Ἐλεύθερος "Y llegado a Roma, me hice una sucesión hasta Aniceto, cuyo diácono era Eleuterio. A Aniceto le sucede Sotero, y a éste, Eleuterio".

[10] Kemler, "Hegesipps römische Bischofsliste", 196.

[11] E. L. E. Caspar, *Die älteste römische Bischofsliste: Kritische Studien zum Formproblem des eusebianischen Kanons sowie zur Geschichte der ältesten Bischofslisten und*

durase veinticinco años es una leyenda. Es decir, a lo largo de los años se ha pasado de negar que bajo la basílica de San Pedro se encontrase el sepulcro del apóstol[12] a sostener que la afirmación de algunos documentos antiguos de que el pontificado fuese tan largo es legendaria y, después, a defender la hipótesis de que las listas episcopales son, en el caso más benévolo, una composición artificial para defender el episcopado monárquico o mono-episcopado[13]. Esta hipótesis está construida a partir del comienzo de una lista que nos ofrece Epifanio de Salamina en su *Panarion*: Κλήμης σύγχρονος ὢν Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου, "Clemente, contemporáneo de Pedro y de Pablo"[14]. De la misma manera que los dos apóstoles gobiernan conjuntamente Roma, Pedro habría elegido como obispo adoptivo, al modo en que lo hacían los emperadores, a Clemente, del que las fuentes antiguas (por ejemplo Tertuliano[15]) dicen que fue ordenado por el apóstol[16]. Su interpretación revela, por tanto, la visión puramente política de un poder en realidad muy poco implicado en cuestiones de este tipo. Por otro lado, la sincronía entre Pedro y Pablo no ofrece dificultades desde el punto de vista histórico, que es el que sigue Eusebio. No obstante, Caspar concluye que la lista de nombres 'Lino-Cleto-Clemente-Evaristo…' sería más antigua y su valor mucho más alto que lo que la investigación histórica crítica sobre el Papado pensaba hasta ahora[17].

Por su parte, Schmidt[18], en un apéndice sobre las listas episcopales romanas añadido a sus estudios sobre las listas pseudo-clementinas, trata principalmente sobre la lista del *Panarion* de Epifanio (*Haer*. 1.309), que concuerda sustancialmente con los datos que ofrecen Eusebio e Ireneo, pero que Caspar no había considerado. La lista de Epifanio no dependería de Ireneo, sino de su propia reflexión sobre los escritos clementinos y pseudo-clementinos, y sostendría la "sincronía de obispos", es decir, el hecho de que Clemente fuera ordenado obispo por Pedro.

---

ihrer Entstehung aus apostolischen Sukzessionenreihen, Berlin 1926, 193.

[12] Dato hoy ya confirmado por la arqueología: vid. V. Saxer, S. Heid, "Pietro apostolo", en *NDPAC*, 4068-74.

[13] Caspar, *Die älteste römische Bischofsliste*, 202. Sobre el tema en general, pueden consultarse P. Burke, "The Monarchical Episcopate at the End of the First Century", *JES* 7, 1970, 499-518; E. Dassmann, "Zur Enstehung des Monoepiskopats", *JAC* 17, 1974, 74-90; Id., "Hausgemeinde und Bischofsamt", in E. Dassmann, K. Thraede (eds.), *Vivarium: Festschrift Theodor Klauser zum 90. Geburtstag*, Münster 1984, 82-97; E. Lohse, "Die Entstehung des Bischofsamtes in der frühen Christenheit", *ZNTW* 71, 1980, 58-73; J. Zizioulas, "Episkopè et épiskopos dans l'Eglise primitive. Bref inventaire de la documentation", *Irenikon* 56, 1983, 484-502.

[14] Epiph. Const. *Haer*. 1.309.2.

[15] Tert. *Praescr*. 32.

[16] Caspar, *Die älteste römische Bischofsliste*, 204.

[17] Ibid., 256: "die Namenreihe (...) ist älter und ihr Überlieferungswert viel höher, als die kritische Papstgeschichtsforschung bisher annahm".

[18] C. Schmidt, *Studien zu den pseudo-Clementinen: Nebst einem Anhange "Die älteste römische Bischofsliste und die Pseudo-Clementinen"*, Leipzig 1929.

En cambio, para Bauer[19], las cartas de Ignacio están dirigidas sólo a las comunidades en unión con la ortodoxia romana, no a aquellas otras en que la presencia de los cristianos deriva de fundadores marginales. En esta línea, el episcopado monárquico, ya implantado en Antioquía[20], sería una tiranía, la forma más efectiva del control de la ortodoxia, opuesta a la democracia episcopal[21]. Para dar credibilidad a esta suposición, le resulta necesario interpretar las listas de sucesión episcopal como una construcción tardía y sin fundamento histórico: en su opinión, resulta muy extraño que durante el mismo periodo de tiempo en Antioquía hubiera seis obispos, mientras en Roma hubo doce y diez en Alejandría[22]. El episcopado monárquico es visto únicamente como una solución a la herejía: sería innecesario suponer razones puramente organizativas. De hecho, Bauer afirma que el episcopado monárquico en Roma nace con Sotero (166-174), pero no llega a demostrarlo. Es más, resulta desconcertante su afirmación de que, si uno se pregunta por qué la decisión sobre el primado fue a favor de Pedro, "no encuentro respuesta en Mateo 16.17-19"[23]. No se da ninguna explicación de tal opinión y, según nos da a entender, en su argumentación quedan más cabos sueltos de los que se anudan.

Es decir, estos autores han tomado la hipótesis de una evolución del episcopado colegial al monárquico como prueba de que los datos eusebianos son incorrectos, sin comprobar si esos mismos datos del polígrafo de Cesarea pueden ser corroborados mediante el cotejo con otras fuentes antiguas, por muy escasas que sean. Una muestra de esta tendencia es la publicación de Simonetti[24], en la que se recoge la afirmación de Ignacio de que él es el primer obispo de Antioquía. Es extraño que Ireneo (de quien depende Eusebio) desconozca la realidad de las iglesias de Asia pero escriba a Policarpo para pedirle que se le sustituya en Antioquía[25]. En cambio, Turner[26] afirma que la lista de Antioquía es "de considerable realidad histórica".

[19] W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, Tübingen 1934.

[20] Aunque Bauer más adelante afirma que aún no es firme: ibid., 74.

[21] Ibid., 66-7.

[22] Ibid., 68.

[23] Ibid., 118.

[24] M. Simonetti, "Roma cristiana tra vescovi e presbiteri", *Vetera Christianorum* 43, 2006, 5-18: "Ancora in Eusebio (*HE* 3.22) leggiamo di Evodio quale primo vescovo di Antiochia e di Ignazio come suo successore, mentre dalle lettere di Ignazio risulta con sicurezza che proprio lui fu il primo effettivo vescovo di quella chiesa". La afirmación, sin embargo, no se encuentra en las cartas de Ignacio.

[25] Iren. Lugd. *Ep. Pol.* 7.2.

[26] H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church*, New York 1978, 343.

Asimismo para Munier[27], la lista de Antioquía tiene carácter artificial, pues ésta hace coincidir los años de comienzo de pontificado de Ignacio con Lino, de Cornelio con Telesforo, de Eros con Pío, pero no se está refiriendo a la *HE*. La fuente de Eusebio habrían sido las *Homilías sobre Lucas* de Orígenes[28], pero el dato que procede de Orígenes no tendría significación cronológica, sino que es un topos literario[29].

Munier se sorprende, como se sorprenden también otros, de que un pontificado dure cuarenta años. Harnack afirmaba que el martirio de Ignacio habría que situarlo entre los años 110-117 o quizá entre los años 117-125. Pero esta datación, como todas las demás acerca del mismo evento, debe considerarse como pura hipótesis. El único dato seguro es que Teófilo es, en el 180, sexto obispo de Antioquía, mientras Ignacio es el segundo; por tanto —es la hipótesis de Munier—, si se establece un promedio de diez-doce años de episcopado para cada uno, Ignacio muere entre el 120 y 135. Sin embargo, a esta teoría se imponen al menos dos objeciones: por una parte, que los promedios son un método poco fiable en las reconstrucciones cronológicas; por otra parte, que se presupone de modo demasiado categórico la general despreocupación del cristianismo antiguo por las sucesiones en Antioquía. De esta revisión se desprende que las listas presentan dificultades evidentes: a seis obispos de Roma corresponden tres de Antioquía, lo cual implicaría, además, dos episcopados de cincuenta años. Se nos plantean por lo menos dos problemas: la coherencia terminológica, por un lado, y la larga duración de los episcopados, por otro.

2. Apóstoles y primeros obispos

En primer lugar, para Eusebio de Cesarea, según Bauer, Ignacio habría sido el segundo obispo de Antioquía después de Pedro. Por su parte, Julio Africano dice también que Ignacio sería el segundo, pero después de Evodio[30]. La sospecha de que las listas son incoherentes arranca de Harnack[31], para quien Evodio resulta primer obispo de Antioquía, como Pedro lo es de Roma. Pero tanto Harnack como Bauer se equivocan al no tomar en cuenta un detalle de suma importancia: en las sucesiones episcopales de Eusebio, el primer obispo es siempre posterior a un apóstol, que no es nunca "elegido" obispo. Así sucede también en el caso de la sede de Roma (*HE* 3.2.1): Τῆς δὲ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας μετὰ τὴν Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου μαρτυρίαν πρῶτος κληροῦται τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν Λίνος, "Después del martirio de Pablo y de Pedro, el primero

[27] C. Munier, "A propos d'Ignace d'Antioche : observations sur la liste épiscopale d'Antioche", *RSR* 55, 1981, 126-431.

[28] *SCh* 87.145.

[29] Munier, "A propos d'Ignace d'Antioche", 131.

[30] Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 119-20.

[31] Harnack, *Die Zeit des Ignatius*, 26, n. 2: "Also gilt Euodius in derselben Weise als erster Bischof Antiochiens wie Petrus als der Rom's".

en ser elegido para el episcopado de la Iglesia de Roma es Lino". Lino habría sido, por tanto, el primer obispo de Roma. Volveremos más adelante sobre el tema, pero antes es preciso observar lo que sucede con la lista de Antioquía.

El pasaje de *HE* 3.36.2 (Ἰγνάτιος, τῆς κατὰ Ἀντιόχειαν Πέτρου διαδοχῆς δεύτερος τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν κεκληρωμένος, "Ignacio, segundo en obtener la sucesión de Pedro en el episcopado de Antioquía"), que indujo a error a Bauer, aparece en su total claridad si se compara con *HE* 3.22: Ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας Εὐοδίου πρώτου καταστάντος δεύτερος ἐν τοῖς δηλουμένοις Ἰγνάτιος ἐγνωρίζετο ("Pero de los antioquenos, después de Evodio, primero que fue instituido, en el tiempo de que hablamos era muy conocido el segundo: Ignacio"). Por tanto, Ignacio sería el primero después del Apóstol Pedro, como indica también Eusebio, *HE* 1.12.2, retomando el texto de Gálatas 2.11: περὶ οὗ φησιν ὁ Παῦλος· "Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην", "del que Pablo dice: 'Pero cuando Cefas vino a Antioquía, me enfrenté con él' ". Es decir, Evodio, que sucedió a Pedro, fue el primer obispo antes de Ignacio. Confirman el caso de la sucesión en Roma varios testimonios de Eusebio, en primer lugar *HE* 5.6.1-2, que reproduce el texto de Ireneo, *Haer*. 3.3.3:

> "Θεμελιώσαντες οὖν καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Λίνῳ τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρισαν· (...) Διαδέχεται δ' αὐτὸν Ἀνέγκλητος. Μετὰ τοῦτον δὲ τρίτῳ τόπῳ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν κληροῦται Κλήμης".
>
> "Los bienaventurados apóstoles, después de haber fundado y edificado la Iglesia, pusieron el ministerio del episcopado en manos de Lino (…). Le sucede Anacleto, y, después de éste, en tercer lugar a partir de los apóstoles, obtiene el episcopado Clemente".

Todas las listas en Eusebio (se podría añadir, e Ireneo) concuerdan en no contar a los apóstoles como obispos. Otros textos nos confirman lo que acabamos de decir:

> *HE* 3.21: Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Ῥωμαίων εἰς ἔτι Κλήμης ἡγεῖτο, τρίτον καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπέχων τῶν τῇδε μετὰ Παῦλόν τε καὶ Πέτρον ἐπισκοπευσάντων βαθμόν. Λίνος δὲ ὁ πρῶτος ἦν καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν Ἀνέγκλητος.
>
> En este tiempo, a los romanos los regía todavía Clemente, que también ocupaba el tercer lugar de los que fueron obispos de allí después de Pablo y Pedro. El primero había sido Lino, y después de él, Anacleto.

> *HE* 5.6.4 (= Iren.Lugd., *Haer*. 3.3.3): Καὶ μετὰ βραχέα φησίν· "Τὸν δὲ Κλήμεντα τοῦτον διαδέχεται Εὐάρεστος καὶ τὸν Εὐάρεστον

Ἀλέξανδρος, εἶθ' οὕτως ἕκτος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καθίσταται Ξύστος, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Τελεσφόρος, ὃς καὶ ἐνδόξως ἐμαρτύρησεν· ἔπειτα Ὑγῖνος, εἶτα Πίος, μεθ' ὃν Ἀνίκητος. Διαδεξαμένου τὸν Ἀνίκητον Σωτῆρος, νῦν δωδεκάτῳ τόπῳ τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κατέχει κλῆρον Ἐλεύθερος".

Y después de breve espacio dice: "A este Clemente sucede Evaristo, y a Evaristo, Alejandro; después es instituido Sixto, el sexto, por lo tanto, a partir de los apóstoles; y después de este, Telesforo, que también sufrió gloriosamente el martirio; luego Higino; después Pío, y, tras éste, Aniceto; habiendo sucedido a Aniceto Sotero, ahora es Eleuterio quien ocupa el cargo del episcopado, en duodécimo lugar a partir de los apóstoles".

HE 3.4.8: Τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἀκολούθων τοῦ Παύλου Κρήσκης μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς Γαλλίας στειλάμενος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μαρτυρεῖται, Λίνος δέ, οὗ μέμνηται συνόντος ἐπὶ Ῥώμης αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολήν, πρῶτος μετὰ Πέτρον τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἤδη πρότερον κληρωθεὶς δεδήλωται.

De los restantes seguidores de Pablo, Crescente está probado que fue enviado por él a las Galias; y Lino, del que hace mención en la segunda carta a Timoteo indicando que se halla con él en Roma, ya queda anteriormente demostrado que fue designado para el episcopado de la iglesia de Roma, el primero después de Pedro.

También en referencia a la iglesia de Alejandría:

HE 4.1: Ἀμφὶ δὲ τὸ δωδέκατον ἔτος τῆς Τραϊανοῦ βασιλείας ὁ μικρῷ πρόσθεν ἡμῖν τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παροικίας δηλωθεὶς ἐπίσκοπος τὴν ζωὴν μεταλλάττει, τέταρτος δ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τὴν τῶν αὐτόθι λειτουργίαν κληροῦται Πρῖμος. Ἐν τούτῳ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπὶ Ῥώμης, ὄγδοον ἔτος ἀποπλήσαντος Εὐαρέστου, πέμπτην ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου κατάγων διαδοχήν, τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ὑπολαμβάνει.

Hacia el año duodécimo del reinado de Trajano, muere el obispo de la iglesia de Alejandría, al que hemos aludido un poco más arriba, y es elegido para el cargo en ella Primo, cuarto obispo a partir de los apóstoles. En este tiempo también, al haber cumplido Evaristo su octavo año, recibe el episcopado de Roma Alejandro, quinto en la sucesión a partir de Pedro y Pablo.

Y, finalmente,

HE 5.28.2-3: ταῦτα κατὰ λέξιν ἱστορεῖ· "Φασὶν γὰρ τοὺς μὲν προτέρους ἅπαντας καὶ αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀποστόλους παρειληφέναι

τε καὶ δεδιδαχέναι ταῦτα ἃ νῦν οὗτοι λέγουσιν, καὶ τετηρῆσθαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ κηρύγματος μέχρι τῶν Βίκτορος χρόνων, ὃς ἦν τρισκαιδέκατος ἀπὸ Πέτρου ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπίσκοπος· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ διαδόχου αὐτοῦ Ζεφυρίνου παρακεχαράχθαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν".

Refiere[32] textualmente lo que sigue: "Dicen, efectivamente, que todos los primeros, incluidos los mismos apóstoles, recibieron y enseñaron esto que ahora están diciendo ellos, y que se ha conservado la verdad de la predicación hasta los tiempos de Víctor, que era el decimotercer obispo de Roma desde Pedro, pero que, a partir de su sucesor, Zeferino, se falsificó la verdad".

En fin, el hecho de que un Apóstol no sea objeto de la misma consideración que un obispo nos lo confirma el mismo Ignacio[33]: οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν. ἐκεῖνοι ἀπόστολοι, ἐγὼ κατάκριτος· ἐκεῖνοι ἐλεύθεροι, ἐγὼ δὲ μέχρι νῦν δοῦλος, "No os mando como Pedro y Pablo. Ellos son apóstoles; yo, un convicto. Ellos, libres; yo, por el momento, siervo".

Se pueden añadir dos notas elocuentes sobre la precisión de Eusebio. Por un lado, como muestra Bernardi[34], acerca de las variantes del nombre Cleto o Anacleto en las demás fuentes antiguas que han sobrevivido al paso de los siglos, ninguna de las dos denominaciones es acertada, sino que el verdadero nombre habría sido Anencleto (κλῆτος sería simplemente *elegido* por Lino), que aparece así en cuatro ocasiones en la *HE* (3.13, 15, 21 y 5.6) y una en Ireneo (3.3.3). La solución viene, como se aprecia, de la mano de Eusebio.

Igualmente, Burgess, en un estudio que abarca los años 282 a 350, especifica que, en los 260 primeros años de historia imperial, Eusebio se equivoca una única vez, pero ésta es una equivocación deliberada e indiferente con respecto a la suma total de años de reinado[35] e, igualmente, en el siglo tercero cometerá tres errores de un año cada uno que desbaratará toda la secuencia. Y no es excepcional que Eusebio entrecruce las cronologías de papas y emperadores:

HE 3.13: Ἐπὶ δέκα δὲ τὸν Οὐεσπασιανὸν ἔτεσιν βασιλεύσαντα αὐτοκράτωρ Τίτος ὁ παῖς διαδέχεται· οὗ κατὰ δεύτερον ἔτος τῆς βασιλείας Λίνος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας δυοκαίδεκα τὴν λειτουργίαν ἐνιαυτοῖς κατασχών, Ἀνεγκλήτῳ ταύτην παραδίδωσιν. Τίτον δὲ Δομετιανὸς ἀδελφὸς διαδέχεται, δύο ἔτεσι καὶ μησὶ τοῖς ἴσοις βασιλεύσαντα.

[32] Sc., un escritor desconocido.

[33] Ign. *Rom*. 4.3.

[34] J. Bernardi, "Les successeurs immediats de Saint Pierre a Rome s'appelaient-ils Clet et Anaclet?", *Augustinianum* 41, 2001, 287-90.

[35] R.W. Burgess, *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*, Stuttgart 1999, 36: "within the first 260 years of imperial history Eusebius errs in his chronology only once, but it is deliberate and it makes no difference to the overall sum of regnal years".

> Después de imperar Vespasiano diez años, le sucede como emperador su hijo Tito. El segundo año del reinado de éste, Lino, obispo de la iglesia de Roma, después de ejercer el cargo durante doce años, se lo transmite a Anacleto. A Tito, que imperó dos años y otros tantos meses, le sucedió su hermano Domiciano.

3. Largos episcopados

La otra cuestión que quedó pendiente es si es posible que la duración de los pontificados fuese tan larga como afirma Eusebio. Como se ha mencionado antes, el gran problema es que entre Evodio e Ignacio suman medio siglo de episcopado[36] en Antioquía. En cambio, la sucesión en Roma no presenta este problema. Se pueden dar las siguientes duraciones de los pontificados romanos:

- Lino (67-76[37]), nueve años.
- (Ana)cleto (76-88[38]), doce años.
- Clemente (92-100[39] ó 88-97[40]), ocho o nueve años.
- Evaristo (97-105[41]), ocho años.
- Alejandro (105-115[42]), diez años.

Ciertamente los primeros papas fueron, según la tradición, mártires. Por tanto, no hay nada que objetar a un posible influjo del estado romano que podría haber efectuado de manera más sistemática el exterminio de obispos en zonas mejor controladas por el aparato estatal, esto por no hablar simplemente de causas naturales de la longevidad de algunos personajes antiguos.

Para el caso de Antioquía, es conocida la correspondencia epistolar entre Ignacio y Policarpo. Ésta transmite la impresión de que Ignacio trata a Policarpo como a uno más joven que él. Policarpo debió de ser nombrado por Juan para la sede de Esmirna[43]. Si esto fuera así, su pontificado habría comenzado hacia el año 100. Se puede calcular que en esa fecha Policarpo tenía unos veinte años (si se admite que nació en el 80[44]). Su muerte, a juzgar por la edad de ochenta y seis años recogida en el *Martirio*[45], pudo producirse en el año 166. Esto supone dos cosas. Por un lado, la carta de Ignacio se dirige

[36] Harnack, *Die Zeit des Ignatius*, 17 subraya que los obispos antioquenos son la mitad que los romanos.

[37] M. Spinelli, "Lino papa", en *NDPAC,* 2845-6.

[38] Id., "Anacleto (o Cleto) papa", en *NDPAC*, 257.

[39] P. F. Beatrice, "Clemente Romano (Lettere di)", en *NDPAC,* 1073-7.

[40] M. Spinelli, "Evaristo papa", en *NDPAC*, 1890.

[41] Ibid.

[42] M. Spinelli, "Alessandro I papa", en *NDPAC*, 197.

[43] Es una de las siete ciudades nombradas en el Apocalipsis: *Apoc.* 1.11 y 2.8.

[44] J. J. Ayán Calvo, *Ignacio de Antioquía. Cartas. Policarpo de Esmirna. Carta*, Madrid 1999, 194.

[45] *Mart.Pol.* 9.3.

a Policarpo cuando éste tenía veintisiete años; por otro, su pontificado dura sesenta y seis años, un periodo mucho más largo que el que se deduce de los datos de Eusebio para dos obispos de Antioquía.

Ireneo conoció a Policarpo, como él mismo demuestra, pero las fechas relativas a aquél no son tampoco seguras. Romero Pose[46] establece las siguientes: Ireneo nace entre los años 130-140, es nombrado obispo en el 177 a la muerte de Potino, muere hacia el 202-203 (lo cual supone veinticinco años de pontificado). Esta cronología supone que habría conocido a Policarpo cuando tenía unos veinte años, hacia el 150, y que cuando este muere, tendría unos treinta.

En el caso de la sede de Antioquía, la incógnita la presenta Evodio, del que no conocemos ninguna fecha. Pero se puede suponer que es encargado por Pedro de regir esta iglesia en el año 58. Pedro no estaba en Roma[47] cuando Pablo escribe la *Carta a los Romanos* en el año 57-58[48], por tanto, podemos conjeturar que Pedro rige la iglesia de Roma del 58 al 67, nueve años. Si Evodio tenía una edad similar a Policarpo cuando recibe el encargo, unos veinte años, bien podría haber sobrevivido hasta finales del siglo primero o comienzos del segundo. Cuarenta años no parecen así desproporcionados. En ese caso, Ignacio habría sido obispo una década. Tampoco sabemos la edad de Ignacio, pero podríamos suponer que era mayor que Policarpo y algo más joven que Evodio. Quizá nace en el 60 y muere con cuarenta y siete años. Simonetti-Prinzivalli[49] sitúan el episcopado de Ignacio entre el 70 y 107, que suman treinta y siete años, y en ese caso el de Evodio habría durado sólo trece. Sea como fuere, las duraciones no son imposibles, como tampoco es de extrañar que haya pequeñas discrepancias en los años exactos de comienzo y fin de cada pontificado[50].

4. Conclusión

A la vista de los textos eusebianos, se desvanecen las dificultades que observábamos acerca de la duración de los episcopados. En primer lugar, se debe subrayar la coherencia terminológica, que distingue con exactitud entre el Apóstol fundador de una iglesia y sus sucesores, ya obispos: el primer obispo no es nunca un apóstol. Igualmente, se evidencia la necesidad de atenerse a la terminología del historiador antiguo si se quiere probar con rigor la veracidad de sus datos.

[46] E. Romero Pose, *Ireneo de Lión. Demostración de la predicación apostólica*, Madrid 2001, 14-6.

[47] V. Saxer, S. Heid, "Pietro apostolo", en *NDPAC*, 4068-74.

[48] C. Pietri, M. Ghilardi, "Roma", en *NDPAC*, 4577-91.

[49] M. Simonetti, E. Prinzivalli, *Letteratura cristiana antica*, Forlì 2000, 74.

[50] Ni tampoco puede extrañar que en la Antigüedad haya personajes cuya vida ha rondado los ochenta años: Varrón (116-27 a.C.) vivió hasta los ochenta y nueve, Catón (234-149 a.C.) hasta los ochenta y cinco, Casiodoro (490-583 d.C.) nada menos que hasta los noventa y tres.

La correspondencia de seis obispos de Roma con tres de Antioquía no implica necesariamente una elaboración artificial de las listas: las causas de esta disparidad pueden ser múltiples. De la misma manera, la sucesión de dos episcopados en cincuenta años se puede explicar de manera satisfactoria si se prescinde de la costumbre mucho más reciente de nombrar obispos sólo a partir de la edad madura. En los primeros momentos, lo habitual pudo ser muy bien lo contrario, no por desprecio de la edad, sino por necesidad.

Visto el rigor histórico que Eusebio sigue para las sucesiones de emperadores, tal como demuestra Burgess, o para los nombres exactos de los obispos de Roma, como indica Bernardi, se puede deducir que sus listas de obispos son coherentes, o que, al menos, su valor no puede ser fácilmente negado con pruebas irrefutables. Muy probablemente Eusebio tenía más interés en las sucesiones de obispos que de emperadores, lo cual implicaría una mayor exactitud en las primeras. Y, por otro lado, los errores que se refieren a un breve periodo, como puede ser un año, no parecen constituir razón suficiente para rechazar en bloque las cronologías eusebianas.

‘UNDER THIS SIGN YOU SHALL BE THE RULER!’ EUSEBIUS, THE *CHI-RHO* LETTERS AND THE *ARCHĒ* OF CONSTANTINE

Fernando López Sánchez
Wolfson College, Oxford (UK)
flopezsanchez@hotmail.com

1. Eusebius's version of Constantine's vision and his aversion to relating "victories in war and triumphs over enemies"

There are two different Christian versions of Constantine's conversion to Christianity. According to Eusebius (*VC* 1.28-29), Constantine and his army saw, above the sun in the sky shortly before noon, a light in the form of a cross bearing the inscription "by this conquer!"[1] That same evening Constantine had another vision in which Christ commanded him to fashion a cross for protection against his enemies. The next morning, a standard of gold and precious stones was made: the *labarum*. The second version, as reported by Lactantius (*De Mort. Pers.* 44.4-5), states, however, that on the night before the battle, Constantine had a dream in which he was directed to have a *caeleste signum dei* ("celestial divine sign") inscribed on his soldiers' shields.[2] It is, moreover, impossible to question the veracity of the claim of the Gallic rethorician of the year 310 (*Pan. Lat.* 7.21), which indicates that what Constantine saw in the context of a dream in the temple dedicated to *Apollo Grannus* in Gaul were in fact crowns, promising him a glorious thirty-year reign.

Many Late Roman coins do in effect feature the number of years wished for the emperor in the context of official anniversaries (*uota suscepta*), with the duration indicated by the number of numeral letters, in this case XXX for "thirty".[3] Portentous announcements of long reigns, of thirty or more years, are common in monarchic literature from Cyrus the Great up to Constantine. In what is supposed to be a Persian text of the fourth century BC, Dinon writes that in a dream Cyrus saw the Sun at his feet, and "he three times reached for it with his hands (…). The mages (…) told Cyrus that it was

[1] A. Cameron, S. G. Hall, *Eusebius. Life of Constantine*, Oxford 1999, 81.

[2] T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge 1981, 43; M. DiMaio Jr, J. Zeuge, N. Zotov, "*Ambiguitas Constantiniana*: the *Caeleste Signum Dei* of Constantine the Great", *Byzantion* 58, 1988, 333-60; D. Hollard, F. López Sánchez, *Le chrisme et le phénix : Images monétaires et mutations idéologiques au IVe siècle*, Bordeaux 2014, 43-4, 57.

[3] Ibid, 45.

portended that he would reign over the Persians for thirty years as a result of the threefold reaching."[4] Moreover, Julius Obsequens, of whom hardly anything is known but who is thought to have lived in the fourth century, describes how on Octavius's entry into Rome shortly after the assassination of Julius Caesar three suns shone at the same time, with the lowest of the three surrounded by a wreath of wheat that radiated a dazzling light. The Sun, having once more taken the form of a single disk, did not return later in all its glory, but for several months only gave off a pale and dim light (Jul. Obs. 68: *Soles tres fulserunt, circaque solem imum corona spiceae similis in orbem emicuit, et postea in unum circulum sole redacto multis mensibus languida lux fuit* [*M. Antonio P. Dolabella coss.*, AUC 710/44BC]). Woods explains this event, which is also mentioned by Pliny the Elder[5] as follows: the absorption of the three suns into one that shines only with a subdued light announces that Augustus's victory over his rivals will be followed by an endless reign, sweetened by the immobility of an ageing prince.[6]

Early on, in a period corresponding to the years 310-312, Constantine benefited, according to Gallic panegyrists, from the apparent support of the supreme Sun-God. *Apollo* (assimilated to the *Sun* in late paganism), appears before him together with *Victoria* to promise a glorious thirty-year reign. Later on, during the early stages of the conflict with Maxentius, a heliacal army was sent from heaven to rescue him, under the command of his father the *diuus* Constantius Chlorus, coming to help his adopted son.[7] In Trier, during the summer of the year 310, an Apollonian epiphany took place at a Gallo-Roman shrine described as "the most beautiful temple in the world" (*ad templum toto orbe pulcherrimum*), a place which is very plausibly identified with the magnificent sanctuary of *Apollo Grannus*. Two essential elements not mentioned in the text must nevertheless be taken into account. This famous temple of Apollo was a sanctuary of incubation, where all kinds of supplicants suffering from all types of disease came to ask for the god's help, spending the night inside the sacred shrine. The god appeared to them during a dream, indicating to them the actions to achieve their aims. There is nothing to suggest that Constantine was any exception to the normal practice, and it was, therefore, in the context of a dream that the Sun-God appeared before him in 310.[8]

[4] Dinon *FGrHist* 690 F100 = Cic. *Div*. 1.23; quoted in D. Ogden, *Alexander the Great: Myth, Genesis and Sexuality*, Exeter 2011, 63.

[5] *HN* 2.99.

[6] D. Woods, "Postumus and the Three Suns: Neglected Numismatic Evidence for a Solar Halo", *NC* 172, 2012, 85-92; Hollard, López Sánchez, *Le chrisme et le phénix*, 49-50 and n. 43, on the huge impact of the figure of Octavius-Augustus and of his many prodigies on all later Roman emperors up to the time of Gallienus (253-268).

[7] *Pan. Lat*. 10.14.

[8] Hollard, López Sánchez, *Le chrisme et le phénix*, 45.

It was only three decades after the apparition of October 28, 312, that Eusebius came to draft an apologetic biography of Constantine from a Christian perspective – his *Vita Constantini* – and consciously merged the two solar apparitions: the pagan apparition before the army, and the Christian dream of the *Chi-Rho* monogram. When questions have been asked about the identity of the pagan deity associated with Christ in the remarkable events that occurred between Constantine's question at the oracle of *Apollo Grannus* and the celestial apparition of October 28, attention has almost always – and rightfully – fallen on *Sol* or *Sol Invictus*, partly because of the abundant presence and importance of this divinity in Constantine's coins up to the years 324-6,[9] as well as because of this deity's extraordinary importance in the Roman army in general, and in Syria and the Balkans in particular.[10] Apart from the phenomenon itself and its circumstances and precedents, which certainly seem to have been heliacal in character, the exact significance of the *Chi-Rho* monogram has so far resisted all attempts at deciphering it convincingly.

As Ramskold and Lenski point out with regard to the exact nature of the "dialogue" between Constantine and the heavens inherent in the sign which the former received from the latter on October 28, 312, "Eusebius's interpretation was surely shared by other Christians (…). By leaving the object of his upward gaze unidentified, Constantine was surely playing on the polyvalence of this gesture, which implied divine connections without identifying overtly the nature of the god upon whom he trained his eyes."[11] It is true that, given that Eusebius was the official narrator of Constantine's ascent and was writing during the reign of Constantius II (circa 338-340 AD), he had the time to carefully select the way his narrative was constructed.[12] The advent of the Christian emperor Constantine (306-337) ensured the establishment of God's kingdom on earth, but the idea of "succession" (*diadochē*) is fundamental to Eusebius's notion of Christianity, as it also was to important schools of philosophy of the time and earlier. To quote Momigliano, "the bishops were the *diadochoi* of the apostles, just as the *scholarchai* were the *diadochoi* of Plato, Zeno and Epicurus".[13] Eusebius recognised the importance of history in his narrative, and he himself used antiquarian methods,

[9] D. N. Christodoulou, *The Figures of Ancient Gods on the Coinage of Constantine the Great (306-326 AD)*, Athens 1996, 47-86; Hollard, López Sánchez, *Le chrisme et le phénix*, 41-3, 57-9.

[10] Ibid, 38-41.

[11] L. Ramskold, N. Lenski, "Constantinople's Dedication Medallions and the Maintenance of Civic Traditions", *NZ* 119, 2012, 31-58, esp. 39.

[12] B. Croke, "Late Antique Historiography, 250-650 CE", in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Malden 2007, 568-581, esp. 574.

[13] A. Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*, Berkeley 1990, 140-1.

seemingly taking from ancient and Hellenistic narratives the inspiration of his own construction. Although Eusebius was naturally interested in the Old Testament, "on the whole, it was Hellenistic scholarship that Eusebius drew upon to shape the new model of ecclesiastical history."[14] He worked in one of the best libraries that existed in the Greco-Roman world, and made use of a variety of innovative technologies and scholarly methods, all of which were Hellenistic in origin.[15]

Despite the fact that Eusebius's *Vita Constantini* has not been sufficiently studied as a work modelled on the encomiastic and novelistic Hellenistic biographical traditions of "Romances" such as the "Alexander Romance" and the "Seleucus Romance", there are, however, common elements that the three share. These focus essentially on the gradual building-up of a general/king through a succession of omens, who then becomes *kosmokrator* thanks to his personal qualities and his dialogue with the god(s). There are in fact indications that at the time of writing the *Vita Constantini* under Emperor Constantius II, Eusebius knew of the Latin translation of the Alexander Romance by Julius Valerius, from the middle of the fourth century or earlier.[16] It is also possible that Eusebius knew something of the "Seleucus Romance", which was so important for a number of Late Roman and Byzantine authors, including Libanius and Malalas, and, as Primo points out, "all this leads us to suppose that Eusebius had access to high-quality sources on the Syrian (Seleucid) world."[17] What is certain is that Eusebius modelled his work on the *Antiquities* of Josephus, an author who was, in the best Hellenistic tradition, thoroughly familiar with all kinds of omens, dreams and military apparitions before kings and emperors,[18] and that it is this Hellenistic world that can help us to better understand the exact meaning of the emergence and triumph of the *Chi-Rho* symbol in the career of Constantine and his descendants. The pages that follow are intended to elucidate not so much the religious and heliacal influences of Constantine's apparition, already sufficiently studied and self-evident, but the precise semantic meaning of the *Chi-Rho* monogram in Constantine's career. Eusebius (*HE* 5.Pin., 3-4) was not interested in "victories in wars, or triumphs over enemies, of the exploits

[14] Ibid., 141.

[15] J. Lössl, *The Early Church: History and Memory*, London 2010, 25.

[16] He was also possibly the anonymous author of the *Itinerarium Alexandri Magni Traianique*, the short and incomplete work dedicated to Constantius II with a view to providing him with encouragement on the occasion of his departure to the Persian Wars in 340. See P. M. Fraser, *Cities of Alexander the Great*, Oxford 1996, 205-26 for the Alexander-Romance.

[17] A. Primo, *La storiografia sui Seleucidi: da Megastene a Eusebio di Cesarea*, Pisa 2009, 291; see also Euseb. *Chron.* 247-261 = A. Schoene, *Eusebi Chronicorum libri duo*, Berlin 1875, *Chron.* 117.1-124.5; J. Karst, *Eusebius Werke. Die Chronik aus dem armenischen übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar*, Leipzig 1911; Porphyrius, *FGrHist* 260 F 32.

[18] The example of Daniel and the interpretations of Nebuchadnezzar's dreams provide a good example of this, *AJ* 10.193-228.

of generals and the valour of soldiers",[19] and so he is of little use in the deciphering of this monogram which appeared in a clearly military context. The same is true of Lactantius, whose attitudes were similar to those of Eusebius. It is therefore necessary to undertake a diachronic study of the ritual surrounding those generals, kings and emperors, who had to prove in combat that they were worthy to wear the purple.

2. Roman emperors and troops in dialogue with the gods

The Roman historian Suetonius (*Vesp.* 5) recounts how Vespasian consulted the oracle of the god of Carmel in Judea and was promised that he would never be disappointed in his plans or desires, and the same author, along with Josephus (*BJ* 3.8.9 [399-408]) tells how the Roman general learnt there that he would soon be emperor of Rome. Shortly after these favourable omens, at the battle of Bediacrum in northern Italy in the year 69, Dio Cassius (64.14.3) recounts how "as the sun was rising the soldiers of the third legion, called the Gallic, that wintered in Syria and was now by chance on the side of Vespasian, suddenly greeted it according to their custom (…) (and) the followers of Vitellius, suspecting that Mucianus had arrived (…) becoming panic-stricken at the shout, took to flight."[20]

Although the number of omens, dreams and wonderful occurrences that might have marked the military victories of other Roman emperors remains unknown, these events were certainly regular occurrences for many before their coming to power. In one example of this, which has sometimes been taken as a direct precedent of Constantine's victory at the Milvian Bridge, the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* describe the dream that Aurelian had shortly before his decisive battle against Zenobia in 272, in which *Sol* outlined for him a precise plan to defeat his enemy (*Aurel.* 25.3-6).[21] After winning the battle, Aurelian made immediately for the temple of *Sol* at Emesa to give thanks for the help provided.[22]

In their extraordinary and insufficiently-studied narrative richness, the coin series of the third century show several examples of what appear to be three-sided dialogues between the emperor and a god of his choice, between a second god and the Emperor's troops, and between the emperor and his

[19] K. Lake, J. E. L. Oulton, H. J. Lawlor, *Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History*, London 1925-1926, 405.

[20] E. Cary, *Dio's Roman history. On the basis of the version of Herbert Baldwin Foster. Vol. 8: Books LXI-LXX*, London 1925, 243-5.

[21] Aurelian had already dreamt of Apollonius of Tyana, who appeared before him to announce victories and to ask him to be magnanimous with the cities he conquered. SHA *Aurel.* 22.5-24.9.

[22] T. Mommsen, *A History of Rome under the Emperors*, transl. by Clare Krojzl, intr. by Thomas Wiedemann, London 1996 (=1882-1886), 351 and n. 824; S. E. Hijmans, *Sol: The Sun in the Art and Religions of Rome*, Doct. Thesis, Univ. Groningen 2009, 10-1.

soldiers. According to the numismatic evidence, these dialogues seem to have occurred both before and after a decisive military victory, and they were produced primarily in mints with special connotations, such as Milan and *Ticinum* (military gateways to Italy) or *Serdica* (especially linked to *Sol* in the late third century). An interesting radiate minted at *Serdica* under the name of the emperor Tacitus (275-276) may be used to support this claim, showing as it does his crowned and yet entirely naked bust, a sure sign of "heroism", clad only in the typical *aegis* of Jupiter and with his spear pointing forward (Fig. 1). The obverse of this coin aims to reinforce Tacitus's connection with Jupiter, either the *Fulgerator* ("thrower of lightning") or the *Conservator* ("maintainer" of the *status quo*). On the reverse of the same coin, meanwhile, *Sol*, in a haranguing posture (*adlocutio*), addresses the imperial army, represented by the female personification of *Exercitus*, bearing two standards.[23] The presence of Jupiter on the front and *Sol* on the back of this radiate bearing the legend PROVIDEN(TIA) DEOR(VM) thus indicate, and very clearly, that it was not one but several gods that watched over the military success of the emperor Tacitus. The representation of *Sol* together with the army seems to suggest, however, that it was this god who was truly responsible for helping the troops in combat, just as he did with Vespasian's soldiers at Bedriacum. It is Jupiter, on the other hand, the most important of the gods, who seems to have been personally in charge of supporting and recognising Tacitus as the most important of men, providing him with a highly impressive "strike force".[24] The personal recognition of Tacitus by Jupiter[25] – and not of *Sol* – is indeed emphasised in many issues of this emperor following his victory over the Goths (Fig. 2). Besides, on a "medallion" from the mint of *Ticinum* coined immediately after his triumph in the Balkans,[26] it is not *Sol* who presents himself to the army, but the Emperor himself (ADLOCVTIO TACITII AVG). The obverse of this medallion shows the emperor with a laurel over his temples in recognition of his victory, as

[23] S. Estiot, *Monnaies de l'Empire romain. XII.1 : D'Aurélien à Florien (270-276 après J.-C.)*, Paris 2004, I, 31.

[24] The campaign against the Goths was conducted between spring and June 276, after several encounters in Asia Minor (Zonar 12.28; SHA *Tac.* 13.2-3). Tacitus's generals had by the end of the year 275 won important victories (including Florianus, Zos. 1.63.1; Zon. 12.28) while the emperor himself was engaged deep in Asia Minor, and in late spring he assumed the title of *Gothicus Maximus*. The victory over the Goths was represented at Serdica by the mention Cos II, S. Estiot, *Monnaies de l'Empire romain. XII.1*, I, 35, II, pl. 61, no 1781.

[25] For this same reason, Mars, as the provider of *Virtus* and military force to the emperor, also appears facing Tacitus on the radiates produced in the wake of his great victory over the Goths.

[26] Estiot, *Monnaies de l'Empire romain. XII.1*, I, no 357, 447, pl. 91 Ticinum; Estiot, who describes this issue in great detail, indicates correctly that "(it) evokes an imperial harangue of the troops, the essential prelude to the distribution of a generous gift to the soldiers"; ibid., 32.

well as with the *parazonium*, the typical Jovian sword with an eagle's head on the end (Fig. 3). A *scipio eburneus* or Jovian staff, with another eagle's head on the end, is also seen in other related radiates as *regalia* presented by Jupiter, along with world domination (*globus mundi*) (Fig. 2).

Fig. 1. Tacitus, antoninianus, first half of 276, Serdica. 3.23 g, Gorny&-Mosch Giessener Münzhandlung, Auction 190, 11 October 2010, Lot 540.

Fig. 2. Tacitus Æ antoninianus. Antioch, 276, 3.99 g, Rome Numismatics Limited, Auction 21 May 2013, Lot 1561.

Fig. 3. Tacitus, Medallion, 276, 19.23 g, Numismatik Lanz München, Auction 100, 20. November 2000, Lot 411.

Fig. 4. Medallion of Gallienus, Wikipedia Commons, F. Gnecchi, "Contibuzione al Corpus Numorum", *RIN* 3, 1890, 199.[27]

Tacitus's medallion is based on mutual recognition between emperor and soldiers after a military victory. Another silver medallion minted a few years before in the name of the emperor Gallienus (253-268), this time in Rome (*RIC* V/1, 106) shows the latter emperor in an identical position of giving thanks to his troops. Here Gallienus is also on a *podium*, accompanied on this occasion not by *Victoria* but by his father Valerian (ADLOCVTIO AVGG). The obverse of this issue, however, rather than focusing on military recognition as in Tacitus's medallion, prefers to emphasise the gratitude professed by Gallienus to the divinity (not explicitly referred to here) that has granted

[27]http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Rivista_italiana_di_numismatica_p_208.png.

him victory.[28] The coin engraver does, however, choose to depict Gallienus looking upwards, probably a sign of the need for immediate victories over the enemies of the imperial order[29] (Fig. 4).

Issues like these from Gallienus and Tacitus are not exceptional, however, as there are many Roman issues showing the two stages, *a priori* and *a posteriori*, of these dialogues between emperor, divinities and army, so important for the proper functioning of the imperial military machine.[30] The famous silver medallion minted in Milan in 315, which shows Constantine the Great associated for the first time with the letters *Chi-Rho* (inscribed on his helmet) appears, quite unsurprisingly, in the context of a military *adlocutio* (Fig. 5). This coin, struck in 315, does not, though, refer to the victory of the Milvian Bridge (312), and it is not directed at the whole army, as in the Tacitus's coin, but only at the cavalry troops stationed in northern Italy, which are depicted individually with their horses. Given that the battle of *Cibalae* (modern city of Vinkovci, in Croatia, ancient Southern Pannonia) in October 314 brought a successful outcome for Constantine against Licinius,[31] and since it occurred not far from the mint of Milan, the key to the whole of northern Italy, it is reasonable to suppose that the coin celebrates this victory. On the obverse Constantine does not bear an *aegis*, and nor does he appear here with a naked torso as in Tacitus's medallion. However, the *Chi-Rho* sign, which was by this time the personal badge of the emperor, appears near the eyes.[32] It may also be noted that Constantine's pupils are particularly dilated, and that their gaze is not in a horizontal direction but a vertical one. This medallion should therefore be viewed as the first of the successive issues in which Constantine is represented in direct dialogue with a celestial god, and although Constantine's divine communications have not yet been studied with the attention they deserve, if the Milan medallion seems to allude to the victory at *Cibalae*, then other issues might equally refer to other subsequent Constantinian military activities, apart from the crucial victory over Licinius at *Chrysopolis* in the

[28] See also SHA *Gall.* 16.4 and 18.2; Hollard, López Sánchez, *Le chrisme et le phénix*, 24 and n. 32.

[29] See the seminal article of C. Grandvallet, "Le prince et le philosophe. Gallien et la pensée de Plotin", *Cahiers Numismatiques* 152, 2002, 23-45, on the upwards gaze of Roman emperors at the time of Gallienus.

[30] R. Leeb, *Konstantin und Christus: Die Verchristlichung der imperialen Repräsentation unter Konstantin dem Grossen als Spiegel seiner Kirchenpolitik und seines Selbstverständnisses als christlicher Kaiser*, Berlin 1992, 57-62; Ramskold, Lenski, "Constantinople's Dedication Medallions", 39.

[31] D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990, 299.

[32] The superimposition of busts between *comites,* emperor and god is common in coin series of the time. The position of the christogram on the helmet appears to allude to the presence of the divinity precisely around Constantine's face.

year 324.[33] In his *Vita Constantini* (4.15.1), Eusebius does make one of the few direct connections we have in Roman times between specific coin issues and historical events, stating that "the great strength of the divinely inspired faith fixed in his soul might be deduced by considering also the fact that he had his own portrait so depicted on the gold coinage that he appeared to look upwards in the manner of one reaching out to God in prayer".[34] Eusebius does not, however, link these gold coins with the vision of the Milvian Bridge, and indeed all of the gold coins described by Constantine's chronicler took place at least twelve or thirteen years after the event. The iconographic picture reflected in Fig. 6 does not in any case correspond with that of a victory in the context of a Roman civil war fought by Constantine against Maxentius (312) or Licinius (324). The representation of two humiliated barbarians, reduced in size, on the reverse, the explicit indication of the mint of Sicia in the exergue, and the year of issue after 324-5 (the adoption of the headband or diadem which did not occur before that year, enables us to be sure of this)[35] suggests that the victory to which reference is made in this issue was in fact a clash with Sarmatian or Goth enemies in the Balkans.[36]

Fig. 5. Electrotype of the silver medallion held in the Staatliche Münzsammlung in Munich, The Trustees of the British Museum, Museum number 2012, 4159.1.

[33] Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle*, 299.

[34] Cameron, Hall, *Eusebius. Life of Constantine*, 158.

[35] The precise dating of the introduction of the diadem in extant Constantinian portraiture has been a matter of scholarly dispute: late 324, as a commemoration of Constantine's victory over Licinius; between July 25, 325 and July 25, 326, in connection with the celebration of Constantine's *vicennalia*; and mid 326, at the time of the killing of Crispus. See I. Popović, "Diadem on Constantine's Portrait from Naissus: Origin and Evolution of New Imperial Insignia", in M. Rakocija (ed.), *Niš and Byzantium, Third Symposium, Niš, 3-5 June 2004*, Niš 2005, 103-118, and Ramskold, Lenski, "Constantinople's Dedication Medallions", 41.

[36] Ibid., 39, on portraits depicting Constantine's "heavenly gaze" with a headband "from" the year 324-5.

Fig. 6. Constantine I, the Great. Gold Medallion of 1½ solidi, 6.29 g, minted at Siscia, 326-327, Ira & Larry Goldberg Coins & Collectibles, Inc, Auction 70, 4. September 2012, Lot 3407.

The reflection of these dialogues between emperors, gods and troops is a highly prominent feature of the Roman coinage of the third century, and it seems likely that the revival of everything connected with the Greek and Alexandrian past that had been in progress since the reign of Caracalla had much to do with this. The gold medallions from two fabulous treasures do, in any case, coincide with the period of the reign of Caracalla or a little later: the first of these was discovered at Tarsus in 1863, with three large gold specimens, and the second, even more spectacular, at Abu Qir (or "Aboukir"), found 39 years later and including twenty medallions, now scattered among a number of museums (Lisbon, Berlin, Boston and Thessaloniki).[37] In several of these medallions Alexander is shown looking up to the heavens in an attitude of prayer.[38] What is probably the most famous of all of them shows Alexander clad in rich armour and shield, holding a spear (Fig. 7). The bust, seen from the front and with the characteristic Alexandrian *anastole* in his hair, raises his eyes to heaven in a way not dissimilar to that of Constantine in his Milan medallion of the year 315.

[37] H. Dressel, *Fünf Goldmedaillons aus dem Funde von Abukir*, Berlin 1906; K. Dahmen, "Alexander in Gold and Silver: Reassessing Third Century AD Medallions from Aboukir and Tarsos", *AJN* 20, 2008, 493-546; K. Dahmen, B. Weisser, "Goldene Alexander zum Geschenk", in S. Drougou (ed.), Κερμάτια Φιλίας : τιμητικός τόμος για τον Ιωάννη Τουράτσογλου, Athens 2009, 343-59.

[38] K. Dahmen, *The Legend of Alexander the Great on Greek and Roman Coins*, London 2007, 144-52 on the most significant of these medallions: fig. 26.2A (Tarsos), 146; fig. 27.1 (Aboukir), 150; fig. 27.5 (Aboukir), 15.

Fig. 7. Alexander the Great gold medallion from Abu Qir, 220-225? 56 mm, Berlin Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 18200016. Aufnahmen durch Lutz-Jürgen Lübke.

3. Jupiter's gifts to Constantine: thunders (the supreme weapons) and archē (supreme rule)

Research into the exact nature of the pagan (or "traditional") divinity that may have communicated with Constantine before the battle of Milvian Bridge has almost invariably focused on *Apollo, Sol* or *Sol Invictus*.[39] Apart from the Gallic rhetorician's explicit description of Constantine's visit in 310 to the shrine of *Apollo Grannus* (*Pan. Lat.* 7.21), this may also be attributed to the abundant presence of *Sol* (*Invictus*) in the coins of Constantine up to the year 324. Without questioning in any way the relevance of the connection between solar deities and Constantine's visions, dreams and celestial apparitions prior to and contemporary with the battle of the Milvian Bridge, the exact significance of the monogram *Chi-Rho* seems however to have become partially disconnected with these solar deities. As is shown by the coins of Tacitus and other Roman emperors of the third century, *Sol* seems to be more linked with the army as a whole, and Jupiter more with the emperor as the head of the army. A priori, then, the ideal divinity to ratify Constantine in his position as leader of the Roman world after a military victory could have been Jupiter, and not *Sol*.[40]

[39] Hollard, López Sánchez, *Le chrisme et le phénix*, 22-52.

[40] For the exceptional importance of the *Jovius-Herculius* nomenclature in Diocletian

In this regard, too, it might be relevant to consider the well-known call for help to the heavens made by the emperor Marcus Aurelius (or his Egyptian friend Anuphis) via the god Mercury, to rescue him from a barbarian army in the Balkans in the second century,[41] when magically a violent thunderstorm sent by Jupiter, loaded with rain (which also satisfied the thirsty legionnaires) saved the Romans, with Jupiter's lightning, the "ultimate weapon" of the time, directed against the enemy positions facing Marcus Aurelius.[42] Eusebius (*HE* 5.5.1-7) was thoroughly aware of this Roman military tradition connecting the prayers of an emperor with the dispatch of lightning by God and the defeat of an enemy of Rome. As far as the Emperor's victory column in Rome is concerned, an entirely pagan interpretation of the scene is recorded, but Eusebius rejects, on the other hand, pagan accounts in favour of the "more reliable" assertion by the Christian Tertullian that Aurelius credited the victory to the Christians (*HE* 5.5.5).[43] If this historical passage is analysed in the light of what we have already seen regarding the traditions of dialogue between emperors and gods in the third century, however, it is easy to conclude that Constantine could have addressed his prayers to the Christian God with Jovian attributes or simply to *Iupiter Conservator* (or *Fulgerator*). The vision in the temple of *Apollo Grannus* occurred two years before the battle and there can be little doubt that this deity was important to Constantine and his army in relation to the final victory over Maxentius. However, the belief that *Apollo* or *Sol* helped Constantine's army is only part of the story, as the other divine figure that provided him with both the personal strength to lead his army and his legitimacy as *kosmokrator* could only have been Jupiter.

It may also be argued that it is a Jupiterine *Chi-Rho* monogram which is linked to a living coin tradition of political primacy in the Hellenic-Roman East.[44] In a bronze coin issue minted at Maeonia (Lydia) in the name of the

---

and Maximian just before Constantine's reign, see W. Seston, *Dioclétien et la tétrarchie. I. Guerres et réformes 284-300*, Paris 1946, 210-30. Maximian played the role of Hercules, the great defender of civilization, to Jupiter's Diocletian..

[41] Visions and miracles associated with emperors were common and include, most famously, the rain miracle of 171. Fundamental for the study of imperial dreams and visions is G. Weber, *Kaiser, Träume und Visionen in Prinzipat und Spätantike*, Stuttgart 2000. On the rain miracle, see P. Kovács, *Marcus Aurelius's Rain Miracle and the Marcomannic Wars*, Leiden 2009.

[42] SHA, *Aurel.* 24.4; Cass. Dio 72.8-10. See the iconographic representation of this miracle in the Column of Marcus Aurelius, C. Caprino et alii, La colonna di Marco Aurelio, Rome 1955, 88-9 (section 16).

[43] F. L. Holt, *Alexander the Great and the Mystery of the Elephant Medallions*, Berkeley 2003, 159.

[44] There are some coins minted before the fourth century that have christograms engraved on the surface, but there is no guarantee that these christograms were engraved at the same time the coins were issued; M. J. Price, *Coins and the Bible*, London 1975, 28; followed by R. A. Abdy, A. Dowler, *Coins and the Bible*, London 2013, 79-80.

emperor Trajan Decius (249-251), the letters *Chi-Rho* are fully integrated in the legend on the reverse, where the magistrate Aurelios Aphianos is referred to as *archōn* (APXΩN = chief city magistrate) with the abbreviation "A⸸", which appears to be conventional rather than invented for this occasion[45] (Fig. 8). On this coin the monogram ⸸ is not related to Christianity (the reverse type shows the carriage of Cibeles, pulled by panthers) nor to a particular religious cult (the christogram is linked to a civic office with official support). What it does make clear is that ⸸ here is linked to the semantic field of "primacy in command", given that "*archōn*" derives from the Greek noun *archē*, which means "origin" and "sovereignty".[46] It is therefore this meaning of "chief" or "commander" (*archōn*)[47] which is conveyed by the Constantine's christogram in the wake of the battle of the Milvian Bridge and other subsequent ones.

Fig. 8. Trajan Decius (AD 249-251), Maeonia (Lydia), 17.54 g, 34 mm, Ob: AVTK Γ M KV TPAIANOC ΔЄKIOC; Rev: ЄΠ AYP AΦΦIANOY B A⸸ A TO B K CTЄΦANH, The trustess of the British Museum, Registration number: 1900, 0404.45.

This significance of the christogram as a sign especially linked to Jupiter is supported by the appearance of the *Chi-Rho* monogram in a number of Ptolemaic coin issues from the city of Alexandria (series 5), corresponding to the middle or late part of the reign of Ptolemy III Evergetes (246-222

[45] Cited ibid., 79.
[46] *LSJ* 252.
[47] *LSJ* 254.

BC) (Fig. 9).[48] Marks found between the eagle and the thunderbolt (celestial attributes of Jupiter) on such Ptolemaic coins are most likely seriation signs, or indicators of the year of issue by the mint. The *Chi-Rho* sign, however, is in these coins linked consistently with the city of Alexandria, and it is a monogram without parallel in the history of the Lagide dynasty. It is therefore possible that its meaning should be understood as linked to the special importance (*archē*) of this particular issue, either because it was connected to Alexandria, the capital of the Ptolemaic kingdom, because it formed part of the first of a number of seriations, or because it referred to a particularly important officer or user of the issue. It is, in any case, significant that the most consistent and prolonged use of the *Chi-Rho* letters in the Greco-Roman world before the reign of Constantine occurred on a series of coins so clearly connected with the attributes of Jupiter.

Fig. 9. Ptolemy III. 246-221 BC. Æ 42mm, 68.15 g, Alexandria mint, Svorōnos 964, V Auctions, Auction 267,28. July 2011, Lot 27.

The recognition of Zeus-Jupiter was the highest distinction a Hellenistic ruler could receive, and there were few who dared to link themselves directly with him. For the Macedonian-Argead kings, an eagle appearing in the clouds in combination with lightning was one of the most favourable war omens possible: it is, in fact, known that an omen of this calibre was revealed to Alexander when he was about to face an innumerable mass of Persians.[49] It is well known, too, that Alexander received the direct recognition of Zeus

[48] This denomination series consists of eight coins, all with the *Chi-Rho* leg monogram, and corresponding coins with no monogram, http://www.megagem.com/ancient/ptolemy_series.html; I. N. Svorōnos, Τα Νομίσματα του Κράτους των Πτολεμαίων, Athens 1904–1908, nos 964-71.

[49] According to Posidippus 31, who worked in the courts of Soter and Philadelphus, Ogden, *Alexander the Great*, 84.

(the Thunderer) and that he was even represented by Apelles with a thunderbolt, the attribute of Zeus, in his hands.[50] A figure that seems to be Alexander is also shown with a thunderbolt in his hands on the reverse of the "elephant medallions" ("dekadrachms") issued by the victorious Alexander, perhaps after his battle at the river Hydaspes in 326 BC with the Indian king Porus, on his return to Babylon in 324 BC (Fig. 10). On the obverse of the coins is depicted a figure on horseback, presumably Alexander, attacking a figure riding an elephant, perhaps intended to represent king Porus, or else a generic Indian warrior. On the reverse, meanwhile, there is a standing figure wearing a Macedonian cloak, a Persian head-dress and full Greek armour, who is almost certainly intended to represent Alexander the Great, but who bears a thunderbolt in his band.[51] Although it has been posited that if Alexander was the issuer of these coins, he was making claims to divinity in his own lifetime, it is more plausible to think that he was presenting himself as the possessor of the *archē* or full sovereignty after achieving a full conquest of the Achemenid Empire in 326 BC.[52] As the supreme ruler or *kosmokrator*, Alexander therefore chose to be depicted as a favourite of Zeus-Jupiter on Earth.

Fig. 10. Alexander III, The Great (336-323 BC), silver dekadrachm, Babylon, The New York Sale, Auction XVII, 4, January 2012, Lot 304.

It seems reasonable, then, to conclude, that what Constantine achieved in the battle at the Milvian Bridge and in other subsequent battles was political

[50] Plut. *Alex.* 4.3; *Mor.* 335A and 360D; Plin. *HN* 35.92*;* Holt, *Elephant Medallions*, 123.

[51] Ibid., 117-38 for a closer look at this coin.

[52] Divinised mortals are generally depicted entirely unclothed in numismatic representation. In this dekadrachm, on the other hand, Alexander is fully clothed and crowned with a garland held up by Victory. No Greco-Roman deity is crowned in this way, it being a rite reserved solely for mortals. This dekadrachm does not show an Alexander whose aim is to be represented as a god, but a *kosmokrator*.

primacy, regardless of whether he had communicated with *Apollo Grannus* in Gaul in 310 and with Apollo / *Sol* or the Christian God in October 312. This primacy would have been granted to him by Jupiter, according to a pagan interpretation of events, or by Christ-Pantocrator with Jovian attributes if a Christian version of the military victory is followed. It is precisely for this reason that the Christian *interpretatio* of Eusebius replaces the *Chi-Rho* monogram with a cross. To any witness of Constantine's feat at the time, the essential element was not the monogram itself, which simply meant "*archē*", but the recognition that the symbol signified "victory" and "supremacy".

4. Constantinople, city of the *archē* of Constantine

After the impressive victory of October 312, the *Chi-Rho* monogram was consolidated by other triumphs and subsequent events as a personal badge attached to Constantine himself and to certain members of his family.[53] It also seems to have become a symbol linked to Constantinople, the city Constantine planned to be the headquarters of his political legacy and inheritance. In this regard, the bronze coin minted only in that city with the obverse legend CONSTANTI-NVS MAX AVG and the reverse legend SPES PVBLIC//A // CONS (*RIC* VII, nos. 19 and 26), showing across the field a *labarum* topped by a christogram with three medallions on the banner, transfixing a coiled serpent to the right, deserves reinterpretation[54] (Fig. 11). Grabar was the first to identify the serpent on this coin reverse as the defeated enemy – that is, Licinius, crushed at the battle of Chrysopolis in the year 324[55]– and the *labarum* as a suitable Christianisation of Roman military imagery.[56] Subsequently, Sutherland and Carson assigned these coin series a chronology of 327 for the first issue and 327-8 for the second in *RIC* VII. Bruun, on the other hand, preferred to give a wider timescale for the latter series, dating it to "the years

[53] Hollard, López Sánchez, *Le chrisme et le phénix*, 37-102; Just. *Epit.* 15.4.2-10, reproducing the common Romance tradition of Seleucus, adds that Seleucus's mother was instructed by Apollo, who had just impregnated her with Seleucus, to give their son the seal-ring, engraved with an anchor, which she would find in her bed when she awoke the next morning. Proof of his origins also endured among his descendants, since his sons and grandsons also bore anchors on their thighs, as if this were the natural token of the family. Ideologically-charged Seleucid symbols such as Apollo's anchor were also used by Hyspaosines of Charascene, Euthydemus I of Bactria, the Kamnashkirids of Elymaïs, the Parthians, and even Alexander Jannaeus of Judaea: P. J. Kosmin, *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire*, Cambridge 2014, 257. The *nummus* of Trier struck in AD 322 or 323 showing a bust of the emperor's son Crispus with a christogram-emblazoned shield has this dynastic meaning also. See image on the cover of Hollard, López Sánchez, *Le chrisme et le phénix*.

[54] *RIC* VII, 572-3.

[55] Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle*, 299.

[56] A. Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin : Recherches sur l'art officiel de l'empire d'Orient*, Paris 1936, 43-4 and 130; S. Kuehn, *The Dragon in Medieval East Christian and Islamic Art*, Leiden 2011, 103; Abdy, Dowler, *Coins and the Bible*, 90.

326-330, at a time when Constantine was sole ruler in the Empire and when he ostentatiously had demonstrated his interest in matters ecclesiastical."[57]

Fig. 11. Constantine I, *nummus* Æ 2.89 g, Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, Auction 78, 26. May 2014, Lot 1156.

This precise chronological dating of the reference catalogue *RIC* VII follows the ecclesiological guidance of Bruun in his explanation of the type, provided in 1961. On 27 November 327 Arius was summoned to the imperial court, and in December of the same year in Nicomedia, where Constantine was residing, two hundred and fifty bishops assembled. 17 April 329, meanwhile, saw the death of the bishop of Alexandria, Alexander, leading to the elevation of Athanasius to the post on 8 June 328.[58] According to Bruun and *RIC* VII, all these events make a Christian reading of this coin type unavoidable. However, as Maurice rightly points out, while it is true that in the years 325 and 326 construction began in Constantinople of the churches of Santa Irenea and Santa Sophia, the temples of the Dioscuri, of Rhea and of other local and pagan Roman and Byzantine deities were also being built at the same time. On the other hand, while they were undoubtedly important, these ecclesiological events of the years 327-8 should not be considered any more relevant than others that occurred before or after that year. As Maurice points out once more, "it would have been impossible to tell, while the work was in progress there between 324 and 330, whether the city was pagan or Christian. The only person who knew that was the emperor."[59]

The idea that the image of the *labarum* on a serpent is a representation of the Christian Good triumphing over Evil is a common claim, too, but

[57] P. Bruun, "The Christian Signs on the Coins of Constantine", *Arctos* 3, 1962, 5-35, esp. 21.

[58] Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 229-30, 385, n. 39-57.

[59] J. Maurice, *Constantin le Grand : L'origine de la civilization chrétienne*, Paris 1925, 202; K. D. Bowes, *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2008, 104.

one of dubious veracity.[60] Christians during the fourth century generally disapproved of images of Christ, and especially of the fight of Christ against the Devil in any form, which was considered "Manichean" and even idolatrous. The 36th Canon of the Synod of Elvira in Spain, laid down around the year 305, is clear on such matters, and Eusebius, who represents a very strong pre-iconoclastic tendency in the Christian church of his time, strongly disapproved of the evils of this work of the imagination in all contexts.[61] While when the same Eusebius notices above the façade of the imperial palace a painting of the emperor stabbing a serpent, (*VC* 3.3), he does not make any disapproving comments, this certainly does not necessarily suggest the Christian content to this painting that is proposed by Grabar, Carson, Sutherland and most modern scholars, and which is supposedly the origin of the *nummus* in question. Neither was the image that Eusebius describes painted in a public place devoted to military victories, such as a forum or circus, but in a private or semi-private space, namely the palace of Constantine itself.[62] Moreover, the legend on this coin, SPES PVBLIC/A, was for centuries reserved in Roman numismatic tradition for the presentation of family heirs to the imperial throne, and the three schematic busts within the *vexillum* bearing the letters *Chi-Rho* provide further evidence of the domestic and civic character of this monetary representation.[63] This is a reverse that seems indeed to celebrate the foundation of the city of Constantinople and the dynasty of Constantine in 330 rather than the victory over Licinius in 324 or the supposed "triumph" of Christian orthodoxy over heretical enemies in the years 327-8.

Since ancient times, and in many different mythologies, the serpent has had ambivalent connotations. The Greek serpent Typhon, the Babylonian Tiamat, the Indian Vritra and the German-Scandinavian Yormund all surround and embrace the world in accordance with the mythological model of the struggle of the order of the gods against the chaos of nature (as embodied by the serpent). This mythological model, which is known by the German term "Chaoskampf", does not, however, presuppose a concept of the serpent as an essentially evil element, but above all as a chthonic and terri-

[60] Abdy, Dowler, *Coins and the Bible*, 88. See F. López Sánchez, "La serpiente androcéfala y la dependencia de Rávena con respecto a los visigodos (425-465 d.C.)", *NAC* 36, 2007, 309-44 for an opposite and positive interpretation of the serpent in the imperial "Christian" iconography of the fourth and fifth centuries AD.

[61] M. Mansi (ed.), *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Graz 1960-1962 (=1759-1798), XIII, 176e, 313a; E. J. Martin, *A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy*, London 1930, 20.

[62] C. Badel, "Adventus et Salutatio", in A. Bérenguer, E. Perrin-Saminadayar (eds.), *Les entrées royales et impériales: Histoire, representation et diffusion d'une cérémonie publique de l'Orient ancien à Byzance*, Paris 2009, 157-75, esp. 158-62.

[63] Hollard, López Sánchez, *Le chrisme et le phénix*.

torial element.[64] The serpent is usually also identified in the Roman world with *Salus*[65] and with the Genius of the Earth, and its relationship with a city is absolutely normal in many civic iconographic traditions in the Greco-Roman world, beginning with Cecrops, the founder and the first king of Athens, who was born of the Earth itself, with his top half shaped like a man and the bottom half in the form of a serpent or fishtail.[66] Alexandria was another city that in its traditions and civic coinage repeatedly showed its pride in its bond with the serpent element, at the same time chthonic and aquatic. It is even said that Alexander himself met the *Agathos Daimon* or *Agathodaimon* ("Good Demon"), the serpent (or *drakon*) that came to preside over and protect the city of Alexandria, and Alexander's architects planned the city so that it would extend between the "Serpent" and "Agathodaimon" rivers.[67] It was precisely on the basis of this tradition linking the serpent with a certain area that heroes and kings, legendary or real, were linked from birth to serpents. Of the three myths regarding the birth of Alexander, it was that of the serpent (or *drakon*) which attracted most attention in antiquity.[68] What is certain, and what is of most interest to us, is that by the age of Gregory of Nazianzus in the mid-fourth century AD this tradition had become so well entrenched that Alexander could be addressed with the epithet *drakontiades*, or "serpent-son" (*Ps.-Callisth.* 1.6-7).

If we consider the *labarum*, as we have so far, to be the accompaniment of Jupiter's thunderbolt and a manifestation of legitimacy, the serpent should not then be regarded as an evil creature, but on the contrary as the (chthonic and aquatic) foundations of *Constantinopolis*, on which Constantine could establish his *archē*.[69] This *archē*, as in Hellenistic tales, was naturally exercised via his person (also identified with the serpent?) and through his offspring. The serpent and the *Chi-Rho* sign, then, are but two positive elements, probably connected to a much-attested folk-tale motif used to indicate a desirable location to found a city. The approval of Constantine as ruler of the world by Jupiter or the Christian God probably also embodied another omen for the founding of Constantinople to take place where it did,[70] and it seems highly probable that the letters *Chi-Rho*, with which he not only "conquered" but also "ruled", took on a prominent role.

[64] López Sánchez, "La serpiente androcéfala".

[65] Ogden, *Alexander the Great*, 53 and n. 106.

[66] Strab. 7.7.1.

[67] The case for this begins with the Alexander Romance (Ps.-Callisth. 1.32.5-7; 10-13); Ogden, *Alexander the Great*, 54-9.

[68] Ibid., 15-56.

[69] Even in the fully Christian *Kaiserchronik* there are constant references to the connection between building a city and chasing a dragon. See A. Matthews, *The Kaiserchronik: A Medieval Narrative*, Oxford 2012, 47-56 for the cases of Rome and *Constantinopolis*.

[70] Ibid., 48-9 and n. 66 for the role played by an angel in instructing Constantine the Great to found Constantinople, as established in medieval tradition.

HISTORIA, *PHYSIOGNOMÍA* Y ENCOMIO: LA FIGURA DE GRACIANO EN AMIANO MARCELINO

Carmen Castillo
Universidad de Navarra
carcasgar@gmail.com

1. Introducción

La historiografía es literatura comprometida con la verdad[1] o al menos con la verosimilitud que se puede deducir de las fuentes, de acuerdo con una de las ideas más importantes que la literatura greco-latina ha legado a la tradición occidental. Así lo afirman cuantos teóricos de la Antigüedad reflexionaron sobre los fines del relato histórico, creando una tradición retórica específica que ha perdurado hasta bien entrada la Edad Moderna[2]. Una cuestión diferente es el grado de cumplimiento de esos principios que las obras históricas concretas compuestas por griegos o romanos llegaran a alcanzar, como ha puesto de relieve la filología clásica de los últimos siglos.

En el caso más particular de la época imperial, un rápido panorama de la historiografía sobre Roma entre los siglos II y IV, escrita en latín o griego, no puede evitar llamar la atención sobre el protagonismo indiscutible que tiene el punto de vista biográfico, bien en el propio género escogido por los autores, bien en la perspectiva adoptada. De hecho, todo el que se propuso escribir Historia de Roma entre los siglos II y IV lo hizo en forma de biografía de Emperadores. Así, contamos con diversos biógrafos de origen oriental que escribieron sobre Adriano, Septimio Severo, Constantino, Constante y Juliano. En esta misma línea hay que mencionar a Herodiano que, en la primera mitad del s. III, recoge en ocho libros la historia de los emperadores romanos,

[1] Cic. *De orat.* 2.62-63: *uidetis ne quantum munus sit oratoris historia? haud scio an flumine orationis et uarietate maximum; neque eam reperio usquam separatim instructam rhetorum praeceptis; sita sunt enim ante oculos. nam quis nescit primam esse historiae legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat? deinde ne quid ueri non audeat? ne qua suspicio gratiae sit in scribendo? ne qua simultatis? haec scilicet fundamenta nota sunt omnibus. ipsa autem exaedificatio posita est in rebus et uerbis.*

[2] Así por ejemplo las palabras que encabezan el memorial de Juan de Palafox a Felipe IV, 12 de mayo de 1635: "Las historias, Señor, más sirven para enseñar que para persuadir, porque en ellas llana, distinta y verdaderamente se refieren los sucesos, sin vestirlos de afectos ni ponderaciones; gobernándose el que escribe con indiferencia, entereza y verdad, sin declinar más a una parte que a otra; refiriendo lo cierto como cierto; lo verosímil como verosímil; lo dudoso como dudoso; y tal vez se acredita tratando con algún desapego las cosas propias, con que es más creído en las muy importantes", R. Fernández Gracia, *Juan de Palafox y Navarra et alia scripta*, Pamplona, 2011.

desde la muerte de Marco Aurelio en el año 180 hasta el reinado de Gordiano III en el año 238. A juzgar por la conocida cita de Amiano, las biografías imperiales del senador Mario Máximo, datables asimismo en la primera mitad del siglo III y que tratan de Nerva a Heliogábalo, eran muy leídas, junto con las sátiras de Juvenal, por los contemporáneos del historiador antioqueno[3]. Según la propuesta de Lippold[4], la colección que conocemos como *Historia Augusta* fue redactada o reunida en torno al año 330 por un solo hombre, llámese autor o redactor, no comprometido en el plano religioso, próximo a los círculos senatoriales. Por último, es también de especial interés en este contexto traer a consideración el *Epitome de Caesaribus*, conservado junto con otros dos breviarios, que habría comenzado a escribirse en el 358 y que abarca desde la batalla de *Actium* hasta la muerte de Teodosio en el 395. Esta obra seguramente anónima, utilizó como fuente el *Liber de Caesaribus* de Aurelio Víctor, que trata desde Octaviano hasta el tercer consulado de Juliano en el 361, y pudo ser utilizado por Amiano[5]. Como es sabido, el *Epitome* se cierra con una *sýnkrisis* entre Trajano y Teodosio delineada en términos elogiosos[6].

Este modo de escribir estableciendo un paralelo entre dos "emperadores buenos" invita sin duda a reflexionar sobre el carácter mixto, desde el punto de vista religioso, de la época que nos ocupa[7]. Como mixto fue también el sistema de géneros literarios de esa época, cuestión suficientemente declarada y mostrada con acierto por Fontaine[8]. El contexto aquí expuesto pretende servir de observatorio privilegiado para considerar la historiografía de Amiano Marcelino. En ésta existe una estrecha conexión entre la tradición historiográfica y la literatura panegírica, conexión que ha sido tratada con

[3] Cf. Amm. 28.4.14 y el comentario al pasaje en J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVIII*, Leiden 2011, 193-5.

[4] A. Lippold, *Die Historia Ausgusta*, Stuttgart 1998, 3-4.

[5] G. Sabbah, "Ammianus Marcellinus", in G. Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, Leiden 2003, 61-2; R. W. Burgess, "A Common Source for Jerome, Eutropius, Festus, Ammianus, and the *Epitome de Caesaribus* between 358 and 378, along with further Thoughts on the Date and Nature of the *Kaisergeschichte*", *CPh* 100, 2005, 166-92; G. Kelly, *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian*, Cambridge 2008, 240-2.

[6] Para esta cuestión puede verse la introducción de M. Festy, *Sextus Aurelius Victor. Abrégé des Césars*, Paris 1999, así como D. S. Rohrbacher, *The Historians of Late Antiquity*, London 2002, 42-8.

[7] La rígida separación que en ocasiones se mantuvo entre la literatura pagana y la cristiana no responde a la realidad histórica en la que conviven la religión tradicional y la novedad del cristianismo, y presenta, por tanto, un panorama deformado de la cultura de la época.

[8] J. Fontaine, "Unité et diversité du mélange des genres et des tons chez quelques écrivains latins de la fin du IVe siècle : Ausone, Ambroise, Ammien", in M. Fuhrmann (ed.), *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'Antiquité tardive en Occident. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique. Fondation Hardt*, Geneva 1977, 425-72.

frecuencia y profundidad por estudios anteriores[9]. No obstante, resulta igualmente relevante llamar la atención sobre otro vínculo cercano que no ha merecido especial atención, el existente entre historiografía y *physiognomía*, como parte de la técnica del retrato, cuya consideración puede ayudar sin duda a profundizar en el propósito y la técnica literaria de las *Res gestae*. Para ello trataré brevemente de la relación entre Historia y *physiognomía* en el contexto de la literatura del siglo IV, del arte retratístico de Amiano y de un caso particular que puede ilustrar tendencias generales, la presentación de Graciano, una figura menor en los últimos libros, pero más significativa de lo que se le atribuye tradicionalmente.

2. Historia y *physiognomía*

Los estudios fisiognómicos estuvieron ligados en su origen, ya en siglo III a.C., a la medicina, en la medida en que sus cultivadores partían del supuesto de que existen relaciones estrechas entre el aspecto físico de las personas y las disposiciones de su espíritu. No obstante, en el siglo IV, la fisiognomía no es tanto una disciplina científica independiente cuanto la aplicación a la literatura de los principios ya tradicionales en la definición de la personalidad y el carácter de las personas, basadas en la observación de sus rasgos físicos. Si bien la relación entre apariencia externa y rasgos de carácter de las personas se daba por sentada, no es menos significativo que la tradición de los escritos fisiognómicos había acumulado a lo largo del tiempo observaciones e interpretaciones que servían de puntos de referencia autorizados tanto para las ciencias naturales como para la invención retórica. Es importante tener en cuenta que la aplicación práctica o literaria de la fisiognomía en Roma no experimentó un cultivo continuado, pero sí parece haber disfrutado de un importante auge precisamente a partir del siglo IV. Junto a los ya conocidos escritos en lengua griega, sobre todo el atribuido a Aristóteles y el de Polemón, tuvo especial difusión y popularidad un tratado anónimo escrito en latín en la segunda mitad del s. IV, del que se conservan quince manuscritos[10].

Rasgos de observación fisiognómica aparecen en obras de géneros muy variados. Baste recordar el texto del conocido Festín de Baltasar que

[9] Sin duda, tiene especial importancia en este contexto considerar la *sphragis* de las *Res gestae*, en la que Amiano afirma de manera ambigua que la historia de los sucesos a partir del punto en el que él interrumpe su narración sólo podría relatarse en forma de panegírico: *Haec ut miles quondam et Graecus a principatu Caesaris Neruae exorsus ad usque Valentis interitum pro uirium explicaui mensura, opus ueritatem professum numquam, ut arbitror, sciens silentio ausus corrumpere uel mendacio. scribant reliqua potiores aetate doctrinis florentes. quos id, si libuerit, aggressuros procudere linguas ad maiores moneo stilos* (Amm. 31.16.9). Sobre este pasaje, véase Kelly, *Ammianus*, 318-21 y F. Paschoud, "Ammien 31, 16, 9 : une 'recusatio'?", *REL* 82, 2004, 238-48.

[10] J. André, *Anonyme latin. Traité de physiognomonie*, Paris 1981; S. Swain (ed.), *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon's Physiognomy from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*, Oxford 2007.

Jerónimo —contemporáneo de Amiano— traduce así: *Tunc facies regis commutata est; et cogitationes eius conturbabant eum, et compages renum eius soluebantur et genua eius ad se inuicem collidebantur* (*Dan.* 5.6). Amiano por su parte hace una referencia explícita a su conocimiento de esta ciencia en el párrafo que cierra el discurso pronunciado por Juliano ante su ejército cuando Constancio declaró su decisión de asociarlo al trono como César. Así escribe en 15.8.16:

> cuius oculos cum uenustate terribiles uultumque excitatius gratum diu multumque contuentes, qui futurus sit, colligebant uelut scrutatis ueteribus libris, quorum lectio per corporum signa pandit animarum interna.
>
> Contemplando intensamente y por largo tiempo sus ojos, terribles en su belleza, y su rostro amable animado por la excitación, iban calculando quién iba a ser, como escrutando en viejos libros cuya lectura deja al descubierto a través de los signos del cuerpo el interior del espíritu.

La idea de que el carácter se manifiesta en el rostro y en especial en los ojos venía desde luego de antiguo, tal como pone de manifiesto la conocida expresión ciceroniana: *imago est animi uultus et indices oculi* (*Orat.* 18.60). Pero otros autores de géneros muy distintos como el caso de Petronio estaban al tanto de estas conexiones, según se deduce de las palabras puestas en boca de una esclava en el Satiricón: *ex uultibus tamen hominum mores colligo et, cum spatiantem uidi, quid cogites scio*[11]. De hecho, el modo de andar es otro de los indicios a los que atiende la fisiognomía según se deduce de los títulos de los códices que han conservado el anónimo tratado con diversas variantes[12].

3. Carácter, biografía, retrato y panegírico en las *Res gestae*

Precisamente el término *mores* que emplea la esclava del *Satiricón* merece aquí una observación especialmente relevante para las técnicas retratísticas que utiliza Amiano. Referido al modo habitual en que actúa una persona, *mores* es uno de los elementos que definen su carácter; pero esta palabra la utilizaba ya Cicerón para referirse a las costumbres de un grupo social o un pueblo: *mores maiorum*. En esta línea, Bonfils ha descrito detalladamente el

[11] Petron. *Sat.* 126.3. El uso de las teorías fisiognómicas por parte de los autores latinos fue tratado minuciosamente por E. C. Evans, "Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography", *HSCPh* 46, 1935, 43-84; Id., "Studies of Physiognomy in the Second Century A.D.", *TAPhA* 72, 1941, 96-108; Id., "Physiognomics in the Roman Empire", *CJ* 45, 1950, 277-82.

[12] *De passibus* (Leodiensis, x. XII); *De incessu* (Londinensis Cottonianus, s. XIII); *De signis incessus* (Erfurtensis, s. XIII/XIV); *De passibus longis et breuibus* (Londinensis Harleiamus, s. XIV).

uso de este término en las *Res gestae* del siguiente modo: lo que la naturaleza humana ha asimilado con el tiempo hasta hacerse hábito, costumbre personal, es el carácter de un sujeto o también de un pueblo[13].

Sabbah por su parte ha identificado con rigor la influencia de los procedimientos fisiognómicos en el modo de hacer de Amiano, que recurre a los tres métodos propios de esta pseudo-ciencia: el anatómico, basado en los rasgos físicos; el zoológico, que establece comparaciones con la conducta propia de diversos tipos de animales, y el etnológico que descubre las relaciones entre la raza, el lugar de habitación y las costumbres de un pueblo[14].

Asimismo Barnes ha descrito como carácter propio del arte retratístico de Amiano su vívido lenguaje, la abundancia de imágenes visuales y la habitual presencia de opiniones morales sobre la conducta y el carácter del personaje retratado[15]. Al autor de las *Res gestae* no le interesa tanto el análisis teórico de los caracteres como la observación y descripción de la conducta humana, y especialmente el análisis de las manifestaciones "patológicas" de la conducta de quienes están expuestos a las tensiones propias del ejercicio del poder[16]; como ejemplo de este arte de diagnóstico de la conducta, menciona Matthews el pasaje en que el historiador describe la actuación del prefecto Petronio Probo, en la que se hace un "diagnóstico magistral de la ambición enfermiza" del personaje, en punzante y certera expresión de Sir Ronald Syme[17].

Amiano ofrece este retrato de Probo en el momento en que narra el acceso de éste a la prefectura del pretorio. Petronio Probo, dice Amiano, *… claritudine generis et potentia et opum amplitudine cognitus orbi Romano, per quem uniuersum paene patrimonia sparsa possedit, iuste an secus, non iudicioli est nostri*, "era conocido en todo el orbe Romano por la nobleza de su linaje, su poderío y sus numerosas posesiones"; con este tópico que es, indirectamente, una crítica a la costumbre establecida entre los nobles de presumir de renombre, introduce Amiano la situación social de Probo, cuyas posesiones se extendían prácticamente por todo el Imperio, añadiendo: "no me atrevo a juzgar si con justicia o con todo lo contrario"[18]. Una frase cargada de intención en la que, a la vez que insinúa el posible origen

[13] G. De Bonfils, *Ammiano Marcellino e l'imperatore*, Bari 1986 100, n. 206, con amplia relación de pasajes concernientes.

[14] Cf. G. Sabbah, *La méthode d'Ammien Marcellin : Recherches sur la construction du discours historique dans les Res Gestae*, Paris 1978, 421-2.

[15] Véase T. D. Barnes, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality*, Ithaca 1998, 107-19.

[16] Cf. J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*, London 1989, 459.

[17] El pasaje citado corresponde al libro 27. En el momento en que Amiano retrata al emperador Probo emparentado con los *Anicii*, una de las familias aristocráticas más destacadas desde tiempos de Constantino, que ya no vivía: *Potuit quoad uixit ingentia*. Esto supone la redacción de este libro en fecha posterior al 389/390, año en que se sitúa la última noticia que se tiene de Probo: la recepción de una embajada de nobles persas.

[18] 27.11.1.

corrupto de las riquezas de Probo, deja entrever lo que es una preocupación constante del historiador: la Justicia, que aparece personificada hasta diez veces a lo largo de los libros conservados.

En la descripción moral de Probo prevalece la existencia de una doble faz: es a la vez benefactor y dañino, tímido y engreído; no incita a cometer crímenes, pero defiende a los culpables si son amigos suyos; sonreía con amargura y, al intentar agradar, hacía daño. Entre estas ambigüedades destaca sin embargo un notorio defecto, el hecho de que Probo era implacable: si había decidido castigar a alguien, eran inútiles todas las súplicas; así, "sus oídos parecían taponados no con cera, sino con plomo"[19]. Es decir, Probo carecía en absoluto de *clementia*. Su afán de ocupar cargos le asimilaba a un pez, que no puede respirar fuera de su elemento, y tiene necesariamente que sumergirse. Cuando se llenaba de confianza, parecía "revestido del coturno trágico", mientras que cuando se achicaba parecía llevar el calzado propio de la comedia (*soccus*)[20]. En definitiva, imágenes literarias, símiles tomados del teatro, y de la observación zoológica confluyen en una descripción fuertemente realista y descarnada que tiene un fondo crítico moralizante.

En otro lugar[21], reseña Amiano el desarrollo de la ambición, la avaricia y la crueldad de Probo, que conduce a la perdición a muchos nobles, a espaldas del emperador Valentiniano, que ignoraba los rumores "como si tuviera los oídos taponados con cera": era un defecto propio de este tipo de caracteres. Asimismo, el cierre del pasaje del libro 27 en el que se afirma que la solicitud, ansiedad y preocupaciones de sus cargos hacían de Probo un personaje enfermizo, lleno de achaques[22], remite a los conocimientos fisiognómicos del historiador.

Además del procedimiento de contraste, del gusto por las imágenes y de la técnica fisiognómica, mencionados en líneas anteriores, debe señalarse otra técnica preferida por Amiano, los paralelos con figuras destacadas del pasado, en la línea clásica de los *exempla* retóricos sin duda, pero con ciertos rasgos muy personales. El historiador introduce referencias o simples comparaciones

[19] 27.11.6. La imagen de los oídos taponados con cera es de origen al menos homérico (véase Hom. *Od.* 12.47-48 y 173-177), pero hacía tiempo que pertenecía al acervo de la imaginación literaria latina.

[20] Rasgos que aparecen en 27.2-3; el símil del coturno está también en 20.1.2, referido a Lupicino; acude de nuevo Amiano a símiles tomados del teatro en el pasaje de la crítica al Senado contemporáneo (28.4.8, 27) y en el "discurso de los abogados" (30.4.19). Sobre las imágenes teatrales de Amiano véase F. W. Jenkins, "Theatrical Metaphors in Ammianus Marcellinus", *Eranos* 85, 1987, 55-63.

[21] Amm. 30.5.4-11.

[22] Amm. 27.11.6: *id autem perspicuum est in eiusmodi moribus malum, tum maxime, cum celari posse existimatur, ita implacabilis et directus, ut, si laedere quemquam instituisset, nec exorari posset nec ad ignoscendum erroribus inclinari ideoque aures eius non cera, sed plumbo uidebantur obstructae.*

con las que se engrandece o se denigra la figura descrita. Así, el emperador Juliano es tan buen militar como Trajano y tan buen gobernante como Marco Aurelio[23], o la conducta de Constancio con Ursicino es similar a la que Nerón tuvo con Domicio Corbulón[24]. Es esta una técnica heredada de la tradición historiográfica en la que se enfrentan "emperadores buenos" y "emperadores malos"[25].

Este procedimiento se ha estudiado ya por extenso y se puede observar en más de un centenar de pasajes de Amiano.[26] Es digno de reseñar que los *exempla* aducidos son griegos y romanos, pero en una proporción considerable a favor de los romanos[27]. El efecto que consigue el autor es elevar el tono del relato situando los personajes y hechos del presente en el venerable pasado. En esta misma línea, otro de los rasgos característicos de la técnica de caracterización de Amiano es el continuo parangón entre *uirtutes* y *uitia*, especialmente notorio en los elogios fúnebres de los emperadores contemporáneos.

Los símiles de animales, a los que ya nos hemos referido, constituyen un recurso tradicional de la poesía épica; sin embargo, generalmente Amiano no los aplica a los héroes, sino más bien como un medio para caracterizar negativamente: Galo César se enfurece "como león saciado de cadáveres"[28]; Valentiniano, tras una derrota, se revuelve buscando a quien atacar, como un león cuando se le escapa su presa[29]; los ricos son como toros[30]; asimismo, en términos relativos, son numerosas las comparaciones con serpientes. No es necesario para el propósito de esta contribución añadir un elenco exhaustivo

[23] Amm. 25.4.17: *linguae fusioris et admodum raro silentis, praesagiorum sciscitationi nimiae deditus, ut aequiperare uideretur in hac parte principem Hadrianum, superstitiosus magis quam sacrorum legitimus obseruator, innumeras sine parsimonia pecudes mactans, ut aestimaretur, si reuertisset de Parthis, boues iam defuturos, Marci illius similis Caesaris…*; 25.8.5: *hac etiam suspicione iam liberi properantesque itineribus magnis prope Hatram uenimus, uetus oppidum in media solitudine positum olimque desertum, quod eruendum adorti temporibus uariis Traianus et Seuerus principes bellicosi cum exercitibus paene deleti sunt, ut in eorum actibus has quoque digessimus partes.*

[24] Amm. 15.2.5.

[25] Véase C. Castillo, "Amiano entre historia y sátira (Res gestae XIV 6)", in A. Alvar, J. F. González (eds.), *Actas del XI Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, Madrid 2006, 173-81.

[26] Véase por ejemplo, Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, "Del enemigo el ejemplo: *exempla* púnicos y etruscos en Amiano Marcelino", in M. L. Harto, J. Villalba (eds.), *Exempla fidem faciunt*, Madrid 2012.

[27] Aproximadamente de siete a tres: véase entre otros A. Brandt, *Moralische Werte in den Res gestae des Ammianus Marcellinus*, Göttingen 1999; Rohrbacher, *Historians*, 36-7; C. Castillo, "Amiano Marcelino historiador", in C. Alonso del Real et al. (eds.), *Urbs aeterna*, Pamplona 2003, 4-20 y G. Zecchini, "Greek and Roman Parallel History in Ammianus", in J. den Boeft, H. J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus After Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 201-18.

[28] Amm. 14.9.9.

[29] Amm. 29.4.7.

[30] Amm. 28.4.10.

de este tipo de símiles, bastará por ahora subrayar su significativa contribución a la técnica retratística del historiador, basada en la mutua dependencia entre lo visible y lo interior, por tanto, atenta a rasgos físicos particulares que revelen los rasgos de personalidad.

En esta línea, no sorprende que el brillo de la mirada sea un rasgo característico que subrayan los distintos retratos de emperadores. Dice Amiano con referencia a Juliano … *uenustate oculorum micantium flagrans, qui mentis eius argutias indicabant* "… resplandeciente por la hermosura de sus brillantes ojos, que expresaban su agudeza de mente"[31]. Asimismo el brillo de los ojos es un rasgo especialmente relevante en la caracterización de Graciano: *quem oculorum flagrantior lux commendabat uultusque et reliqui corporis iucundissimus nitor et egregia pectoris indoles* "lo hacían agradable la luz resplandeciente de sus ojos, así como el atractivo color del resto de su cuerpo y la noble índole de su corazón"[32].

Por último, resulta pertinente mencionar aquí que las referencias que hace Amiano a los comienzos de años consulares permiten entender indirectamente que el autor era consciente de la conexión entre técnica retratística y el género literario de los panegíricos. Era costumbre, establecida ya desde antiguo, que el cónsul *designatus* pronunciara una *gratiarum actio* ante el senado antes de comenzar el desempeño de su cargo. Por ejemplo, conservamos la que el uno de enero del año 362, ya en edad avanzada, pronunció Claudio Mamertino en homenaje a Juliano y en presencia del Senado y de la capital de Oriente, en su mayoría cristianos de origen plebeyo. Como es natural, el orador pretende ante todo mostrar su adhesión a la persona del Emperador, aunque su discurso supone inevitablemente una "auto-propaganda" al mencionar detalladamente su brillante y rápido *cursus*, que él considera un "regalo" de Juliano. Rasgo común a otros panegíricos es la alusión a la *mens* imperial como *diuina* y *praesaga*. Por otro lado, el panegirista es ambiguo en sus menciones de la divinidad; sin duda por evitar alusiones directas al comportamiento de Juliano en cuestiones religiosas, y pondera principalmente sus cualidades de gobernante. El modelo originario de estos *elogia* estaba ya diseñado por Cicerón en el *Somnium Scipionis*: *clementia*, *iustitia*, *aequitas* (y por otra parte, el *consensus uniuersorum* respecto al ideal del buen príncipe)[33].

Volviendo al texto de Amiano, el cuarto consulado de Juliano, cónsul asociado a Salustio en el año 363, marca el inicio del libro 23 al modo analístico; dice el historiador que el inmediato precedente de un Emperador que asocia a un particular a su consulado es Diocleciano (23.1.1):

[31] Las traducciones de pasajes de los libros 20-31 de Amiano son de A. Sánchez-Ostiz.

[32] Amm. 27.6.15.

[33] Para todo lo referente a la *Gratiarum actio* y para esta cuestión en particular, véase M. García Ruiz, *Claudio Mamertino. Panegírico (Gratiarum actio) al emperador Juliano*, Pamplona 2006.

> Haec eo anno, ut praetereamus negotiorum minutias, agebantur. Iulianus uero iam ter consul ascito in collegium trabeae Sallustio praefecto per Gallias quater ipse amplissimum inierat magistratum. et uidebatur nouum adiunctum esse Augusto priuatum, quod post Diocletianum et Aristobulum nullus meminerat gestum.
>
> Esto fue lo ocurrido en este año, sin entrar en cuestiones de escasa importancia. En cuanto a Juliano, ya cónsul por tercera vez, tras recibir como colega en el cargo a Salustio, que era prefecto de las Galias, revistió por cuarta vez personalmente la más alta magistratura. Parecía una novedad que se hubiese asociado al Emperador un particular, cosa que nadie recordaba que hubiera ocurrido desde Diocleciano y Aristóbulo.

Sin embargo, hay varios casos intermedios[34], entre los que está el del año 288: Maximiano y *Pompeius Ianuarius*[35] (se ve que Amiano "no se acordaba"; o más bien que el lector debe tener en cuenta también "lo que no se dice"); además el que asoció a *Ianuarius* no fue Diocleciano, sino Carino[36]. En opinión de Barnes, ésta y otras imprecisiones de Amiano revelan la "función apologética" de su *Historia*. Función que da a entender asimismo que Amiano aplica el método analístico solamente en tres años significativos: el 356, en que Juliano César asume las *fasces* (pasaje acompañado de un breve panegírico[37], el año 358 (consulado de los hermanos de la emperatriz Eusebia) que abre el libro 18, y el año 363 en el pasaje inicial del libro 23 que nos ocupa. Así pues, en esas tres ocasiones el historiador muestra que es consciente de la relación entre presentación del personaje, uso de los *exempla* y literatura panegírica.

4. El Graciano de las *Res gestae* (31.10)

En el capítulo 10 del último libro de las *Res gestae* delinea Amiano un retrato del joven emperador Graciano[38], en el que combina, como es habitual, elogios y críticas. En el aprecio de sus cualidades, como la elocuencia o la preparación, ha visto Alvar[39] una alusión velada de Amiano a su contemporáneo Ausonio, que había sido preceptor del Emperador. Ausonio, si bien era originario de la Galia meridional como la mayor parte de los

[34] Como ya indicó T. D. Barnes, "New year 363 in Ammianus Marcellinus. Annalistic Technique and Historical Apologetics", in J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Cognitio Gestorum. The Historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Amsterdam 1992, 1-8.

[35] Cf. A. Degrassi, *I fasti consolari dell'Impero dal 30 avanti Cristo al 613 dopo Cristo*, Rome 1952, ad loc.

[36] Barnes, "New year 363 in Ammianus Marcellinus".

[37] Amm. 16.1, especialmente 4-5: comparación con Tito, Trajano y Marco Aurelio; es decir, Juliano militar y filósofo.

[38] *PLRE* I 401 (Gratianus 2).

[39] A. Alvar, *Décimo Máximo Ausonio. Obras*, Madrid 1990, 30, n. 56.

autores de los *Panegíricos Latinos* que conservamos, no está presente en esta colección, aunque sí cultivó el género de la *gratiarum actio*[40].

La singularidad de la *gratiarum actio* de Ausonio por el honor del consulado está en que fue pronunciada al término de su desempeño en Tréveris, el año 379. Por la razón que fuera, por su adscripción religiosa o por motivos meramente literarios, no hay mención explícita de este notable escritor y afamado poeta en las *Res gestae*. No obstante, hay coincidencias llamativas entre las respectivas técnicas literarias de ambos autores: una de ellas es precisamente el uso de la *physiognomía*.

En esta misma línea, Amiano destaca que la victoria de Graciano sobre los lencienses, alamanes fronterizos con *Raetia*, saca a Graciano de su miedo anterior. Amiano lo presenta *erectus* ("erguido") por el éxito, expresión en la que la postura exterior indica el rasgo interior del enorgullecimiento (31.10.11):

> Hac laeti successus fiducia Gratianus erectus, iamque ad partes tendens eoas, laeuorsus flexo itinere latenter Rheno transito, spe incitatior bona, uniuersam, si id temptanti fors affuisset, delere statuit malefidam et turbarum auidam gentem.
>
> Graciano, erguido por la confianza de este éxito y dirigiéndose ya hacia las regiones orientales, tras cambiar su itinerario hacia la izquierda y cruzar el Rin en secreto, llevado de una esperanza favorable decidió aniquilar a todo ese pueblo desleal y ávido de revueltas, si la suerte le ayudaba en su intento.

La imagen de Graciano resulta sin embargo un tanto ensombrecida por la comparación con Cómodo en 31.10.18 que sigue a los elogios: el joven emperador es de *praeclara indoles*, *facundus, et moderatus et bellicosus et clemens* pero tenía la manía de matar fieras, como Cómodo, aunque no era sanguinario[41]:

> Hanc uictoriam opportunam et fructuosam, quae gentes hebetauit ociduas, sempiterni numinis nutu Gratianus incredibile dictu est, quo quantoque uigore exserta celeritate aliorsum properans expediuit, praeclarae indolis adolescens, facundus et moderatus et bellicosus et clemens, ad aemulationem lectorum progrediens principum, dum etiamtum lanugo genis inserperet speciosa, ni uergens in ludibriosos actus natura laxantibus proximis semet ad uana studia Caesaris Commodi conuertisset licet hic incruentus.

[40] Véase asimismo Sym. *Or*. 3; Them. *Or*. 13.

[41] Sobre la posible relación de este pasaje con Herodiano, véase Kelly, *Ammianus*, 234-5.

> Esta victoria oportuna y provechosa, que redujo a las gentes del Occidente con el beneplácito del *numen* sempiterno, la consiguió Graciano, increíble de decir con qué y con cuán gran arrojo, mientras se apresuraba con toda celeridad en otra dirección. Era un joven de carácter sobresaliente, elocuente, moderado, belicoso y clemente, que progresaba en la emulación de los príncipes más notables mientras un agraciado bozo le iba cubriendo sus mejillas, si su naturaleza propensa a actos ridículos no le hubiese distraído con los afanes del emperador Cómodo, aunque sin crueldades, con el consentimiento de sus más cercanos allegados.

A este respecto conviene recordar que el Calendario del año 354 contiene mezcladas fiestas paganas y cristianas; Amiano critica la pasión de los espectadores que "devoraba" uno de cada tres días.

Es preciso destacar, sin embargo, que el malestar del historiador se manifiesta con referencia a la conducta del joven Emperador —tenía dieciséis años a la muerte de Valente, cuando quedó como Augusto *senior*— que se dejaba llevar por malos consejeros. Entre esos actos reprobables están las terribles torturas y la muerte infligida a Doriforiano por orden del *princeps*, aconsejado por su madre (28.1.57: *matris consilio*)[42] y probablemente el historiador tenía también *in mente*, aunque no lo dice, el edicto publicado por Graciano y Teodosio, en el 379.

Hay otro momento en que Amiano adelanta el retrato de Graciano como "promesa"[43]. Era el 24 de agosto del año 367. El emperador Valentiniano presenta su decisión de asociar al trono a su hijo de ocho años como *imperator destinatus*: se va a la tribuna, toma al niño en su mano derecha, y elogia sus cualidades *mores* y *appetitus* (27.6.9):

> ut enim mihi uideri solet mores eius et appetitus licet nondum maturos saepe pensanti, ineunte adolescentia, quoniam humanitate et studiis disciplinarum sollertium expolitus, librabit suffragiis puris merita recte secusue factorum; faciet, ut sciant se boni intellegi; in pulchra facinora procursabit signis militaribus et aquilis adhaesurus; solem niuesque et pruinas et sitim perferet et uigilias; castris, si necessitas adegerit aliquotiens, propugnabit; salutem pro periculorum sociis obiectabit et, quod pietatis summum primumque munus est, rem publicam ut domum paternam diligere poterit et auitam.

[42] *Sed uigilarunt ultimae dirae caesorum. namque ut postea tempestiue dicetur, 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 reuersumque ad lares per cruciatus oppressit immensos. uerum unde huc fleximus, reuertamur.*

[43] Amm. 27.6.5-9.

> Pues aunque, como es habitual cuando lo pondero, me parece que sus costumbres y tendencias no están todavía maduros, al entrar en la adolescencia, como estará pulido por la humanidad y los estudios de las disciplinas intelectuales, juzgará con equilibrio intachable el mérito de las acciones rectas o de sus contrarias. Conseguirá que los buenos se sepan comprendidos. Correrá hacia las bellas hazañas para sumarse a las enseñas y las águilas. Soportará sol, nieves, heladas, sed y vigilias. Defenderá el campamento, si alguna vez lo exige la necesidad. Expondrá su vida por sus compañeros de peligros y, lo que es el sumo y primer deber de piedad, podrá amar a la patria como a su casa paterna y familiar.

Así pues, Graciano será capaz de distinguir entre lo recto y lo no recto, se afanará por realizar *pulchra facinora*, y como es tradicional en los héroes soportará las exigencias de la vida militar, las inclemencias del tiempo, la sed, los turnos de guardia… pero sobre todo en este retrato "profético" destaca la *pietas*: expondrá su vida a favor de los suyos; la *pietas* es el *summum primumque munus* (*rem publicam ut domum paternam diligere poterit et auitam*).

Este elogio profético coincide con los rasgos que mencionan los títulos honoríficos grabados en los epígrafes de Graciano. Otra coincidencia del texto con la epigrafía se ve asimismo en el texto citado anteriormente de 26.6.15[44] donde se dice que todos celebran las alabanzas de los tres: el emperador anciano (*maior,* Valentiniano), el joven (*nouellus,* su hijo Valente) y el niño (*puer*, Graciano). La alabanza conjunta a los tres Augustos se refleja abundantemente en la epigrafía de distintos lugares a lo largo del Imperio que los celebra como *uictores maximi ac perennes Augus(t)i*[45].

En la titulatura de Graciano se enumeran sus victorias militares: *Germanicus maximus*, *Alammanicus maximus*, *Francus maximus*, *Gothicus maximus*[46]. Por su parte, la *pietas* es una virtud a la vez familiar y política, que enlaza con el rasgo más característico del héroe épico romano por excelencia, el *pius Aeneas*, y además con las tradiciones romanas más conocidas. La *pietas* es una de las cuatro *uirtutes* del *clypeus* de Augusto;

[44] *Consurrectum est post haec in laudes maioris principis et nouelli maximeque pueri, quem oculorum flagrantior lux commendabat uultusque et reliqui corporis iucundissimus nitor et egregia pectoris indoles; quae imperatorem implesset cum ueterum lectissimis comparandum, si per fata proximosque licuisset, qui uirtutem eius etiamtum instabilem obnubilarunt actibus prauis.*

[45] *ILS* 772 en Italia; *ILS* 773 (Arabia): *Victoriossisimi Semper Aug(usti)* puesta en el año 371 por un *Iulius*; según Dessau (ad loc.) es la misma persona que menciona Amiano en 31.16.8, el último personaje mencionado en las *Res gestae*.

[46] Véase por ejemplo, *ILS* 771, en el puente de San Bartolomé que une la isla Tiberina con la orilla derecha del Tiber, puesta a finales del 369.

cabe recordar que la fórmula de los epígrafes funerarios (quizá la más generalizada) es *pius in suis*. *Pius* era ya el *cognomen* de Cecilio Metelo, colega de Sila en el consulado (a. 80 a.C.), que lo obtuvo como recompensa a su piedad filial. Por su parte, la *pietas* figura en lugar destacado en los monumentos honoríficos de Graciano, tanto en Roma como en provincias[47]. En el panegírico de Ausonio[48] se lee: *indulgentia pater, aetate filius, pietate utrumque*; el máximo orgullo del *praeceptor* del príncipe es haberle formado *pia uoce, iusta ratione, liberali largitate*[49].

Sería, sin duda, conveniente explorar el significado de la *pietas* de Graciano en el marco más amplio de la auto-presentación de la dinastía Valentiniana, en la que esta cualidad debió de cobrar sin duda un protagonismo singular. De hecho, Valentiniano asoció al trono a su hermano Valente, como antes Marco Aurelio (destacado entre los buenos emperadores) había hecho con su hermano adoptivo Vero según recuerda explícitamente Amiano[50].

Sin embargo, este argumento sobrepasa las pretensiones y el propósito de esta contribución, que no eran otras que destacar el papel de la fisiognomía y del encomio en la técnica retratística de Amiano, tomando como ejemplo el retrato de un "emperador secundario" de los últimos libros. Un rápido análisis de la presentación de Graciano en las *Res gestae* ha permitido destacar cómo el historiador ha querido entrelazar diversas tradiciones literarias y culturales. Es más, el énfasis de Amiano en la *pietas* de este emperador es, de hecho, un índice de la mente romanizada de este *miles Graecus* que escribe Historia de Roma, y de la inclusión de Graciano entre los *boni imperatores*, a pesar de los pesares.

[47] Véase entre otras *ILS* 778, puesta por el gobernador de Africa *Sextius Rusticus Iulianus* (a. 371-373).

[48] Aus. *Grat. actio* 7.35.

[49] Ibid., 18.83.

[50] Amm. 27.6.16.

CONSTANTIUS, JULIAN, AND THE FALL OF SIRMIUM

David Woods
University College Cork
D.Woods@ucc.ie

In 361, when his cousin and rival Constantius II was engaged in the defence of the Persian frontier, the emperor Julian advanced so swiftly from Gaul to Illyricum that he apparently surprised the defenders of Sirmium, the capital of Pannonia Secunda, and succeeded in capturing this key administrative centre without a struggle. According to Ammianus Marcellinus, Julian had travelled at speed down the Danube, and landed by night at Bononia, a mere nineteen miles from Sirmium (21.9.6).[1] He then sent his *comes domesticorum* Dagalaifus with a light-armed force to capture the *comes* Lucillianus based in Sirmium. Lucillianus awoke to find himself surrounded by a crowd of strange soldiers who bundled him off to meet Julian (21.9.7-8). When he had accepted Lucillianus' surrender, Julian himself advanced to enter the city (21.10.1). He stayed there until dawn of the third day when he proceeded as far as the strategic pass of Succi. He occupied this without any resistance, and left it under the control of his *magister equitum* Nevitta (21.10.2). He then retraced his steps back as far as Naissus (21.10.5), where he remained still when word finally reached him that Constantius had died (21.12.3). This, in brief, is Ammianus' account of how Julian acquired Illyricum, by a campaign whose speed and success has sometimes caused it to be characterized as a 'blitzkrieg'.[2] It is my intention to review the evidence in detail once more in order to show how Ammianus was either less well informed than he would have us believe, or far more calculating in his treatment of details which did not suit his propagandistic aims on behalf of Julian. In either case, the result is a serious misrepresentation of the military campaign in 361 resulting in an exaggerated estimate of the military ability of Julian himself, while the military reputation of Constantius II has suffered undeservedly.

[1] Unless otherwise stated, all references within this paper are to the *Res Gestae* of Ammianus Marcellinus.

[2] See e.g. N. J. E. Austin, *Ammianus on Warfare: An Investigation into Ammianus' Military Knowledge*, Brussels 1979, 87; H. W. Bird, "Julian and Aurelius Victor", *Latomus* 55, 1996, 870-4; E. Fournier, "The Adventus of Julian at Sirmium: The Literary Construction of Historical Reality", in R. M. Frakes, E. DePalma Digeser, J. Stephens (eds.), *The Rhetoric of Power in Late Antiquity: Religion and Politics in Byzantium, Europe, and the Early Islamic World*, London 2010, 24.

The key to understanding the full circumstances of the fall of Sirmium to Julian, and of the real nature of the wider campaign in 361, lies in Ammianus' description not of the fall of Sirmium itself, but of the news which reached Julian at Naissus shortly thereafter (21.11.1).[3] After he had taken Sirmium, Julian had ordered some forces captured there – two *legiones Constantiacae* and a *cohors sagittariorum* – to proceed to Gaul because he was unsure of their loyalty.[4] However, at Naissus he learned that these had revolted, seized Aquileia, and now posed a serious threat to his rear.[5] So who were these *legiones Constantiacae*? Unfortunately, this is the only occasion on which Ammianus uses the adjective *Constantiacus*. One possibility is that he uses it here to refer to legions which included this adjective, or some variation thereof, among their official titles. However, only one such unit is known to have existed by the early 5th-century, the *Flavia Victrix Constanti(a)na* (*ND. Oc.* 5.252), also known as the *Constantiaci* (*ND. Oc.* 7.150). A second possibility is that *Constantiacus* was used in a wider sense, meaning 'belonging to (the side of) Constantius' rather than as a technical designation associated with specific legions.[6] So when Ammianus states that Julian found two *legiones Constantiacae* at Sirmium, he simply means that Julian captured there two legions belonging to the side of Constantius in the civil-war then current. At one level, this interpretation renders the description of these legions as *Constantiacae* entirely superfluous, since Sirmium belonged to that part of the empire long under the control of Constantius II, and any forces which Julian discovered there can only have belonged to Constantius. However, Ammianus may have chosen to describe these legions as *Constantiacae* here in the foreknowledge that they would revolt shortly afterwards at Aquileia, and so to emphasise their particular loyalty to Constantius as demonstrated by this subsequent revolt.

While Ammianus does not preserve the proper titles of these legions, nor explain how or why they happened to be at Sirmium when Julian's forces managed to seize that town, it is arguable that their subsequent treatment by, and behaviour towards, Julian is far more revealing than may initially seem to be the case. The fact that Julian entertained such strong doubts concerning the loyalty of these two units in particular that he decided to send

[3] In general, see W. E. Kaegi, "The Emperor Julian at Naissus", *AC* 44, 1975, 161-71.

[4] 21.11.2: *Duas legiones Constantiacas addita una sagittariorum cohorte, quas invenerat apud Sirmium, ut suspectae adhuc fidei, per speciem necessitatum urgentium misit in Gallias. Quae pigrius motae, spatiaque itinerum longa, et Germanos hostes truces et assiduos formidantes, novare quaedam moliebantur, auctore et incitatore Nigrino, equitum turmae tribuno, in Mesopotamia genito...*

[5] Fournier, "The Adventus of Julian at Sirmium", 23-4, wonders whether these legions are identifiable with the 'soldiers' (*militaris turba*) who allegedly welcomed Julian to Sirmium (21.10.1). The answer is obviously not.

[6] So suggests J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXI*, Groningen 1991, 148.

them to Gaul so that they would be well removed from the expected region of conflict in the coming confrontation with Constantius is important. He does not seem to have had similar worries concerning any of the other units which he must have passed in his long journey eastwards, and this suggests that there was something different about them. The fact that they dared to seize the key strategic town of Aquileia during their journey westwards, and then successfully defended it against sustained attack (21.12.4-15), proves not only that they were particularly loyal to Constantius, but that they were elite troops. This combination of characteristics, fierce loyalty to Constantius and elite military abilities, suggests that these units may have formed part of some advance force that Constantius had despatched to Illyricum in order to bolster his defences there before he himself was able to be present. Indeed, their recent origin from the court of Constantius in the East, where they had probably left wives and children, would far better explain their persistent loyalty to Constantius than, as has sometimes been claimed, an almost superstitious belief that Constantius could not lose a civil-war.[7] One may find some small support also for this interpretation in the alleged Mesopotamian origin of Nigrinus, the tribune of the cavalry unit which joined these legions in their revolt at Aquileia.[8] An obvious interpretation of the origin of a unit whose tribune was from Mesopotamia, is that it was from Mesopotamia also. Yet if this unit was a recent arrival in Illyricum from Mesopotamia, then the same was presumably true of the two legions in whose company it was, and over whose members Nigrinus appears to have held such sway. This strengthens the identification of these legions as recent arrivals from the court of Constantius because he had in fact spent late 360 and much of 361 in or about Mesopotamia.[9]

The final, and most important, reason for identifying these *legiones Constantiacae* as an advance guard whom Constantius had sent to Illyricum ahead of his own arrival there is that he did indeed despatch a pair of legions to Illyricum for this purpose. For according to Ammianus, sometime during the latter part of 361, while at Hierapolis in Syria, Constantius decided to send two smaller battle-groups to the Balkans ahead of his main

[7] On the reputation of Constantius as lucky in civil-war, see Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 42.20-21; Eutrop. *Brev.* 10.15; Amm. 21.1.2; *Epit. de Caes.* 42.18. Bird, "Julian and Aurelius Victor", 872 attributes the loyalty which these legions showed Constantius to a belief in this luck.

[8] It is not clear from Ammianus' description whether the cavalry unit commanded by Nigrinus is a fourth unit in addition to the *legiones Constantiacae* and the *cohors sagittariorum* or is identifiable with the last so that it was actually a unit of mounted archers such as were certainly stationed in the region of Sirmium by the early 5th century (*ND Oc.* 32.32, 35). A. Müller, "Militaria aus Ammianus Marcellinus", *Philologus* 64, 1905, 573-632 identifies the two units and den Boeft, den Hengst, Teitler, *Commentary on Ammianus XXI*, 148-9 seem to favour this interpretation also.

[9] On the residences and journeys of Constantius II, see T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge 1993, 219-24.

force, one led by his *magister equitum praesentalis* Arbitio consisting of two legions, the *Lancearii* and the *Mattiarii*, together with some *catervae expeditorum*, and the other led by Gomoarius consisting of some *laeti*, where the latter was supposed to seize the pass at Succi and to prevent any force from advancing through there.[10] It is my argument, therefore, that the two legions which Julian found at Sirmium were the *Lancearii* and the *Mattiarii*, while the *cohors sagittariorum* and the *turma equitum* which accompanied the legions found at Sirmium are identifiable as the *catervae expeditorum* which had accompanied the *Lancearii* and *Mattiarii*. Thus, the *magister* Arbitio led a group consisting of the *Lancearii*, the *Mattiarii*, a *cohors sagittariorum* and a *turma equitum* and had occupied Sirmium before Dagalaifus attacked it on behalf of Julian. Similarly, the *comes* Gomoarius and his *laeti* had already occupied the pass of Succi when Julian arrived there. There are two further arguments in support of this interpretation.

Firstly, Ammianus contradicts himself. For shortly before his description of Constantius' despatch of Gomoarius and the *Laeti* to oppose the future advance of Julian's forces through the pass of Succi, he describes how Constantius was informed that Julian had already captured this pass (21.13.6). This contradiction suggests either that he was using two contradictory accounts, or that he was editing one main source to suit his particular re-interpretation of events. In either case, he has failed to erase this major contradiction, and its mere existence raises serious questions about his overall description of events.[11] Furthermore, the claim that Constantius decided to send Arbitio and Gomoarius to the West ahead of his own return, but at the same time as he decided to return there himself, makes little sense in so far as it seems inconsistent with the alleged rapidity of his own advance. For if he had advanced as swiftly as claimed, and Arbitio and Gomoarius were depatched to the West exactly when alleged, then there should have been little distance between these parties, a journey of a day or two perhaps. In brief, it does not seem possible than any great advantage should have accrued to Constantius

[10] 21.13.16: *Qua gratia in laetitiam imperator versus ex metu, contione mox absoluta, Arbitionem ante alios faustum ad intestina bella sedanda, ex ante actis iam sciens, iter suum praeire cum Lancearíis et Mattiariis, et catervis expeditorum praecepit, et cum laetis itidem Gomoarium, venturis in Succorum angustiis opponendum, ea re aliis antelatum, quod ut contemptus in Galliis erat Juliano infestus.* The Lanceani and *Mattiarii* here are best identified as the elite units sub-divided at some point to create the two pairs of palatine legions with the titles *seniores* and *iuniores* (*ND Or*. 5.42, 5.47. 6.42, 6.47). See den Boeft, den Hengst, Teitler, *Commentary on Ammianus XXI*, 212-13.

[11] It is not the only such contradiction within his text. For example, he initially states that the emperor Valens sent Sebastianus to conduct harrying operations against the Goths after he had arrived at Nice from Melanthias (31.11.2), but later states that he was already receiving reports by Sebastianus of his successful operations against the Goths while at Melanthias still (31.12.1).

by splitting his forces in the manner described, which is one more reason to doubt Ammianus' apparent chronology in this matter.

Secondly, in a speech which he delivered before Julian himself at Antioch on 1 January 363, Libanius reels off a list of items which had allegedly provoked Julian to begin his advance through Illyricum, including a claim that infantry and archers had already begun advancing from the East, with nothing turning them back, neither the Persian cavalry neighing on the banks of the Euphrates, nor siege engines attacking Roman walls.[12] Thus, Libanius supports the present interpretation of events, that Constantius had despatched forces from the Persian frontier to Illyricum before Julian's advance. Furthermore, his reference to a force of infantry and archers reminds one of Ammianus' description of the *legiones Constantiacae* with their accompanying *cohors sagittariorum*, so reinforcing the present identification of these as units recently despatched from the East.

Although this reconstruction of events contradicts some of Ammianus' claims for 361, it may be said in its defence also that it accords with, and sets in their full context even, other of his claims. In particular, Ammianus recalls that before he set out from Antioch during Spring 361 Constantius was concerned not to be seen to be doing nothing about the threat from Julian in the West (21.7.2). Hence he sent the *notarius* Gaudentius to Africa in order to re-organise the defences there in case of an attempted invasion by Julian. But why should Constantius have feared an invasion of Africa rather than of Italy or of Illyricum, particularly as the most likely route for any invasion of Africa was via Italy and Sicily? The more recent civil wars had been decided primarily in the Balkans, not northern Africa, so that it is difficult to believe that Constantius did not take some measures to secure those regions also.[13] Indeed, Julian himself reveals that Constantius did not neglect his western front, claiming both that Constantius wrote to his forces in Italy telling them to be on their guard, and that he stockpiled a large amount of wheat there in anticipation of a campaign against Julian (*Ep. ad Ath.* 286b). It is evident, therefore, that Ammianus does not provide a full account of the precautions which Constantius took to prevent the invasion of his western territory while he himself was absent in the East. In particular, it is difficult to believe that Constantius did not send emissaries in the manner of Gaudentius to the rest of his dominions also. One is immediately struck by a common factor between the appointments of Gaudentius and Gomoarius in that each had strong reason to fear Julian, which made them all the more

[12] *Or.* 12.62: ἐχώρει δὲ ὁ πεζός, ἐπορεύετο δὲ ὁ τοξότης, κατεῖχε δὲ οὐδὲν οὐδὲ ἐπέστρεφεν, οὐ Περσῶν ἵππος χρεμετίζων περὶ τὸν Εὐφράτην, οὐ μηχαναὶ προσαγόμεναι τείχεσιν.

[13] E.g. in 316-317 Constantine I defeated Licinius in battles at Cibalae and the Campus Ardiensis (*Origo* 16-18), and near Hadrianopolis again in 324 (*Cons. Constant.* s.a. 324); the turning point in the war between Magnentius and Constantius II came at the battle of Mursa in 351 (Zos. *HN* 2.49-50).

trustworthy as instruments of Constantius' policy.[14] It is tempting, therefore, to regard their appointments as different elements of the same package of strategic appointments which Constantius completed at one and the same time in Spring 361, sure in the knowledge that he himself would not be able to return to the West before the end of that year.

A number of issues remain to be discussed. One notes, for example, that Ammianus claims that Lucillianus had received some slight warnings of the approach of Julian which roused him to gather together at Sirmium troops whom he summoned from the neighbouring posts.[15] Again, this does not seem entirely consistent with his other claims concerning both the swiftness of Julian's descent down the Danube and the manner in which Lucillianus was allegedly surprised in his bed. Was Julian's arrival a surprise or not? Ammianus seems to want things both ways, but there can be no half-surprises. One explanation for his inconsistency here is that Ammianus has tried himself to provide an answer where none was present in his source(s). So why did Lucillianus summon neighbouring troops to Sirmium? In the absence of relevant detail, Ammianus was forced to hazard a guess, that Lucillianus had received some slight warnings of Julian's arrival, a rationalisation of his own making, totally unsupported by any of his sources. However, there was an alternative explanation, neglected by Ammianus, that Lucillianus was unaware of Julian's approach, but was beginning to gather an army in Sirmium anyway, as part of the same plan which saw the stockpiling of wheat in northern Italy. Hence, in accordance with Constantius' instructions as communicated by the newly-arrived Arbitio, Lucillianus was just beginning to gather a force with which to prevent Julian exiting Gaul, when Julian beat him to the punch.

I argue here that there were essentially two different forces in or about Sirmium, those whom Arbitio and Lucillianus had begun gathering from local resources, and those newly arrived from Constantius in the East, the *legiones Constantiacae* and accompanying units whom Julian was to despatch to Gaul later. But why not identify these groups as the same forces differently described? Why assume that these constituted two different groups? The answer is that Ammianus himself forces us to adopt this position. He

[14] Gaudentius had been set to watch over Julian during his early period in Gaul (21.7.2), and had interpreted in sinister fashion even his most innocent actions such as when he gave some small change to a soldier for a shave (17.9.7). Hence he was executed under Julian in 362 (22.11.1). Gomoarius had betrayed the usurper Vetranio to Constantius in 350, which was the ostensible cause of his dismissal earlier by Julian from his post as *magister equitum*, because he was perceived as untrustworthy (21.8.1).

[15] 21.9.5: *Levibus tamen indiciis super Iuliani motu Lucillianus percitus comes, qui per illas regiones rem curabat ea tempestate castrensem, agensque apud Sirmium milites congregans, quos ex stationibus propinquis acciri celeritatis ratio permittebat, venturo resistere cogebat.*

claims that Julian assembled the *exercitus Illyricus* only when he reached Naissus (21.12.22). But if the *exercitus Illyricus* was not assembled until sometime during Julian's stay at Naissus, how do we explain those troops discovered at Sirmium? Although Sirmium, as an important administrative centre, must have possessed a reasonable garrison, and Lucillianus is alleged to have summoned more troops from some of the neighbouring posts in addition to those already stationed in Sirmium itself, this still does not explain either the size or status of the forces allegedly discovered there.[16] My suggestion, therefore, is that the majority of the forces discovered at Sirmium did not belong to the *exercitus Illyricus* properly speaking, but were recent arrivals from the court of Constantius in the East under the command of the *magister* Arbitio.

One possible objection to the present reconstruction of events is that it does not accord with the evidence for the career of Gomoarius. According to Ammianus, Julian appointed Nevitta as his *magister equitum* in replacement of Gomoarius during Spring 361 (21.8.1). As described, this seems to imply that the dismissal of Gomoarius occurred in Spring 361 when Julian was at Rauraci still, just before he commenced his advance through Raetia into Illyricum. It does not seem chronologically possible, therefore, for Gomoarius to have fled to Constantius in the East and have returned back as far as the pass of Succi again, all before Julian had himself reached the pass of Succi. If Julian had dismissed Gomoarius in Spring 361, then Gomoarius should not have outstripped his own rapid advance all that much, with the result that Constantius could only have re-commissioned Gomoarius to return to his western front once more long after Julian had already occupied the pass at Succi, exactly as Ammianus describes. However, it remains doubtful whether Gomoarius really was dismissed in Spring 361, and not at some earlier date. It seems foolhardy in the extreme that Julian should have dismissed a senior military commander who must have had a detailed knowledge both of the number and condition of his troops, and have allowed him then to return to the enemy against whom he was just about to set these troops. More perplexingly still, Ammianus describes first the distribution by Julian of a written order to begin the invasion of Constantius' territory (21.5.13), then the dismissal of Gomoarius because he was felt to be untrustworthy. This seems to require that Gomoarius was allowed to return within Constantius' administration with a detailed knowledge of the invasion which was about to occur. Again, this scarcely seems possible. Ammianus is either mistaken in this matter, or he did not intend his description of the dismissal of Gomoarius to be so interpreted. Since the description of Nevitta's appointment

[16] The *Notitia* records the presence at Sirmium of the *Milites Calcarienses* (*Oc.* 32.49), the headquarters of the *classis Prima Flavia Augusta* (*Oc.* 32.50), and the *ala Sirmensis* (*Oc.* 32.54). Some of these may have been stationed there during the mid-4th century also.

in replacement of Gomoarius constitutes only one item in a longer passage describing a whole series of similar such appointments, Ammianus may have wished simply to list Julian's key officers at that particular crisis-point, with no intention to convey their dates of appointment.[17] Whatever the case, Gomoarius' dismissal should be re-dated to a period when the intelligence to which he was party posed no serious threat to Julian's plans should it fall into the wrong hands, and so probably to early or mid-360.

A second possible objection concerns the failure of Ammianus even to mention that Arbitio was at Sirmium at the time of its capture. Why would he have failed to mention Julian's capture of Constantius' most senior and influential commander? The answer to this may be that he did not actually realise that this was what Julian had done. Ammianus is only as good as his sources, and if these did not mention that Julian had captured Arbitio at Sirmium, he can hardly have been expected to realise this himself. Here one notes that in December 361 Julian appointed Arbitio to act as the president of the so-called Commission of Chalcedon, which suggests that Julian and Arbitio were not quite as hostile towards each other by then as Ammianus believes (22.3.9). Indeed, Ammianus himself appears genuinely puzzled by Julian's choice in this matter. It is my argument, therefore, that Arbitio surrendered his forces to Julian without a fight at Sirmium, and that his appointment to the Commission of Chalcedon came in recognition of this fact. This is not to claim that Arbitio had set out deliberately to betray Constantius, but that when he found himself in a difficult position at Sirmium, he made a calculated decision to surrender and co-operate rather than to risk his own life, and the lives of his men, in a futile attempt at resistance.

So what happened at Succi? There is no evidence that any force garrisoned the pass there other than Gomoarius and his *laeti*. As already noted, Gomoarius had been dismissed in Gaul by Julian during the previous year only. So few men would have been less likely to defect to Julian than Gomoarius, and Constantius is to be commended for his choice in this matter. Much less farsighted, however, was his decision to assign the *laeti* to Gomoarius as the force with which he was to accomplish his task. These men were barbarian refugees who had been assigned lands in Gaul on condition that they supplied recruits for the Roman army.[18] It does not seem wise on the part of Constantius, therefore, to have opposed his *laeti* from Gaul to the Gallic army of Julian. The *laeti* may well have felt that their wider families were in danger because these remained within Julian's territory still. Fur-

[17] R. C. Blockley, "Constantius II and His Generals", in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II*, Brussels 1980, 480-1, n. 85, concludes that Ammianus had probably "lumped together a number of appointments made at various times".

[18] See den J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XX*, Groningen 1987, 202-4; H. Elton, *Warfare in Roman Europe AD 350 - 425*, Oxford 1996, 129-33.

thermore, Julian probably included *laeti* within his own forces also, and may have used these to persuade Gomoarius' *laeti* to surrender.[19] Indeed, Julian and the *laeti*, or their senior officers at least, may well have known one another, for Julian had probably sent the *laeti* to Constantius in the first place. He had already defeated the rebellious *laeti* in Gaul as early as 357 (16.11.4-6). He had also offered to furnish Constantius with recruits from the *laeti* even after he was declared Augustus in Spring 360 (20.8.13). Hence one explanation for Julian's success at Succi is that he managed to persuade the *laeti* to defect to his side in defiance of their commander Gomoarius.

A few words are necessary at this point concerning the relative chronology of events in East and West. The exact date of the fall of Sirmium to Julian has been much discussed. It had long been accepted that it only occurred in October 361, but some have argued for mid-May or mid-July instead.[20] The variety of scholarly opinion on this subject serves to demonstrate a key point here, that Ammianus' narrative is sufficiently vague or contradictory to allow not only of a variety of different opinions in this matter, but of the possibility even that he did not himself understand the proper sequence of events. Hence it is not possible to establish the exact date of the fall of Sirmium, to within a month even, because there remain too many imponderables in any calculation to this effect. It probably fell in Summer 361, but whether this was early, mid-, or late Summer must remain beyond our grasp. However, in order for Arbitio to have reached Sirmium, and Gomoarius to have reached Succi, by late Summer 361, they must both have left Constantius by late Spring at latest, well before the end of his own campaign in the East. So the question arises, how could Constantius have afforded to deprive himself of some of his best troops in this way?

Ammianus paints Constantius as a ditherer who remained unsure what to do in response to the danger in the West throughout the whole of 361 (21.7.1, 13.1-2) until the news of the fall of Italy and Illyricum finally forced him to act. Then, just when he had decided gradually to send soldiers on in advance to the West, Sapor retired home from Rome's eastern frontier, and allowed him to assemble his entire force for return to the West instead, a wonderful coincidence which must arouse our suspicions for this very rea-

[19] Julian is said to have included among his army former supporters of the usurper Magnentius who had taken to banditry since his defeat (Lib. *Or*. 18.104). In so far as Magnentius was himself from the *laeti* (Zos. *HN* 2.54.1), and the *laeti* did engage in raiding following his death, these men are probably identifiable as *laeti* also.

[20] E.g. R. Browning, *The Emperor Julian*, London 1975, 116, and G. W. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate*, London 1978, 58, have accepted a date in October, while J. Szidat, "Zur Ankunft Iulians in Sirmium 361 n. Chr. auf seinem Zug gegen Constantius II", *Historia* 24, 1975, 375-8 and S. N. C. Lieu, *The Emperor Julian: Panegyric and Polemic*, Liverpool 1989, xiii have preferred May. C. E. V. Nixon, "Aurelius Victor and Julian", *CPh* 86, 1991, 113-25 favours July.

son. Yet the evidence allows that Constantius did not dither at all, but that he had decided on a definite course of action as early as Autumn 360, to which plan he resolutely stuck throughout the following year. It is arguable that the reason why he embarked upon his campaign of 360 at such an unusually late date, after the Autumn equinox on 21 September (20.11.4), was that he had already decided by that time that he would have to return many of his troops to the West both to replace those taken from Illyricum earlier and to reinforce the same. For by Autumn 360 it was finally clear that Julian would not submit peacefully. However, this would leave him in no condition to take the offensive against Sapor during the following year. Yet if he did not make some effort to avenge the Persian attacks of the last two years, and to re-take some of the positions which they had captured, this itself might have been taken as a sign of weakness and have encouraged another attack when he was least ready to meet it. He had no choice, therefore, but to take to the field for the little time which remained before the onset of winter in 360, both to demonstrate his strength to the Persian king and to try and inflict some serious loss upon him while he still could. He could then adopt a defensive posture throughout 361 in the hope that Sapor would soon be distracted by problems elsewhere in his empire, following which Constantius could himself return to the West again. It remains difficult otherwise to explain both his attack upon Bezabde at such an impossibly late date in 360, and his failure to follow up on this with a renewed attack in Spring 361. For so late did Constantius begin his siege of Bezabde in 360 that he could not realistically have hoped to starve it into submission before winter conditions forced him to withdraw, which is exactly what happened (20.11.24-25). Nor was it realistic to expect to be able quickly to storm this town. A serious attempt to retake Bezabde from its Persian occupiers once more should have required Constantius to delay his attack there until Spring 361 when he would have had a whole campaign season before him during which to accomplish this objective. However, he knew beforehand that some of his best troops would be no longer with him still to press this attack in Spring 361, and he advanced its date accordingly.

Two final questions deserve consideration together, because they are closely related. The first concerns the manner in which Julian advanced so fast through Illyricum that he caught Arbitio and Lucillianus by surprise at Sirmium. How did he manage that? The second concerns the office held by Lucillianus at the time of his capture. The best explanation for the speed of Julian's advance, the fact that he was able to penetrate whatever defence arrangements that Constantius surely had in place already along the frontier with him by the Spring of 361, is that some very highly placed officer betrayed these arrangements to him, probably the *magister equitum per Illyricum* himself. Among other things, this defector may have revealed where Julian would find the necessary supplies, including the boats themselves, so

making his sudden descent down the Danube a rather less risky venture than it might have seemed beforehand.[21] Sudden decisive defections were a hallmark of the civil-wars both before and after this civil-war, so there is no reason to suppose they cannot have happened then also.[22] If this officer did defect to Julian in early 361, then one may expect him to have demanded a high price for this service, retention of his rank, if not promotion even, and other honours. Perhaps the most plausible candidate here is the Iovinus who led one of the three columns into which Julian divided his army as he launched his invasion of Illyricum (21.8.3). When describing his appointment to the so-called Commission of Chalcedon in December 361, Ammianus notes in passing that Iovinus had recently been appointed as *magister equitum per Illyricum* (22.3.1). While it is tempting to assume that he had been appointed to this position by Julian, this was not necessarily the case. Indeed, the fact that Julian subsequently transferred him to Gaul as the *magister equitum per Gallias* (26.5.2) encourages the belief that it was Constantius who had initially appointed him as *magister equitum per Illyricum*, not Julian, since it is not particularly credible that Julian should have changed his mind so fast, relatively speaking, and have transferred his recent appointee from Illyricum to Gaul instead.

It is usually assumed that Lucillianus was the *magister equitum per Illyricum* at the time of his capture at Sirmium, even though Ammianus never actually calls him that.[23] Unfortunately, Ammianus' language is notoriously vague in such matters, sometimes perhaps deliberately so as he seeks to mould events to better suit his propagandistic aims.[24] However, in this case, there is a real possibility that Ammianus has committed another serious error as he sought to compose his text out of whatever materials he had before him. A certain *comes* Lucillianus commanded the *Lancearii* and the *Mattiarii* during Julian's Persian expedition in 363 until he was dismissed from his post when he questioned Julian's wisdom in ordering a frontal assault across

[21] Amm. 21.9.2 reports that Julian discovered a good supply of boats by which to begin his voyage simply by chance. Some commentators seem content to believe this. See E. A. Thompson, "Three Notes on Julian in 361 A.D.", *Hermathena* 62, 1943, 83-95; Austin, *Ammianus on Warfare*, 85. It was more probably the result of collusion by the *magister equitum per Illyricum* before he defected.

[22] Gomoarius had betrayed Vetranio in 350 (21.8.1) and would betray Procopius in favour of Valens in 365 (26.9.6); Silvanus had deserted Magnentius for Constantius II before the battle of Mursa in 351 (15.5.33); Agilo defected from Procopius to Valens in 365 also (26.9.7); Arbitio defected to Theodosius during the battle of Frigidus in 394 (Oros. 7.35.16).

[23] See e.g. N. J. E. Austin, N. B. Rankov, *Exploratio: Military and Political Intelligence in the Roman World from the Second Punic War to the Battle of Adrianople*, London 1995, 228, following *PLRE* I 517. Similarly, den Boeft, den Hengst, Teitler, *Commentary on Ammianus XXI*, 148 conclude that he was *comes et magister equitum*.

[24] For his attempt to conceal the fact that Artemius had been appointed as *magister equitum per Orientem* by the time of his execution in 362, see D. Woods, "The Final Commission of Artemius the Former Dux Aegypti", *BMGS* 23, 1999, 2-24.

the Tigris against a steep and highly fortified enemy bank.[25] If, as I have suggested, the *legiones Constantiacae* which Julian discovered at Sirmium in the summer of 361 are identifiable as the *Lancearii* and *Mattiarii*, then the *comes* Lucillianus who was captured at Sirmium with these legions is probably identifiable as the same *comes* Lucillianus who was leading them down Euphrates again in 363. The identification of these two men has been denied in the past because when the new emperor Jovian had reached relatively safe territory once more, he sent messengers to Sirmium announcing the appointment of his father-in-law Lucillianus, who had retired to there, as *magister militum* (25.8.9), and the obvious assumption seemed to be that this was the Lucillianus who had been captured there in 361 rather than the Lucillianus who had accompanied the Persian expedition, and that these were two different men.[26] However, the realisation that the Lucillianus who had accompanied the Persian expedition had been dismissed from service just before the Romans reached Ctesiphon, and that he could have been on his way to Sirmium for several weeks already, and by an easier route, by the time that Jovian sent a message to him announcing his re-commissioning, changes all this.

The identification of the Lucillianus captured at Sirmium in 361 as a *comes rei militaris* in command of the *Lancearii* and *Mattiarii* raises a question because Ammianus specifically refers to the individual whom Julian's troops captured while asleep there as a *magister equitum*. In light of the other evidence to suggest that Arbitio ought to have been present there also, and the fact that he really was a *magister equitum*, it seems preferable to identify him rather than Lucillianus as the commander captured while asleep. Indeed, this makes best sense also of the words that Julian is alleged to have addressed to the newly woken *magister equitum* when he was brought to him, that he was offering his cloak to him to venerate not in order to appoint him as a *consiliarius*, but to remove his fear. As *magister equitum praesentalis* Arbitio had been entitled to, and did play, an important role upon Constantius' advisory council, and Julian's words may have been intended to emphasise that he would no longer play such a role.[27] Hence Ammianus has made a serious error, best explained as a result of his composition of his account from two different sources, one of which described Julian's capture at Sirmium of an anonymous *magister equitum* while asleep still, and a second which de-

[25] The full story of Lucillianus' role during the Persian expedition can only be reconstructed by combining the evidence of several different sources, Ammianus, Zosimus, Malalas, and Libanius. See D. Woods, "The Role of the Comes Lucillianus during Julian's Persian Expedition", *AC* 67, 1998, 243-8.

[26] Hence *PLRE* I 517-18 distinguishes between a Lucillianus 2, who served on the Persian expedition, and a Lucillianus 3, who was captured by Julian at Sirmium in 361 and remained there until late 363.

[27] On Arbitio's role as advisor in the *consistorium*, see Amm. 15.5.8.

scribed his capture there of the *comes* Lucillianus. Ammianus seems to have mistakenly conflated these two separate individuals because neither source provided full details about the command structure operating at Sirmium at the time. In reality, Arbitio was the *magister equitum praesentalis* and senior commander there, while Lucillianus was a *comes rei militaris* under his command, and probably his second in command. As for why any source would have bothered to describe the capture of the *comes* Lucillianus at Sirmium when he was not actually the senior ranking officer there, and not have clarified this very point, this may be related to his status as the father-in-law of the future emperor Jovian. This status may have attracted far more literary attention to his achievements afterwards than they would otherwise have enjoyed, and in compositions which may not have been concerned to set them in their proper context.

Finally, there has been some debate as to why Julian took such a risk as he seems to have done, travelling at high speed with a relatively small force deep into enemy territory, in order to capture Sirmium, and why he then delayed there for several days before resuming his advance eastwards. The answer to this is not so much that Sirmium was a rich storehouse of much needed gold and silver from surrounding mines, although it probably was, nor that the population there was particularly hostile to Constantius and so could be relied upon to receive Julian well and present him with a welcome opportunity for propaganda, although there may well have been some truth to this also.[28] The main reason that Julian focussed upon Sirmium in the way that he did was the presence there of Arbitio and Lucillianus with their advance guard from Constantius. Not only was this force likely to put up stiff resistance itself, but its continued existence would also have encouraged scattered local forces to put up a much better fight than they would otherwise have done. Hence Julian headed straight to Sirmium in order to pre-empt Constantius' newly arrived advance guard there before it managed to re-organise and stiffen the defences of the whole region.

The present interpretation of the events of 361 requires a reassessment of the value of Ammianus as a military historian, and of his sources. He served along the Persian frontier on the staff of the *magister equitum* Ursicinus in 359, and was back in Antioch by the end of that year (19.8.12). He also served in Julian's Persian expedition of 363 (23.5.7). However, his whereabouts and station during the intervening period remain a mystery. It is a reasonable assumption that he remained a serving soldier still, but it would appear that the dismissal of his patron Ursicinus (20.2.5) on whose staff he had served since 353 (14.9.1) saw the eclipse of his own career also. It has been argued that speculation is possible on the basis of the quality and the type of informa-

[28] S. Dušanić, "Julian's Strategy in AD361", *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 41, 2004, 55-66; Fournier, "The Adventus of Julian at Sirmium", 24-5.

tion which Ammianus provides for these 'lost' three years. In particular, one commentator has reviewed his account of the events of 361 and reached the conclusion both that he 'made thorough use of good sources in Julian's headquarters', and that he 'was himself stationed in a headquarters or had access to records and personnel who were themselves aware of Constantius' planning of the war against the usurper [Julian]'.[29] The latter conclusion was reached on the assumption, for example, that such detail as Ammianus provides concerning the forces assigned to Arbitio and Gomoarius - their identification as the *Lancearii*, *Mattiarii* and *laeti* with accompanying *catervae expeditorum* - and those who revolted at Aquileia - their identification as *duae legiones Constantiacae*, a *cohors sagittariorum*, and a *turma equitum* - could only have been available at Constantius' headquarters. Yet the fact that he does not actually preserve the official titles of any of the units which had revolted at Aquileia suggests a far less authoritative source. It is noticeable also that he does not seem to have known the names of any of their tribunes other than Nigrinus who surely acquired some notoriety simply because he was made the scapegoat for the whole affair. His statements concerning the plans and states of mind of both Julian and Constantius remain unverifiable because of their very nature, but it is their cumulative effect which encourages one to believe in these headquarter-sources. Strictly speaking, however, Ammianus himself makes no such claim, nor does he let slip any hint even that he himself worked at a military headquarters, whether of Constantius himself or of one of his more senior officers. Hence any attempt to invest his account of the events of 361, of those in the East in particular, with some special authority on the basis of his detailed knowledge of senior decisions must fail to impress. It is impossible to recover his sources now, but it seems more probable that he gathered a wide variety of written and oral sources which he had then to cobble together to form a more complex whole, than that he had just one or two privileged sources at headquarters-level.[30] And it was probably the variety and complexity of his sources which prevented him from realising that the *legiones Constantiacae* discovered at Sirmium were identifiable as the *Lancearii* and *Mattiarii* whom Constantius had sent to the West under the command of his *magister* Arbitio.

To conclude, therefore, I have argued that Ammianus fails to realise that the troops whom Julian had captured at Sirmium, and who then revolted against him when sent to Aquileia, were those whom Constantius had sent to the West under the command of the *magister equitum praesentalis* Ar-

[29] See Austin, *Ammianus on Warfare*, 87-8.

[30] His sources for the early reign of Julian probably included the eunuch Eutherius, who had served as Julian's *praepositus sacri cubiculi* 356-60, and the Alamannic prince Vadomarius whom Julian had taken captive in 361. See D. Woods, "Ammianus and Eutherius", *AClass* 41, 1998, 110-8; Id., "Ammianus Marcellinus and the *rex Alamannorum* Vadomarius", *Mnemosyne* 53, 2000, 690-710.

bitio. As a result, he has misplaced Arbitio's mission to the West within his narrative, and distorted our understanding of the real sequence of events. Furthermore, the probable reason why Julian was able to advance so swiftly through Illyricum was that he received a senior defector, probably the *magister equitum per Illyricum* himself, who revealed all the military secrets of the region to him. Once this commander had defected, there was domino effect as other commanders found their positions seriously weakened also, until Julian was able to surprise Arbitio at Sirmium, perhaps even capturing him while asleep in bed still, so that he too made the pragmatic choice to surrender and co-operate rather than to try and resist any further. This momentum brought Julian to Succi where the garrison probably defected en masse in defiance of their commander Gomoarius. In brief, Constantius had planned his defence well, but one senior defection was enough to undermine all his efforts. However, Ammianus does not tell us any of this because, even if he did know this, it does not serve his attempted depiction of Julian as a new Alexander the Great (21.8.3) to reveal that his success was probably due more to one key defection than to any particular military ability on his part.

THE *ADVENTUS* OF THE EMPEROR JULIAN IN AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS'S *RES GESTAE*

Matilde Caltabiano
Università degli studi di Milano
matilde.caltabiano@unimi.it

If, as P. Brown has written, late antiquity is also an "age of ceremony",[1] there is no doubt that Ammianus Marcellinus was an expert on these ceremonies. Indeed, the *Res gestae* is marked by regular references to contemporary ceremonial customs such as, for example, the *adoratio*,[2] the offer of *aurum coronarium*,[3] the proclamation of games,[4] the solemn oaths sworn by the military to the emperor[5] and, above all, the descriptions of the investiture ceremonies of the Caesars and the Augusti[6] and the various imperial *adventus*.[7]

[1] P. R. L. Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*, Madison 1992, 56.

[2] Ammianus (15.5.18) recalls that it was Diocletian who introduced this custom in the Roman empire: *Diocletianus enim Augustus omnium primus externo ritu et regio more instituit adorari, cum semper antea ad similitudinem iudicum salutatos principes legerimus*; R. Teja, "Il cerimoniale imperiale", in A. Carandini, L. Cracco Ruggini, A. Giardina (eds.), *Storia di Roma. L'età tardoantica. Crisi e trasformazioni 3, 1*, Turin 1993, 614-617. There are other examples of the worship of purple in 15.5.27; 17.10.9; 21.6.2; 21.9.8; 22.9.16; 23.3.8.

[3] See 23.3.3, 8; 25.9.4.

[4] Games were proclaimed on diverse occasions and exclusively by emperors and senators. The former made an offering of them to the people during the celebration of the *adventus* in the various cities (es. Gallus in Constantinople, 14.11.12; Constantius in Rome, 16.10.13; Julian in Sirmium, 21.10.2), of the anniversaries of rises to power (e.g. Constantius for his thirteenth year as emperor 14.5.1; Julian for his fifth 21.1.4) and on many other occasions: senators to celebrate their appointment to positions reserved for them (in the *quaestura, praetura, consulatus*): for example, Claudius Mamertinus proclaimed games for the inauguration of his post as consul in 362 (22.7.2); the urban prefect Lampadius for his in praetorship (27.3.6).

[5] 21.5.7.

[6] Ammianus describes Julian's proclamations as Caesar (15.8.4-17) and his proclamations as Augustus (20.4.1-22; 5.1-10); those of Iovianus (25.5.1-9); of Valentinianus (26.2.1-7); of Valens (26.4.1-4); of Gratianus (27.6.4-16); of Valentinianus II (30.10.4-5), and of the usurper Procopius (26.6.15-16).

[7] The *adventus* described in most detail is that of Constantius in Rome in 357 (16.10.1-20). On this event, see: A. Fraschetti, *La conversione. Da Roma pagana a Roma cristiana*, Roma 1999, 53-54; M. Caltabiano, "I trionfi di Costanzo II", *Studi di antichità in memoria di Clementina Gatti*, Milan 1987, 37-46; D. Vera, "La polemica contro l'abuso imperiale del trionfo: rapporti fra ideologia, economia e propaganda nel Basso Impero", *RSA* 10, 1980, 89-132; Id., *Commento storico alle Relationes di Quinto Aurelio Simmaco*, Pisa 1981, 83-89; R. Klein, "Der Rombesuch des Kaisers Constantius II. in Jahre 357", *Athenaeum* 47, 1979, 98-115;

Although scholars of the imperial *adventus* have dwelt mostly on the ceremonial aspects of these events,[8] primarily by investigating the panegyrics delivered on these occasions, they have not neglected to look into their origins and their historical evolution, as well as their political, social and economic significance. Lastly, Porena[9] has seen them as one of the most important forms of the citizens' collective participation in political life.

I shall limit myself to a few observations on the *adventus* of the emperor Julian as described by Ammianus Marcellinus, which have come to mind in the course of a historical and historiographic examination of the texts.

1. The *adventus* in Vienne

According to Ammianus's account, during the *adventus* of December 355 in Vienne,[10] Julian's epiphany before the army in Milan, when Augustus Constantius II proclaimed him Caesar, is repeated and completed.[11] The historian writes:

> Cumque Viennam venisset, ingredientem optatum quidem et impetrabilem honorifice susceptura omnis aetas concurrebat et dignitas proculque visum plebs universa cum vicinitate finitima, imperatorem clementem appellans et faustum, praevia consonis laudibus celebrabat, avidius pompam regiam in principe legitimo cernens: communiumque

Y.-M. Duval, "La venue à Rome de l'empereur Constance II en 357, d'après Ammien Marcellin (XVI, 10, 1-20)", *Caesarodunum* 5, 1970, 299-304; S. Mazzarino, *Aspetti sociali del quarto secolo*, Roma 1951, 125-7; on the impression that Constantius's *adventus* produced on the Roman aristocracy R. O. Edbrooke, Jr., "The Visit of Constantius II to Rome in 357 and Its Effect on the Pagan Roman Senatorial Aristocracy", *AJPh* 97, 1976, 40-61.

[8] S. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley 1981; P. Dufraigne, "Quelques remarques sur l'*adventus* chez Ammien Marcellin et les panègyristes", in L. Holtz, J. C. Fredouille, M.-H. Jullien (eds.), *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes. Mélanges offerts à J. Fontaine* 2, París 1992, 497-509; Id., *Adventus Augusti, adventus Christi : Recherche sur l'exploitation idéologique et littéraire d'un cérémonial dans l'antiquité tardive*, Paris 1994; "Quelques remarques"; G. Sabbah, *La méthode d'Ammien Marcellin : Recherches sur la construction du discours historique dans les Res Gestae*, Paris 1978; Teja, "Il cerimoniale imperiale"; M. Vitiello, "Nuove prospettive sull'adventus in età imperiale", *MedAnt* 3, 2000, 551-80, J. Lehnen, *Adventus principis: Untersuchungen zu Sinngehalt und Zeremoniell der Kaiserankunft in den Städten des Imperium Romanum*, Frankfurt am Main 1997; Fraschetti, *La conversione*; M. García Ruiz, *Claudio Mamertino. Panegírico (Gratiarum actio) al emperador Juliano*, Pamplona 2006.

[9] P. Porena, "Forme di partecipazione politica cittadina e contatti con il potere imperiale", in F. Amarelli (ed.), *Politica e partecipazione nelle città dell'impero romano*, Roma 2005, 13-92.

[10] A. Cerri, "Il viaggio di Giuliano Cesare nelle Gallie (Dicembre 355)", *RIL* 106, 1972, 567; MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony*, 61.

[11] 15.8.4-17. On the epiphanies of the emperors at their public appearances and the importance of alternating the visibility-invisibility of the sovereign as a means of maintaining power in late antiquity: Teja, "Il cerimoniale imperiale", 624-9.

> remedium aerumnarum in eius locabat adventu, salutarem quendam genium adfulsisse conclamatis negotiis arbitrata. Tunc anus quaedam orba luminibus cum percontando, quinam esset ingressus, Iulianum Caesarem comperisset, exclamavit hunc deorum templa reparaturum (15.8.21-22).

In his description, Ammianus not only focuses on elements characteristic of the description of the *adventus* in Latin panegyrics – the crowd of people of all ages and social classes who rush to meet the sovereign together with the city authorities, the acclamations of the emperor, the imperial procession and the admiration gathered by the sovereign as he passes[12] – but he also gives emphasis to two significant political aspects: the *consensus provinciarum* and the legitimacy of the sovereign, from whom an answer to everyday troubles was expected.

As well as being a typical element in this ceremony, as S. MacCormack observes, the manifestation of c*onsensus* serves here specifically to confirm the earlier proclamation of Julian as Caesar in Milan;[13] however, the reference to the coming of the Caesar as *princeps legitimus* has a more complex significance.

On the one hand, it is a reminder that Constantius II's decision to appoint a Caesar arose out of the need to deal with the uncertain situation in Gaul, ravaged by the attacks of the barbarians,[14] and the Empress Eusebia's conviction that it would be better to choose a relative rather than an outsider to settle these difficulties.[15] On the other hand, it reminds us that the inhabitants of the provinces were no longer used to seeing legitimate sovereigns in their lands, which had been shaken by civil wars up until then. By summoning Julian, a cousin on his father's side of the family (he was, in fact the son of Julius Constantius, the brother of Constantine the Great), to share imperial power, he was making a dynastic choice, since this

[12] Libanius, too, (*Or.* 18.40) presents Julian's journey in accordance with the canons of panegyrics; in particular, he notes that the Caesar, who left in mid-winter, was accompanied by brilliant sunshine and that the winter season was transformed into spring by his passage. Similarly, the author of panegyric 291, composed on the occasion of Maximianus's birthday (*Pan. Lat.* 3.9.1-2; 10.4-5), describing the *adventus* of Maximianus and Diocletian in Milan, reports that the two emperors had crossed the Alps during the winter season, illuminated by the sun's rays and accompanied by *aurae lenes vernique flatus*.

[13] MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony*, 61.

[14] 15.8.1.

[15] 15.8.3. On Eusebia: N. Aujoulat, "Eusébie, Héléne et Julien, I : le témoignage de Julien", *Byzantion* 53, 1983, 78-103; Id., "Eusébie, Héléne et Julien, II : le témoignage des historiens", *Byzantion* 53, 1983, 421-52; on the influence of the Empress on Constantius's decision to share power with Julian: P. García Ruiz, "Eusebia vista por Amiano: un retrato entre líneas", *CFCEL* 2, 2008, 54-6; C. Di Spigno, "Studi su Ammiano Marcellino. Il regno di Costanzo II. Il Cesarato di Giuliano", *Helikon* 2, 1962, 445-6.

prince was the last surviving member of the Constantinian family and also its legitimate heir.[16]

Nonetheless, Ammianus does not merely intend to highlight Julian's dynastic legitimacy, but also to contrast it with the illegitimacy of the usurpers Flavius Magnus Magnentius,[17] Magnus Decentius[18] and Silvanus,[19] who had recently led a civil war in the regions of Gaul. The presence of a legitimate sovereign in those territories would thus be the best guarantee against the recurrence of any future attempt to usurp the power.

The description of this *adventus*, however, also has a strong religious significance, made evident by references to the *genius salutaris* and to the prophecies of the old blind woman. It should first be noted that Ammianus had not made any previous mention of Julian's leanings towards the cult of the gods, even in his account of the imperial proclamation, in which he limited himself to recalling that during the ceremony the soldiers interrupted Constantius's speech with their acclamations and, almost as though foretelling the future, affirmed that the choice of this prince as Caesar had been determined not by the decision of a human being but by the will of the supreme god.[20] It was thus an authentic divine investiture. However, as often happens in late antiquity, and due also to the cultural influence of neo-Platonic thought, reference to the divine is so ambiguous that it is not easy to determine whether Julian was chosen as Caesar by the supreme god of the pagans or of the Christians.

This ambiguity ceases immediately afterwards, in this very description of the *adventus* in Vienne where, as well as shedding light on the sense of the soldiers' prophecy, it is mainly Julian's religious mission that is defined: the prophetic words pronounced by the old blind woman who, like the prophet Tiresias in the Odyssey, though deprived of sight, can see perfectly into the future, announces that the new Caesar will rebuild the temples of the gods.

In line with pro-Julian propaganda, Ammianus uses an image corresponding to one of the titles attributed to Julian when he became the sole holder of power; indeed, in 363, *FOENICVM [COE]TVS* dedicated to the emperor an inscription known as the inscription of Ma'ayan Baruk after the

[16] M. Caltabiano, "Giuliano l'Apostata e Costantino: rottura o continuità?", (forthcoming).

[17] On Magnentius and his usurpation, see the wealth of notes on Julian's first Oration for Constantius by I. Tantillo, *La prima orazione di Giuliano a Costanzo: Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Roma 1997, 333-8; I. Didu, "Magno Magnenzio. Problemi cronologici ed ampiezza della sua usurpazione. I dati epigrafici", *CS* 14, 1977, 11-56.

[18] On Decentius: *PLRE* I Decentius 1, 244.

[19] On Silvanus: D. C. Nutt, "Silvanus and the Emperor Constantius II", *Antichton* 2, 1983, 80-9; W. den Boer, "The Emperor Silvanus and His Army", *AClass* 3, 1960, 105-9.

[20] *Dicere super his plura conantem interpellans contio lenius prohibebat arbitrium summi numinis id esse, non mentis humanae velut praescia venturi praedicans* (15.8.9).

place where it was found, conferring upon him the official honour of the title *templorum restaurator*.[21]

The prophecy of the old blind woman thus illuminates Julian's religious mission, his faith in the gods and his decision to oblige the empire to return to the traditional religious cults. Using this formula, Ammianus effectively manages to sum up the prince's plans for reform or, rather, for restoration.[22]

2. The *adventus* in Sirmium

In the *Res gestae*, the detailed description of Julian's march from Gaul to Illyria following the suspension of negotiations with Constantius to obtain recognition of his proclamation as Augustus in *Lutetia Parisiorium* in February 360,[23] precedes and paves the way for an account of the *adventus* of the new Augustus in Sirmium, which probably took place in July 361.[24]

The historian presents the essential aspects: firstly he follows the progress of Julian, who, after leaving *Raurica*, reaches a spot where the Danube becomes navigable: *lembis escensis, quos oportune fors dederat plurimos, per alveum, quantum fieri potuit, ferebatur occulte, ideo latens quod toleranter et fortiter nullius cibi indigens mundioris sed paucis contentus et vilibus, oppida forinsecus transibat et castra...* (21.9.2), noting later on that the emperor *ut fax vel incensus malleolus volucriter ad destinata festinans, cum venisset Bononeam a Sirmio miliario nono disparatam et decimo, senescente luna ideoque obscurante noctis maximam partem e navi exiluit inprovisus, statimque Dagalaifum misit cum expeditis ad Lucillianum vocandum trahendumque si resistere niteretur* (21.9.6).

He then mentions the reaction of the *praefectus praetorio Italiae et Africae* Taurus. Seized by panic on hearing the news of Julian's imminent arrival and in order to avoid meeting the new Augustus, whom he considered *ut hostem externum*, he left the region in great haste in the direction

[21] *R[o]mani orbis liberat[ori]/ templorum/ restauratori cur/ [ia]rum et Reipublicae/ recreatori bar/barorum extinctori/ D(omino) n(ostro) Iouliano/ perpetuo Augusto/ Alamannico Maximo/ Francico Maximo/ Sarmatico Maximo/ Pontifici Maximo Pa/[tri] Patriae Foenicum/ [coe]tus ob impet[rata] / [beneficia]*: A. Negev, "The Inscription of the Emperor Julian at Ma'ayan Barukh", *IEJ* 19, 1969, 170-3; *AE* 1968, 631; M. Mazza, "Filosofia religiosa ed 'Imperium' in Giuliano", in B. Gentili (ed.), *Giuliano Imperatore. Atti del convegno della S.I.S.A.C., Messina, 3 aprile 1984*, Urbino 1986, 48-50.

[22] Julian defines his plan of reforms "Hellenism" (*Ep.* 84.429c); see here U. Criscuolo, "Giuliano e l'Ellenismo: conservazione e riforma", *Orpheus* 7, 1986, 272-92; C. Fouquet, "L'hellénisme de l'empereur Julien", *BAGB* 2, 1981, 192-202; on the Hellensim of late antiquity in general: G. W. Bowersock, *Hellenism in Late Antiquity*, Ann Arbor 1990.

[23] 20.4.10-19.

[24] C. E. V. Nixon, "Aurelius Victor and Julian", *CPh* 86, 1991, 113-25; M. Caltabiano, "Un decennio di studi sull'imperatore Giuliano", Κοινωνία 17, 1993, 158.

of the Julian Alps, dragging along with him the *praefectus praetorio Illyrici* Florentius.[25]

Lastly, he describes the efforts of the *magister equitum* Lucillian to prepare the city's defences, all rendered vain by the sudden arrival of the emperor who, after having him arrested, removed him from his position as commander of the army (21.9.5-8).[26]

Having eliminated Lucillian, the last remaining obstacle to Julian's entry into the city, Ammianus describes the *adventus* as follows:

> Nihil deinde amoto Lucilliano differendum nec agendum segnius ratus, ut erat in rebus trepidis audax et confidentior, civitatem ut praesumebat dediticiam petens, citis passibus incedebat, eumque suburbanis propinquantem amplis nimiumque protentis, militaris et omnis generis turba cum lumine multo et floribus votisque faustis Augustum appellans et dominum duxit in regiam. Ubi eventu laetus et omine, firmata spe venturorum, quod ad exemplum urbium matris populosae et celebris per alias quoque civitates ut sidus salutare susciperetur, edito postridie curuli certamine cum gaudio plebis, ubi lux excanduit tertia, morarum impatiens percursis aggeribus publicis Succos nemine auso resistere praesidiis occupavit, isdemque tuendis Nevittam praefecit ut fidum… (21.10.1-2).

The attention of scholars has focused on three aspects in particular: the speed with which the sovereign reached the heart of Illyria from Gaul, compared by Ammianus to a torch or an incendiary arrow flying swiftly to its target;[27] the manifestation of *consensus* interpreted in terms of confirmation of the recent proclamation as Augustus in *Lutetia Parisiorum*;[28] the image of the emperor, who trusts he will also be welcomed in the other cities he enters in the future, as *salutare sidus*, bearer of light and safety, borrowed from the panegyric tradition.[29]

[25] 21.9.4. Taurus (*PLRE* I *Flavius Taurus* 3, 879-80) and Florentius (*PLRE* I *Flavius Florentius* 10, 365) enjoyed Constantius II's greatest confidence. That same year the latter had granted them not only the prefecture but also the consulate ordinary. Both were condemned the following year in the Calcedone trial: Taurus was exiled to *Vercellum*, by a sentence that was severely criticised by Ammianus (22.3.4); Florentius was condemned to capital punishment, but escaped, remaining in hiding up until Julian's death (22.3.6).

[26] Lucillian was called back into service as *magister equitum et peditum* in 363, but not until after Julian's death, when his son-in-law Iovianus was acclaimed emperor 25.8.9-10: *PLRE* I *Lucillianus* 3, 517-8.

[27] 21.9.6.

[28] MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony*, 61.

[29] 21.10.2. The star image had already been used during the tetrarchy and assumes a particularly pregnant significance in Julian's rise to power: Nixon, "Aurelius Victor and Julian", 59. The star also recurs in Julian's bronze coins; on the back they bear the word *SECURITAS REI*

Whilst acknowledging the legitimacy of all these elements, I believe the description of this *adventus* conceals something quite different to a triumphant welcome by the city. It is true that Julian arrived in Sirmium, just as he had arrived in Vienne, after a proclamation as emperor but, whilst he had entered as a legitimate sovereign in the latter city, and Ammianus did not fail to emphasize this, he arrived at the gates of Sirmium as *hostis externus*, according to the opinion of Taurus, and as a usurper lacking recognition by Constantius II. Indeed, the latter was ready to take up arms against him.

As regards the speed of his march to Illyria, which is emphasized not only by Ammianus,[30] the emperor himself and other pagan authors,[31] but also by Gregory of Nazianzus,[32] there is no doubt that this was a deliberate part of the prince's strategy. Indeed, Julian wished to avoid any obstacles that might delay his final clash with Constantius.

Quite unlike Claudius Mamertinus, who describes the emperor's voyage as taking place by light of day with crowds of amazed subjects and barbarian supplicants[33] rushing to see him on the opposite side of the Danube, this would seem to be confirmed by Ammianus[34] who, like Gregory of Nazianzus,[35] reports that Julian advanced along the river in hiding as far as possible. This strategy was obviously chosen not only to take advantage of the element of surprise in an unforeseen arrival but also because, by passing unobserved and leaving the riverside towns behind him without taking up arms, he was attempting to avoid unnecessary rebellions and the consequent need to stop and consume his energies in long sieges, whilst he desired, instead, to make use of all his resources as soon as possible in the final clash with Constantius.[36]

PUB(LICAE) and the image of a bull with two stars above, or more often between, its horns (*RIC* VIII, 195, 236-238; 229, 313-317; 337, 242-243; 380, 411-413, 417-419; 392, 105-107; 423, 222-226; 462, 161-164; 483, 118-122). Scholars give differing intepretations of this iconography, but do not link them with the *salutare sidus* of literary sources. *RIC* VIII 46-47; J. P. C. Kent, "Notes on Some Fourth Century Coin Types", *NC* 14, 1954, 216-7; F. D. Gilliard, "Notes on the Coinage of Julian the Apostate", *JRS* 54, 1964, 138-41; J. L. Desnier, "Renaissance taurine", *Latomus* 44, 1985, 402-9; S. H. Griffith, "Ephraem the Syrian's Hymns 'Against Julian': Meditations on History and Imperial Power", *VChr* 41, 1987, 238-66, 253-4; R. A. G. Carson, *Coins of the Roman Empire*, London 1989, 189.

[30] 21.9.6.

[31] Iul. *Ep. ad Ath.* 269d; Lib. *Or.* 18.111; Zos. 3.10.3; *Pan. Lat.* 3.6.2.

[32] Greg. Naz. *Or.* 4.47.

[33] *Pan. Lat.* 3.7.2. Claudius Mamertinus pronounced the *gratiarum actio* on 1 January 362 inaugurating, together with Flavius Nevitta the consul ordinary, see: R. S. Bagnall, A. Cameron, S. R. Schwartz, K. A. Worp, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta 1987, 258-9; on the comparison between the *gratiarum actio* of Claudius Mamertinus and Libanius's Oration 12, pronounced at the inauguration of the consulate the following year, assumed by the emperor Julian himself together with the prefect of Gaul Flavius Sallustius: García Ruiz, "Eusebia vista por Amiano", 137-53.

[34] 21.9.2.

[35] Greg. Naz. *Or.* 4.47.

[36] A similar strategy followed with a view to Julian's prospected clash with Constantius.

Even the city of Sirmium did not seem ready to welcome and acknowledge the new Augustus, judging from Lucillian's defensive measures, but once Julian had removed this senior officer from his command, it was obviously unable to defend itself and the soldiers who were to have protected it chose instead to meet the emperor on the outskirts of the city with all the traditional honours. In order to praise his hero, Ammianus very skilfully describes the festive welcome received by Julian in Sirmium, the acclamation of the soldiers garrisoned in the city and the crowds of jubilant citizens. According to the custom of the *adventus*, he emphasizes the *consensus* obtained by the sovereign thanks to his earlier proclamation as Augustus, but does not mention the illegitimacy of the latter which had not been recognized by Constantius II. As a consequence, when the soldiers and citizens of Sirmium welcomed Julian with all the traditional honours, they were actually acknowledging a usurper and siding openly against the legitimate emperor. At this point, doubt arises as to whether an *adventus* was celebrated at Sirmium or rather the city's surrender. In either situation it would have been possible for soldiers and happy, festive private citizens to flock outside the city to welcome the emperor. In the case of surrender, they would have demonstrated their gratitude for having obtained his clemency, or in order to obtain it; in the case of an *adventus*, in accordance with the rules of traditional ceremony.

In any event, Sirmium probably had no choice but to surrender: without the commander of the troops that were to defend it, the city was in no position to resist, and so was obliged to welcome the new Augustus with all the traditional honours.

This hypothesis may be confirmed by the fact that, despite the welcome he had received, after the *adventus* Julian showed his lack of trust by ordering Constantius's two legions and cohorts of archers, which presided over the city, to leave Sirmium and move urgently to Gaul.[37] The soldiers marched off reluctantly and when they reached Aquileia, supported by the citizens, they barricaded themselves in the city, where they opposed long and determined resistance to a siege by the troops sent by Julian to win it back. The rebels did not capitulate until later when, after a lot of insistence, they were finally convinced that Constantius had died on 3 November 361.[38]

Ammianus, with a touch of irony when describing the Augustus as being undecided whether or not to lay siege to Bezabde, attributes his hesitation to his reluctance not to subject his soldiers to the dangers of a siege, in order to keep them in reserve for the civil wars (21.13.2) and thus for the coming clash with Julian.

[37] 21.11.2.

[38] 21.11.2-3; 12.1-19. Ammianus indicates 5 November 361 as the date of Costantius's death (21.15.3), but scholars generally prefer the date given by *Cons.* Constant. s.a. 361, and confirmed by other authors: Jer. *Chron.* s.a. 361; *Ep.* 42.17; Socrat. 2.47.4; 3.1.1; Sozomen. 5.1.6.

This episode suggests that Julian was not perhaps welcomed into Sirmium with the enthusiasm described by Ammianus and Mamertinus. I believe that on the one hand the *adventus* at Sirmium conceals the city's surrender to the usurper, whilst on the other it reveals the intention of the Antiochian historian to relegate the true nature of Julian's expedition to the background. Most probably it was not simply a rapid and triumphal naval procession along the Danube, as Ammianus and Mamertinus wished their readers to believe, but an authentic civil war with all the attendant difficulties, which only ended without losses because of Constantius's sudden death.

3. The *adventus* in Constantinople

Unlike the *adventus* in Vienne and Sirmium, their equivalent in Constantinople, on 11 December 361,[39] is preceded in Ammianus's account not by the description of a proclamation as emperor, but by the official news of Constantius's death and of his appointment of Julian as his successor before dying.[40] The news reached Julian on his arrival at Naissus, where he was being plagued by great doubts as to the advisability of continuing his march towards the East.

It was the arrival of this news that changed the perspective of Julian's expedition and above all transformed the usurper into the empire's legitimate sovereign. Julian, *in inmensum elatus* on learning it, decided to head for Constantinople with his army as rapidly as possible.[41]

Once again Ammianus highlights the speed of the march and presents what must have been Julian's first thought on learning the news of his cousin's death in terms of a reflection by his soldiers. He writes that the soldiers, following the brisk pace of their supreme commander: *advertebant enim imperium, quod ereptum ibant cum ultimorum metu discriminum, praeter spem ordinario iure concessum* (22.2.3).

In letters addressed to those close to him immediately after his arrival in Constantinople, Julian expresses great relief at being saved or liberated by the hand of the gods from the danger of experiencing or committing irreparable actions.[42]

Constantius's death did in fact make it possible to avoid a civil war and, just as the soldiers reasoned, allowed Julian to obtain the supreme power by means of his ordinary legal rights: he was, indeed, Constantius's last remaining heir and, in addition, named by Constantius II on his deathbed as

[39] 22.2.4.
[40] 22.2.1.
[41] 22.2.2.
[42] The letters are addressed respectively to the philosopher Maximus, to *praepositus sacri cubiculi* Eutherius, his uncle of the same name, Julian (Iul. *Ep.* 26, 28, 29); M. Caltabiano, *L'Epistolario di Giuliano Imperatore: saggio storico, traduzione, note e testo in appendice*, Naples 1991, 99-103.

his successor. This is why the *adventus* in Constantinople was, as Sabine MacCormack argues, the real proclamation of Julian as emperor.[43]

Ammianus describes the entry of the new Augustus into Constantinopole as follows:

> Quo apud Constantinopolim mox conperto effundebatur aetas omnis et sexus tamquam demissum aliquem visura de caelo. Exceptus igitur tertium Iduum Decembrium verecundis senatus officiis et popularium consonis plausibus, stipatusque armatorum et togatorum agminibus, velut acie ducebatur instructa, omnium oculis in eum non modo contuitu destinato sed cum admiratione magna defixis (22.2.4).

In this description the terminological assonance with a paragraph in the description of Constantius II's *adventus* in Rome is particularly striking. In describing Julian's adventus, Ammianus writes: *stipatusque armatorum et togatorum agminibus velut acie ducebatur instructa omnium oculis in eum non modo contuitu destinato, sed cum admiratione magna defixis* (22.2.4); and with regard to Constantius': *magnis stipatusque agminibus formidandi tamquam acie ducebatur instructa omnium oculi in eo contuitu pertinaci intentis* (16.10.4).

As Dufraigne has pointed out, the analogy is certainly no coincidence.[44] Not only does Ammianus use formulaic expressions to describe the two ceremonies, but he attributes a similar significance to them: both in Constantius's solemn entry into Rome and in Julian's into Constantinople, he intends to emphasize the consolidation of power by both. In the ancient capital Constantius celebrates the end of a long series of civil wars; in the new capital Julian celebrates his legitimate rise to power by the will of the gods, rightfully obtained without bloodshed. In both cases, the historian also points out the participation of the respective senates in the ceremony. Julian is accompanied to Constantinople not only by the army, but also by *togati*; in Rome, Constantius was welcomed by acts of respect from the senate, which greeted him with a solemn procession bearing the venerable effigies *patriciae stirpis* (16.10.5).

Unlike Claudius Mamertinus, when describing Julian's *adventus*, Ammianus neglects to mention that Constantinople was the emperor's place of birth. He does not do so until much later, on giving an account of the sovereign's *profectio* when, after a few months, he leaves the city for Antioch, chosen as his base for preparing the Persian campaign (22.9.2). In the following paragraph, taking the opportunity to build up a striking eulogy of Julian, he then sets down in epic tones the reasons why the new Augustus was so greatly admired by the citizens of Constantinople:

[43] MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony*, 62-3.
[44] Dufraigne, *Adventus Augusti, adventus Christi*, 508 n. 61.

> Somnio enim propius videbatur adultum adhuc iuvenem exiguo corpore, factis praestantem ingentibus, post cruentos exitus regum et gentium ab urbe in urbem inopina velocitate transgressum, quaqua incederet accessione opum et virium famae instar cuncta facilius occupasse, principatum denique deferente nutu caelesti absque ulla publicae rei suscepisse iactura (22.2.5).

The image of Julian, gradually built up like a mosaic by the historian in his descriptions of the different *adventus*, is almost complete: the new Augustus, who entered Vienne as legitimate Caesar, accompanied by the prophecy that he would restore the temples of the gods, and Sirmium as emperor, or rather as a usurper in search of consensus, is now revealed in the empire's new capital for what he really is: a man sent by the gods and rising to supreme power after overcoming all sorts of difficulties, *deferente nutu caelesti*.

Ammianus adds the last *tessera* to this mosaic in his description of the *adventus* in Antioch in summer 362: "On approaching the city, he was officially received with good wishes, as though he were a god, and was amazed at the cries of the huge crowd, which acclaimed him as a lucky star appearing above the regions of the east", *at hinc videre properans Antiochiam, orientis apicem pulcrum, usus itineribus solitis venit, urbique propinquans in speciem alicuius numinis votis excipitur publicis, miratus voces multitudinis magnae, salutare sidus inluxisse eois partibus adclamantis* (22.9.14).

At this point it is impossible not to be reminded of the autobiographical myth elaborated by the emperor himself in the Oration to Heraclius the Cynic, in which Julian depicts himself as a son or messenger of the gods.[45] By means of skilful use of the whole range of encomiastic techniques with which he was perfectly familiar, he has succeeded in the ambitious task of transforming his live hero into a divinity.

[45] Iul. *Eracl.* 228d; P. Athanassiadi, *Julian and Hellenism: An Intellectual Biography*, Oxford 1981, 186-187; S. Conti, "Da eroe a dio: la concezione teocratica del potere in Giuliano", *AntTard* 17, 2009, 123.

AMMIANUS ON EASTERN LAWYERS (30.4): LITERARY ALLUSIONS AND THE DECLINE OF FORENSIC ORATORY

Álvaro Sánchez-Ostiz
Universidad de Navarra
asostiz@unav.es

1. Introduction

As has long been observed,[1] the last hexad of Ammianus's *Res gestae* (26-31), which covers fourteen years of Roman history (364-378), differs from books 14-25 in its narrative pace, arrangement, and tenor. Actually, in the preface of book 26, after the detailed recount of the years 353-364 centred on Julian, the historian calls his audience to concentrate on relevant facts and put aside insignificances: … *non humilium minutias indagare causarum, quas si scitari voluerit quispiam, individua illa corpuscula volitantia per inane, atomos, ut nos appellamus, numerari posse sperabit* (26.1.1). From this point on, the storyline hastens and turns more episodic, and separates into different lines of events. The main history is found from 27-28 for Valentinian in the West, while another extends from 29-30 for Valens in the East.[2] In turn, book 31 restrains its step and gradually prepares the climactic depiction of the disaster at Adrianople. As a cause or as a result of these variations, Ammianus's autobiographical comments become less frequent in the last six books,[3] while moral judgements[4] and historiographical remarks

[1] This study was carried out in the context of the research project "*Alteritas*: Alteridad lingüística y alteridad cultural en el Imperio Romano (ss. III-V): historiografía y géneros afines" (Ref. FFI2010-15402/FILO; Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad de España). A shorter version was presented with the title "Ammianus on eastern lawyers (Amm. 30.4.1-22): autobiographical comments, literary allusions and authorial voice" at the IASH, University of Edinburgh (30.7.2013). I am very grateful to the public attending that seminar for their suggestions and remarks. Especial thanks are owed to T.D. Barnes, G. Kelly and J. Stenger, with whom I also discuss my ideas personally in Edinburgh and Glasgow. All errors and shortcomings remaining are mine.

[2] In general, J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*, London 1989, 204-6, 227-8; T. D. Barnes, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality*, Ithaca 1998, 181-3; G. Sabbah, "Ammianus Marcellinus", in G. Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, Leiden 2003, 43-84.

[3] For R. C. Blockley, "Ammianus Marcellinus's Use of Exempla", *Florilegium* 13, 1994, 53-64, also the function of *exempla* varies in this part of the *Res gestae*: see G. Kelly, *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian*, Cambridge 2008, 281-2.

[4] E. A. Thompson, *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Cambridge 1947, 87-120; J. den Boeft, "*Non consolandi gratia, sed probrose monendi* (Res Gestae 28.1.4): The Hazards of (Moral) Historiography", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. Teitler

increase.[5] However, it is not certain whether these divergences imply, as is often argued,[6] that Ammianus had appended books 26-31 some years after he had published book 25, which he had originally planned as the end of his work, or even less that the new mood of the last hexad reveals the historian's clumsy skills.

However, the last hexad contains well-constructed and effective passages that even show significant continuities with the Julianic narrative of 14-25. This paper focuses on one of those: the so-called "digression on Eastern Lawyers". This non-narrative unit of the book 30 includes moral judgments, an autobiographical comment and a noteworthy accumulation of literary allusions; moreover, it has frequently been labelled as "chaotic" or "carnivalesque". Therefore it can be an excellent text for a case study, since it poses challenges and illustrates some recent trends in Ammianus's scholarship.

The "digression on lawyers" is placed in the chapter 30.4, where Ammianus interrupts his narrative of the deeds of the Emperor Valens, who in contrast to Julian is incapable of administering justice. So the praetorian prefect of the East, Domitius Modestus, prevents Valens from acting as a judge, under the pretext that an emperor should not waste his time in the trivialities of private cases. Ammianus then points out that the legal profession is a particular branch of eloquence that has degenerated progressively from the golden beginning of literary artistry. However, in his opinion, in recent times the legal practice in the eastern provinces has led to a definite turn for the worse. Consequently, he announces a digression about the "unworthiness" (*indignitate*) of those easterners, which he had experienced while living in those parts of the Empire: *in illis partibus agens expertus*

(eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 293-311.

[5] J. W. Drijvers, "Ammianus on the revolt of Firmus", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, 2007, 129-55: Valentinian and Valens had acted guided by whim, cruelty, greed, lack of leadership, and above all by the crudest injustice. In the opinion of Christopher C. Kelly, "Crossing the Frontiers: Imperial Power in the Last Books of Ammianus", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 271-92, the historian had reflected through an unconnected narrative the fact that he was aware of his incapability of explaining the reasons of the disaster in year 378 in a cohesive manner.

[6] From O. Seeck, "Ammianus Marcellinus", *RE* I, 1894, col. 1845-52 to G. Sabbah, "Ammien Marcellin, Libanius, Antioche et la date des derniers livres des Res gestae", *Cassiodorus* 3, 1997, 89-116: see Id., *La méthode d'Ammien Marcellin : Recherches sur la construction du discours historique dans les Res Gestae*, Paris 1978, 108-9. Cfr. Matthews, *The Roman Empire*, 26-7; C. W. Fornara, "The Prefaces of Ammianus Marcellinus", in M. Griffith, D. J. Mastronarde (eds.), *Cabinet of the Muses: Studies in Honor of T. G. Rosenmeyer*, Atlanta 1990, 170-171; J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVI*, Leiden 2008, ix-x.

sum "with which I became acquainted while I was living in those parts" (30.4.4), being this statement one of the few autobiographical comments in the last books. After some references to great Greek and Roman orators, four different types of wicked lawyers are portrayed. The description, however, becomes a general catalogue of corruptions, with elements that can be found in the usual repertoires of lawyer-jokes: basically, greed, lack of scruples and fake eloquence. More properly, although the division into vignettes[7] clearly marks the structure of the passage, each section accumulates detailed descriptions, satirical hyperboles and allusive references without an evident plan.

In this regard, the passage resembles the other two satirical digressions in the *Res Gestae* on the city of Rome at 14.6 and 28.4.[8] For some scholars, these Roman digressions are pieces of "Zeitkritik" in a broad sense, that is to say, they condemn historical events which Ammianus himself had witnessed.[9] Others argue that the historian separates those digressions from any historical referent and deploys them to arrange the narrative structure, to make moral comments from a superior position[10] or to diagnose the perversion of the Urbs as an extreme instance the general decadence[11]. In this case, both digressions have presumably been constructed on the conventions[12] and

[7] In fact, the most characteristic part of the digression, in which Ammianus divides the lawyers into four categories, is a digression within the digression.

[8] H. P. Kohns, "Die Zeitkritik in den Romexkursen des Ammianus Marcellinus. Zu Amm. Marc. 14,6,3-26; 28,4,6-35", *Chiron* 5, 1975, 485-91.

[9] For example, the expulsion of foreigners from the Urbs, the lack of culture and solidarity of Roman senatorial elite. See J. Straub, *Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike*, Darmstadt 1939, 200-2; R. Pack, "The Roman Digressions of Ammianus Marcellinus", *TAPhA* 84, 1953, 181-9; A. Cameron, "The Roman Friends of Ammianus", *JRS* 54, 1964, 15-28, 26-27; A. Demandt, *Zeitkritik und Geschichtsbild im Werk Ammians*, Bonn 1965, 14–21; F. Paschoud, *Roma aeterna : Études sur le patriotisme romain dans l'Occident latin à l'époque des grandes invasions*, Rome 1967, 59–67; S. Bocci, *Ammiano Marcellino XXVIII e XXIX. Problemi storici e storiografici*, Rome 2013, 73-104. In this sense, but referring to 30.4, also I. G. Mastrorosa, "Ammiano Marcellino e l'oratoria forense tardorepubblicana: un antidoto contro 'pravitas' giudiziaria dell'età di Valente?", in F. Leonardelli, G. Rossi (eds.), *Officina humanitatis. Studi in onore di Lia de Finis*, Trento 2010, 87-98.

[10] Kohns, "Die Zeitkritik"; Matthews, *The Roman Empire*, 207; Sabbah, "Ammianus Marcellinus", 56-58, 76: in his opinion, the second digression on Rome in 28.4 has a structural function, as it links chapters 28.2, 3 and 5 with the rest of the work, but the first in 14.6 reflects Ammianus's personal experience as a newcomer in the *Urbs*. For D. S. Rohrbacher, "Ammianus's Roman Digressions and the Audience of the Res Gestae", in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, London 2007, 468-73, the Roman digressions expose the opinions of the bureaucratic elite.

[11] J. R. Stenger, "Ammian und die Ewige Stadt: Das spätantike Rom als Heterotopie", in T. Fuhrer (ed.), *Rom und Mailand in der Spätantike. Repräsentationen städtischer Räume in Literatur, Architektur und Kunst*, Berlin 2012, 189-216.

[12] R. Rees, "Ammianus Satiricus", in J. W. Drijvers, D. Hunt (eds.), *The Late Roman World and Its Historian: Intrepreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London 1999, 141-155; D. den Hengst, "Literary Aspects of Ammianus's Second Digression on Rome", in J. den Boeft, H. J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. Teitler (eds.), Leiden 2007, 159-79; Stenger, "Ammian und

models of the Roman or Menippean satire, rather than on historical or technical works.[13] With respect to the description of the lawyers, no particular event or personal experience of Ammianus[14] can be deduced from the text: in 30.4.3-7 the notes on the history of forensic oratory derived from Cicero's Brutus, and the description of the lawyers in 9-22 abounds in satirical common places, which can be found for example in the discourses 47, 51, and 52 of Libanius.[15] So, the chapter is also not different from other non-satirical digressions of the *Res gestae*, in which the historian emphasizes his direct knowledge of the matter, but whose sources are literary, mainly previous Latin authors.[16]

However, this question about the sources necessarily supplements the issue of literary allusions in chapter 30.4. The reader is confronted with an overloaded texture of reminiscences of previous Latin authors, particularly of Gellius, but also of Cicero, Horace, Lucan and Juvenal among others.[17] The first commentators had highlighted these verbal coincidences already, as the material collected by Wagner-Erfurdt[18] shows. The article of Hertz[19] goes

die Ewige Stadt".

[13] A significant line of research has focused on identifying the sources of Ammianus's digressions, the points where he may have contaminated them with other pieces of information and the passages in which he had interwoven his own experiences: R. C. Blockley, "Ammianus Marcellinus and his Classical Background: Changing Perspectives", *IJCT* 2, 1996, 461-2, with previous bibliography.

[14] Den Boeft, "*Non consolandi gratia, sed probrose monendi* (Res Gestae 28.1.4): The Hazards of (Moral) Historiography", 293-4 contrasts it with other first-person intrusions in previous books.

[15] Sabbah, *La méthode*, 286-7; J. Matthews, "Ammianus on Roman Law and Lawyers", in J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Cognitio Gestorum: The historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Amsterdam 1992, 45-57; G. Viansino, *Ammiano Marcellino. Storie*, Milan 2001-2002, 457, 525-527 ad loc., and M. Kulikowski, "Coded Polemic in Ammianus Book 31 and the Date and Place of its Composition", *JRS* 102, 2012, 92. See also den Hengst, "Literary Aspects of Ammianus's Second Digression on Rome" on the Greek parallels for the Roman digressions.

[16] E.g. 22.8.1; 23.4.3 (*ekphrasis*); 23.6.21, 30; 27.4.5. See F. Paschoud, "'Si non è vero, è ben trovato' : Tradition littéraire et vérité historique chez Ammien Marcellin", *Chiron* 19, 1989, 37-54, 39-41; C. W. Fornara, "Studies in Ammianus Marcellinus: II: Ammianus's Knowledge and Use of Greek and Latin Literature", *Historia* 41, 1992, 425; H. Teitler, "*Visa vel lecta*? Ammianus on Persia and the Persians", in J. W. Drijvers, D. Hunt (eds.), *The Late Roman World and Its Historian: Intrepreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London 1999, 216-23, and G. Kelly, "Ammianus and the Great Tsunami", *JRS* 94, 2004, 165.

[17] Although Ammianus tries to guide the reader towards an understanding of moral types rather than mislead him, the sophisticated allusions make the passage more difficult than other parts of the *Res gestae*.

[18] C. G. A. Erfurdt, J. A. Wagner, *Ammiani Marcellini quae supersunt, cum notis integris Frid. Lindenbrogii, Henr. et Hadr. Valesiorum et Iac. Gronovii, quibus Thom. Reinesii quasdam et suas adiecit Io. Augusti. Wagner. Editionem absolvit Car. Gottlob Aug. Erfurdt*, Leipzig 1808, ad loc.

[19] M. Hertz, "Aulus Gellius und Ammianus Marcellinus", *Hermes* 8, 1874, 295-302.

a step further in this direction, identifying the Gellian allusions throughout the *Res gestae*, but comes to a cul-de-sac: perplexed by the bizarre combination of fragments from the *Noctes Atticae*, Hertz concludes that Ammianus cumulates without a logical design, following a carnivalesque ("faschingsmässig")[20] method, because his main purpose is to build up a literary language by adding, mingling and altering fragments of the original. In turn, for Sabbah, who specifically analyses Amm. 30.4 as an example of allusive language used for historical argumentation, the chapter has been built on the single source of Gellius to present a literary game for initiates, the "senatorial pagan opposition", who had been admirers of Aulus Gellius.[21]

For his part, Salemme[22] takes up the point of view of Hertz, paying special attention to the digression on lawyers. He discovers some unobserved allusions in 30.4, and highlights the variety of literary references. To his mind, Ammianus's allusive style essentially consists in accumulating literary reminiscences and arranging them as the pieces of a mosaic.[23] Among other implications, this idea assumes that the "carnivalesque" or "mosaic-like" accumulation is a goal in itself, which should be ascribed to a late antique trend common to visual and literary arts. Consequently the historian exhibits classical erudition in a non-classical manner.[24]

This paper's purpose is to challenge the applicability of the paradigm of late-antique mosaic-like aesthetic to this passage, emphasizing that Ammianus combines allusions to Cicero and Aulus Gellius following a defined argument, whose meaning surpasses the burlesque or erudite exhibitionism. In other words, a non-chaotic meaning can be found in the apparently chaotic accumulation of references. My hypothesis is not only supported by the fact that some of the previously identified allusions can be coincidences,[25] but also is based on the result that the rhetorical point of view unites the whole passage and the four types of lawyers are in fact four levels of degenerated oratory.

[20] Note that Hertz is not using "carnivalesque" in Bakhtinian sense. However, Ammianus obviously stresses the grotesque and the subversion of values in a world upside-down in his three "satirical digressions", so that the categories of modern literary theory can be applied to them (as Stenger, "Ammian und die Ewige Stadt" attests applying Foucault's concept of "heterotopia").

[21] Sabbah, *La méthode*, 518: "Dans ce cas privilégié, l'allusion apparaît plus clairement comme ce qu'elle est toujours plus ou moins : une sorte de mot de passe, qui serait ' fidélité ', et qui permet aux membres d'une opposition de se reconnaître et de se rassembler".

[22] C. Salemme, *Similitudini nella storia: un capitolo su Ammiano Marcellino*, Naples 1989, 37-58.

[23] Viansino, *Ammiano Marcellino. Storie*; Id., "Satira indignata e ironia grottesca in Ammiano Marcellino", *Aevum Antiquum* 12, 1999, 173-87.

[24] A detailed discussion can be found in Kelly, *Ammianus*, 185-92; he analyses the allusions to Aulus Gellius of 30.4.12-13 in pp. 207-9 under the label of "glossing". The present study substantially benefited from his points of views about Ammianus's allusive art.

[25] So the Varronian and Apuleian echoes mentioned by Salemme, *Similitudini*, 47-9.

I will discuss in section 2 how the argumentative thread of rhetorical decay structures paragraphs 30.4.8-22. This helps reconsider in section 3 the autobiographical value of the remark *quae in illis partibus agens expertus sum*. Finally, section 4 includes a brief note about how the excursus on lawyers can illustrate the nature of Ammianus's historiography.

2. Four levels of decadence

Other than the transitions between units, almost every paragraph in Amm. 30.4 shows hints of previous Greek and Roman authors. The most obvious cases of such presences are the quotations of Cicero (7 and 10) and the exemplary references to great figures of Greece or Rome who united military glory and eloquence, above all in 3-6. Significantly the main source for the brief summary of the forensic oratory in 3-8 seems to be Cicero's *Brutus,*[26] but Ammianus tries to create the impression that he has composed it on his own.[27] However, most of the intertextual presences are verbal echoes, predominantly in 9-22, and the historian marks by contamination, variation or parody that some of those reminiscences add a nuance relevant for interpreting the passage. Through those notes the different vignettes show that the four categories of wicked lawyers have betrayed the legal profession and have in common a degenerated use of rhetoric.

So, the first type besieges the houses of the rich and the poor, and sows discord as soon as they sniff the opportunity. They are capable of twisting anything by means of a false eloquence (30.4.9):

> … inter rapinas insatiabiles inopes ad capiendam versutis orationibus iudicum fidem, quorum nomen ex iustitia natum est, sicam ingenii destringentes.

They have oratorical skills, but this talent becomes the dagger of an assassin (*sicam ingenii destringentes*), and as a result their apparent eloquence becomes vacuous. This idea is amplified in 10 through an allusion to a passage in Cicero's *Partitiones*:

> Horum obstinatione libertatem temeritas, constantiam audacia praeceps, **eloquentiam** inanis quaedam **imitatur** fluentia loquendi: quarum artium scaevitate, ut Tullius adseverat, nefas est religionem decipi iudicantis (30.40.10).

[26] Cfr. above all paragraphs 3-6, which include exemplary anecdotes of Demosthenes, Callistratus, Rutilius, Galba, Scaurus, among others.

[27] So Ammianus contaminates Ciceronian and Gellian material: Fornara, "Studies in Ammianus Marcellinus: II", 425-6. Ammianus treats the pieces of information similarly in the scientific, ethnographic or geographic digressions that he derives from erudite sources.

> Cic. *Part.* 81: Cernenda autem sunt diligenter, ne fallant ea nos vitia, quae **virtutem videntur imitari**. Nam et prudentiam malitia et temperantiam inmanitas in voluptatibus aspernandis et magnitudinem animi superbia in nimis extollendis et despicientia in contemnendis honoribus et liberalitatem effusio et fortitudinem audacia **imitatur** et patientiam duritia inmanis et iustitiam acerbitas et religionem superstitio et lenitatem mollitia animi et verecundiam timiditas et illam disputandi prudentiam concertatio captatioque verborum [et] hanc oratoriam vim inanis quaedam profluentia loquendi.

In contrast to previous paragraphs, in which Ammianus conceals his dependence of Cicero, he marks here through minor variations that he is specifically referring to the spirit of the original. Not only does he follow a common place on vice that is disguised as virtue,[28] but also reproduces in a small scale the argument of Cicero, reducing to three the original ten virtues in accusative which were deformed by false appearances in nominative. The historian adds to this allusion of language and content a quote from Cicero about the perverse use of eloquence, possibly drawn from the *De re publica* and put in Scipio's mouth.[29]

For its part, the second breed pretends to have legal science, through their silence and frowns, and by citing ancient jurisconsults. The image reflects what has already been said in earlier paragraphs about the *subagreste ingenium* of Valens, who concealed his philistine nature under an artificial seriousness (30.4.11-12):

> Secundum est genus eorum, qui iuris professi scientiam, quam repugnantium sibi legum abolevere discidia, velut vinculis ori inpositis reticentes, iugi silentio umbrarum sunt similes propriarum. Hi velut fata natalicia praemonstrantes aut Sibyllae oraculorum interpretes, vultus gravitate ad habitum composita tristiorem, ipsum quoque venditant, quod oscitantur. Hi ut altius videantur iura callere, Trebatium loquuntur et Cascellium et Alfenum et Auruncorum Sicanorumque iam diu leges ignotas, cum Evandri matre abhinc saeculis obrutas multis. Et si voluntate matrem tuam finxeris occidisse, multas tibi suffragari absolutionem lectiones reconditas pollicentur, si te senserint esse nummatum.

[28] See in this regard the thematic parallels cited by Viansino, *Ammiano Marcellino. Storie*, ad loc.

[29] Traditionally located in *Rep.* 5.9.11: K. Büchner, *M. Tullius Cicero. De re publica: Kommentar*, Heidelberg 1984, 421-2.

Previous commentators have already underscored several textual coincidences with Gellius.[30] More precisely,[31] the paragraph 12 recasts two different anecdotes that Aulus Gellius remembers about his master Favorinus and that are especially relevant to the point of Ammianus, since the philosopher replies to a young who speaks in an antiquated and unintelligible manner. But in addition, Ammianus adapts the text of Gellius contaminating it with Horace and inserting a wordplay between the poet Horace and the three *Horatii*. Undoubtedly, Ammianus had in memory the text of Aulus Gellius and Horace, so that he was able to connect both in a sophisticated joke. But more significantly the pun about Favorinus's pupil is meaningful in its context, since it is criticizing the sort of rhetorical degeneration that Ammianus describes.[32] In brief, this allusion is rather sophisticated than "carnivalesque". Furthermore, this second group represents a lower level with respect to the first degeneration, insofar as these lawyers are not capable of deploying the apparent eloquence of the formers, but only an apparent erudition.

The third kind of lawyers prefers to exercise the legal profession by brawling and disputing (30.4.13):

> Tertius eorum est ordo, qui ut in professione turbulenta clarescant, ad expugnandam veritatem ora mercenaria procudentes, per prostitutas frontes vilesque latratus, quo velint, aditus sibi patefaciunt crebros: …

Apparently, nothing in this sketch suggests a degradation of rhetoric, but the words *procudentes ora mercenaria* "sharpen their venal tongues to attack the truth" again alludes to Cic. *De Orat.* 3.121, which conveys moral connotations,[33] and has here the sense of sharpening their tongues, making them mercenary, that is to say, "they offer their oratorical skills for sale". The fact that the *sphragis* of the *Res Gestae* also recalls the metaphor of "forging of the tongues"[34] indicates that the image is used at least in another

[30] Erfurdt, Wagner, *Ammiani Marcellini quae supersunt*, ad loc., Hertz, "Aulus Gellius und Ammianus Marcellinus", 282, 299; Sabbah, *La méthode*, 516-8; Viansino, *Ammiano Marcellino. Storie*, ad loc.; G. Sabbah, L. Angliviel de la Beaumelle, *Ammien Marcellin. Histoire, t. VI, livres XXIX-XXXI*, Paris 1999, 220-2.

[31] As explained by Kelly, *Ammianus*, 207-9.

[32] A somewhat different use of Favorinus's anecdote can be found in Macrobius: see A. Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome*, Oxford 2011, 584.

[33] *De Orat.* 3.121. The more frequent presence of Cicero in the digressions and in passages which include moral judgements, does not imply that Ammianus has used a specific source for the war sections (so H. Michael, *De Ammiani Marcellini studiis Ciceronianis*, Bratislava 1874), but rather that Cicero is preferred for the more "authorial" parts of the narration.

[34] In three statements traditional contents and Ammianus's original historiographical views are intermingled, Amm. 31.16.9: *Haec ut miles quondam et Graecus a principatu Caesaris Nervae exorsus ad usque Valentis interitum pro virium explicavi mensura, opus veri-*

highly allusive passage, under apparently inoffensive words and referring to oratorical skills.[35]

For its part, the meaning of the metaphor in Amm. 30.4.13 is clear in comparison with the Ciceronian original, which claims that a few books and a sharpened tongue is not enough for the beginner in the art of eloquence, but he will have to devote time to the study and imitation of models:

> Cic. *De Orat*. 3.121: … quare non est paucorum libellorum hoc munus, ut ii, qui scripserunt de dicendi ratione, arbitrantur, neque Tusculani atque huius ambulationis antemeridianae aut nostrae posmeridianae sessionis. Non enim solum acuenda nobis neque procudenda lingua est, sed onerandum complendumque pectus maximarum rerum et plurimarum suavitate, copia, varietate.

Thus the third race of lawyers is comprised of those who had begun oratorical training but are satisfied with getting enough shrewdness of word to become hired troublemakers. So, it supposes a new step, lower than the previous, of degeneration in the forensic oratory.

Not surprisingly the last group of lawyers is simply uncultured, because they have dropped out of elementary school. Moved by greed they pretend to have an erudition that makes fools of themselves. They look like street comedians that enter the court as if it were a theatre (30.4.14-15):

> Quartum atque postremum est genus inpudens, pervicax et indoctum eorum, qui cum inmature a litterariis eruperint ludis, per angulos civitatum discurrunt, mimiambos non causarum remediis congrua commentantes, fores divitum deterendo, cenarum ciborumque aucupantes delicias exquisitas. Qui cum semel umbraticis lucris, et inhiandae undique pecuniae sese dediderint, litigare frustra quoslibet innocentes hortantur, et ad defendendam causam admissi, quod raro contingit, suscepti nomen et vim negotii sub ore disceptatoris inter ipsos conflic-

---

tatem professum numquam, ut arbitror, sciens silentio ausus corrumpere vel mendacio. scribant reliqua potiores aetate doctrinis florentes. Quos id, si libuerit, aggressuros procudere linguas ad maiores moneo stilos.

[35] To discuss the *sphragis*, which may be intentionally ambiguous about who can read, see or continue the *Res Gestae*, falls outside the scope of this paper: see G. Kelly, "'To Forge Their Tongues to Grander Styles': Ammianus's Epilogue", in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Malden 2007, 474-80; Id., "The Sphragis and Closure of the Res gestae", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 219-41; Id., *Ammianus*, 318-321 and F. Paschoud, "Ammien 31, 16, 9 : une 'recusatio'?", *REL* 82, 2004, 238-48 who examines previous points of view, mainly Matthews, *The Roman Empire*, 461-70; R. C. Blockley, "Ammianus and Cicero: The Epilogue of the History as a Literary Statement", *Phoenix* 52, 1998, 305-14.

tuum articulos instruuntur, circumlocutionibus indigestis ita scatentes, ut in colluvione taeterrima audire existimes ululabili clamore Thersiten.

Ammianus expands the portrayal of this class until paragraph 19, using new allusions to Gellius and satirical commonplaces, which underscore the contrast between the ideal of an eloquent lawyer and the reality of comedians-lawyers (cfr. 19: *histrionico gestu*). These theatrical metaphors also emphasize the moral ascendancy of the historian over the lawyers, recalling a Ciceronian motif.[36] It is not possible to deal here with every allusion in paragraphs 14-19, but a precision about the Gellian echoes commented on by Sabbah[37] may be added. Certainly, paragraphs 14 and 15 refer to passages from different books of the *Noctes Atticae* (6.16.1; 3.1.10; 1.15.11). For its part, Amm. 30.4.17: *et si* ***in circulo doctorum*** *auctoris veteris inciderit nomen, piscis aut edulii peregrinum esse vocabulum arbitrantur*, indeed matches the wording of Gel. 4.1.1: ***In circulo doctorum*** *hominum, Favorino Philosopho praesente…*, a passage alluded to lines before in Amm. 30.4.11. Therefore a mere coincidence can be ruled out, and the presence of Favorinus adds an authoritative connotation.

Conversely, the two echoes that Sabbah found in 30.4.19 are somewhat different. On the one hand, *conrugatis hinc inde frontibus brachiisque histrionico gestu formatis*, apparently refers to Gel. 1.5.tit.: *Hortensius orator ob eiusmodi munditias gestumque in agendo histrionicum Dionysiae saltatriculae cognomento compellatus est*; however, the expression can be non-specific and is used by Ammianus also in 14.6.18 and 18.7.7 without any reference to the *Noctes Atticae*. On the other hand, although the *contionaria Gracchi fistula* 30.4.19 is mentioned in Gel. 1.11.tit.: … *de Gracchi fistula contionaria*, the expression is also used in Cic. *De orat.* 3.225: *itaque et idem Graccus (…) cum eburneola solitus est habere fistula, qui staret occulte post ipsum, cum contionaretur*, and was included in other repertoires of *exempla*.[38] Thus, reminiscences of Aulus Gellius undoubtedly concentrate on 14 and 15, and just vaguely appear in 17 and 19. But even if this gathering of references combines different Gellian passages, it is debatable that the result is an aimless cento, since for the most part 16, 18 and 19 do not refer to any text in particular. In any case, regardless of the question of the allusions in mosaic, the fourth category of lawyers is the lowest level of rhetorical ignorance and those lawyers are portrayed through Gellian allusions and Ciceronian metaphors as street comedians.

[36] F. W. Jenkins, "Theatrical Metaphors in Ammianus Marcellinus", *Eranos* 85, 1987, 55-63, who considers that Ammianus used theatrical metaphors in the chapter 30.4 as a whole, not specifically about the fourth category of lawyers.

[37] Sabbah, *La méthode*, 517-8.

[38] See also Val. Max. 8.10.1 and Quint. 1.10.22.

Finally, Ammianus completes the digression with three paragraphs (20-22) between the lowest degree of lawyers and the formula redirecting to the main narration. These last subsections deal with the tribulations that judges and clients cause to attorneys, and properly fall outside the argument of rhetorical decadence. However, Gellian allusions on 20 and an essentially rhetorical perspective in 21 unite this colophon with previous descriptions. So *sellulariis quaestibus inescati* in 20 takes up the allusion of paragraphs 14-15 about gluttony and greed. In addition this paragraph underlines the quackery of lawyers unable to fix the shortcomings of the causes: *quam tunc effutiunt cum commissarum sibi causarum infirmitatem rationibus validis convallare non possunt*. Furthermore, the judges described in 21 are also ignorant and could belong to the fourth category of lawyers. They add to corruption and greed their scarce intellectual training, since they are learned only in the jokes (*cavillationibus*) of Philistio and Aesop[39]: *et iudices patiuntur interdum doctos ex Philistionis aut Aesopi cavillationibus, quam ex Aristidis illius Iusti vel Catonis disciplina productos*. Thus, while these paragraphs fall out of the argument, however refer to the essentially rhetorical point of view Ammianus has already used in previous paragraphs to describe the professionals of justice.

To sum up, describing the four categories of lawyers, Ammianus was following a consistent line describing a gradation in the misuse of rhetorical training: the first deploys a speech without content; the second pretends oratorical skills through purported gravity; the third uses what they have learnt in school for quarrelling; and the fourth did not absolve even elementary school and act as though the court of justice were a theatre or a street performance. This portrayal is preceded by a brief note about Greek and Roman models of oratory and is completed with a reference to judges' rhetorical incompetence. In other words, the subject of chapter 30.4 is not the vileness of lawyers, but the decline of judicial oratory.

Ammianus has built his argument primarily on references to Cicero and Aulus Gellius, but, as I have pointed out, the historian has avoided easy quotations and has contaminated the references. As a result, only who is versed in the history and practice of judicial oratory will be able to appreciate those allusions to the rhetorical decline of lawyers. Thus, the existence of references apparently becomes a philological version of "The Emperor's New Clothes",[40] which neither the stupid nor the unfit for ruling could see. However, there is a significant irony in that only a reader polished by clas-

[39] Philistio is a mimographer of the Augustan period, and this Aesopus must be Clodius Aesopus, the actor of tragedies contemporaneous with Cicero, who praises his ability of facial expression in Cic. *Div*. 1.37 (*pace Valesii…*: cfr. Erfurdt, Wagner, *Ammiani Marcellini quae supersunt*, ad loc.)

[40] Cfr. the Spanish medieval tale "De lo que contesció a un rey con los burladores que ficieron el paño" in *El conde Lucanor*, or Cervantes' *Retablo de las Maravillas*.

sical authors, but specifically by Ciceronian and Gellian passages about fake eloquence, will be able to understand which the problem of Eastern advocates was: they had changed the *lectiones antiquitatis* for an appearance of rhetoric. So, Ammianus has explained in his own set of allusions how it was to be interpreted.[41]

Consequently, the argumentative thread of rhetorical ineptitude described here questions that the late antique mosaic-aesthetic is applicable in this case, but also adds new evidence about other long debated points in 30.4. I will concentrate just on one of them: the validity of the first-person statement *in illis partibus agens expertus sum*, "with which I became acquainted while I was living in those parts" (30.4.4), what connects this chapter with the problem of Ammianus's autobiographical remarks.

3. Ammianus the lawyer

In the absence of external evidence, the author's life has often been reconstructed on the hints or clues that the author gives in his work. Nevertheless, it has been plausibly argued that some of those statements,[42] particularly the declarations of autopsy or *autopatheia*, are devices of Ammianus's rhetorical argumentation.

On the basis of Ammianus's claim that he can deal with the "unworthiness" of the legal profession, because he has directly experienced it in the East, a scholarly tradition has inferred that, after being discharged from the Army in his thirties, Ammianus has been a lawyer in Antioch, or that he had negative experiences with the lawyers there.[43] Furthermore, if Ammianus had practiced at the bar, it could explain his precise knowledge in legal matters and his interest for treason trials, and even his high esteem of Cicero.[44]

[41] According to the term used by Kelly, *Ammianus*, 207-9.

[42] See above all the synthesis on the matter ibid., 104-5 with previous bibliography.

[43] Erfurdt, Wagner, *Ammiani Marcellini quae supersunt*, xliii: *Valentiniano et Valente imperantibus Ammianus M. militiae renuntiavit, et Antiochiam domumque rediit. Ubi post Theodori coniurationem patefactam atque oppressam, iniquo Iudicum Advocatorumque colludio litibus inquietatus ac vexatus videtur fuisse, non sine aliqua rei familiaris iactura. Sic enim explicanda iudico verba haec A. Marcellini in libro XXX cap. 4 § 4 ubi in Orientalium Rom. caussidicinam fuse invehitur. "Ergo absolutis super eius indignitate paucis, quam in illis partibus (Orientis) agens expertus sum".* R. B. Steele, "Ammianus Marcellinus", *CW* 16, 1922, 18-24, 27-8; R. Pack, "Ammianus Marcellinus and the Curia of Antioch", *CPh* 48, 1953, 80-4, K. Rosen, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, Darmstadt 1982, 20, 24; H. Sivan, "Ammianus at Rome: Exile and Redemption?", *Historia* 46, 1997, 116-21. Contra, Matthews, "Ammianus on Roman Law and Lawyers", 47-8.

[44] As argued by Pack, "Ammianus Marcellinus and the Curia of Antioch", Matthews, "Ammianus on Roman Law and Lawyers". Note that such arguments are irremediably speculative and self-referring. So, the legal language and world were familiar to Ammianus because he had been one of them, but that he has been one of them is inferred from his being akin to legal matters. In this sense, Fornara, "Studies in Ammianus Marcellinus: II", 431.

However, since Ammianus follows a rhetorical-satirical pattern in this digression, the claim that he was a witness or a victim of legal incompetence might be interpreted as a device to produce *enargeia* or *evidentia*, a vivid presentation of the matter.[45] Thus, declaring the direct autopsy – "I have seen it with my own eyes" – Ammianus gives a privileged status of authority to the whole passage, and also intends to turn the reader into spectator.

This impression is clearly reinforced by "implied autopsy" in the way he introduces the four types of lawyers: *nunc est videre* "now it is possible to see", "now you can see",[46] and by satirical exaggerations in the second person: 30.4.12: *et si voluntate matrem tuam finxeris occidisse, multas tibi suffragari absolutionem lectiones reconditas pollicentur, si te senserint esse nummatum* (evidently this does not imply that Ammianus has ever pretended to murder his mother) and 15: *circumlocutionibus indigestis ita scatentes, ut in colluvione taeterrima audire existimes ululabili clamore Thersiten*. Similarly, Ammianus combines a hyperbole or a *reductio ad absurdum* with the second person in other passages of the *Res gestae*[47]. In a similar way, the other satirical hyperboles in the third person[48] are forms of rhetorical *enargeia* as well, as they also present the description in a more vivid way. In other words, we cannot be sure about what the bad experience of Ammianus with the lawyers in the East was, but we can be sure that his concern was just to emphasize his authority in describing the legal practices in the East.[49]

4. Conclusions

In summary, the analysis of Ammianus's literary allusions in his "excursus on Eastern lawyers" reveals that this section properly deals with "the decline of forensic oratory", is equally appropriate to both parts of the Empire, and does not refer to specific events. This understanding rescues the text from the paradigm of the "mosaic-aesthetic", since it stresses that Ciceronian and Gellian references serve a particular plan and make the structure cohere. This finding also limits the autobiographical validity of Ammianus's first-person remark in 30.4.4.

[45] Following the line of research mainly developed by Kelly, *Ammianus*; see also Sabbah, *La méthode*, 286-7.

[46] Note the sense of timelessness: *nunc* is the time of narrator, but the text describes "facts" dating in the time of Valens. See in this regard Stenger, "Ammian und die Ewige Stadt", 199.

[47] For example in 14.6.20: *et licet, quocumque oculos flexeris, feminas affatim multas spectare cirratas*; 26.6.15: *subito putares emersum…*; or 28.4.27: *soccos ut Micionas videbis*.

[48] For example in 13: *in quas si captus ceciderit quisquam, non nisi per multa exiliet lustra, ad usque ipsas medullas exsuctus*.

[49] These phenomena of vivid speech also built the historian's authorial voice, the way in which the literary persona of Ammianus intrudes into the main discourse to create the illusion of authority in his explanation of the events.

However, although the interpretation raised in this study answers some questions about the passage, there are some others to be elucidated. Undoubtedly, more detailed research needs to be done about the allusions contained in paragraphs 13-19 on the fourth group of lawyers. It would also be appropriate to examine the use of satirical hyperboles and implied autopsy as secondary means of producing *enargeia* more systematically than I could do here.

Finally, further examination should explore which structural purpose this digression performs in the plot strategy of the last books, since the excursus on the rhetorical decline of lawyers clearly balances different parts of books 27-30:[50] it presents an Eastern *responsio* to the Western digression on the city of Rome in 28.4, giving coherence to the last hexad[51]. The chapter indeed emphasizes the contrast between East and West, between Valentinian and Valens, and between both of them and Julian, a just and eloquent Emperor, increasing the atmosphere of pessimism that prepares book 31.

Consequently, the chapter on lawyers is not only memorable, but also representative of the historiographical concept of Ammianus, inasmuch as it arranges heterogeneous material according to a strategy to present his particular explanation of reality. In the book 26 preface, the historian proclaims that his account would focus on significant episodes and trustworthy justifications: … *similia plurima praeceptis historiae dissonantia discurrere per negotiorum celsitudines assuetae, non humilium minutias indagare causarum*. In turn, Chapter 30.4 appears in open opposition, as it presents a catalogue of satiric motives and trivia that do not reflect any event-related "Zeitkritik". However, the diagnosis of oratorical decline falls upon a nuclear issue of Ammianus's arguments in the last books: the widespread ignorance

[50] Recent research on Ammianus's digressions has paid more attention to their function than to the erudite sources from which they derived (a tradition at least since Seeck, "Ammianus"). Generally (M. Caltabiano, "Il carattere delle digressioni nelle Res gestae di Ammiano Marcellino", in A. Garzya (ed.), *Metodologie della ricerca sulla tarda antichità, Atti del Primo Convegno dell'Associazione di Studi Tardoantichi*, Naples 1989, 289-96; U. Richter, "Die Funktion der Digressionen im Werk Ammians", *WJA* 15, 1989, 209-22), geographic, technical and scientific digressions help interpret the text, stating general laws of behaviour, emphasizing Rome's uniqueness by describing their "Gegenwelten" (W. Vergin, *Das Imperium Romanum und seine Gegenwelten: Die geographisch-ethnographischen Exkurse in den Res Gestae des Ammianus Marcellinus*, Berlin 2013), or providing technical information. Those passages can also structure the narrative alternating descriptive and narrative sections (clearly in book 23 for example), balancing the extension of matter, or gradually presenting an event: G. B. Pighi, *I discorsi nelle storie d'Ammiano Marcellino*, Milan 1936, 78-81.

[51] Thus, books 27-28 focus on Valentinian (with a brief episode of Valens and the Goths in 27.5), and include military campaigns in the West (27.2, 8, 10; 28.2, 3, 5), magic and treason trials in Rome (28.1), and the second satirical excursus on Rome in 28.4. For their part, books 29-30 follow a parallel line with Valens' deeds and significant events in the East. The trials of Antioch in 29.1-2 correspond to those in Rome in book 28. Book 30 highlights the injustice and cruelty of both brothers and culminates in Valentinian's death in 30.6, anticipating Valens's death at the end of book 31. See Sabbah, "Ammianus Marcellinus", 76.

of any references of the past that could help interpret and understand the events narrated. In this sense, the *exempla* in 31.5.10-17 show that Rome had met such and even more difficult dangers in the past, but at those times the *res publica* gave an answer of greatness.[52] Instead, although times were not worse under Valentinian and Valens, their responses to the ills had been fundamentally wrong, because they – unlike Julian – were greedy, unjust, and incapable of finding a guide in the *lectiones vetustatis*.[53] But the historian wants to go a step further: author and reader, narrator and narratee, should identify those lessons of the past, but also should learn how and why the characters in that critical time were not able to read them.

[52] Barnes, *Ammianus*, 181-3; Kelly, *Ammianus*, 281-2.

[53] M. Hose, "Appian und Ammian: Griechisches historisches Denken in zwei Sprachen", in J. B. Torres (ed.), *Utroque sermone nostro: Bilinguismo social y literario en el imperio de Roma*, Pamplona 2011, 99-114.

DICTA ET VISA: RHETORICAL STRATEGIES IN AMMIANUS'S *RES GESTAE*

Alberto J. Quiroga Puertas
Universidad de Granada
aquiroga@ugr.es

It has long been argued by scholars of Late Antiquity that rhetoric was a powerful and multi-functional tool with which authors forged the cultural, political and religious identity of their characters.[1] Furthermore, contemporary trends in the study of late antique historiography are helping us to re-assess the real importance of rhetoric in the composition of historiographical works.[2] This tendency has strengthened the existing bonds between these two literary genres and at the same time has opened new avenues of research. In this regard, Ammianus Marcellinus has gained a reputation as an author notable for his ability to compose a monumental historiographical work in a non-native language (i.e., Latin), a fact duly emphasized in countless scholarly works.[3] In fact, his work evidences that he managed to create his own language, a sort of meta-vocabulary rich in metaphors and with an imagery embedded with literary motifs readapted from the Classical legacy whose use in the late antique literary milieu was abundant.[4] In this sense, his frequent comparisons between animals and men, his ability to link supernatural events with political situations, or his tendency to use paradoxographical passages when discussing important issues show an awareness of how to utilise various literary mechanisms depending on the circumstances.[5]

[1] Part of this work was delivered at the International Conference "Beginning and End: from Ammianus Marcellinus to Eusebius of Caesarea" (Pamplona, 12-13 December 2013). I would like to thank everyone who attended the conference – especially Prof. Sánchez-Ostiz – for their valuable suggestions. Research for this paper received financial suppport from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (Researh Group FFI2012-32012 "La teatralización de la retórica y el establecimiento de un canon en la literatura griega y latina en la Antigüedad tardía)".

[2] See especially M. S. Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400-1500*, Manchester 2011 and P. van Nuffelen, *Orosius and the Rhetoric of History*, Oxford 2012.

[3] See for instance, G. Kelly, "Ammianus's Greek Accent", Ταλάντα: Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society 45, 2014, 69-72.

[4] P. M. Camus, *Ammien Marcellin: témoin des courants culturels et religieux à la fin du IVe siècle*, Paris 1967, 35-50.

[5] G. Sabbah, *La méthode d'Ammien Marcellin : Recherches sur la construction du discours historique dans les Res Gestae*, Paris 1978, 552-6.

Likewise, Ammianus paid particular attention to other types of rhetorical devices that are illustrative of his literary skills to bring different episodes of his narration to life, and which provide us with information regarding the *ethos* of some of the characters of his work.[6] Although some authors have considered his stylistic preferences to be excessively flamboyant,[7] references to characters' clothing, their gaze or way of walking should be revisited as elements that the historian scrutinized and used to reveal the personality of some of the actors of his work.

Therefore, the aim of my contribution will be to analyse how the historian resorted to and integrated different rhetorical strategies that contributed to shaping the historiographical programme of his *Res Gestae*, and to describing the Zeitgeist of the fourth century AD. First, I will focus on Ammianus's emphasis on presentational aspects of characters and places, which reveals a literary plan intended to cover all angles of the communication process, especially those related to the rhetorical concepts *ekphrasis* and *enargeia*. Second, I will examine accounts of rhetorical deliveries, which are highly revealing of Ammianus's strategies to characterize the actors of his work. In this sense, *actio* – rhetorical delivery – will be broadly understood in Ammianus's narrative, including not only rhetorical aspects *stricto sensu* but also techniques that fall into the category of communication and presentational strategies. This understanding of *actio* requires that my approach to rhetorical deliveries will not confine its boundaries only to speech acts, but will also comprise other aspects that caught Ammianus's attention, such as physiognomy, emotions, clothing or walking.

1. Bringing events vividly before your eyes

Ekphrasis and *enargeia* are two rhetorical devices that have attracted much scholarly attention in recent decades due to their frequent usage in compositions of several different literary genres.[8] The concepts were often treated as synonymous[9] and refer to the ability to describe people, objects

[6] Id., *La méthode*, 375-411.

[7] M. Martínez Pastor, "Amiano Marcelino, escritor romano del siglo IV. Perfil literario", *EClas* 102, 1992, 102-3: "La retórica, por otra parte, aparece en las *Res Gestae* en primer plano de forma casi hiriente para nosotros (…) El resultado de tal recargamiento de elementos retóricos es a veces la afectación o hinchazón".

[8] See especially A. Manieri, *L'immagine poetica nella teoria degli antichi. Phantasia ed enargeia*, Pisa-Roma 1988; N. Otto, *Enargeia: Untersuchung zur Charakteristik alexandrinischer Dichtung*, Stuttgart 2009; R. Webb, *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*, Farnham 2009, 87-106; P. Zanker, "Enargeia in the Ancient Criticism of Poetry", *RhM* 124, 1981, 297-311.

[9] On the specific differences of *ekphrasis* and *enargeia*, see Manieri, *L'immagine poetica nella teoria degli antichi. Phantasia ed enargeia*, 123-4, 49-54; Zanker, "Enargeia", 298. For a brief list of definitions of *ekphrasis*, see F. J. D'Angelo, "The Rhetoric of Ekphrasis", *JAC* 18, 1998, 439-47; Webb, *Ekphrasis*, 1.

or situations in a very lively fashion and with great detail so the audience or the reader feel as though they are actually contemplating the situation.[10] Although the appearance and treatment of *ekphrasis* as a literary device in rhetorical treatises was not customary until the first century AD,[11] the works of Theon, Hermogenes or Aphthonius provide us with an almost identical definition in which the term *ekphrasis* is predominant over *enargeia*,[12] with the latter an integral element of the former.[13] From a rhetorical and stylistic point of view, the classical sources define both concepts as methods of placing a scene or a description before the audience's eyes,[14] yet what interests us for the purposes of this paper is the aim of these literary devices when deployed in a historiographical work. In her punctilious work, Manieri argues that "mediante l'ἐνάργεια, infatti, la 'mediazione' dello storico deve ridursi al minimo, in modo tale che i fatti stessi sembrino presentati alla vista di chi ascolta o legge".[15] The following examples of the use of *ekphrasis* and *enargeia* in Ammianus's *Res Gestae* will establish to what extent Manieri's judgment can be applied to the historian's work.

MacMullen's multidisciplinary and rigorous study of Ammianus's literary technique in portraying and describing scenes emphasizes that the historian was skilful enough to transform his work into the perfect setting for his opinion about the Zeitgeist of the fourth century AD to take form.[16] Among the plethora of literary features to which the historian resorted, two stand out: first, Ammianus brought into play numerous physical descriptions that acted as identity markers that contributed to complement his opinion of the main characters of his work. In this sense, Ammianus was highly indebted to physiognomy, turning to it often when characterizing both physically

[10] On the subjects of *ekphrasis*, see J. Elsner, "The Genres of *ekphrasis*", *Ramus* 31, 2002, 1-18, 1-2.

[11] Zanker, "Enargeia", 305.

[12] As Manieri, *L'immagine poetica nella teoria degli antichi. Phantasia ed enargeia*, 150 points out, in the imperial period *enargeia* "appare anzi come qualità discriminante tra la διήγησις e l' ἔκφρασις". Otto, *Enargeia: Untersuchung zur Charakteristik alexandrinischer Dichtung*, 131 places a stronger emphasis on ἐνάργεια: "Denn einer Wahrnehmung, die das Konkret-Eigentümliche, Partikulare hinreichend berücksichtigt, kommt ἐνάργεια zu. Genauso verhält es sich in bezug auf die Literatur: Ein in Detail gehender Text ist ἐναργές. Sowohl die philosophische als auch die rhetorische ἐνάργεια verlangt die Konzentration auf das Partikulare".

[13] Theon 2.118.7-8: Ἔκφρασις ἐστὶ λόγος περιηγηματικὸς ἐναργῶς ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον; Hermog. 2.16.10.1: Ἔκφρασίς ἐστι λόγος περιηγηματικός, ὥς φασιν, ἐναργὴς καὶ ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον; Apht. 10.36.22: Ἔκφρασίς ἐστι λόγος περιηγηματικὸς ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγων ἐναργῶς τὸ δηλούμενον.

[14] See especially D.H., *Lys.* 7; *Thuc.* 22-23; Ad Heren. 4.39.51; Cic. *Ac.* 2.17; *Part. Or.* 6.20; Quint. 6.2.32, 8.3.61ff, 9.2.40.

[15] Manieri, *L'immagine poetica nella teoria degli antichi. Phantasia ed enargeia*, 158.

[16] R. MacMullen, "Some Pictures in Ammianus Marcellinus", *Art Bulletin* 46, 1964, 435-57.

and morally the characters of his *Res Gestae*.[17] Note, for instance, how the description of Julian's and Jovian's physique and mannerisms supplements the historian's analysis of these emperors.[18] Attention to the characters' clothing is also remarkable for its constant presence and its skilful insertion into the narration of events. For instance, when Gallus was deprived of his royal robes and was dressed in a tunic and a soldier's cloak (14.11.20), this change of clothing emphasized the dramatic tone of this most unpleasant journey for Gallus, which ended with his beheading. Ammianus's technique of portrayal, based on the depiction of clothing or physical descriptions,[19] is related to the use of *ekphrasis* and *enargeia* in his work, which reveals his preoccupation with detail and vividness.

Second, *ekphrasis* and *enargeia* should be considered to be the rhetorical devices that offered Ammianus the most appropriate means to chronicle contemporary *mores* and contrast them with moralizing intentions. Thus, the representation of the trivial and superficial character of Roman society relies on a long ekphrastic passage that aims to contrast the reverential and almost lost "white hair of the senators and their authority" (14.6.6: *patrum reverenda cum auctoritate canities populique Romani*) with the whimsical and luxurious life-style of fourth century AD Rome, a place where cultural and political elites were more concerned with their appearance than with the affairs of State.[20] Ammianus's two long digressions on Rome present us with the debasement of the capital when compared to her glorious origins. Rome was no longer the city that had formed a pact with Virtus and Fortune (14.6.3: *foedere pacis aeternae Virtus convenit atque Fortuna*), nor the charming and inviting place that the historian likened to the land of the Lotus-eaters (14.6.21: *ut Homerici bacarum suavitate Lotophagi*). Rather, it had become a real bonfire of vanities (14.6.9):

[17] See E. C. Evans, "Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography", *HSCPh* 46, 1935, 43-84; D. S. Rohrbacher, *The Historians of Late Antiquity*, London 2002, 103-9; S. Swain (ed.), *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon's Physiognomy from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*, Oxford 2007, and Castillo's contribution in this volume.

[18] On Julian, 15.8.16: *cuius oculos cum venustate terribiles vultumque excitatius gratum diu multumque contuentes, qui futurus sit colligebant velut scrutatis veteribus libris, quorum lectio per corporum signa pandit animorum interna*; 22.14.3: *ridebatur enim ut Cercops, homo brevis, humeros extentans angustos et barbam prae se ferens hircinam, grandiaque incedens tamquam Oti frater et Ephialtis, quorum proceritatem Homerus in inmensum tollit*. On Jovian, 25.10.14: *Incedebat autem motu corporis gravi, vultu laetissimo, oculis caesiis, vasta proceritate et ardua, adeo ut diu nullum indumentum regium ad mensuram eius aptum inveniretur*. See also Sabbah, *La méthode*, 421-5.

[19] R. F. Newbold, "Attire in Ammianus and Gregory of Tours", *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* 6.4, 2005, 1-14.

[20] For an analysis of these digressions from a rhetorical point of view, see R. Pack, "The Roman Digressions of Ammianus Marcellinus", *TAPhA* 84, 1953, 181-9, who considers that Ammianus's criticism is based on the subversion of Menander the Rhetor's topics and on their conversion into *psogoi*.

> Alii summum decus in carruchis solito altioribus et ambitioso vestium cultu ponentes sudant sub ponderibus lacernarum, quas in collis insertas iugulis ipsis annectunt, nimia subtegminum tenuitate perflabiles, expectantes crebris agitationibus maximeque sinistra, ut longiores fimbriae tunicaeque perspicue luceant varietate liciorum effigiatae in species animalium multiformes.
>
> Other men, taking great pride in the coaches higher than common and in ostentatious finery of apparel, sweat under heavy cloaks, which they fasten about their necks and bind around their very throats, while the air blows through them because of the excessive lightness of the material; and they lift them up with both hands and wave them with many gestures, especially with their left hands, in order that the overlong fringes and the tunics embroidered with party-coloured threads in multiform figures of animals may be conspicuous.

These ekphrastic lines are full of *enargeia* as their stylistic nature serves to accurately describe and realistically represent a common scene of late antique Rome.[21]

To Ammianus's eyes, therefore, Rome was then a city where luxury and superficiality were paraded,[22] and where the vices and tendencies to vain spectacularity (and, sometimes, to a superficiality redolent of the Ciceronian *o tempora o mores*) were staged. In fact, his criticism of the Romans' fondness for the theatre, costume or architectural displays is itself based on references to the theatre in order to appeal to his audience's imagination. It should be noted that Ammianus knew how to satisfy his audience's thirst for theatricality since he narrated some events as if they happened in a theatre (18.5.6; 19.12.8; 26.6.15; 28.6.29; 29.1.38). The narration of the battle of Strasbourg, for example, is compared to the aquatic spectacles that were so frequent in Late Antiquity[23] (16.12.57):

> Et velut in quodam theatrali spectaculo aulaeis miranda monstrantibus multa licebat iam sine metu videre nandi strenuis quosdam nescios adhaerentes, fluitantes alios, cum expeditioribus linquerentur ut stipites et velut luctante amnis violentia vorari quosdam fluctibus involutos, nonnullos clipeis vectos praeruptas undarum occursantium

[21] On the qualities of *enargeia* for these purposes, see *Ad Heren*. 4.51; Quint. 4.2.63-64; 9.2.40-41.

[22] See especially 14.6.17; 28.4.18, 19.

[23] On aquatic spectacles in the theatre, see A. Berland-Bajard, *Les spectacles aquatiques Romains*, Rome 2006; L. Miguélez-Cavero, "Espectáculos acuáticos en las *Dionisíacas* de Nono de Panópolis: ¿Reflejo de una realidad, ficción literaria o necesidad retórica?", in A. J. Quiroga Puertas (ed.), *Ἱερά καὶ λόγοι. Estudios de literatura y de religión en la Antigüedad Tardía*, Zaragoza 2001, 193-9.

moles obliquatis meatibus declinantes ad ripas ulteriores post multa discrimina pervenire. spumans denique cruore barbarico decolor alveus insueta stupebat augmenta.

And just as in some theatrical scene, when the curtain displays many wonderful sights, so now one could without apprehension see how some who did not know how to swim clung fast to good swimmers; how others floated like logs when they were left behind by those who swam faster; and some were swept into the currents and swallowed up, so to speak, by the struggling violence of the stream; some were carried along on their shields, and by frequently changing their direction avoided the steep masses of the onrushing waves, and so after many a risk reached the further shores. And at last the reddened river's bed, foaming with the savages' blood, was itself amazed at these strange additions to its waters.

The realistic portrait of the casualties suffered by the German army is constructed with the detail and rhetorical prowess that an *ekphrasis* empowered by *enargeia* could offer. On this occasion, the precise description helps to stress the importance and dimension of the victory of the Caesar Julian over the Germans.[24]

Another important event was related by Ammianus using an illustrative *ekphrasis*. The synesthetic description of Constantius's *adventus* to Rome is a passage replete with colours and sounds that prove that Ammianus knew how to do justice – in literary terms – to pompous scenes such as an emperor's arrival to the capital (16.10.6-7):

… insidebat aureo solus ipse carpento fulgenti claritudine lapidum variorum, quo micante lux quaedam misceri videbatur alterna. eumque post antegressos multiplices alios purpureis subtegminibus texti circumdedere dracones hastarum aureis gemmatisque summitatibus illigati hiatu vasto perflabiles et ideo velut ira perciti sibilantes caudarumque volumina relinquentes in ventum.

[Constantius] sat alone upon a golden car in the resplendent blaze of shimmering precious stones, whose mingled glitter seemed to form a sort of shifting light (…) he was surrounded by dragons, woven out of purple thread and bound to the golden and jewelled tops of spears, with wide mouths open to the breeze and hence hissing as if roused by anger.

[24] See also Sabbah, *La méthode*, 572-9.

In these lines, Ammianus seems to follow the rhetorical precepts that encouraged composing an *ekphrasis*[25] as a description of a scene by emphasising the sensorial elements of Constantius's *adventus*.[26]

Together with his attention to sensorial innuendos (sounds, colours and odours are omnipresent in the *Res Gestae*) when presenting his characters and situations, the specific mention of real events as staged in the theatre contributed to highlighting the historian's rhetorical strategy, one which was supported by the usage of *ekphrasis* and *enargeia*, two rhetorical tropes central to the internal architecture of Ammianus's work that allowed him to narrate historical events, to paint "tableaux vivant", as MacMullen labelled them,[27] following deuterosophistic trends on the composition of ekphraseis.[28] These scenes owe a great deal to his intention to have an emotional impact on the audience, a key feature that Ammianus wanted his work to have. As Matthews put it,[29] Ammianus was "the eloquent witness of almost every aspect of the life and society of his times",[30] which reminds us that the lust for pomp and ceremony among late antique authors and audiences can hardly be overestimated.[31]

Ekphrasis and *enargeia* were supplemented by Ammianus's lexical choices, as the historian tried to be accurate and attentive when selecting verbs, prefixes and prepositions that could add further nuance that would provide a hint of what he wanted his words to depict.[32] By blending an evocative use of these

[25] See especially Lucian of Samosata's instructions in his *Hist. Conscr.* 51: Τοιοῦτο δή τι καὶ τὸ τοῦ συγγραφέως ἔργον εἰς καλὸν διαθέσθαι τὰ πεπραγμένα καὶ εἰς δύναμιν ἐναργέστατα ἐπιδεῖξαι αὐτά. καὶ ὅταν τις ἀκροώμενος οἴηται μετὰ ταῦτα ὁρᾶν τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπαινῇ, τότε δὴ τότε ἀπηκρίβωται καὶ τὸν οἰκεῖον ἔπαινον ἀπείληφε τὸ ἔργον τῷ τῆς ἱστορίας Φειδίᾳ.

[26] See E. Fournier, "The Adventus of Julian at Sirmium: The Literary Construction of Historical Reality", in R. M. Frakes, E. DePalma Digeser, J. Stephens (eds.), *The Rhetoric of Power in Late Antiquity: Religion and Politics in Byzantium, Europe, and the Early Islamic World*, London 2010, 13-45.

[27] MacMullen, "Some Pictures", 436-8.

28 For the different traditions and types of *ekphrasis*, see D'Angelo, "The Rhetoric of Ekphrasis", 441-4.

[29] J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*, London 1989, 228.

[30] For a discussion of the implications of the concept of theatricality in the *Res Gestae*, see T. D. Barnes, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality*, Ithaca 1998, 14-5; MacMullen, "Some Pictures", 441-5. On theatricality in Ammianus's sources, A. J. Pomeroy, "Theatricality in Tacitus' Histories", *Arethusa* 39.2, 2006, 171-91.

[31] Manieri, *L'immagine poetica nella teoria degli antichi. Phantasia ed enargeia*, 148-9: "Contemporaneamente, dunque, garantisce la bellezza e l' eleganza del discorso, rende più efficace la narrazione, partecipa alla persuasione e alla mozione degli affetti. Ogni classificazione che voglia limitarla ad un ámbito ristretto, resulta dunque parziale e in contraddizione con le altre".

[32] A. Chauvot, "Détail et representation de la réalitè dans les Res Gestae d'Ammien Marcelin", *Ktèma* 37, 2012, 227-37; I. Moreno Ferrero, "La escenografía del mal en Amiano Marcelino", (forthcoming).

rhetorical tropes with a careful selection of words, Ammianus constructed vivid scenes capable of showing us the grandeur (and miseries) of the fourth century Roman Empire. If our main concern is to follow the representation of the historical reality of Ammianus's work, then we must decolour the jewelled style that he employed and which was firmly rooted in late antique compositions.[33] However, if we regard Ammianus as a historian with his own views and tenets, we should follow the path of his glittering prose. It may be a slippery path, but it was Ammianus's choice in the composition of his work, and it reflects the literary taste of a society in which "all emotions appropriate to a scene must be fully expressed, violently, assertively, publicly."[34]

2. Rhetoric and Performance

It is widely recognized that Ammianus Marcellinus's *Res Gestae* is full of anecdotes and *exempla* that have a profound and significant meaning, and which helped him to develop his historiographical programme. One of these anecdotes can be found in 27.3.1-2:[35]

> In oppido enim Pistoriensi, prope horam diei tertiam, spectantibus multis, asinus tribunali escenso audiebatur destinatius rugiens, et stupefactis omnibus, qui aderant quique didicerant referentibus aliis, nulloque coniectante ventura postea quod portendebatur evenit. Terentius enim, humili genere in urbe natus et pistor, ad vicem praemii, quia peculatus reum detulerat Orfitum ex praefecto, hanc eandem provinciam correctoris administraverat potestate.
>
> In the town of Pistoria, at about the third hour of the day, in the sight of many persons, an ass mounted the tribunal and was heard to bray persistently, to the amazement both of all who were present and of those who heard of it from the reports of others; and no one could guess what was to come, until later the portended event came to pass. For one Terentius, born in that city, a fellow of low origin and a baker by trade, by way of reward because he had brought Orfitus, an ex-prefect, into court on the charge of embezzlement, held the position of governor in that province.

In another example of what we can call a "rhetoric of incompetence", the figure of the usurper Procopius is portrayed as suffering from stage fright (26.6.18) when he attempted to address the Roman senators:

[33] M. Roberts, *The Jewelled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity*, Ithaca 1989.

[34] MacMullen, "Some Pictures", 452.

[35] Text and translation taken from J. C. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus with an English Translation*, London 2006 (=1939). For a historical interpretation of this passage, see J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVII*, Leiden 2009, 33, 37.

> Cum itaque tribunal idem escendisset Procopius, et cunctis stupore defixis, timeret silentium triste, procliviorem viam ad mortem (ut sperabat), existimans advenisse, per artus tremore diffuso, implicatior ad loquendum, diu tacitus stetit; pauca tamen interrupta et moribunda…
>
> Accordingly, when the said Procopius had mounted the tribunal, and all were filled with amazement, fearing the gloomy silence, and believing (as indeed he had expected) that he had merely come to a steeper road to death, since a trembling which pervaded all his limbs hindered his speaking, he stood for a long time without a word…

I find these passages particularly fitting for the purposes of this contribution as these instances of occasions of public speaking exemplify how Ammianus used not only rhetoric in a broad sense but also communication strategies based on non-verbal elements to express his opinion on society, politics and religion.

Thus, the following set of examples I want to explore is concerned with the extra-linguistic means indicated by Ammianus in his accounts of rhetorical performances delivered by the actors of his *Res Gestae*. I will not circumscribe my study to the twelve formal speeches that Pauw counted in the historian's work,[36] but will focus on references to the gaze, to the tone of voice or to the general disposition of an important figure when speaking in front of an audience (mostly, the Roman army) to be found in the *Res Gestae*, since they are telling of the character and internal disposition of emperors and Caesars. In this, I depart from Pauw when he states "Ammianus does not intentionally or primarily use the speech as a medium of character portrayal."[37] In my opinion, the speeches and the extra-linguistic elements that accompany them in Ammianus's accounts of his characters are indicative of the evolution of their emotions and representative of their personality. This communication strategy (the allusion to speeches and the extra-linguistic elements) should not be read as isolated indicators but as extra-verbal links that relate and cohere actions, speeches and the development of Ammianus's own historiographical programme.[38]

Note, for instance, how Ammianus narrates the reaction of Gallus when he is summoned to the imperial court by Domitianus, a prefect sent to Antioch, where Gallus was tyrannously carrying out his duties as Caesar, and realizes that the emperor Constantius has already had enough of his misdeeds as Caesar (14.7.13):

[36] For a specific list of those speeches, see D. A. Pauw, "Methods of Character Portrayal in the *Res gestae* of Ammianus Marcellinus", *AClass* 20, 1977, 190.

[37] Ibid., 191.

[38] See, for instance, a catalogue of non-verbal activities and their significance in Ammianus's literary models, in R. F. Newbold, "Nonverbal Communication in Tacitus and Ammianus", *Ancient Society* 21, 1990, 191-2.

> His cognitis Gallus ut serpens adpetitus telo vel saxo iamque spes extremas opperiens et succurrens saluti suae quavis ratione colligi omnes iussit armatos et cum starent attoniti, districta dentium acie stridens adeste inquit viri fortes mihi periclitanti vobiscum.
>
> On learning this, Gallus, like a serpent attacked by darts or stones, waiting now for a last expedient and trying to save his life by any possible means, ordered all his troops to be assembled under arms, and while they stood in amazement, he said, baring and gnashing his teeth.

Barnes considers that Ammianus's attitude towards Gallus was ambiguous due to the latter's kinship with Julian, while Pauw thinks that the historian held Gallus in low esteem.[39] In this context, the alliteration *ut serpens appetitus telo vel saxo, iamque spes extremas opperiens, et succurrens saluti suae quavis ratione* suggests that Ammianus wanted to highlight the baseness of Gallus's character by likening his elocutio to a serpent's hiss through an explicit comparison supported by alliteration. Consequently, I believe that we can arrive at a better understanding of Ammianus's work if we analyse the implications of such extra-linguistic signs, which derive from the rhetorical interventions of the more relevant characters of the *Res Gestae*.

This is the case of the oratorical interventions of the emperors Constantius and Julian, two pivotal actors in the historian's work. In my opinion, a careful review of the extra-linguistic dimension of some of their speeches not only enriches the literary analysis of Ammianus's work but also helps us to understand the historiographical purposes that the historian pursued when he narrated such extra-linguistic features in those rhetorical performances. In the case of Constantius, for instance, the information we are provided with regarding the extra-verbal elements on occasions when he delivered an oration serves to reinforce two weaknesses of the emperor's character consistently present in Ammianus's derogatory representation of Constantius, viz. his inability successfully to fight barbarian peoples and his highly impressionable and mutable character.[40] In this manner, when the *Alamanni*

[39] Barnes, *Ammianus*, 129-30: "Ammianus' treatment of Gallus is inevitably ambiguous (…) He [Ammianus] presents Gallus as a tyrant, as different from his younger brother Julian (…) On the other hand, as a victim of Constantius, the executed Caesar merited pity and sympathy". A different opinion in D. A. Pauw, "Methods of Character Portrayal in the *Res gestae* of Ammianus Marcellinus", *AClass* 20, 1977, 184: "Within the compass of a few pages the reader gets to know Gallus as violent, arrogant, irascible, cruel, unrighteous, ruthless, ambitious, fickle, and yet a man of authority, but uncontrolled – an overall picture of depravity".

[40] See Barnes, *Ammianus*, 134–6. For Constantius's moral weaknesses, see Amm. 21.16.15-16: *Vt autem in externis bellis hic princeps fuit saucius et adflictus, ita prospere succedentibus pugnis civilibus tumidus et intestinis ulceribus rei publicae sanie perfusus horrenda: quo pravo proposito magis quam recto vel usitato triumphalis arcus ex clade provinciarum sumptibus magnis erexit in Galliis et Pannoniis titulis gestorum adfixis, quoad stare poterunt, monumenta lecturis. uxoribus et spadonum gracilentis vocibus et*

obtained the armistice they sought (14.10.11-15), Constantius delivered a short address to his soldiers, a *contio*[41] whose rhetorical disposition was based on a long *captatio benevolentiae* (at least half of his intervention is constructed on an "*excusatio non petita*" argument) in order to present the peace treaty as a Roman victory. Constantius needed to appease his army's spirit after a hard and weary campaign, shown to have been unnecessary by the armistice, and to remind his soldiers that they were serving the greater good of the Empire (14.10.11-12):

> Nemo, quaeso, miretur, si post exsudatos labores itinerum longos congestosque affatim commeatus fiducia vestri ductante barbaricos pagos adventans velut mutato repente consilio ad placidiora deverti … quisque vestrum reputans id inveniet verum, quod miles ubique licet membris vigentibus firmior se solum vitamque propriam circumspicit et defendit, imperator vero officiorum dum aequis omnibus alienae custos salutis nihil non ad sui spectare tutelam ratio.
>
> Let no one, I pray, be surprised, if after going through the toil of long marches and getting together great quantities of supplies, I now, when approaching the abode of the savages, with my confidence in you leading the way, as if by a sudden change of plan have turned to milder designs. For each one of you (…) will find it to be true that the soldier in all instances, however strong and vigorous of body, regards and defends only himself and his own life. The commander, on the other hand, has manifold duties… and being the guardian of others' safety.

According to Ammianus, this short address, based on a well-crafted *captatio benevolentiae*, was positively received by Constantius's soldiers not because of its ability to persuade but because the emperor had a bad reputation when fighting foreign peoples (14.10.16):

---

palatinis quibusdam nimium quantum addictus ad singula eius verba plaudentibus et quid ille aiat aut neget, ut adsentiri possint, observantibus. See also N. Henck, "Constantius' Paideia, Intellectual Milieu and Promotion of the Liberal Arts", *PCPhS* 47, 2001, 172-87, 186: "Ammianus is clearly presenting us with only some of the facts –namely those which place the emperor in a bad light. By suppressing much pertinent information that redounds to Constantius's credit, Ammianus promotes a totally misleading image of the emperor, and ultimately fails to give him his due for his promotion of the liberal arts". S. Elm, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*, Berkeley 2012, 31 has underlined the difficulties involved in reaching a consensus: "To do justice to Constantius II, the man and his rule, is, however, no easy undertaking: our chief narrative sources present sharply divergent pictures".

[41] On the nature and purposes of *contio*, see F. Pina Polo, "*Contio*, *auctoritas* and Freedom of Speech in Republican Rome", in S. Benoist (ed.), *Rome, a City and its Empire in Perspective. The Impact of the Roman World through Fergus Millar's Research*, Leiden 2012, 45-58.

> … ea ratione maxime percita quod norat expeditionibus crebris fortunam eius in malis tantum civilibus vigilasse; cum autem bella moverentur externa, accidisse plerumque luctuosa.
>
> They [i.e., his soldiers] were influenced especially by the conviction, which they had formed from frequent campaigns, that his fortune watched over him only in civil troubles, but that when foreign wars were undertaken, they had often ended disastrously.

This passage, therefore, presents Constantius as an orator unable to deliver a psychagogic speech capable of convincing his audience by the strength of its argumentation. Instead, the emperor appears as a weak orator forced to strengthen the *captatio benevolentiae* in order to persuade an army that was neither influenced nor convinced by this weak oration but rather by Constantius's inability to overcome barbarian peoples.

The content and form of this episode should be compared with the speech delivered by Constantius himself after a number of victories in the Sarmatian campaign (17.13.25-33). On this occasion, Ammianus does not include any allusion or reference that could point to the emperor's alleged inability to defeat barbarian peoples. Contrary to the previous example, this is a well-structured speech in which Constantius does not need to resort to a long *captatio benevolentiae* to appease or please his soldiers. The emperor regards the campaign as (17.13.31-33):

> "quadruplex igitur praemium (…) nos quaesivimus et res publica, primo ultione parta de grassatoribus noxiis; deinde quod vobis abunde sufficient ex hostibus captivi, his enim virtutem oportet esse contentam, quae sudore quaesivit et dexteris. nobis amplae facultates opumque sunt magni thesauri (…) postremo ego quoque hostilis vocabuli spolium prae me fero, secundo Sarmatici cognomentum, quod vos unum idemque sentientes mihi – ne sit arrogans dicere – merito tribuistis."
>
> "A fourfold prize (…) [which] was won by us and by our country; first, by taking vengeance on wicked robbers; then, in that you will have abundant booty taken from the enemy; for valour ought to be content with what it has won by toil and a strong arm. We ourselves have ample wealth and great store of riches (…) Lastly, I also display the spoil of an enemy's name, surnamed as I am Sarmaticus for the second time, a title not undeserved (without arrogance be it said), which you have with one accord bestowed upon me."

According to Ammianus, this speech was received by the soldiers (17.13.32) "with more enthusiasm than common". Modern scholarship appears to be puzzled by the tone of this passage, which seems to contradict Ammianus's

previous statements on Constantius's inability to fight against barbarians.[42] Two arguments could explain this apparent contradiction: first, the narrative nature of these paragraphs abounds in ekphrastic images and diegetic lines,[43] so the passage would contribute to the narratological[44] development of the content of Ammianus's historiographical work by reporting the strategy and movements against the Sarmatians. Second, the account of this *contio* shows that oratorical pieces in the *Res Gestae* are not unconnected rhetorical adornments but signal an evolution in the development of the intertwining plots and main characters of Ammianus's work, for Constantius is portrayed very differently if compared to 14.10.11-15 and, as we will immediately see, to 15.8.4-15. With this in mind, we might question and reconsider the degree of animosity towards Constantius that, according to modern scholars, the historian showed in his work.[45]

The use of accounts of rhetorical deliveries as literary devices intended to describe the changeable psychology of the *Res Gestae*'s characters is revealed again in other passages where Constantius and Julian are paired and contrasted. Thus, regarding Constantius's unstable character, the scene (15.8.4-15) where the emperor appoints Julian Caesar is telling of his flimsy ethos. In a pompous setting, Constantius addresses the army *placido sermone* "in a quiet tone" and *immobilis dum silerent* "motionless until the soldiers became silent", a controlled disposition in front of his soldiers that changes once he has clothed Julian, Ammianus telling us that at that point he became "melancholy in aspect… and with careworn countenance" (15.8.11: *his alloquitur contractiore vultu submaestum*). This change in Constantius's disposition is repeated in his speech before his confrontation with Julian (21.13.9-16) as Constantius's self-assurance was not supported by natural confidence but had to be artificially assumed (21.13.9: *ad serenitatis speciem et fiduciae vultu formato*). The successful acceptance of his speech soothed him (21.13.16: *qua gratia in laetitiam imperator versus ex metu*), thus emphasizing his lack of real confidence in himself and his weak personality, two flaws that did not suit the ethos of an emperor.

In this manner, the historian draws our attention to the performative arena when he wants to detail Constantius's psyche and behaviour. In this milieu, the psychological effects caused by Constantius's inconstant personality

[42] Barnes, *Ammianus*, 137-8.

[43] G. Kelly, "The New Rome and the Old: Ammianus Marcellinus's Silences on Constantinople", *CQ* 53, 2003, 598-600.

[44] For an example of the narratological and historiographical implications of the reproduction of speeches in Ammianus's works, see Matthews, *The Roman Empire*, 130-2.

[45] Elm, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church*, 48.

become evident.[46] The "dramatic immobility,"[47] a virtue that an emperor has to embody, crumbles as Constantius's internal doubts surface. If his image in his *adventus* to Rome (16.10) capitalizes on a majestic hieratism (16.10.9: *Augustus itaque faustis vocibus appellatus, non montium litorumque intonante fragore cohorruit, talem se tamque immobilem*),[48] the insight into Constantius's difficulty in controlling and stabilizing his emotions in the previous examples contribute to the creation of an image of an emotionally fragile and changeable emperor.

As one would expect from a biased historian such as Ammianus, the accounts of Julian's rhetorical displays (the main character and hero of the *Res Gestae*) are narrated in order to produce a very different impression. According to the historian, Julian not only mastered the composition and delivery of speeches but was also an expert when it came to using the *kairos*: he could adopt a calm and solemn tone (16.12.8: *indictaque solitis vocibus quiete… genuine placiditate sermonis*) in order to appear as a self-confident leader when he wanted to lift the spirits of his troops before a battle, but he did not shy away from confronting his soldiers when they were not happy with the reward he had promised them (24.3.3: *ad indignationem plenam gravitatis erectus*), rebuking them with the address "of an emperor self-contained amid prosperity and adversity" (24.3.8: *hac modesta imperatoris oratio, inter secunda et aspera medii*), which was positively received by his soldiers. His rhetorical prowess allowed him to address simultaneously different types of audiences during the battle of Strasbourg: strangers and acquaintances, those behind the standards, experienced and inexperienced soldiers, all of whom received words of support specifically suited to their position and rank (16.12.28-34). Whenever he felt that his interventions in a *contio* required a firm demonstration of the imperial *dignitas*, he exaggerated – Ammianus tells us – his demeanour (20.5.1: *progressus principes ambitiosius solito*) and voice (21.5.1: *fidentior haec clarius solito disserebat*).[49] Other contemporary sources also praised the emperor for his skill in commanding the rhetorical *variatio*.[50] However, Julian's ability to adapt his

[46] Julian's laudatory and insincere panegyric to Constantius praised his oratorical dexterity, see Jul. *Or*. 1.31c-d.

[47] MacMullen, "Some Pictures", 440.

[48] Kelly, "The New Rome and the Old", 11-2; J. R. Stenger, "Ammian und die Ewige Stadt: Das spätantike Rom als Heterotopie", in T. Fuhrer (ed.), *Rom und Mailand in der Spätantike. Repräsentationen städtischer Räume in Literatur, Architektur und Kunst*, Berlin 2012, 189-216.

[49] Even the narration of his death (25.3.15-21) contains rhetorical elements strongly reminiscent of a Socratic tone, for he spoke *placide dicta* on his deathbed (25.3.22).

[50] See especially Lib. *Or*. 18.154: "Julian, however, as Homer says of the able speaker, 'with unerring discourse' attended such debates, allowing any who so desired to speak his mind freely before him and delivering speeches himself, sometimes 'with words brief and clear', sometime 'with words like snowflakes in winter', now imitating those speakers in Homer, now

oratorical style to different circumstances should not be considered an empty compliment.[51] As Penella has pointed out,[52] there is a long tradition in rhetorical treatises of relating the oratorical plain and grand style to two Homeric figures, Menelaus and Odysseus. In this sense, in addition to Barnes's approach to Julian as the "new Achilles" in Ammianus's work,[53] it is also tempting to think that Ammianus may have implicitly compared Julian's rhetorical prowess and varied style to that of Odysseus. If rhetorical strategies – both verbal and non-verbal – presented Constantius as a fickle and insecure orator, Ammianus's emphasis on Julian's rhetorical adaptability to different scenarios helps to highlight his virtues as a resourceful ruler and a true Homeric hero.[54]

3. Conclusion

Ammianus's descriptions of rhetorical deliveries and oratorical interventions should be understood as presentational elements[55] intimately related to communication strategies in that they attempted to send a signal that would influence someone's decision through the use of non-verbal elements that helped to characterize the main actors of the *Res Gestae*. Consequently, the extra-linguistic elements involved in oratorical interventions acted as literary devices concerning presentational aspects of characters and events that were brought into play by Ammianus in order to supplement the ethical implications of peoples and actions that an artless description may have overlooked.

Regarding *ekphrasis* and *enargeia*, I would like to counterpoise the aforementioned Manieri's statement ("mediante l' ἐνάργεια, infatti, la "mediazione" dello storico deve ridursi al minimo") to Jas Elsner's consideration of the function of *ekphrasis* and the qualities prescribed (*sapheneia* and *enargeia*) to compose it: "its aim is all about creating an emotional effect in the audience's imagination and literally bringing the object described before the eyes of the listener or reader."[56] In my opinion, the use of *ekphrasis* and

excelling each of them in his own particular technique". Translation from A. F. Norman, *Libanius. Selected Works*, Cambridge 1977.

[51] On Julian's interventions in Latin, see Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, "*Iulianus Latinus*: la lengua cambiada de los personajes de Amiano Marcelino", in Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, J. B. Torres (eds.), *De Grecia a Roma y de Roma a Grecia: un camino de ida y vuelta*, Pamplona 2007, 300-4.

[52] R. Penella, "Menelaus, Odysseus, and the Limits of Eloquence in Libanius, Declamations 3 and 4", in O. Lagacherie, P.-L. Malosse (eds.), *Libanios, le premier humaniste : Études en homage à Bernard Schouler*, Alessandria 2011, 98-9.

[53] Barnes, *Ammianus*, 143-65.

[54] On the oratorical dimension of Homeric heroes, see J. B. Torres, "El héroe como orador", in A. L. Eire, J. M. Labiano, A. M. Seoane (eds.), *Retórica, política e ideología: desde la Antigüedad hasta nuestros días. Actas del II Congreso Internacional*, Salamanca 1998, 39-43.

[55] Pauw, "Ammianus Marcellinus and Ancient Historiography, Biography, and Character Portrayal", 126 defines them as "the technique of indirect portrayal of characters". See also Sánchez-Ostiz, "Iulianus Latinus", 306-7.

[56] Elsner, "The Genres of *ekphrasis*", 1.

enargeia in the *Res Gestae* does not minimize the status of Ammianus as a historian nor silence his voice. On the contrary, as Elsner suggests, a firm intention of *movere* and *delectare* was behind Ammianus's recurrent use of these rhetorical tropes.

PARODY AND INVERSION OF LITERARY GENRES IN AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS

Francisco J. Alonso
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile
francisalonsogut@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The extensive use that Ammianus Marcellinus makes of the literature that came before him, both Latin and Greek, has often been emphasised. Throughout history, the different interpretations given to this use have been fundamental for judging the style of Ammianus in the context of Late Antique aesthetics.[1] Because the intertextuality of the *Res Gestae* has always been an object of study, the list of allusions and references to preceding works (beginning with the first commentators) has been growing over time. Each period has had a different opinion about this technique, from nineteenth century criticism to the re-evaluation of Ammianus's merits that has taken place over the last decades. Nevertheless, and despite this longstanding interest, the study intertextuality of the *Res Gestae* has been limited in most cases to pointing out and commenting on allusions to specific passages and authors, while the work's use of genres and subgenres has not received similar attention.[2]

This paper aims at mitigating this omission by delving into a particular form of intertextuality, namely Ammianus Marcellinus's inversion of literary genres and subgenres in the work at hand. My objective is to show that the historian is original in his use of traditional forms taken from preceding literary works, and that he has a specific expressive purpose. Keeping in mind that the structure of the plot cooperates in producing the meaning of the historical text,[3] the inversion of a literary genre involves a complex operation performed upon that meaning. As an example, the inversion of a tragedy refers in the first place to the narrative meaning of this genre (which we can summarise as the catharsis achieved through the hero's suffering); then

[1] I would like to acknowledge the editor of this volume for his useful and interesting suggestions for improving this paper.

[2] G. Kelly, *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian*, Cambridge 2008, 163-4, has already pointed out the limited sense in which intertextuality in Ammianus has normally been understood.

[3] H. White, "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact", *Tropics of Discourse. Essays in Cultural Criticism*, Baltimore 1978, 81-100; D. Carr, "Narrative and the Real World: An Argument for Continuity", *History and Theory* 25, 1986, 117-31.

it modifies that first meaning, attempting either to mock the hero's disgrace or to produce the catharsis that results from the suffering of a villain. Therefore, the inversion of a literary genre is a complex operation that refers to the meaning of a well known genre and modifies it. Ammianus carries out this operation intentionally. The literary tradition does not remain static in his hands; rather, it is a dynamic bearer of meaning. Consequently, understanding the way in which he carries out this operation may help to better understand the historical discourse of the *Res Gestae* itself.

In the next section, I will discuss the most significant milestones in the ongoing research on this topic, and I will identify the main points in the discussion about Ammianus's intertextuality. Next, I use three examples to highlight his use of inversion, a method for alluding to a literary genre or subgenre, and its meaning will be untangled. Finally, I close with some reflections on inversion and its contribution to our understanding of the *Res Gestae*.

2. Ammianus's allusions

The creation of lists of allusions and parallels between the *Res Gestae* and earlier works begins with the editors and commentators of the 17th century,[4] and was extended during the 19th and 20th centuries. The scholars of the 19th century claimed that Ammianus distorted classical literature with his clumsy and strange style,[5] while in the 20th century scholars preferred to focus on connections with the performing arts,[6] mosaics[7] and even jewellery.[8] According to this latter point of view, these disciplines share with the *Res Gestae* the ornamental style typical of Late Antiquity. In Ammianus's case, his blending of allusions creates a series of decorative *tableaux*. In any case, allusions have always been considered to be ornamental or stylistic elements lacking any meaning other than an aesthetic one.[9] The work of Gavin Kelly,

[4] For the commentaries of Lindenbrog and the Valois brothers, see C. G. A. Erfurdt, J. A. Wagner, *Ammiani Marcellini quae supersunt, cum notis integris Frid. Lindenbrogii, Henr. et Hadr. Valesiorum et Iac. Gronovii, quibus Thom. Reinesii quasdam et suas adiecit Io. Augusti. Wagner. Editionem absolvit Car. Gottlob Aug. Erfurdt*, Leipzig 1808. For a more detailed analysis and a more extensive list of the secondary literature that refers to this discussion Kelly, *Ammianus*, 185-92.

[5] One of the most significant examples of this point of view is found in M. Hertz, "Aulus Gellius und Ammianus Marcellinus", *Hermes* 8, 1874, 257-302.

[6] E. Auerbach, *Mimesis: Dargestelle Wirklichkeit in der abendländischen Literatur*, Bern 1942; R. MacMullen, "Some Pictures in Ammianus Marcellinus", *Art Bulletin* 46, 1964, 435-57; F. W. Jenkins, "Theatrical Metaphors in Ammianus Marcellinus", *Eranos* 85, 1987, 55-63.

[7] C. Salemme, *Similitudini nella storia: un capitolo su Ammiano Marcellino*, Naples 1989.

[8] M. Roberts, *The Jewelled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity*, Ithaca 1989.

[9] Kelly, *Ammianus*, 164. Inevitably this interpretation of Ammianus's style led many scholars to doubt his credibility as a historian: the lavish or *carnivalesque* decoration distracts from the message, disguises it and ultimately makes it unrecognisable.

however, interprets that many allusions within the Res Gestae have a meaning and a strategic function. My paper follows this path of analysis, applying it to an aspect that has yet to be studied: how generic intertextuality can also bear meaning – the "ornamentation" does not disguise the message, but is rather a part of it.

The most reiterated claim among those who have studied the literary genres present in Ammianus's text regards the disparity and even confusion of genres. On the one hand, Marincola claims that Ammianus is the last great historian of Antiquity. Somewhat poetically, he brings together all the historiographical subgenres: annals, biography, memoirs, ethnography.[10] On the other hand, Fontaine makes a significant contribution, albeit too general:

> Il faut lier la vigueur, et même la violence, d'une telle imagerie, à la démesure surréelle, sinon déjà surréaliste, qui caractérise chez Ammien l'expression exagérative, dans l'ordre du drame ou de la satire. Les bornes raisonnées et traditionnelles du comique et du tragique sont alors franchies.[11]

Both readings classify the *Res Gestae* as a hybrid historiographical discourse, where the limits between genres and subgenres are not clear-cut. Those limits must be defined in order to understand the literary meaning that Ammianus gives to the blending and inversion of genres.

Ratti sees the inversion of a literary model in 31.4.1-14, when a group of Goths crosses the river to be accepted into the Empire with the consent of Valens.[12] In his article about the inversion of motifs in Ammianus Marcellinus, Ratti points out that the historian intentionally modifies the typical scene of a hero crossing a river, instead representing the Goths as the opposite of a traditional hero. Thus, in this scenario Ammianus would be taking a symbolic stance against the admission of barbarians into the Empire, which was the subject of an on-going debate at the end of the 4th century.

3. Inversion of genres

I will analyse three passages in which Ammianus Marcellinus inverts certain traditional literary forms. The first is the oratorical form of the *adlocutio*, the speech of an Emperor to his troops; the second and the third cases relate to the form of tragedy. I work from the hypothesis that these forms are

[10] J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge 1997, 217-57.

[11] J. Fontaine, "Ammien Marcellin, historien romantique", *BAGB* 28, 1969, 417-35.

[12] S. Ratti, "La traversée du Danube par les Goths : La subversion d'un modèle héroïque (Ammien Marcellin 31.4)", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus After Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 181-99.

found in those passages – but with some inversions – and that in using them the author expresses a definite meaning.

3.1. Parody of adlocutio (14.7)

Chapter 14.7 narrates (and criticises) several political decisions made by the Caesar Gallus in the year 354, some of which even led to riots among the populace (14.7.6). The Augustus Constantius hears about the news and, afraid of the possibility that Gallus's thirst for power could become a real danger to his authority, he progressively withdrew Gallus's troops until only his personal guard remained (14.7.9). In addition, he sends a messenger, Domitianus, to summon Gallus to Italy. Domitianus enters the presence of the Caesar in an insolent fashion (14.7.11), and Gallus orders his arrest. However, the quaestor Montius tries to persuade the palace troops that arresting Domitianus would be an attack against the Augustus (14.7.12). When Gallus finds out, he becomes furious, gathers his men and addresses them with the speech that will be the object of the first part of this paper (14.7.14):

> "adeste", inquit, "uiri fortes, mihi periclitanti uobiscum. Montius nos tumore inusitato quodam et nouo ut rebelles et maiestati recalcitrantes Augustae per haec, quae strepit, incusat iratus nimirum, quod contumacem praefectum, quid rerum ordo postulat, ignorare dissimulantem formidine tenus iusserim custodiri".
>
> [H]e said (…): "Stand by me, my brave men, who are, like myself, in danger. Montius, with a kind of strange and unprecedented arrogance, in this loud harangue, accuses us of being rebels and as resisting the majesty of Augustus, no doubt in anger because I ordered an insolent prefect – who presumes to ignore what proper conduct requires – to be imprisoned, merely to frighten him."[13]

Gallus's harangue has not received attention in studies of the speeches included in the *Res Gestae*, since it is improvised and therefore does not comply with the characteristics of a formal speech.[14] Other examples of *adlocutiones* in the work are always marked as ritual,[15] something that the

[13] English translations from Ammianus are taken from J. C. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus with an English Translation*, London 2006 (=1939).

[14] A. Reiter, *De Ammiani Marcellini usu orationis obliquae*, Amberg 1887; G. B. Pighi, *I discorsi nelle storie d'Ammiano Marcellino*, Milan 1936; P. H. O'Brien, *Speeches and Imperial Characterization in Ammianus Marcellinus*, Doct. Thesis, Boston University, 2002; Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, "*Iulianus Latinus*: la lengua cambiada de los personajes de Amiano Marcelino", in Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, J. B. Torres (eds.), *De Grecia a Roma y de Roma a Grecia: un camino de ida y vuelta*, Pamplona 2007, 293-308. My sincere thanks to Dr. O'Brien for making his work accessible to me.

[15] O'Brien, *Speeches and Imperial Characterization in Ammianus Marcellinus*, 31-234.

Caesar's address lacks. Nevertheless, this speech alludes to the characteristics of a formal *adlocutio* and inverts them as follows:

a. An *adlocutio* is delivered by an Emperor. In the *Res Gestae*, if we exclude that of Gallus, it is only Julian – who afterwards will become Augustus – that delivers an address as a Caesar. Not only did Gallus not become Emperor, his time in office would come to a miserable end.

b. In an *adlocutio* the troops gather before the Emperor, ready for battle – or after a battle. In this case Gallus does not have an army, just a handful of armed men (*colligi omnes iussit armatos*) who, astonished (*attoniti*), respond to Gallus's call. It is worthy of note that when Montius addresses his audience it is as *palatinarum primos scholarum* (14.7.12), whereas when Gallus speaks to the same men they are just *omnes armatos*.

c. The Emperor that delivers an *adlocutio* is usually characterised by *auctoritas* and restraint. But Gallus is presented as being assailed by an animal anxiety (*ut serpens appetitus telo uel saxo … districta dentium acie stridens*), and desperate to save himself, whatever the cost (*iamque spes extrema opperiens et succurrens saluti suae quauis ratione*).

d. As with every formal speech, an *adlocutio* usually has a classical rhetorical structure. Gallus's address, however, is an example of bad practice: after an agitated *exordium* and a rocky narration, it ends abruptly. One might argue that since he persuades his audience, his *adlocutio* was a perfect *suasoria* under the correct form. Here the high point of the inversion is attained, as I point out in item e.

e. The result of an *adlocutio* prior to a battle is normally a glorious fight against the enemy. Nevertheless, in the case at hand, the result was that Gallus's men attacked two Roman magistrates, hanging them until dead (14.7.15-16).

Ammianus deprives Gallus of the typical characteristics of an Emperor through his inversion of the *adlocutio*. This type of speech follows a ritual pattern, which allows the venerable authority of the Emperor to be symbolised to the audience (which is not so much the soldiers present as it is the reader of the historical text).[16] This symbolism would be the original meaning of a common *adlocutio*, following the "model of meaning" discussed at the beginning of this paper. Here Ammianus turns upside down those symbols that we imperfectly recognise in Gallus. The historian is trying to signify just the opposite. At this point in book 14 it is clear that Gallus is an incompetent ruler, but Ammianus still emphasises this point symbolically: Gallus's character lacks the authority required to be an Emperor. The inversion – and, in a certain

[16] These kinds of representations are more or less fictitious devices.

way, the exaggeration – turn Gallus into a caricature of a ruler. Ammianus confirms this characterisation of Gallus with a subtle display of narrative skill.

3.2. The inversion of a tragedy in 14.11

At this point I will discuss chapter 14.11, whose protagonist is also Gallus. Constantius has been cornering Gallus more and more tightly. After pacifying the Alamanni (14.10), the Augustus can finally give his attention to Gallus, and summons him to Mediolanum through the mediation of his sister Constantia, wife of Gallus (14.11.6). She dies during the voyage, she who was the only hope that Gallus had for being well treated by Constantius. Gallus then sinks into a horrible anguish and vacillates about whether he should answer the Augustus's summons (14.11.7-10). Unfortunately for him, he is deceived by the envoys and decides to answer the call, although he first organises a number of races in Constantinople (14.11.11-12). Irritated, Constantius tries to hurry Gallus and strips him of more and more of his already small guard (14.11.13-18). Finally the count Barbatio crosses Gallus's path and arrests him, no longer dissimulating (14.11.19-20). In his confinement Gallus is interrogated, and he blames his late wife – Constantius's sister – for his crimes; the Augustus then becomes infuriated and orders Gallus's execution (14.11.21-23). The chapter ends with a prolepsis or *flashforward* – Gallus's executioners (Scudilo and Barbatio) will also meet their end ignominiously thanks to divine justice (*superni numinis aequitas*) – as well as an *excursus* about the inescapable intervention of Adrastea, she whom no one can escape, illustrated with a number of *exempla* (14.11.24-34).

The account that Ammianus provides of the government of Gallus (or at least that which is preserved in book 14) provides some dramatic hints. Thompson in fact points this out in chapters 1, 7, 9 and 11 (in which the actions of Gallus as Caesar are narrated).[17] Blockley claims that the narration follows the *hybris-nemesis* model and that "though hardly tragic in the Aristotelian sense (Gallus is too much a monster to evoke the necessary response), it is undoubtedly dramatic and at times pathetic".[18] Certainly the narration is not "tragic in the Aristotelian sense", although it still resembles that literary genre. Let us delve a bit more into the tragic features of Ammianus's account of Gallus' government, comparing them with three of the essential elements of tragedy according to Aristotle: *mythos, ethos* and *dianoia*.[19]

[17] E. A. Thompson, *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Cambridge 1947, 60-71.

[18] R. C. Blockley, *Ammianus Marcellinus: A Study of his Historiography and Political Thought*, Brussels 1975, 23-5.

[19] Arist. *Poet.* 1450a, 7-12: ἀνάγκη οὖν πάσης τῆς τραγῳδίας μέρη εἶναι ἕξ, καθ' ὃ ποιά τις ἐστὶν ἡ τραγῳδία· ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶ μῦθος καὶ ἦθη καὶ λέξις καὶ διάνοια καὶ ὄψις καὶ μελοποιία. οἷς μὲν γὰρ μιμοῦνται, δύο μέρη ἐστίν, ὡς δὲ μιμοῦνται, ἕν, ἃ δὲ μιμοῦνται, τρία, καὶ παρὰ ταῦτα οὐδέν, "The elements of tragedy are six: *mythos, ethos, lexis, dianoia, opsis*

In this context, to Aristotle *mythos* means the structure of the incidents,[20] and requires unity of action and verisimilitude.[21] In addition, there are three elements that are part of the *mythos*: peripety, anagnorisis and pathos.[22] Unity of action means developing a plot with a beginning, a middle and an end, disregarding those actions of the main character that are unnecessary for the development of the plot. Following this analysis, Gallus's plot can be summarised clearly: rise to the office of Caesar, tyrannical use of power exemplified in several actions (*hybris*) and his subsequent execution because of his vices (*nemesis*). The verisimilitude of the narration is achieved precisely by this cause-effect structure: Gallus is executed because of his faults.

In Aristotle's view, peripety and anagnorisis are connected, because the latter (the recognition) causes the former (the reversal of fortune). In the case of Gallus it could be said that the peripety is his wife's death (14.11.7): when the Augustus's sister dies, the Caesar recognises himself as defenceless before the Augustus's power[23]; there is a reversal of the situation and punishment – despite Gallus's impunity – is already imminent. Nevertheless, Gallus never admits the mistake that brings him to his execution; even in the moment of being interrogated by his executioners he blames his wife (14.11.21-22). As a result we cannot say that the anagnorisis is complete. In fact, Gallus's reversal of fortune is visible in all its splendour when he is just a corpse: *colligatis manibus in modum noxii cuiusdam latronis ceruice abscisa ereptaque uultus et capitis dignitate cadauer est relictum informe paulo ante urbibus et prouinciis formidatum* (14.11.23), "his hands were bound, after the fashion of some guilty robber, and he was beheaded. Then his face and head were mutilated, and the man who a little while before had been a terror to cities and provinces was left a disfigured corpse".

In addition, in this image there is a movement to pathos: in an Aristotelian analysis compassion and fear should be the answer sought by the plot.[24] In order to achieve that, says the philosopher, the tragic hero cannot deserve

---

and *melopoiia* (plot, character, diction, thought, spectacle and musical composition). Of the six elements, two of them are the means by which tragedy tries to imitate reality (*lexis* and *melopoiia*), one is the manner of imitating (*opsis*) and the other three are the things imitated (*mythos, ethos* and *dianoia*)." The means and manner of imitation are typical of the theatre, so a non-theatrical work can only resemble a tragedy in the things imitated (plot, character and thought). However, these are precisely the three principal parts, and are those which are most characteristic of a tragedy, according to Aristotle's famous analysis (1450a, 38-39 and 1450b, 4).

[20] Arist. *Poet.* 1450a, 3-5: ἔστιν δὲ τῆς μὲν πράξεως ὁ μῦθος ἡ μίμησις, λέγω γὰρ μῦθον τοῦτον τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν πραγμάτων.

[21] Arist. *Poet.* 1450b, 21-1452a, 11.

[22] Arist. *Poet.* 1452a, 22-1452b, 13.

[23] This would be the anagnorisis, a recognition of oneself (as in Sophocles' *Oedipus*).

[24] Arist. *Poet.* 1453b, 1-6: Ἔστιν μὲν οὖν τὸ φοβερὸν καὶ ἐλεεινὸν ἐκ τῆς ὄψεως γίγνεσθαι, ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς συστάσεως τῶν πραγμάτων, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πρότερον καὶ ποιητοῦ ἀμείνονος. δεῖ γὰρ καὶ ἄνευ τοῦ ὁρᾶν οὕτω συνεστάναι τὸν μῦθον ὥστε τὸν ἀκούοντα τὰ πράγματα γινόμενα καὶ φρίττειν καὶ ἐλεεῖν ἐκ τῶν συμβαινόντων.

his misfortune.[25] Even if, as Blockley says, "Gallus is too much a monster to evoke the necessary response", and despite him seeming to deserve his execution, Ammianus shows compassion for him in chapter 14.11. Indeed, in the next book he briefly refers to Gallus's execution in the following terms: *miserandam deleti Caesaris cladem* (15.2.1), "the pitiful downfall of the murdered Caesar". This ambiguity makes one think that despite everything perhaps Gallus did not deserve a death like the one he suffered. And that is precisely what leads to fear. If compassion is produced by an undeserved misfortune, fear arises when one sees a fellow man suffering, says Aristotle. Fear, in this case, is produced both by the authority of Constantius – before which everyone is the same, villains and heroes, like Gallus, Silvanus and Julian – and by the wheel of Fortune (14.11.29-30). Therefore it is possible, as has been pointed out several times,[26] that the purpose of compassion for Gallus is to serve as background for an even more negative assessment of Constantius. At the same time, the episode becomes another *exemplum* we can add to those of people that saw their fortunes change abruptly. As an aside, it is interesting to note that Constantius and Gallus are connected by kinship, a link that Aristotle's model of tragedy suggests employing in the effort to inspire compassion and pathos among the audience.[27]

Ethos, i.e. character,[28] must be good, and despite the protagonist's being similar to us he is better than we are.[29] Here is where Ammianus inverts the canonical rules of tragedy, since he turns the villain of book 14 into a tragic hero. The inversion is neither accidental nor a careless and clumsy mistake. As I have already stated, it is not just a moralising argument (the villain gets the end he deserves); rather, there is also compassion for the protagonist. Ammianus tries to communicate a message that seems ambiguous, just as its form does. On the one hand, in the end Adrastea punishes and changes the fortune of those that believed themselves invulnerable, *ultrix facinorum impiorum bonorumque praemiatrix* (14.11.25), "the chastiser of evil deeds and the rewarder of good actions"; in addition, years later Gallus's executioners – Scudilo and Barbatio – meet a horrible end (14.11.24: *uigilauit utrubique superni numinis aequitas*). On the other hand, everyone without exception must fear the inexorable action of the goddess and therefore pity

[25] Arist. *Poet.* 1453a, 4-6: ὁ μὲν γὰρ περὶ τὸν ἀνάξιόν ἐστιν δυστυχοῦντα, ὁ δὲ περὶ τὸν ὅμοιον, ἔλεος μὲν περὶ τὸν ἀνάξιον, φόβος δὲ περὶ τὸν ὅμοιον.

[26] G. Sabbah, *La méthode d'Ammien Marcellin : Recherches sur la construction du discours historique dans les Res Gestae*, Paris 1978, 456-63; R. C. Blockley, "Ammianus Marcellinus's Use of Exempla", *Florilegium* 13, 1994, 53-64; T. D. Barnes, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality*, Ithaca 1998, 131; Kelly, *Ammianus*, 47.

[27] Arist., *Poet.* 1453b, 15-22.

[28] Arist., *Poet.* 1450a, 5-6: [λέγω] τὰ δὲ ἤθη, καθ' ὃ ποιούς τινας εἶναί φαμεν τοὺς πράττοντας.

[29] Arist., *Poet.* 1454a, 16-17 and 24: Περὶ δὲ τὰ ἤθη τέτταρά ἐστιν ὧν δεῖ στοχάζεσθαι, ἓν μὲν καὶ πρῶτον, ὅπως χρηστὰ ᾖ ... τρίτον δὲ τὸ ὅμοιον.

the suffering even of the villain. This ambiguity can be understood in several ways, not completely contradictory to one another. The human being is a puppet in divine hands, and thus when we witness the drama in the protagonist of the tragedy we discover compassion arising in us, since we know that we too may also suffer the same blows of fate. At the same time, while the villain deserves to be punished for his abuses, he is still a human being and therefore his suffering can still arouse compassion in us. Julian's tragic death later on in the *Res Gestae* sheds light on this matter: divinity seems blind before a Gallus or a Julian. Beyond their behaviour, both are treated with a certain "equity", which provokes a deep perplexity in the historian, which is expressed in turn via the ambiguity of Caesar Gallus's end.

Dianoia, the expression of the thought, consists in saying out loud what is implied in an action, and which, in a tragedy, is spoken through the characters.[30] *Dianoia* is one of the forms for producing a variety of feelings in the audience, such as compassion and fear. In the case of the *Res Gestae*, a work in which characters very rarely express themselves in their own words, we must seek the thought of its characters in what passes through the filter of the narrator. That is, the *focalization* of the characters. In the present case, the change in points of view produces plenty of tragic ironies. As observers we receive information about what Gallus and Constantius know: the Augustus hides his real intentions while the Caesar, albeit suspicious, never fully understands the future that awaits him. Moreover, his ignorance is the result of a divine confusion (14.11.12): *utque solent manus iniectantibus fatis hebetari sensus hominum et obtundi, his illecebris ad meliorum exspectationen erectus egressusque Antiochia numine laeuo ductante prorsus ire tendebat de fumo, ut prouerbium loquitur uetus, ad flammam*. In 14.11.19 readers are allowed to see that the gods are already willing to condemn him to a wretched end: *pandente itaque uiam fatorum sorte tristissima*. The character's ignorance makes him suffer and therefore reinforces the pathos.

The employment of "stacked" tragic devices has led, as I have already pointed out, to the presence of a dramatic and pathetic structure in this whole passage; however, there has long been a certain reluctance to call it specifically tragic. Nonetheless, Ammianus ends the story of Gallus in an intentionally ambiguous fashion, making him the protagonist of a tragic outcome. The story of Gallus's execution seeks pathos and tragic irony in order to cause compassion and fear. The fact that Gallus has been presented as a villain up until that moment is part of that ambiguous meaning that Ammianus is looking to communicate. This time, the blurred limits between

[30] Arist. *Poet*. 1450a, 6-7: [λέγω] διάνοιαν δέ, ἐν ὅσοις λέγοντες ἀποδεικνύασίν τι ἢ καὶ ἀποφαίνονται γνώμην; 1456a, 36-37: ἔστι δὲ κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν ταῦτα, ὅσα ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου δεῖ παρασκευασθῆναι.

genres are very useful to the historian, so that he can demonstrate his perplexity: the historical discourse expresses Ammianus's cosmic uncertainty in a symbolic way.

3.3. Tragedy and comedy in the usurpation of Procopius (26.6-10)

The third example is found in book 26 – the usurpation of Procopius.[31] In book 25 we witness Julian's death, the end of the Persian expedition and the consequent peace with the enemy. The Augustus Jovianus surrenders several regions on the other side of the Tigris to them, as well as the important cities of Nisibis and Singara. The book ends abruptly with the premature death of Jovianus and the possibility of rebellions within the Empire. At the beginning of book 26 the troops choose Valentinian as the new Emperor, hitherto Tribune of the Second Division of the Imperial Guard (*Schola Scutariorum Secunda*). Thereupon Valentinian proclaims his brother Valens to be Augustus of the eastern part of the Empire (26.4) and they split up the troops: the former marches to Mediolanum and the latter to Constantinople (26.5.1-4). Soon after, Valentinian receives two pieces of bad news: new raids by the Germans in Gaul and the revolt of Procopius in the East (26.5.7-8). Ammianus then shows us the doubt that shakes the western Emperor, who does not know where to go first, for he has received rumours – obviously false – affirming the death of Valens (26.5.9-12). Finally, however, he makes a decision: he decides to confront the Germans first and to trust that his brother – still alive – will be able to confront the rebellious Procopius (26.5.13). The rest of book 26 is dedicated to a narration of Procopius's usurpation; the conflict against the Germans will be dealt with at the beginning of book 27.

As Matthews points out, the Procopius episode is "a most elegantly constructed narrative" and "a minor masterpiece of construction": "Ammianus has created a dramatic structure... by artful deployment of the factual material available to him".[32] The historian goes back in time to tell us what the origin of this usurper and his honours was. Ammianus reports a rumour stating that Julian has secretly named Procopius his successor in case the Persian campaign fails (26.6.1-3). The same rumour makes Procopius go into hiding, fearing possible retaliation from the new Augustus Jovian. He ends up staying in the house of a friendly senator in Chalcedon on the other side of the

[31] Regarding the attempts to legitimate the usurpers during the 4th century, see A. E. Wardman, "Usurpers and Internal Conflicts in the 4th Century A.D.", *Historia* 2, 1984, 220-37, which maintains that usurpations were a form of imperial succession in this age.

[32] J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*, London 1989, 191-2. This vision is not entirely shared by J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVI*, Leiden 2008, x, who hold that "[f]rom a narrative point of view the structure of Ammianus' account is excellent", but, on a historical plane, "Ammianus's description of the entire coup leaves much to be desired. It consists of a series of vivid individual episodes" (xi).

Bosphorus, whence he makes numerous incognito visits to Constantinople in order to take the political and social pulse of the city (26.6.4-6). Ammianus narrates the indignation of the city's inhabitants because of the abuses of the patrician Petronius, father-in-law of Valens, who grew rich through cruel hunts for defaulters on loans, bankrupting many households (26.6.7-9). Procopius sees an ideal opportunity to seize power when Valens, on his way to Syria, sends a contingent of infantry and cavalry to fight the Goths, who threaten to invade Thrace. The troops take a two-day break in Constantinople and Procopius tempts some of them to come to his side – the troops take the bribe and quickly proclaim him Emperor (26.6.11-14). After that comes an account of the grotesque proclamation of the usurper, shaped with powerful images: they cannot find clothes that fit him; they rush him through the city, almost flying; then, when he decides to talk – before an astonished populace – he is unable to articulate a single word; and the only people he finds in the Curia are some functionaries of low rank (26.6.15-18). Everything happens, as Ammianus says, *irrisione digna ... incaute ... et temere* ("in a deriding, unexpected and random fashion"), and yet *ad ingemiscendas erupisse rei publicae clades* ("broke out in lamentable disasters for the state", 26.6.19).

After taking control of Constantinople without resistance, Procopius seizes Thrace and attracts two of Valens' legions to his side, via stratagems rather than violence (26.7). After that, the rebels besiege and capture Nicaea and repel Valens' siege of Chalcedon; as a result, Bithynia falls completely under Procopius' control (26.8). The troops finally meet in Nacolia, Phrygia; the combat was evenly matched until one of Procopius' generals defected to the rival force. The usurper then escapes with two partners that later on betray him and deliver him to Valens. The Augustus executes Procopius along with his two partners (26.9); later, the usual purge of the supporters of the usurper takes place (26.10). Book 26 ends with a powerful image: a fateful tsunami devastates the Mediterranean.[33]

In the narration of Procopius's time as usurper, tragedy and comedy are mixed. The episode is composed as a usurpation that endangers the order of the Empire. The protagonist, Procopius, sees himself as almost inevitably forced to rebel, but even so his actions lead him to a tragic end. That

[33] As G. Kelly, "Ammianus and the Great Tsunami", *JRS* 94, 2004, 141-67 has already pointed out, it is not by chance that Ammianus decides to change the chronological order of events. When he puts the account of the tsunami at the end of the book, just after the defeat of Procopius and the purge, he produces a dramatic feeling that he could hardly have achieved if he had narrated the tsunami according to strict chronological criteria. We once again see Ammianus's skill as he constructs the historical discourse. This idea is briefly discussed by B. Bleckmann, "Vom Tsunami von 365 zum Mimas-Orakel: Ammianus Marcellinus als Zeithistoriker und die spätgriechische Tradition", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 7-31. Also den Boeft, Drijvers, den Hengst, Teitler, *Ammianus Marcellinus XXVI*, xiii point out the same issue.

said, it seems no different from the episode of Silvanus, the usurper of book 15. There are, nevertheless, some differences worth noting, because this time Ammianus uses comic devices that, when mixed with the tragic account, produce a burlesque farce.[34]

The key moment for this representation is the proclamation of Procopius as Augustus, in 26.6.14-20. The usurper goes to the public baths, where the garrisons that he bribed to proclaim him Emperor are gathered. There the soldiers see him more as a prisoner than as their superior (*admissus ... cum honore quidem, sed in modum tenebatur obsessi*, 26.6.14) and they clothe him in a particularly grotesque fashion while he passively lets them proceed, as narrated in a paragraph that is worth looking at in detail (26.6.15):

> Stetit itaque subtabidus – excitum putares ab inferis – nusquam reperto paludamento tunica auro distincta ut regius minister indutus a calce in pubem in paedagogiani pueri speciem purpureis opertus tegminibus pedum hastatusque purpureum itidem pannulum laeua manu gestabat, ut in theatrali scaena simulacrum quoddam insigne per aulaeum uel mimicam cauillationem subito putares emersum.
>
> So there he stood wasting away (you would think that he had come up from the lower world), and because a purple robe could nowhere be found, he was dressed in a gold-embroidered tunic, like an attendant at court, but from foot to waist he looked like a page in the service of the palace; he wore purple shoes on his feet, and bore a lance, and a small piece of purple cloth in his left hand; just as sometimes on the stage you might think that a splendidly decorated figure was suddenly made to appear as the curtain was raised, or through some deceptive mimicry.

Procopius is represented as an actor in a burlesque farce; he is no more than *simulacrum quoddam* ("some figure") hiding behind the curtain or *per mimicam cauillationem* ("through a scoffing mimicry"). Both *simulacrum* and *cauillationem* refer to a defective representation, even mocking in the second case.[35] To conclude this representation the next paragraph con-

[34] Matthews, *The Roman Empire*: "Procopius' elevation ... is characterised as a ridiculous piece of burlesque" (193-194). Also den Boeft, Drijvers, den Hengst, Teitler, *Ammianus Marcellinus XXVI*, x: "Ammianus spends the rest of Book 26 on an episodic description of the affair, of which the very first stage, up to and including the usurpation scene itself, emphasizes its farcical aspects; the author revels in a satirical sketch of the immediate sequel of events".

[35] The word *cauillatio* has a clear parodic sense. The word *simulacrum*, however, need not have any pejorative meaning, and can refer just to an "image". Nevertheless, even in its non-pejorative sense it can have a meaning similar to "shadow" or "ghost" (analogous to the Greek word εἴδωλον). However, there is also a pejorative use of *simulacrum* that does have the sense of mere imitation or even mockery. The *OLD* provides examples from Lucretius, Cicero, Virgil, Livy, Quintilian, Gellius and Tacitus. In the context of Ammianus's account it

tinues with the same idea: *ad hoc igitur dehonestamentum honorum omnium ludibriose sublatus* ("Raised in a laughable manner to this dishonour of all honours", 26.6.16); the shame and tragedy of a usurpation are mixed with laughter. The Dutch commentators wonder how it is possible that a revolt that started in such a ridiculous way became powerful enough to threaten the Emperors.[36] However (and even though Ammianus tries, not very successfully, to give an answer to that question through *exempla*: 26.6.19-20), perhaps it would be more appropriate to ask why the historian decides to represent the revolt as he does, even at the risk of appearing excessive.

It is worth pointing out that the idea of illusion or poor representation is a leitmotiv during almost the entire episode about Procopius: the events revert because of a delusion, things are not what they seem, or else they just resemble what they should be in a pathetic way.[37] Procopius wants to be Emperor but he merely looks like a parody of one; he disguises himself *ritu itaque sollertissimi cuiusdam speculatoris* ("after the fashion of some clever spy", 26.6.6) in order to investigate the political situation in Constantinople without being discovered; his followers are merely bribed mercenaries (26.6.13-14); his own supporters betray him and deliver him to Valens (26.9.9); there are several changes of side just before the combat between the rebels and the followers of Valens begins (26.7.17; 26.9.7). The scene in which he is proclaimed Augustus, which begins as we saw above, contains several moments of inversion and parody, as Matthews has already pointed out:[38] the shields of the soldiers that escort him clink against one another and resound while they protect against any potential throwing of stones or tiles (26.6.16), which recalls the way in which soldiers show joy on other occasions;[39] when he has to give his first imperial speech, he takes a long time just to haltingly say a few words; when he goes to the curia he just finds some functionaries of low station (*ignobilium paucitate inuenta*) and he enters the palace *pessimo pede* (26.6.18).

The end of the whole episode transpires under the appearance of an exemplary tragedy: Procopius committed the sin of *hybris*, unconscious of the changes of Fortune (*ultra homines sese Procopius efferens et ignorans, quod quiuis beatus uersa rota Fortunae ante uesperum potest esse miserrimus*, 26.8.13). He received his punishment when he was executed and the order of the Empire was restored. However, those who handed over Procopius are executed just after him. Next the usual trials of the supporters of a usurper begin. For Ammianus not all those who were convicted deserved

isn't unreasonable to interpret *cauillatio* as theatrical-burlesque vocabulary.

[36] den Boeft, Drijvers, den Hengst, Teitler, *Ammianus Marcellinus XXVI*, 125-6.

[37] This idea calls to mind Plautus's *Amphitruo* and Apuleius's *Metamorphoses*, but perhaps this is going too far.

[38] Matthews, *The Roman Empire*, 193-4.

[39] 15.8.15, 20.5.8, 21.5.9.

the fatal verdict: *saeuitum est in multos acrius, quam errata flagitauerant uel delicta* (26.10.6); moreover, those who were most ambitious accused innocent people so they could take their riches, "for the emperor, rather inclined himself to do injury, lent his ears to accusers, listened to death-dealing denunciations, and took unbridled joy in various kinds of executions" (*imperator enim promptior ad nocendum criminantibus patens et funereas delationes asciscens per suppliciorum diuersitates effrenatius exultauit*, 26.10.12). Nevertheless, the restored order is not the real peace of Rome, which some say was ruined by Procopius (*rebellem et oppugnatorem internae quietis, ut ferebatur*, 26.9.10).

The theatrical similes reinforce the reference to the tragic and comic genres. It is not, of course, accidental that Ammianus decided to paint the power struggles in the post-Julian era in this way. On this occasion, the original meaning of a tragedy – moving the audience to compassion and fear – also leads to a sardonic laugh, to pathetic histrionics. The continuous reversions and parodies throughout the episode reflect a world turned upside down.[40] The tragedy of the Empire is represented by comic actors, the Emperors that are supposed to represent the law actually enjoy executions more than justice – tragedy is not completely tragedy nor is comedy completely comedy. This reflected world, in which nothing is what it seems nor what it should be, reveals a clash between the idealism of the narrator and the reality that surrounds him. Ammianus looks for models of ideal behaviour, and thus constantly uses *exempla* that validate or condemn the actions of his characters. This idealistic attitude makes the encounter with political and social reality disappointing. The author demonstrates this through his transformation of a tragedy into a comedy, through grimace, mockery and pessimistic exasperation. It has its positive aspects as well, but he focuses his attention on the negative facets, on that which is far from the ideal. The account of Julian's administration is different: the positive aspects overcome the disappointment of the narrator. Nevertheless, as the narration progresses the discouragement of the historian becomes more obvious. Now, at the beginning of the last hexade, Procopius's usurpation is stripped of all dignity; the actors are just *simulacra*, shadows of the ideal.[41] The tragedy of a usurpation has

[40] There are several studies about the inversion of values in the world that Ammianus represents through satire and a carnivalesque atmosphere. The most famous example of this reading is Auerbach, *Mimesis*, although there are more recent examples, such as R. Rees, "Ammianus Satiricus", in J. W. Drijvers, D. Hunt (eds.), *The Late Roman World and Its Historian: Intrepreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London 1999, 141-55, and the article by Sánchez-Ostiz in the present volume.

[41] The introduction to den Boeft, Drijvers, den Hengst, Teitler, *Ammianus Marcellinus XXVI* points out the contrast between the beginning of this hexade and the previous one, whose protagonist was Julian. In addition, the joint volume J. Den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. Den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007 refers in its title to a difference be-

been corrupted with comedy, just as there is nothing left of the ideal government except usurpers and semi-monstrous Emperors.

4. Conclusions

The study of intertextuality in Ammianus has in the past been limited by several factors: first, aesthetic assessments that did not take into consideration the meaning of the allusions, and second, the exclusion of extra-verbal references. In this paper, however, I have analysed Ammianus's intertextuality from a more global perspective. The use of specific literary forms in the *Res Gestae* conveys a meaning. In particular, when Ammianus inverts an *adlocutio* in 14.7 and a tragedy in 14.11, and when he combines tragic and comic elements in 26.6-9, he is communicating messages that help to describe his characters and to convey part of his historiographical *Weltanschauung*. Gallus's intervention in 14.7 inverts the usual symbolic content of this type of speech and thereby characterises Gallus as a dreadful ruler. The inversion of a tragedy in 14.11 fulfils two functions. On the one hand, it makes Constantius into the main villain of the story and, on the other hand, it communicates part of the historian's own interpretation of divine action and the perplexity it produces in him. Finally, the mix of tragedy and comedy in 26.6-9 portrays the participants as mimes in a grotesque work and, at the same time, reveals Ammianus's discouragement about the state of the Empire.

The results of my investigation also reinforce the idea that Ammianus has carefully built his style at several levels. Furthermore, the aesthetic elements of the *Res Gestae* are revealed as being historiographical as well, since it is not possible to grasp ancient historiography without understanding the specific form in which it is written. Moreover, the meaning of the historical work is deduced not just from the narrated events, but also from the plot – understood as the narrative form used, the *syuzhet* of Russian Formalists.[42] Therefore, far from being an obstacle to an inquiry into history, literary analysis is the *condicio sine qua non* for reaching a complete understanding.

Given the results of my research, the way is open for future research to ask whether Ammianus inverts the elements of the historical text in a systematic or isolated way. In this paper, I have identified three specific examples, but it is highly likely that a more in-depth study would produce similar results that would permit the opening of new perspectives. Without going any further, it is easy to see how the tragic genre also features in stories about

tween books about Julian and other, post-Julian books.

[42] The distinction between *fabula* and *syuzhet* has become paradigmatic in narratological studies. Its origin can be found in the works of Viktor Shklovsky and Boris Tomashevsky (for an English translation with commentaries, see L. T. Lemon, M. J. Reis (eds.), *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, Lincoln 1965).

characters such as Silvanus and Julian – with more detail in the latter case – and the genre of memoirs in the historian's expedition to the city of Amida.[43]

[43] 18.6–19.8.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

R. A. Abdy, A. Dowler, *Coins and the Bible*, London 2013.
W. Adler, "Alexander Polyhistor's 'Peri Ioudaiōn' and Literary Culture in Republican Rome", in S. Inowlocki, C. Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius*, Leiden 2011, 225-40.
A. Alvar, *Décimo Máximo Ausonio. Obras*, Madrid 1990.
J. André, *Anonyme latin. Traité de physiognomonie*, Paris 1981.
O. Andrei, "Canons chronologiques et Histoire ecclésiastique", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 33-82.
A. Assmann, *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*, Munich 1999.
J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich 1992.
P. Athanassiadi, *Julian and Hellenism: An Intellectual Biography*, Oxford 1981.
E. Auerbach, *Mimesis: Dargestelle Wirklichkeit in der abendländischen Literatur*, Bern 1942.
N. Aujoulat, "Eusébie, Héléne et Julien, I : Le témoignage de Julien", *Byzantion* 53, 1983, 78-103.
N. Aujoulat, "Eusébie, Héléne et Julien, II : Le témoignage des historiens", *Byzantion* 53, 1983, 421-52.
N. J. E. Austin, *Ammianus on Warfare: An Investigation into Ammianus' Military Knowledge*, Brussels 1979.
N. J. E. Austin, N. B. Rankov, *Exploratio: Military and Political Intelligence in the Roman World from the Second Punic War to the Battle of Adrianople*, London 1995.
J. J. Ayán Calvo, *Ignacio de Antioquía. Cartas. Policarpo de Esmirna. Carta*, Madrid 1999.
C. Badel, "Adventus et Salutatio", in A. Bérenguer, E. Perrin-Saminadayar (eds.), *Les entrées royales et Impériales : Histoire, representation et diffusion d'une cérémonie publique de l'Orient ancien à Byzance*, Paris 2009, 157-75.

R. S. Bagnall, A. Cameron, S. R. Schwartz, K. A. Worp, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta 1987.
T. D. Barnes, "The Composition of Eusebius' 'Onomasticon'", *JThS* 26, 1975, 412-5.
T. D. Barnes, "The Editions of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*", *GRBS* 21, 1980, 191-201.
T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge 1981.
T. D. Barnes, "Panegyric, History and Hagiography in Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*", in R. Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, Cambridge 1989, 94-123.
T. D. Barnes, "New year 363 in Ammianus Marcellinus: Annalistic Technique and Historical Apologetics", in J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Cognitio Gestorum: The Historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Amsterdam 1992, 1-8.
T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge 1993.
T. D. Barnes, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality*, Ithaca 1998.
T. D. Barnes, *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire*, Chichester 2011.
W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, Tübingen 1934.
A. Berland-Bajard, *Les spectacles aquatiques Romains*, Rome 2006.
J. Bernardi, "Les successeurs immediats de Saint Pierre a Rome s'appelaient-ils Clet et Anaclet?", *Augustinianum* 41, 2001, 287-90.
H. W. Bird, "Julian and Aurelius Victor", *Latomus* 55, 1996, 870-4.
B. Bitton-Ashkelony, *Encountering the Sacred: The Debate on Christian Pilgrimage in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley 2005.
B. Bleckmann, "Vom Tsunami von 365 zum Mimas-Orakel: Ammianus Marcellinus als Zeithistoriker und die spätgriechische Tradition", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 7-31.
R. C. Blockley, *Ammianus Marcellinus: A Study of his Historiography and Political Thought*, Brussels 1975.
R. C. Blockley, "Constantius II and His Generals", in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II*, Brussels 1980, 467-86.
R. C. Blockley, "Ammianus Marcellinus's Use of *Exempla*", *Florilegium* 13, 1994, 53-64.
R. C. Blockley, "Ammianus Marcellinus and his Classical Background: Changing Perspectives", *IJCT* 2, 1996, 455-66.
R. C. Blockley, "Ammianus and Cicero: The Epilogue of the History as a Literary Statement", *Phoenix* 52, 1998, 305-14.

S. Bocci, *Ammiano Marcellino XXVIII e XXIX: Problemi storici e storiografici*, Rome 2013.
J. den Boeft, "*Non consolandi gratia, sed probrose monendi* (Res Gestae 28.1.4): The Hazards of (Moral) Historiography", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 293-311.
J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XX*, Groningen 1987.
J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXI*, Groningen 1991.
J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVI*, Leiden 2008.
J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVII*, Leiden 2009.
J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXVIII*, Leiden 2011.
W. den Boer, "The Emperor Silvanus and His Army", *AClass* 3, 1960, 105-9.
U. Bouriant, "Fragments du texte grec du livre d'Énoch et de quelques écrits attribués à saint Pierre", *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire, IX, fasc. 1*, Paris 1892.
G. W. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate*, London 1978.
G. W. Bowersock, *Hellenism in Late Antiquity*, Ann Arbor 1990.
K. D. Bowes, *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2008.
A. Brandt, *Moralische Werte in den Res gestae des Ammianus Marcellinus*, Göttingen 1999.
H. C. Brennecke, "Die Kirche als διαδοχαὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων: Das Programm der ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία des Euseb von Caesarea (Eus., h.e. I 1)", in O. Wischmeyer, E. M. Becker (eds.), *Was ist ein Text?*, Tübingen 2001, 81-93.
S. Brock, "Eusebius and Syriac Christianity", in H. W. Attridge, H. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Leiden 1992, 212-34.
P. R. L. Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*, Madison 1992.
R. Browning, *The Emperor Julian*, London 1975.
P. Bruun, "The Christian Signs on the Coins of Constantine", *Arctos* 3, 1962, 5-35.
K. Büchner, *M. Tullius Cicero. De re publica: Kommentar*, Heidelberg 1984.

R. W. Burgess, "The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' 'Chronici Canones' and 'Historia Ecclesiastica'", *JThS* 48, 1997, 471-504.
R. W. Burgess, "A Common Source for Jerome, Eutropius, Festus, Ammianus, and the *Epitome de Caesaribus* between 358 and 378, along with further Thoughts on the Date and Nature of the *Kaisergeschichte*", *CPh* 100, 2005, 166-92.
R. W. Burgess, W. Witakowski, *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*, Stuttgart 1999.
P. Burke, "The Monarchical Episcopate at the End of the First Century", *JES* 7, 1970, 499-518.
M. Caltabiano, "I trionfi di Costanzo II", *Studi di antichità in memoria di Clementina Gatti*, Milan 1987, 37-46.
M. Caltabiano, "Il carattere delle digressioni nelle Res gestae di Ammiano Marcellino", in A. Garzya (ed.), *Metodologie della ricerca sulla tarda antichità: Atti del Primo Convegno dell'Associazione di Studi Tardoantichi*, Naples 1989, 289-96.
M. Caltabiano, *L'Epistolario di Giuliano Imperatore: saggio storico, traduzione, note e testo in appendice*, Naples 1991.
M. Caltabiano, "Un decennio di studi sull'imperatore Giuliano", *Κοινωνία* 17, 1993, 143-72.
M. Caltabiano, "Giuliano l'Apostata e Costantino: rottura o continuità?", (forthcoming).
A. Cameron, "The Roman Friends of Ammianus", *JRS* 54, 1964, 15-28.
A. Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome*, Oxford 2011.
A. Cameron, S. G. Hall, *Eusebius. Life of Constantine*, Oxford 1999.
P. M. Camus, *Ammien Marcellin: Témoin des courants culturels et religieux à la fin du IVe siècle*, Paris 1967.
C. Caprino et alii, La colonna di Marco Aurelio, Rome 1955.
D. Carr, "Narrative and the Real World: An Argument for Continuity", *History and Theory* 25, 1986, 117-31.
A. J. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, Leiden 2003.
R. A. G. Carson, *Coins of the Roman Empire*, London 1989.
E. Cary, *Dio's Roman history. On the basis of the version of Herbert Baldwin Foster. Vol. 8: Books LXI-LXX*, London 1925.
E. L. E. Caspar, *Die älteste römische Bischofsliste: Kritische Studien zum Formproblem des eusebianischen Kanons sowie zur Geschichte der ältesten Bischofslisten und ihrer Entstehung aus apostolischen Sukzessionenreihen*, Berlin 1926.
C. Castillo, "Amiano Marcelino historiador", in C. Alonso del Real *et al.* (eds.), *Urbs aeterna*, Pamplona 2003, 4-20.
C. Castillo, "Amiano entre historia y sátira (Res gestae XIV 6)", in A. Alvar, J. F. González (eds.), *Actas del XI Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, Madrid 2006, 87-93.

A. Cerri, "Il viaggio di Giuliano Cesare nelle Gallie (Dicembre 355)", *RIL* 106, 1972, 567-78.
P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque : Histoire des mots*, Paris 1983-1984^2.
A. Chauvot, "Détail et representation de la réalitè dans les Res Gestae d'Ammien Marcelin", *Ktèma* 37, 2012, 227-37.
G. F. Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories*, Macon 1986^2.
D. N. Christodoulou, *The Figures of Ancient Gods on the Coinage of Constantine the Great (306-326 AD)*, Athens 1996.
C. U. Clark, *The Text Tradition of Ammianus Marcellinus*, New Haven 1904.
R. S. Coleman, *Embedded Letters in Acts and in Jewish and Hellenistic Literature*, Doct. Thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary 1994.
R. H. Connolly, "Eusebius H. E. V. 28", *JThS* 49, 1948, 73-9.
S. Conti, "Da eroe a dio: la concezione teocratica del potere in Giuliano", *AntTard* 17, 2009, 119-26.
R. Crawley, *Thucydides. The History of the Peloponnesian War*, Auckland 1874.
U. Criscuolo, "Giuliano e l'Ellenismo: conservazione e riforma", *Orpheus* 7, 1986, 272-92.
B. Croke, "Late Antique Historiography, 250-650 CE", in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Malden 2007, 567-81.
F. J. D'Angelo, "The Rhetoric of Ekphrasis", *JAC* 18, 1998, 439-47.
K. Dahmen, *The Legend of Alexander the Great on Greek and Roman Coins*, London 2007.
K. Dahmen, "Alexander in Gold and Silver: Reassessing Third Century AD Medallions from Aboukir and Tarsos", *AJN* 20, 2008, 493-546.
K. Dahmen, B. Weisser, "Goldene Alexander zum Geschenk", in S. Drougou (ed.), *Κερμάτια Φιλίας : τιμητικός τόμος για τον Ιωάννη Τουράτσογλου*, Athens 2009, 343-59.
E. Dassmann, "Zur Enstehung des Monoepiskopats", *JAC* 17, 1974, 74-90.
E. Dassmann, "Hausgemeinde und Bischofsamt", in E. Dassmann, K. Thraede (eds.), *Vivarium: Festschrift Theodor Klauser zum 90. Geburtstag*, Münster 1984, 82-97.
G. De Bonfils, *Ammiano Marcellino e l'imperatore*, Bari 1986.
R. J. Deferrari, *Eusebius Pamphili. Ecclesiastical History, Books 1-5*, Washington 1953.
A. Degrassi, *I fasti consolari dell'Impero dal 30 avanti Cristo al 613 dopo Cristo*, Rome 1952.
A. Demandt, *Zeitkritik und Geschichtsbild im Werk Ammians*, Bonn 1965.
J. L. Desnier, "Renaissance taurine", *Latomus* 44, 1985, 402-9.

D. DeVore, "Genre and Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*: Toward a Focused Debate", in A. Johnson, J. Schott (eds.), *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*, Washington 2013, 19-45.
L. Di Segni, "The 'Onomasticon' of Eusebius and the Madaba Map", in M. Piccirillo, E. Alliata (eds.), *The Madaba Map Centenary 1897–1997: Travelling Through the Byzantine Umayyad Period*, Jerusalem 1999, 115-20.
C. Di Spigno, "Studi su Ammiano Marcellino. Il regno di Costanzo II. Il Cesarato di Giuliano", *Helikon* 2, 1962, 442-64.
I. Didu, "Magno Magnenzio: Problemi cronologici ed ampiezza della sua usurpazione. I dati epigrafici", *CS* 14, 1977, 11-56.
M. DiMaio Jr, J. Zeuge, N. Zotov, "*Ambiguitas Constantiniana*: the *Caeleste Signum Dei* of Constantine the Great", *Byzantion* 58, 1988, 333-60.
H. Dressel, *Fünf Goldmedaillons aus dem Funde von Abukir*, Berlin 1906.
J. W. Drijvers, "Abgarsage", in W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen. II. Apostolisches Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*, Tübingen 1987[5], 389-95.
J. W. Drijvers, "Ammianus on the revolt of Firmus", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, 2007, 129-55.
A. J. Droge, "The Apologetic Dimensions of the *Ecclesiastical History*", in H. W. Attridge, G. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Detroit 1992, 492-509.
D. Dueck, *Geography in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge 2012.
P. Dufraigne, "Quelques remarques sur l'*adventus* chez Ammien Marcellin et les panègyristes", in L. Holtz, J. C. Fredouille, M.-H. Jullien (eds.), *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes: Mélanges offerts à J. Fontaine*, París 1992, 497-509.
P. Dufraigne, *Adventus Augusti, adventus Christi : Recherche sur l'exploitation idéologique et littéraire d'un cérémonial dans l'antiquité tardive*, Paris 1994.
S. Dušanić, "Julian's Strategy in AD361", *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 41, 2004, 55-66.
Y.-M. Duval, "La venue à Rome de l'empereur Constance II en 357, d'après Ammien Marcellin (XVI, 10, 1-20)", *Caesarodunum* 5, 1970, 299-304.
R. O. Edbrooke, Jr., "The Visit of Constantius II to Rome in 357 and Its Effect on the Pagan Roman Senatorial Aristocracy", *AJPh* 97, 1976, 40-61.
P. M. Edo, *El Evangelio de Pedro. Fragmento de Akhmîm. Introducción, texto bilingüe y notas*, Salamanca 2015.
Y. Elitsur, *Ancient Place Names in the Holy Land: Preservation and History*, Jerusalem 2004.

S. Elm, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*, Berkeley 2012.
J. Elsner, "The Genres of *ekphrasis*", *Ramus* 31, 2002, 1-18.
H. Elton, *Warfare in Roman Europe AD 350-425*, Oxford 1996.
C. G. A. Erfurdt, J. A. Wagner, *Ammiani Marcellini quae supersunt, cum notis integris Frid. Lindenbrogii, Henr. et Hadr. Valesiorum et Iac. Gronovii, quibus Thom. Reinesii quasdam et suas adiecit Io. Augusti. Wagner. Editionem absolvit Car. Gottlob Aug. Erfurdt*, Leipzig 1808.
S. Estiot, *Monnaies de l'Empire romain. XII.1 : D'Aurélien à Florien (270-276 après J.-C.)*, Paris 2004.
E. C. Evans, "Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography", *HSCPh* 46, 1935, 43-84.
E. C. Evans, "Studies of Physiognomy in the Second Century A.D.", *TAPhA* 72, 1941, 96-108.
E. C. Evans, "Physiognomics in the Roman Empire", *CJ* 45, 1950, 277-82.
M. Festy, *Sextus Aurelius Victor. Abrégé des Césars*, Paris 1999.
J. Fontaine, "Ammien Marcellin, historien romantique", *BAGB* 28, 1969, 417-35.
J. Fontaine, "Unité et diversité du mélange des genres et des tons chez quelques écrivains latins de la fin du IVe siècle : Ausone, Ambroise, Ammien", in M. Fuhrmann (ed.), *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'Antiquité tardive en Occident. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique. Fondation Hardt*, Geneva 1977, 425-72.
C. W. Fornara, "The Prefaces of Ammianus Marcellinus", in M. Griffith, D. J. Mastronarde (eds.), *Cabinet of the Muses: Studies in Honor of T. G. Rosenmeyer*, Atlanta 1990.
C. W. Fornara, "Studies in Ammianus Marcellinus: II: Ammianus' Knowledge and Use of Greek and Latin Literature", *Historia* 41, 1992, 420-38.
P. Foster, *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary*, Leiden 2010.
C. Fouquet, "L'hellénisme de l'empereur Julien", *BAGB* 2, 1981, 192-202.
E. Fournier, "The Adventus of Julian at Sirmium: The Literary Construction of Historical Reality", in R. M. Frakes, E. DePalma Digeser, J. Stephens (eds.), *The Rhetoric of Power in Late Antiquity: Religion and Politics in Byzantium, Europe, and the Early Islamic World*, London 2010, 13-45.
A. Fraschetti, *La conversione. Da Roma pagana a Roma cristiana*, Roma 1999.
P. M. Fraser, *Cities of Alexander the Great*, Oxford 1996.
G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville, R. L. Chapman III, J. E. Taylor, *The Onomasticon by Eusebius of Caesarea: Palestine in the Fourth Century A.D.*, Jerusalem 2003.

T. Fuhrer, F. Mundt, J. R. Stenger (eds.), *Cityscaping: Constructing and Modelling Images of the City*, Berlin 2015.
M. García Ruiz, *Claudio Mamertino. Panegírico (Gratiarum actio) al emperador Juliano*, Pamplona 2006.
M. García Ruiz, "Eusebia vista por Amiano: un retrato entre líneas", *CFCEL* 2, 2008, 49-64.
O. L. von Gebhardt, *Das Evangelium und die Apokalypse des Petrus: Die neuentdeckten Bruchstücke nach einer Photographie der Handschrift zu Gizeh in Lichtdruck herausgegeben*, Leipzig 1893.
G. Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, transl. by C. Newman and C. Doubinsky, Lincoln 1997.
D. E. Gershenson, "Coryphaion, Cephalorion, and Rhosos", *JQR* 89, 1998, 127-30.
E. H. Gifford, *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae praeparationis libri XV*, Oxford 1903.
F. D. Gilliard, "Notes on the Coinage of Julian the Apostate", *JRS* 54, 1964, 135-41.
F. Gnecchi, "Contibuzione al Corpus Numorum", *RIN* 3, 1890, 199-206.
A. Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin : Recherches sur l'art officiel de l'empire d'Orient*, Paris 1936.
A. Grafton, M. Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*, Cambridge 2006.
C. Grandvallet, "Le prince et le philosophe: Gallien et la pensée de Plotin", *Cahiers Numismatiques* 152, 2002, 23-45.
R. M. Grant, *Eusebius as a Church Historian*, Oxford 1980.
S. H. Griffith, "Ephraem the Syrian's Hymns 'Against Julian': Meditations on History and Imperial Power", *VChr* 41, 1987, 238-66.
D. E. Groh, "The *Onomasticon* of Eusebius and the Rise of Christian Palestine", *Studia Patristica* 18, 1985, 23-31.
M. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, transl. and ed. by L.A. Coser, Chicago 1992.
A. von Harnack, *Die Zeit des Ignatius und die Chronologie der antiochenischen Bischöfe bis Tyrannus nach Julius Africanus und den Späteren Historikern*, Leipzig 1878.
N. Henck, "Constantius' Paideia, Intellectual Milieu and Promotion of the Liberal Arts", *PCPhS* 47, 2001, 172-87.
J. R. Henderson, "Defining the Genre of the Letter: Juan Luis Vives' *De Conscribendis Epistolis*", *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* 19, 1983, 89-105.
J. R. Henderson, "Humanism and the Humanities: Erasmus's Opus *de conscribendis epistolis* in Sixteenth-Century Schools", in C. Poster, L. C. Mitchell (eds.), *Letter-Writing Manuals from Antiquity to the Present: Historical and Bibliographic Studies*, Columbia 2007, 141-77.

D. den Hengst, "Literary Aspects of Ammianus' Second Digression on Rome", in J. den Boeft, H. J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 159-79.
M. Hertz, "Aulus Gellius und Ammianus Marcellinus", *Hermes* 8, 1874, 257-302.
S. E. Hijmans, *Sol: The Sun in the Art and Religions of Rome*, Doct. Thesis, Univ. Groningen 2009.
D. Hollard, F. López Sánchez, *Le chrisme et le phénix : Images monétaires et mutations idéologiques au IVe siècle*, Bordeaux 2014.
F. L. Holt, *Alexander the Great and the Mystery of the Elephant Medallions*, Berkeley 2003.
C. Horton (ed.), *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels – The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel P45*, London 2004.
M. Hose, "Appian und Ammian: Griechisches historisches Denken in zwei Sprachen", in J. B. Torres (ed.), *Utroque sermone nostro: bilinguismo social y literario en el imperio de Roma*, Pamplona 2011, 99-114.
E. D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire AD 312-460*, Oxford 1982.
L. W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*, Grand Rapids 2003.
J. C. Iglesias Zoido, "Acercamiento a la polémica sobre Tucídides I, 22, 2", *AEF* 12, 1989, 125-32.
J. C. Iglesias Zoido, *La argumentación en los discursos deliberativos de Tucídides y su relación con la normativa retórica del siglo IV*, Cáceres 1995.
S. Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors: His Citation Technique in an Apologetic Context*, Leiden 2006.
S. Inowlocki, C. Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius: Collected Papers on Literary, Historical, and Theological Issues*, Leiden 2011.
B. H. Isaac, "Eusebius and the Geography of Roman Provinces", in B. H. Isaac, *The Near East under Roman Rule: Selected Papers*, Leiden 1998, 284-309.
A. M. Javierre, "El 'Diadochen Epoiesamen' de Hegesipo y la primera lista papal", *Salesianum* 21, 1959, 237-53.
F. W. Jenkins, "Theatrical Metaphors in Ammianus Marcellinus", *Eranos* 85, 1987, 55-63.
A. P. Johnson, *Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius' Praeparatio Evangelica*, Oxford 2006.
A. P. Johnson, "Eusebius' Polemic against Porphyry: A Reassessment", in S. Inowlocki, C. Zamagni (eds.), *Reconsidering Eusebius*, Leiden 2011, 119-50.

E. Junod, "Eusèbe de Césarée, Sérapion d'Antioche et l'Évangile de Pierre : D'un évangile à un pseudépigraphe", *RSLR*, 1988, 3-16.
E. Junod, "'Pseudépigraphe' (ψευδεπίγραφος) chez Denys D'Halicarnasse et Sérapion D'Antioche : Les premiers emplois d'un terme rare", *WST* 20, 2007, 177-84.
W. E. Kaegi, "The Emperor Julian at Naissus", *AC* 44, 1975, 161-71.
J. Karst, *Eusebius Werke. Die Chronik aus dem armenischen übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar*, Leipzig 1911.
C. Kelly, "Crossing the Frontiers: Imperial Power in the Last Books of Ammianus", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 271-92.
G. Kelly, "The New Rome and the Old: Ammianus Marcellinus' Silences on Constantinople", *CQ* 53, 2003, 588-607.
G. Kelly, "Ammianus and the Great Tsunami", *JRS* 94, 2004, 141-67.
G. Kelly, "'To Forge Their Tongues to Grander Styles': Ammianus' Epilogue", in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Malden 2007, 474-80.
G. Kelly, "The Sphragis and Closure of the Res gestae", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus after Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 219-41.
G. Kelly, *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian*, Cambridge 2008.
G. Kelly, "Ammianus' Greek Accent", *Talanta: Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 45, 2014, 97-114.
H. Kemler, "Hegesipps römische Bischofsliste", *VChr* 25, 1971, 182-96.
M. S. Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400-1500*, Manchester 2011.
G. A. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*, Princeton 1983.
G. A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, Chapel Hill 1999[2].
J. P. C. Kent, "Notes on Some Fourth Century Coin Types", *NC* 14, 1954, 216-7.
D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990.
R. Klein, "Der Rombesuch des Kaisers Constantius II. in Jahre 357", *Athenaeum* 47, 1979, 98-115.
R. Klein, "Die Entwicklung der christlichen Palästinawallfahrt in konstantinischer Zeit", *RQ* 85, 1990, 145-81.
E. Klostermann, *Eusebius Werke. 3.1: Das Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen*, Leipzig 1904.

H. P. Kohns, "Die Zeitkritik in den Romexkursen des Ammianus Marcellinus. Zu Amm.Marc. 14,6,3-26; 28,4,6-35", *Chiron* 5, 1975, 485-91.
J. König, T. Whitmarsh, "Ordering Knowledge", in J. König, T. Whitmarsh (eds.), *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge 2007, 3-39.
P. J. Kosmin, *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire*, Cambridge 2014.
P. Kovács, *Marcus Aurelius' Rain Miracle and the Marcomannic Wars*, Leiden 2009.
T. J. Kraus, T. Nicklas, *Das Petrusevangelium und die Petrusapokalypse: Die griechischen Fragmente mit deutscher und englischer Übersetzung*, Berlin 2004.
S. Kuehn, *The Dragon in Medieval East Christian and Islamic Art*, Leiden 2011.
M. Kulikowski, "Coded Polemic in Ammianus Book 31 and the Date and Place of its Composition", *JRS* 102, 2012, 79-102.
K. Lake, J. E. L. Oulton, H. J. Lawlor, *Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History*, London 1925-1926.
R. Leeb, *Konstantin und Christus: Die Verchristlichung der imperialen Repräsentation unter Konstantin dem Grossen als Spiegel seiner Kirchenpolitik und seines Selbstverständnisses als christlicher Kaiser*, Berlin 1992.
J. Lehnen, *Adventus principis: Untersuchungen zu Sinngehalt und Zeremoniell der Kaiserankunft in den Städten des Imperium Romanum*, Frankfurt am Main 1997.
L. T. Lemon, M. J. Reis (eds.), *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, Lincoln 1965.
H. Leppin, *Von Constantin dem Großen zu Theodosius II.: Das christliche Kaisertum bei den Kirchenhistorikern Socrates, Sozomenus und Theodoret*, Göttingen 1996.
H. Leppin, "The Church Historians (I): Socrates, Sozomenus, and Theodoretus", in G. Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, Leiden 2003, 219-54.
Y. Leroy, "L'Evangile de Pierre et la notion d'"hétérodoxie' : Sérapion d'Antioche, Eusèbe de Césarée et les autres", *RBi* 114, 2007, 80-98.
S. N. C. Lieu, *The Emperor Julian: Panegyric and Polemic*, Liverpool 1989.
A. Lippold, *Die Historia Ausgusta*, Stuttgart 1998.
A. Lods, "L'Évangile et l'Apocalypse de Pierre publiés pour la première fois d'après les photographies du manuscript de Gizéh", *Mémories publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire, IX, fasc. 3*, Paris 1893, .
E. Lohse, "Die Entstehung des Bischofsamtes in der frühen Christenheit", *ZNTW* 71, 1980, 58-73.

F. López Sánchez, "La serpiente androcéfala y la dependencia de Rávena con respecto a los visigodos (425-465 d.C.)", *NAC* 36, 2007, 309-44.
J. Lössl, *The Early Church: History and Memory*, London 2010.
A. Louth, "The Date of Eusebius' 'Historia Ecclesiastica'", *JThS* 41, 1990, 111-23.
A. Louth, "Eusebius and the Birth of Church History", in F. Young, L. Ayres, A. Louth (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, Cambridge 2004, 266-74.
S. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley 1981.
R. MacMullen, "Some Pictures in Ammianus Marcellinus", *Art Bulletin* 46, 1964, 435-57.
A. Manieri, *L'immagine poetica nella teoria degli antichi. Phantasia ed enargeia*, Pisa-Roma 1988.
M. Mansi (ed.), *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Graz 1960-1962 (=1759-1798) .
J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge 1997.
R. A. Markus, "How on Earth Could Places Become Holy? Origins of the Christian Idea of Holy Places", *JECS* 2, 1994, 257-72.
E. J. Martin, *A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy*, London 1930.
M. Martínez Pastor, "Amiano Marcelino, escritor romano del siglo IV. Perfil literario", *EClas* 102, 1992, 91-114.
I. G. Mastrorosa, "Ammiano Marcellino e l'oratoria forense tardorepubblicana: un antidoto contro 'pravitas' giudiziaria dell'età di Valente?", in F. Leonardelli, G. Rossi (eds.), *Officina humanitatis: Studi in onore di Lia de Finis*, Trento 2010, 87-98.
A. Matthews, *The Kaiserchronik: A Medieval Narrative*, Oxford 2012.
J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*, London 1989.
J. Matthews, "Ammianus on Roman Law and Lawyers", in J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Cognitio Gestorum: The historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Amsterdam 1992, 47-57.
J. Maurice, *Constantin le Grand : L'origine de la civilization chrétienne*, Paris 1925.
M. Mazza, "Filosofia religiosa ed 'Imperium' in Giuliano", in B. Gentili (ed.), *Giuliano Imperatore. Atti del convegno della S.I.S.A.C., Messina, 3 aprile 1984*, Urbino 1986, 39-108.
S. Mazzarino, *Aspetti sociali del quarto secolo*, Roma 1951.
L. M. McDonald, *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority*, Peabody 2007.
A. C. McGiffert, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Second Series. Vol. 1. Eusebius. Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine*, Buffalo 1890.

H. Merkel, *La pluralité des Evangiles comme problème théologique et exégétique dans l'Eglise ancienne*, Bern 1978.
B. M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*, Oxford 1987.
H. Michael, *De Ammiani Marcellini studiis Ciceronianis*, Bratislava 1874.
L. Miguélez-Cavero, "Espectáculos acuáticos en las *Dionisíacas* de Nono de Panópolis: ¿Reflejo de una realidad, ficción literaria o necesidad retórica?", in A. J. Quiroga Puertas (ed.), *Ἱερά καὶ λόγοι. Estudios de literatura y de religión en la Antigüedad Tardía*, Zaragoza 2001, 193-229.
A. Mirkovic, *Prelude to Constantine: The Abgar Tradition in Early Christianity*, Frankfurt 2004.
A. Momigliano, "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.", in A. Momigliano (ed.), *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford 1963, 79-99.
A. Momigliano, "The Lonely Historian Ammianus Marcellinus", *ASNP* 3, 1974, 1393-407.
A. Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*, Berkeley 1990.
T. Mommsen, *A History of Rome under the Emperors*, transl. by Clare Krojzl, intr. by Thomas Wiedemann, London 1996 (=1882-1886).
I. Moreno Ferrero, "La escenografía del mal en Amiano Marcelino", (forthcoming).
S. Morlet, "L'introduction de l'*Historie ecclésiastique* d'Eusèbe de Césarée (HE I, ii-iv) : Étude génetique, littéraire et rhétorique", *REA* 52, 2006, 167-98.
S. Morlet, "Eusèbe de Césarée : Biographie, chronologie, profil intellectual", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 1-31.
S. Morlet, L. Perrone, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012.
A. Müller, "Militaria aus Ammianus Marcellinus", *Philologus* 64, 1905, 573-632.
C. Munier, "A propos d'Ignace d'Antioche : Observations sur la liste épiscopale d'Antioche", *RSR* 55, 1981, 126-431.
A. Negev, "The Inscription of the Emperor Julian at Ma'ayan Barukh", *IEJ* 19, 1969, 170-3.
V. Neri, "Les éditions de l'Histoire ecclésiastique (livres VIII-IX) : bilan critique et perspectives de la recherche", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 151-83.
R. F. Newbold, "Nonverbal Communication in Tacitus and Ammianus", *Ancient Society* 21, 1990, 189-200.

R. F. Newbold, "Attire in Ammianus and Gregory of Tours", *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* 6.4, 2005, 1-14.
C. E. V. Nixon, "Aurelius Victor and Julian", *CPh* 86, 1991, 113-25.
A. F. Norman, *Libanius. Selected Works*, Cambridge 1977.
F. W. Norris, "Eusebius on Jesus as Deceiver and Sorcerer", in H. W. Attridge, G. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Detroit 1992, 523-42.
R. S. Notley, Z. Safrai, *Eusebius, Onomasticon: The Place Names of Divine Scripture*, Boston 2005.
P. van Nuffelen, *Orosius and the Rhetoric of History*, Oxford 2012.
D. C. Nutt, "Silvanus and the Emperor Constantius II", *Antichton* 2, 1983, 80-9.
P. H. O'Brien, *Speeches and Imperial Characterization in Ammianus Marcellinus*, Doct. Thesis, Boston University 2002.
D. Ogden, *Alexander the Great: Myth, Genesis and Sexuality*, Exeter 2011.
R. S. Olson, *Tragedy, Authority, and Trickery: The Poetics of Embedded Letters in Josephus*, Washington 2010.
N. Otto, *Enargeia: Untersuchung zur Charakteristik alexandrinischer Dichtung*, Stuttgart 2009.
R. Pack, "The Roman Digressions of Ammianus Marcellinus", *TAPhA* 84, 1953, 181-9.
R. Pack, "Ammianus Marcellinus and the Curia of Antioch", *CPh* 48, 1953, 80-4.
F. Paschoud, *Roma aeterna : Études sur le patriotisme romain dans l'Occident latin à l'époque des grandes invasions*, Rome 1967.
F. Paschoud, "'Si non è vero, è ben trovato' : Tradition littéraire et vérité historique chez Ammien Marcellin", *Chiron* 19, 1989, 37-54.
F. Paschoud, "Ammien 31, 16, 9 : *une recusatio*?", *REL* 82, 2004, 238-48.
D. A. Pauw, "Methods of Character Portrayal in the *Res gestae* of Ammianus Marcellinus", *AClass* 20, 1977, 181-98.
D. A. Pauw, "Ammianus Marcellinus and Ancient Historiography, Biography, and Character Portrayal", *AClass* 22, 1979, 115-29.
R. Penella, "Menelaus, Odysseus, and the Limits of Eloquence in Libanius, Declamations 3 and 4", in O. Lagacherie, P.-L. Malosse (eds.), *Libanios, le premier humaniste : Études en homage à Bernard Schouler*, Alessandria 2011, 93-105.
M.-Y. Perrin, M. Cassin, M. Debie, "La question des éditions de l'Histoire ecclésiastique et le livre X", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 185-207.
A. Petersen, "The Diversity of Apologetics: From Genre to a Mode of Thinking", in A. C. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, D. Brakke (eds.), *Critique and Apologetics: Jews, Christians, and Pagans in Antiquity*, Frankfurt 2006, 15-42.

G. B. Pighi, *I discorsi nelle storie d'Ammiano Marcellino*, Milan 1936.
F. Pina Polo, "*Contio*, *auctoritas* and Freedom of Speech in Republican Rome", in S. Benoist (ed.), *Rome, a City and its Empire in Perspective: The Impact of the Roman World through Fergus Millar's Research*, Leiden 2012, 45-58.
A. J. Pomeroy, "Theatricality in Tacitus' Histories", *Arethusa* 39, 2006, 171-91.
I. Popović, "Diadem on Constantine's Portrait from Naissus: Origin and Evolution of New Imperial Insignia", in M. Rakocija (ed.), *Niš and Byzantium, Third Symposium, Niš, 3-5 June 2004*, Niš 2005, 103-18.
P. Porena, "Forme di partecipazione politica cittadina e contatti con il potere imperiale", in F. Amarelli (ed.), *Politica e partecipazione nelle città dell'impero romano*, Roma 2005, 20-93.
M. J. Price, *Coins and the Bible*, London 1975.
A. Primo, *La storiografia sui Seleucidi: da Megastene a Eusebio di Cesarea*, Pisa 2009.
E. Prinzivalli, "Le genre historiographique de l'Histoire ecclésiastique", in S. Morlet, L. Perrone (eds.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique : Commentaire. I. Études d'introduction. Anagôgê*, Paris 2012, 83-111.
A. J. Quiroga Puertas, "The Limits of Philology: Aulus Gellius, *NA* 2.9", *Ágora* 15, 2013, 95-112.
L. Ramskold, N. Lenski, "Constantinople's Dedication Medallions and the Maintenance of Civic Traditions", *NZ* 119, 2012, 31-58.
S. Ratti, "La traversée du Danube par les Goths : La subversion d'un modèle héroïque (Ammien Marcellin 31.4)", in J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. C. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus After Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 181-99.
R. Rees, "Ammianus Satiricus", in J. W. Drijvers, D. Hunt (eds.), *The Late Roman World and Its Historian: Intrepreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London 1999, 141-55.
A. Reiter, *De Ammiani Marcellini usu orationis obliquae*, Amberg 1887.
L. D. Reynolds, "Ammianus Marcellinus", in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission*, Oxford 1983, 6-8.
U. Richter, "Die Funktion der Digressionen im Werk Ammians", *WJA* 15, 1989, 209-22.
U. Roberto, *Le Chronographiae di Sesto Giulio Africano: storiografia, politica e cristianesimo nell'età dei Severi*, Soveria Mannelli 2011.
M. Roberts, *The Jewelled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity*, Ithaca 1989.
D. S. Rohrbacher, *The Historians of Late Antiquity*, London 2002.
D. S. Rohrbacher, "Ammianus' Roman Digressions and the Audience of the Res Gestae", in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, London 2007, 468-73.

J. C. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus with an English Translation*, London 2006 (=1939).
E. Romero Pose, *Ireneo de Lión. Demostración de la predicación apostólica*, Madrid 2001.
K. Rosen, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, Darmstadt 1982.
P. A. Rosenmeyer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature*, Cambridge 2001.
G. Sabbah, *La méthode d'Ammien Marcellin : Recherches sur la construction du discours historique dans les Res Gestae*, Paris 1978.
G. Sabbah, "Ammien Marcellin, Libanius, Antioche et la date des derniers livres des Res gestae", *Cassiodorus* 3, 1997, 89-116.
G. Sabbah, "Ammianus Marcellinus", in G. Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, Leiden 2003, 43-84.
G. Sabbah, L. Angliviel de la Beaumelle, *Ammien Marcellin. Histoire, t. VI, livres XXIX-XXXI*, Paris 1999.
C. Salemme, *Similitudini nella storia: un capitolo su Ammiano Marcellino*, Naples 1989.
Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, "*Iulianus Latinus*: la lengua cambiada de los personajes de Amiano Marcelino", in Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, J. B. Torres (eds.), *De Grecia a Roma y de Roma a Grecia: un camino de ida y vuelta*, Pamplona 2007, 292-308.
Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, "Del enemigo el ejemplo: *exempla* púnicos y etruscos en Amiano Marcelino", in M. L. Harto, J. Villalba (eds.), *Exempla fidem faciunt*, Madrid 2012, 137-46.
C. Schmidt, *Studien zu den pseudo-Clementinen: Nebst einem Anhange "Die älteste römische Bischofsliste und die Pseudo-Clementinen"*, Leipzig 1929.
A. Schoene, *Eusebi Chronicorum libri duo*, Berlin 1875.
O. Seeck, "Ammianus Marcellinus", *RE* I, 1894, col. 1845-52.
W. Seston, *Dioclétien et la tétrarchie. I. Guerres et réformes 284-300*, Paris 1946.
W. Seyfarth, *Ammianus Marcellinus. Römische Geschichte. Lateinisch und deutsch mit einem Kommentar*, Darmstadt 1968.
M. Simonetti, "Roma cristiana tra vescovi e presbiteri", *Vetera Christianorum* 43, 2006, 5-18.
M. Simonetti, E. Prinzivalli, *Letteratura cristiana antica*, Forlì 2000.
N. Sims-Williams, "Christian Sogdian Texts from the Nachlass of Olaf Hansen I: Fragments of the Life of Serapion", *BSOAS* 58, 1995, 50-68.
H. Sivan, "Ammianus at Rome: Exile and Redemption?", *Historia* 46, 1997, 116-21.
H. Sivan, *Palestine in Late Antiquity*, New York 2008.
M. Slusser, "Docetism: A Historical Definition", *SCent* 1, 1981, 163-72.

J. A. Smith, "'My Lord's Native Land'. Mapping the Christian Holy Land", *ChHist* 76, 2007, 1-31.
R. B. Steele, "Ammianus Marcellinus", *CW* 16, 1922, 18-24, 27-8.
J. R. Stenger, "Ammian und die Ewige Stadt: Das spätantike Rom als Heterotopie", in T. Fuhrer (ed.), *Rom und Mailand in der Spätantike: Repräsentationen städtischer Räume in Literatur, Architektur und Kunst*, Berlin 2012, 189-216.
J. R. Stenger, "Eusebios' Erfassung des Heiligen Landes: Die Evidenz des Raumes im Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen", in K. Geus, M. Rathmann (eds.), *Vermessung der Oikumene: Mapping the Oikumene*, Berlin 2013, 223-41.
J. R. Stenger, "The Encounter with Christianity", in D. Schenker, M. Hose (eds.), *A Companion to Greek Literature*, Chichester 2015, 126-37.
J. R. Stenger, "Eusebius and the Representation of the Holy Land", in S. Bianchetti, M. R. Cataudella, H.-J. Gehrke (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Geography*, Leiden 2016, 381-98.
J. Straub, *Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike*, Darmstadt 1939.
I. N. Svorōnos, *Τα Νομίσματα του Κράτους των Πτολεμαίων*, Athens 1904-1908.
S. Swain (ed.), *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon's Physiognomy from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*, Oxford 2007.
H. B. Swete, *The Akhmîm Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter*, London 1893.
J. Sykutris, "Epistolographie", *RE Suppl.* 5, 1931, coll. 185-220.
J. Szidat, "Zur Ankunft Iulians in Sirmium 361 n. Chr. auf seinem Zug gegen Constantius II", *Historia* 24, 1975, 375-8.
I. Tantillo, *La prima orazione di Giuliano a Costanzo: Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Roma 1997.
H. Teitler, "*Visa vel lecta*? Ammianus on Persia and the Persians", in J. W. Drijvers, D. Hunt (eds.), *The Late Roman World and Its Historian: Intrepreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London 1999, 216-23.
R. Teja, "Il cerimoniale imperiale", in A. Carandini, L. Cracco Ruggini, A. Giardina (eds.), *Storia di Roma. L'età tardoantica. Crisi e trasformazioni 3, 1*, Turin 1993, 613-42.
A. Thomas, *Prague Palimpsest: Writing, Memory, and the City*, Chicago 2010.
E. A. Thompson, "Three Notes on Julian in 361 A.D.", *Hermathena* 62, 1943, 83-95.
E. A. Thompson, *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Cambridge 1947.
P. Thomsen, *Palästina nach dem Onomasticon des Eusebius*, Doct. Thesis, Univ. Tübingen 1903.
S. Timm, *Eusebius und die Heilige Schrift: Die Schriftvorlagen des*

Onomastikons der biblischen Ortsnamen, Berlin 2010.
D. Timpe, "Che cos'è la storia della Chiesa? La *Historia Ecclesiastica* di Eusebio. Caratteristiche di un genere", in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, D. Lanza (eds.), *Lo Spazio Letterario della Grecia antica. II. La ricezione e l'attualizzazione del testo*, Roma 1995, 389-435.
J. B. Torres, "El héroe como orador", in A. L. Eire, J. M. Labiano, A. M. Seoane (eds.), *Retórica, política e ideología: desde la Antigüedad hasta nuestros días. Actas del II Congreso Internacional*, Salamanca 1998, 39-43.
J. B. Torres, "Literatura griega: las bases del canon", *Minerva* 25, 2012, 21-48.
J. B. Torres, "Traducción e interpretación en Eusebio de Cesarea, *Historia de la Iglesia*", in Á. Martínez, B. Ortega, H. Velasco, H. Zamora (eds.), *Ágalma. Ofrenda desde la Filología Clásica a Manuel García Teijeiro*, Valladolid 2014, 647-53.
J. B. Torres, "Image and Word in Eusebius (*VC* 3,4-24): Constantine in Nicaea", in A. J. Quiroga Puertas (ed.), *Rhetorical and Literary Strategies in Imperial and Late Antique Literature*, (forthcoming).
H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church*, New York 1978.
J. Ulrich, *Euseb von Caesarea und die Juden: Studien zur Rolle der Juden in der Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea*, Berlin 1999.
L. Vaganay, M.-J. Lagrange, *L'Evangile de Pierre*, Paris 1930.
A. Velasco-Delgado, *Eusebio de Cesarea. Historia Eclesiástica*, Madrid 1997.
D. Vera, "La polemica contro l'abuso imperiale del trionfo: rapporti fra ideologia, economia e propaganda nel Basso Impero", *RSA* 10, 1980, 89-132.
D. Vera, *Commento storico alle Relationes di Quinto Aurelio Simmaco*, Pisa 1981.
M. Verdoner, "Transgeneric Crosses: Apologetics in the Church History of Eusebius", in A. C. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich (eds.), *Three Greek Apologists: Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius*, Frankfurt 2007, 75-92.
W. Vergin, *Das Imperium Romanum und seine Gegenwelten: Die geographisch-ethnographischen Exkurse in den Res Gestae des Ammianus Marcellinus*, Berlin 2013.
G. Viansino, "Satira indignata e ironia grottesca in Ammiano Marcellino", *Aevum Antiquum* 12, 1999, 173-87.
G. Viansino, *Ammiano Marcellino. Storie*, Milan 2001-2002.
M. Vinzent, "Origenes als *Subscriptum*: Paulinus von Tyrus und die origenistische Diadoche", in W. A. Bienert, U. Kühneweg (eds.), *Origeniana Septima: Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Leuven 1999, 149-57.

M. Vitiello, "Nuove prospettive sull'adventus in età imperiale", *MedAnt* 3, 2000, 551-80.
P. W. L. Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century*, Oxford 1990.
M. Wallraff, *Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronistik*, Berlin 2006.
M. Wallraff (ed.), *Iulius Africanus. Chronographiae: The Extant Fragments*, Berlin 2007.
A. E. Wardman, "Usurpers and Internal Conflicts in the 4th Century A.D.", *Historia* 2, 1984, 220-37.
R. Webb, *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*, Farnham 2009.
G. Weber, *Kaiser, Träume und Visionen in Prinzipat und Spätantike*, Stuttgart 2000.
H. White, "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact", *Tropics of Discourse. Essays in Cultural Criticism*, Baltimore 1978, 81-100.
R. L. Wilken, "Eusebius and the Christian Holy Land", in H. W. Attridge, G. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Leiden 1992, 736-60.
R. L. Wilken, *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought*, New Haven 1992.
G. A. Williamson, A. Louth, *Eusebius. The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine*, London 1969.
C. U. Wolf, "Eusebius of Caesarea and the Onomasticon", *The Biblical Archaeologist* 27, 1964, 66-96.
D. Woods, "The Role of the Comes Lucillianus during Julian's Persian Expedition", *AC* 67, 1998, 243-8.
D. Woods, "Ammianus and Eutherius", *AClass* 41, 1998, 110-18.
D. Woods, "The Final Commission of Artemius the Former Dux Aegypti", *BMGS* 23, 1999, 2-24.
D. Woods, "Ammianus Marcellinus and the *rex Alamannorum* Vadomarius", *Mnemosyne* 53, 2000, 690-710.
D. Woods, "Postumus and the Three Suns: Neglected Numismatic Evidence for a Solar Halo", *NC* 172, 2012, 85-92.
P. Zanker, "Enargeia in the Ancient Criticism of Poetry", *RhM* 124, 1981, 297-311.
G. Zecchini, "Greek and Roman Parallel History in Ammianus", in J. den Boeft, H. J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, H. Teitler (eds.), *Ammianus After Julian: The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*, Leiden 2007, 201-18.
J. Zizioulas, "Episkopè et épiskopos dans l'Eglise primitive. Bref inventaire de la documentation", *Irenikon* 56, 1983, 484-502.

GENERAL INDEX

Abgar V, King of Edessa: 58, 68, 69, 70, 73, 74, 77, 80
Abgar VIII, King of Edessa: 58
Abraham: 55, 56, 93, 126
Abu Qir: 149
actio: 228
Actium: 162
Acts of the Apostles: 64, 68
Adam: 56
adlocutio: 144, 147, 247-9
adoratio: 195
Adrastea: 250, 252
Adrianople: 181 n. 13, 209
Adummim: 94 n. 43
adventus: 193-205, 233, 240
Aelia: 58-9, 93-4, 96-7, 104; *see Jerusalem*
Aeneas: 172
Aenon: 96 n. 49
Aeropolis: 94 n. 44
Africa: 173 n. 47, 181, 199
Agathos Daimon: 158
Agilo: 187 n. 21
Akeldama: 96 n. 49
Akhmîn: 111-3
Alexander Jannaeus: 155 n. 53
Alexander of Jerusalem: 80, 81
Alexander of Rome: 131, 133
Alexander Polyhistor: 90 n. 22
Alexander the Great: 149-50, 153-8, 191; Alexander Romance: 142, 158
Alexandria: 59, 71, 73, 81, 86, 88-9, 128, 131, 152-3, 156, 158; Alexandrian Senate: 67 n. 13
Alps: 197 n. 12, 200
Amathe: 99

Amathus: 99
Amida: 260
Amman: 91
Ammianus: allusions: 207-23, 243-60; anecdotes: 216, 234; apologetic function of the *Res gestae*: 169; autobiography: 209-12, 220-1; autopsy: 220-1; character portrayal: 163-73, 225-42, 243-59; conception of time: 45; consular dates: 168-9; date of the *Res gestae*: 37 n. 3; digressions: 210, 212, 222 n. 50; discourses: 236-41; *exempla*: 45, 166-7, 169, 207-23, 234, 250, 257-8; historical explanation: 45, 221-3; historiographical conception: 35-45; intertextuality: 243-59; last book: 209; last hexad: 209-10; on lawyers: 207-23; moral judgements: 209-10; narrative technique: 243-6, 259; obituaries: 167; pessimism: 44, 221-3; programmatic remarks: 209; structure of the *Res gestae*: 209-10; rhetoric: 207-23, 225-42; Roman digressions: 211-2, 230-1; satirical hyperboles: 222; similes: 167; *sphragis*: 40, 163 n. 9, 216-7; style: 212-4, 245-7; textual tradition: 38 n. 9
Anacletus: 127, 130, 132-3
Ananias: 74
Anatolius: 67 n. 13
Androclus: 98
Anicetus: 126 n. 9, 131
Anicii: 165 n. 17
Anilinus: 82
Anim: 96 n. 49
Anonymous *De Physiognomonia*: 163-4
Antinoë: 80
Antioch: 50, 52, 59, 71, 80-1, 107-21, 123-35, 145, 181, 189, 204-5, 220, 236
Antoninus Pius: 80
Antony: 57
Anuphis: 151
Apelles: 154
Aphrodite: 104
Aphthonius: 229
Apollinaris: 111
Apollo: 140, 150, 154, 155 n. 53; Apollo Grannus: 139, 140-1, 150-1, 154
Apollodorus of Athens: 90
Apollonius of Tyana: 143 n. 21
apostolic succession: 53, 58-9, 65, 123-35
Apuleius: 213 n. 25
Aquileia: 178-9, 190, 202
Arabia: 93, 172 n. 45
Ararat: 91, 99 n. 60
Arba: 92 n. 33

Arbitio: 180, 182-91
Aristides: 73, 80
Aristotle: 163, 250-4
Arius: 54-5, 156
Arnon: 94 n. 43
Artemius: 187 n. 22
Artemon: 76 n. 46
Asclepiades: 76, 80
Ashdoth: 92
Asia: 80, 128, 144 n. 24
Athanasius: 49, 55, 156
Athens: 64, 158
Augustine: 75 n. 45
Augustus: 57, 140, 162, 172
Aurelian: 143
Aurelios Aphianos: 152
Aurelius Victor: 162
Ausonius: 169-70, 173

Baal: 93
Babylon: 154
Bactria: 155 n. 53
Balkans: 141, 144, 148, 151, 179-81
Balthasar: 163
Barbatio: 250, 252
Batanaea: 92
Bediacrum: 143-4
Beer-sheba: 91-2, 94 n. 43
Bela: 87, 94 n. 43, 95
Beth-tappuah: 86
Beth-zatha: 98
Beth-zur: 96 n. 49
Bethabara: 87 n. 4, 96 n. 49, 97-8
Bethany: 92, 95 n. 49, 96-7
Bethlehem: 89 n. 15, 96, 103
Bethphage: 96 n. 49
Bezabde: 186, 202 n. 36
Bible: 78, 83-109
biography, genre: 37, 103, 141, 142-3, 161-5, 247
Bithynia: 255
Bononia: 177
Bounos: 93 n. 36

Caecilianus: 82
Caecilius Metellus: 173
Caesarea: 88, 90, 94, 96, 125; school: 89
Callistratus: 214 n. 26
Campus Ardiensis: 181 n. 13
canon: 77-9, 116 n. 31
captatio: 237-8
Caracalla: 149
Caricus: 80, 111
Carmel: 94 n. 43, 143
Cassiodorus: 134 n. 50
Cassius Dio: 143
Cato: 134 n. 50
Cecrops: 158
Cephalorion: 113 n. 19
ceremonial: 195-8, 202, 204, 233
Chalcedon: 184, 187, 254-5
Chananaeus: 99
Charascene: 155 n. 53
Chi-Rho sign: 141-2, 147, 150-8
Christ: *see Jesus Christ*
Christogram: 147 n. 32, 151 n. 44, 152, 155
Chrysopolis: 148, 155
Church: 65-6, 70-1, 75, 77-8, 80-2, 85-9, 101-2, 104, 111, 118-21, 157, 237
Church history: 50-1, 64 n. 5
Cibalae: 147, 181 n. 13
Cibeles: 152
Cicero: 168, 212-20, 257 n. 35
Claudius Mamertinus: 168, 195 n. 4, 201-4
Clemens: 51-2, 55, 80, 127, 133
Cleopatra: 57
Cletus: *see Anacletus*
Clodius Aesopus: 219
Colonia Aelia Capitolina: 93, 94 n. 45, 96, 97, 104; *see Jerusalem*
Commodus: 170-1
consensus: 168, 197, 200, 202, 205
Constans: 161
Constantia, wife of Gallus: 250
Constantiacae, *legiones*: 178-9, 181-2, 188, 190
Constantine: 68, 82, 99, 137-58, 161, 197; buildings: 67 n. 16; and Christianity: 38, 101-3; coinage: 137-58; 'edict of Milan': 104 n. 83
Constantinople: 141, 147-8, 155-8, 168, 195, 203-5, 239, 250, 254-5, 257
Constantius Chlorus: 140

Constantius II: 38, 141, 143, 167, 175-91, 195-204, 252-3, 259; *adventus* in Rome: 195 n. 4, 204, 232-3, 240; death: 202 n. 38; discourses: 236-7, 241, 248-9; games for his thirteenth year as emperor: 195 n. 4
contio: 198, 237, 239-40
Cornelius: 81, 129
Crescens: 131
Crestus: 82
Crispus: 148 n. 35, 155 n. 53
Ctesiphon: 188
Cyril of Alexandria: 86
Cyrus the Great: 139

Dagalaifus: 177, 180
Dan: 91
Daniel: 142 n. 18
Danube: 177, 182, 187, 199, 201, 203, 247
Daroma: 94
David: 57, 96 n. 50
Dead Sea: 95
Decretum Gelasianum: 112 n. 15
Demetrius: 81
Demetrius of Scepsis: 89
Demiurge: 54-5
Demosthenes: 214 n. 26
dialogue with the gods: 141, 143-50
Didymus: 81
Didymus the Blind: 112 n. 15
Dinon: 139-40
Diocletian: 150 n. 40, 168-7, 197 n. 12
Diogenianus: 90
Dionysius of Alexandria: 81
Dionysius of Corinth: 75, 80
Dionysius of Rome: 82
Dioscuri: 156
Diospolis: 93
discourses in historiography: 63-5, 70, 79
docetism: 112, 115, 117-20
Dometius: 82
Domitian: 133
Domitianus, *praefectus praetorio*: 235, 248
Domitius Corbulo: 167
Domitius Modestus: 210
Domninus: 111

Donatism: 82
Doryphorianus: 171
dreams: 139-43

Ebal: 93
Eden, Garden of: 56, 59
Edessa: 58, 68-70, 74
Egeria: 87 n. 8
Egypt: 57, 81, 86, 91, 112
ekphrasis: 212 n. 16, 225-42
Elam: 94 n. 43
Eleutherius of Rome: 80, 126 n. 9, 131
Eleutheropolis: 94
Elvira, synod of: 157
Elymaïs: 155 n. 53
Emesa: 143
enargeia: 221-2, 225-42
encomium: 65 n. 6, 159-73
Ephesus: 98
Epicurus: 141
Epiphanius: 59, 121, 127
Epitome de Caesaribus: 162
epitomes: 37 n. 2, 155, 162
Eros: 129
ethnography: 165, 214 n. 27, 247
Eusebia: 197
Eusebius of Caesarea: 37-9, 47-59; apologist: 49-60; *Chronica*: 38, 66 n. 11, 125; *Chronici Canones*: 50-2; chronographer: 49-50; Church historian: 49-61; conception of time: 44; *Demonstratio Evangelica*: 38; documents, use of: 39, 61-82; *Eclogae Propheticae*: 57; *Historia Ecclesiastica*: 107-21, 123-35; *Historia Ecclesiastica*, date: 37, 67 n. 17; exeget: 38, 42, 49-59; historiographical conception: 65; imperial panegyrist: 49; legitimacy of Christianity: 45; letters, embedded in narrative: 67-74; literary genres: 37-40, 51-2, 66 n. 11; *Onomasticon*: 38, 83-106; optimism: 44; *Praeparatio Evangelica*: 38; quotations: 39, 107-21; quotations' literality (κατὰ λέξιν): 71-3; quotation as demonstration (εἰς ἐπίδειξιν): 71-3; rhetorical abilities: 64; sources: 67, 107-21; theologian: 49-61; toponyms: 83-105; *Vita Constantini*: 38, 137-58
Eutherius: 190 n. 30, 203 n. 42
Euthydemus: 155 n. 53
Eutropia: 88 n. 15
Evagrius: 37 n. 1
Evaristus: 127, 131, 133

evidentia: 221
Evodius: 128-30, 133-4
exegesis: 55, 87, 90, 102
exempla: 45, 166-7, 169, 207-23, 234, 250, 257-8

Fabius of Antioch: 81
Favorinus: 216, 218
Florentius, *praefectus praetorio*: 200
Florianus: 144 n. 24
Florinus: 74, 80
Fortuna: 230, 238, 251-2, 257
Frigidus: 187 n. 21

Gadara: 95
Galba: 214 n. 26
Galerius: 68, 82
Gallienus: 81, 140 n. 6, 146, 147 n. 29
Gallus: 81, 195 n. 4, 230, 235-6, 248-53, 259
Gaudentius: 181, 182 n. 14
Gaul: 72, 80, 131, 139, 155, 169, 177-9, 182, 184-5, 187, 197-202, 254
Gellius: 212-3, 216, 219, 257 n. 35
Gergesa: 96 n. 49
Germanus: 81
Gethsemane: 95-6
Gilgal: 91
Golgotha: 89 n. 15, 96 n. 49
Gomoarius: 180-91
Gordianus III: 162
Gospel of Peter: 107-21; Akhmîn fragment: 111-3
Gratian: 163, 169-73, 195 n. 6
Gregory of Nazianzus: 158, 201

Hadrian: 80, 94, 161
Hazazon Tamar: 94 n. 43
Hebron: 92
Hegesippos: 59, 126
Helen, Empress: 88 n. 15
Heliogabalus: 162
Hellenica Oxyrhynchia: 64 n. 5
Heraclius the Cynic: 205
Hercules: 150 n. 40
heresies: 58-9, 80, 111, 115, 117-8, 121
Hermammon: 81

Hermogenes: 229
Hermon: 96
Herod: 58, 79
Herodotus: 40, 66, 68
Hierapolis: 179
Hierax: 81
Hippo: 75 n. 45
Hippolytus of Rome: 50, 59, 76, 121
Historia Augusta: 161
Holy Land: 49, 56, 83-107
Homer: 52, 89, 90, 166, 230, 240
Horace: 212, 216
Horatii: 216
Horonaim: 91
Hydaspes: 154
Hyspaosines: 155 n. 53

Ignatius of Antioch: 71, 80, 123-35
Illyricum: 177, 179, 181, 185-8, 199-201
Inachus: 51
intertextuality: 102, 214-20, 245-7, 259
Invictus: 141
Iovinus: 187
Irenaeus of Lyon: 59, 72, 74-5, 80, 118, 121, 126-8, 130, 132, 134
Israel: 57
Issos, Bay of: 113
Italy: 143-4, 147, 181-2, 185
Itinerarium Burdigalense: 87 n. 8
Iustitia: 165

Jacob: 56
James: 59
Jattir: 94, 96 n. 49
Jearim: 93
Jericho: 86, 92, 99
Jerome: 75 n. 45, 87 n. 4, 99 n. 61, 105, 126, 163
Jerusalem: 57-9, 69, 74, 85, 88, 92-4, 96-8, 100, 104; Colonia Aelia Capitolina: 58, 93, 94 n. 45, 96-7, 104
Jesse: 96 n. 50
Jesus Christ: 39, 53-4, 56-8, 68-70, 73-7, 80, 87, 93, 95-7, 102, 104, 139, 141, 157
Jethira: 94
John Malalas: 142, 188 n. 25

John the Apostle: 80, 133; Gospel 97, 116
John the Baptist: 58, 93, 95, 97
Jordan: 86-7, 93, 95, 97
Josephus, Flavius: 51, 57, 64, 68, 91, 98, 99 n. 60, n. 62, 79, 143
Joshua: 57, 86, 91, 92
Jovian: 188-9, 195 n. 6, 230, 254
Judaea: 87-8, 143, 155 n. 53
Judah: 86, 93-4
Julian: 38, administering justice: 210; *adventus*: 193-205; battle of Strasbourg: 231-2; biography: 161; death: 253, 259; discourses: 164, 198 n. 17, 236-7, 239-40, 249; games for his fifth year as emperor: 195 n. 4; *gratiarum actio* by Mamertinus: 168, 196, 201-4; *imitatio Alexandri*: 191; Latin language: 241 n. 51, 248; military prowess: 166-7; Persian expedition: 187-9; physique: 168, 230; contrast with Valens: 222-3; year 361: 175-91
Julianus, maternal uncle of Emperor Julian: 203 n. 42.
Julius Africanus: 50-2, 55, 58, 66, 73, 80, 125, 129
Julius Caesar: 140
Julius Constantius: 197
Julius Obsequens: 140
Julius Valerius: 142
Jupiter: 144-5, 150-5, 158
Justin: 50, 55-6, 74, 80, 155 n. 53; *Apology*: 74; *Dialogue with Trypho*: 55
Juvenal: 162, 212

Kadesh-barnea: 91
Karkor: 94 n. 43
Kidron: 93
Kiriath-jearim: 93
Kiriathaim: 96 n. 49

labarum: 139, 155-6, 158
Lactantius: 139, 143
laeti: 180, 184, 185, 190
Lampadius: 195 n. 4
Lancearii: 180, 187-8, 190
Lazarus: 96-7
Legio: 86, 94, 96
Libanius: 142, 181, 188 n. 25, 197 n. 12, 212; *Oratio* 12: 201 n. 33
Licinius: 67 n. 16, 147-8, 155, 157, 181 n. 13
Linus: 127-33
Livy: 257 n. 35
Longinus: 115 n. 23

Lot: 99 n. 62
Lucan: 212
Lucillianus: 182-3, 186-9, 199-202
Lucretius: 257 n. 35
Luke: 57, 68; Gospel: 116, 119-20
Lutetia Parisiorum: 199-200
Lydia: 151-2

Ma'ayan Baruk: 198-9
Macarius: 104
Macrobius: 216 n. 32
Madaba: 105
Maeonia: 151-2
Magnentius: 181 n. 13, 185 n. 19, 187 n. 21, 198
Magnus Decentius: 198
Malatha: 94
Mamre: 56, 89, 93, 96, 101, 104 n. 82, n. 84
Manasseh: 86
Marcianus: 115, 117
Marcion: 115 n. 24, 117, 119
Marcus Aurelius: 82, 151, 162, 167, 169 n. 37, 173
Marius Maximus: 162
Mark, Gospel: 116, 118
Mars: 144 n. 25
Matthew, Gospel: 97, 116
Mattiarii: 180, 187-8, 190
Maxentius: 140, 148, 151
Maximian: 151 n. 40, 169, 197 n. 12
Maximianopolis: 96 n. 53
Maximinus, bishop of Antioch: 111
Maximinus Daia: 68, 82
Maximus: 203 n. 42
Maximus of Alexandria: 82
medallions: 146-51
Melanthias: 180 n. 11
memoirs, genre: 118, 247, 260
Menahem: 92
Menander Rhetor: 230 n. 20
Menelaus: 241
Menippean satire: 212
Mephaath: 94 n. 43
Mercury: 151
Mesopotamia: 91

Milan: 67 n. 16, 82, 144, 147, 149, 196-7, 250, 254; 'Edict of Milan': 67 n. 16, 82
Miltiades: 82
Milvian Bridge: 143, 147-8, 150, 152, 154
Minucius Fundanus: 80
Miriam: 91
Moab: 94 n. 44
Montanus: 80
Montius: 248-9
Moses: 51-2, 54-7, 86, 97
Mount of Olives: 96-7
Mount Shepher: 93 n. 36
Mount Zalmon: 93 n. 36
Mursa: 181 n. 13, 187 n. 21
Museion: 89

Nacolia: 255
Naissus: 177-8, 183, 203
Narcissus: 80
Neapolis: 96
Nebuchadnezzar: 142 n. 18
Neoplatonism: 198
Nephtoah, spring: 93 n. 36
Nerva: 40, 162
Nevitta: 177, 183, 201
New Testament: 70, 87, 91; canon: 116-21
Nicaea: 255; Council 59; Nicean theology: 49
Nice: 180 n. 11
Nicomedia: 156
Nigrinus: 179, 190
Nisibis: 254
Novatian: 81

Octavius Augustus: 140, 162
Odysseus: 241
Odyssey: 198
oikonomia: 54
Old Testament: 91, 94, 100
Olympiads: 126
Origen: 49-50, 80-1, 86, 88-90; *Hom. in Lucam*: 128-9; library: 90 n. 23; school of Caesarea: 89

Palestine: 38, 42, 49, 58, 79-80, 83-105
palimpsest: 102-5
Pamphilus: 49, 88, 90 n. 23
Paneas springs: 93 n. 36
Panegyrici Latini: 169
panegyrics: 41, 67, 103, 163-4, 168-9, 196, 197 n. 12, 200, 240 n. 46
Pantaenus: 80
Papias: 118 n. 34
Paul of Samosata: 82
Paul the Apostle: 127, 131-2; *Epistle to the Romans*: 134
Paulinus of Tyre: 67 n. 13, 88, 89 n. 17
Pausanias: 98-9
Pericles: 79
Peter the Apostle: 112, 123-35
Petronius *arbiter*: 164
Petronius Probus: 165-7
Petronius, Valens' father-in-law: 255
Philadelphus: 153 n. 49
Phileas of Thmuis: 71, 73, 82
Philemon: 81
Philip the Apostle: 80
Philip the Arab: 72
Philippos: 80
Philistio: 219
Philo: 56
Philomelium: 80
Phrygia: 80, 255
physiognomy: 159-73, 228-30
pietas: 172-3
Pius: 128
Plato: 52, 141; *Timaeus*: 54-5
Pliny the Elder: 140
Polemon: 163
Polycarp: 80, 128, 133-134
Polycrates: 80
Pompeius Ianuarius: 169
Pompeius Trogus: 155 n. 53
Pompey: 57
Pontius: 80, 111
Porus: 154
Potino: 134
Primus: 131
Procopius: 187 n. 21, 195 n. 6, 234-5, 254-8

psogos: 230 n. 20
Ptolemy III Evergetes: 152-3

Quintilian: 257 n. 35
Quirinius: 57

Raetia: 170, 183
Rauraci: 183, 199
rescripta, imperial: 67 n. 16
rethoric: 65, 161, 163, 225-42
Rhea: 156
Rhossos: 113-21
Rome: 38, 41-2, 44, 59, 70-1, 76, 80-2, 123-35, 140, 143, 146, 151, 158 n. 69, 204, 211, 222-3, 230-2, 240, 258
Rufinus, translator of Eusebius: 115 n. 23, 118
Rutilius: 214 n. 26

Sabellius: 81
Sabinus: 68 n. 18, 82
Salus: 157
salutare sidus: 200-1
sapheneia: 241
Sapor: 185-6
satire: 211
Saul: 57
Scaurus: 214 n. 26
Scipio: 215
Scudilo: 250, 252
Sebastianus: 180 n. 11
Second Sophistic: 233
Seleucus Romance: 142, 155 n. 53
Seleucus: 155 n. 53
Septimius Severus: 161
Serapion of Antioch: 80-1, 107-21
Serdica: 144-5
serpent, sign: 155-8
Shepherd of Hermas: 79 n. 59
Sicia: 148
Sicily: 181
Sila: 173
Silvanus: 187 n. 21, 198, 252, 256, 260
Singara: 254
Sirmium: 175-91, 199-204

Sixtus: 81
Smyrna: 80, 133
Socrates: 240-1 n. 49
Socrates Scholasticus: 37 n. 1
Sodom: 56, 95, 99
Sol: 139-44, 150-1, 154
Soter: 153 n. 49
Soterus: 126 n. 9, 128, 131
Sozomen: 37 n. 1
Stephen I: 81
Strasbourg, battle of: 231, 240
Succi: 177, 180, 183-5, 191
Suetonius: 143
Syria: 93, 141, 143, 179, 255

Tacitus, emperor: 144-7, 150
Tacitus, historian: 40, 235, 257 n. 35
Tahath: 86
Tanaach: 86
Tappuah: 86
Tarsus: 149
Tatian: 51
Taurus: 113
Taurus, *praefectus praetorio*: 199-201
Telesphorus: 128, 131
Teman: 94 n. 43
Terah: 86
Tertullian: 59, 127, 151
Thaddeus: 58, 74 n. 40
Tharsila: 92
Theodoret: 37 n. 1
Theodosius: 162, 171, 187 n. 22
theologia: 49-55
Theon: 229
Theophilus of Antioch: 50, 55, 115 n. 24, 129
Thersites: 221
Thmuits: 82
Thomas the Apostle: 58, 74 n. 40
Thrace: 255
Thucydides: 63-5, 68, 79
Tiamat: 157
Ticinum: 144
Tigris: 188, 254

Tiresias: 198
Tirzah: 92
Titus: 133, 169 n. 37
Tophel: 86
Trajan Decius: 151-2
Trajan: 131, 162, 167, 169 n. 37
Trier: 140, 155 n. 53, 170
Typhon: 157
Tyre: 88 n. 15, 91

Ursicinus: 167, 189

Valens: 38, 40, 170-3, 180 n. 11, 187 n. 21, 196, n. 6, 209, 210, 215, 221 n. 46, 222-3, 247, 254-7
Valentinianus: 38, 166-7, 171-3, 195 n. 6, 209, 210 n. 5, 222-3, 254
Valentinianus II: 195 n. 6
Valerian: 81, 146
Varro: 134 n. 50, 213 n. 25
Verus: 173
Vespasian: 133, 143-4
Vetranio: 182 n. 14, 187 n. 21
Victory: 140, 146, 154 n. 52
Vienne: 196-8, 201, 203-4
Vinkovci: 147
Virgil: 257 n. 35
visions: 139, 148, 150-1
Vitellius: 143
Vritra: 157

wadi Kishon: 93 n. 36

Yormund: 157

Zeno: 141
Zenobia: 143
Zephyrinus: 132
Zeus: 153-4
Zo'ora: 95
Zoar: 95
Zosimus: 37, 41 n. 16, 188 n. 25

INDEX OF PASSAGES DISCUSSED

Greek and Latin Texts
Ad Herennium
4.39.51: 229 n. 14
4.51: 231 n. 21

Ammianus Marcellinus
14.10.11-15: 237, 239
14.11: 250-4; 259
14.11.12: 195 n. 4
14.5.1: 195 n. 4
14.6: 211
14.6.17: 231 n. 22
14.6.18: 218
14.6.20: 221 n. 47
14.7: 248-9, 259
14.7.6: 248
14.7.9: 248
14.7.11: 248
14.7.12: 248
14.7.13: 235
14.7.14: 248
14.7.15-16: 249
14.9.1: 189
14.9.9: 167 n. 28
15.2.1: 252
15.2.5: 167 n. 24
15.5.8: 188 n. 27
15.5.18: 195 n. 2
15.5.27: 195 n. 2
15.5.33: 187 n. 22
15.8.1: 197 n. 12
15.8.3: 197 n. 15
15.8.4-17: 195 n. 6, 196 n. 11
15.8.4-15: 239
15.8.9: 198 n. 20
15.8.11: 239
15.8.15: 257 n. 39
15.8.16: 164, 230 n. 18
16.1: 169 n. 37
16.10.1-20: 195 n. 7
16.10.6-7: 232
16.10.9: 240
16.10.13: 195 n. 4
16.12.8: 240
16.12.28-34: 240
16.12.57: 231
17.9.7: 182 n. 14
17.10.9: 195 n. 2
17.13.25-33: 238
17.13.32: 238
18.5.6: 231
18.7.7: 218
19.8.12: 189
19.12.8: 231
20.1.2: 166 n. 20
20.2.5: 189
20.4.1-22: 195 n. 6
20.4.10-19: 199 n. 23
20.5.1-10: 195 n. 6
20.5.1: 240
20.5.8: 257 n. 39
21.1.2: 179 n. 7
21.1.4: 195 n. 4
21.5.1: 240
21.5.7: 195 n. 5
21.5.9: 257 n. 39
21.6.2: 195 n. 2
21.7.1: 185

21.7.2: 181; 182 n. 14
21.8.1: 182 n. 14; 183; 187 n. 22
21.8.3: 187; 191
21.9.2: 187 n. 21, 201 n. 34
21.9.4: 200 n. 25
21.9.5: 182 n. 15
21.9.6: 177, 200 n. 27, 201 n. 30
21.9.7-8: 177
21.9.8: 195 n. 2
21.10.1: 177; 178 n. 5
21.10.2: 177, 195 n. 4
21.10.5: 177
21.11.1: 178
21.11.2-3: 202 n. 38
21.11.2: 178 n. 4, 202 n. 37
21.12.1-19: 202 n. 38
21.12.3: 177
21.12.4-15: 179
21.12.22: 183
21.13.1-2: 185
21.13.2: 202 n. 36
21.13.6: 180 n. 11
21.13.9-16: 239
21.13.16: 180 n. 11
21.15.3: 202 n. 38
21.16.15-16: 237 n. 40
22.2.1: 203 n. 40
22.2.2: 203 n. 41
22.2.4: 203 n. 39
22.3.1: 187
22.3.4: 200 n. 25
22.3.6: 200 n. 25
22.3.9: 184
22.7.2: 195 n. 4
22.8.1: 212 n. 16
22.9.16: 195 n. 2
22.11.1: 182 n. 14
22.14.3: 230 n. 18
23.1.1: 168
23.3.3: 195 n. 3
23.3.8: 195 n. 2, n. 3
23.4.3: 212 n. 16
23.5.7: 189
23.6.21: 212 n. 16
23.6.30: 212 n. 16
24.3.3: 240
24.3.8: 240
25.3.15-22: 240 n. 49
25.4.17: 167 n. 23
25.5.1-9: 195 n. 6
25.8.5: 167 n. 23
25.8.9-10: 200 n. 26
25.8.9: 188
25.9.4: 195 n. 3
25.10.14: 230 n. 18
26.1.1: 209, 222
26.2.1-7: 195 n. 6
26.4.1-4: 195 n. 6
26.5.2: 187
26.6-10: 254-8; 259
26.6.15-16: 195 n. 6
26.6.15: 172, 221 n. 47, 231
26.6.16: 256-7
26.6.18: 234
26.9.6: 187 n. 22
26.9.7: 187 n. 22
27.2: 222 n. 51
27.3.1-2: 234
27.3.6: 195 n. 4
27.4.5: 212 n. 16
27.5: 222 n. 51
27.6.4-16: 195 n. 6
27.6.5-9: 171 n. 43
27.6.9: 171-2
27.6.15: 168 n. 32
27.6.16: 173 n. 50
27.8: 222 n. 51
27.10: 222 n. 51
27.11.1: 165
27.11.6: 166 n. 22, n. 19
28.1: 222 n. 51
28.1.57: 171
28.2: 222 n. 51
28.3: 222 n. 51
28.4: 211, 222
28.4.8: 166 n. 20
28.4.10: 167 n. 30
28.4.14: 162 n. 3
28.4.18: 231 n. 22
28.4.19: 231 n. 22

28.4.27: 166 n. 20, 221 n. 47
28.5: 222 n. 51
28.6.29: 231
29.1-2: 222 n. 51
29.1.38: 231
30.4: 207-23
30.4.3-22: 212
30.4.4: 210-1, 220-1
29.4.7: 167 n. 29
30.4.9: 214
30.4.10: 214
30.4.11-12: 215
30.4.11: 218
30.4.13: 216-7
30.4.14: 217
30.4.15: 221
30.4.17: 218
30.4.19: 166 n. 20, 218
30.4.20-22: 219
30.5.4-11: 166 n. 21
30.6: 222 n. 51
30.10.4-5: 195 n. 6
31.4.1-14: 247
31.5.10-17: 223
31.10: 169-173
31.10.11: 170
31.10.18: 170
31.11.2: 180 n. 11
31.12.1: 180 n. 11
31.16.8: 172 n. 45
31.16.9: 40, 163 n. 9, 216 n. 34

Aphthonius
10.36.22: 229 n. 13

Aristoteles
Poet.
1450a,7-1454a,24: 250-3
Rh.
1358a36-b8: 71 n. 29

Athanasius Alexandrinus
Decr.
18.3.1: 79 n. 59

Aurelius Victor
Caes.
42.20-21: 179 n. 7

Ausonius
Grat. actio
7.35: 173 n. 48
18.83: 173 n. 49

Basilius Caesariensis
Ep.
204: 115 n. 23

Cassius Dio
64.14.3: 143
72.8-10: 151 n. 42

Cicero
Ac.
2.17: 229 n. 14
De Orat.
3.121: 216-7
2.62-63: 161 n. 1
3.225: 218
Div.
1.23: 140 n. 4
1.37: 219 n. 39
Fin.
5.2: 100 n. 65
Orat.
18.60: 164
Part.
6.20: 229 n. 14
23.81: 215
Phil.
2.7: 67 n. 15
Rep.
5.9.11: 215 n. 29

Clemens Alexandrinus
Prot.
1.1: 55

Consularia Constantinopolitana
s.a. 324: 181 n. 13
s.a. 361: 202 n. 38

Dionysius Halicarnassensis
De Lys.
7: 229 n. 14
De Thud.
22-23: 229 n. 14

Didymus Alexandrinus
In. Eccl.
1.6-8: 112 n. 15_

Dino
FGrHist 690 F100: 140 n. 4

Epiphanius
Haer.
1.309: 127 n. 14
1.366: 73 n. 36
2.201: 73 n. 36
2.308: 73 n. 36
3.196: 73 n. 36
3.209: 73 n. 36
3.224: 73 n. 36
3.445: 73 n. 36

Epitome de Caesaribus
42.18: 179 n. 7

Eusebius Caesarensis
Chron.
117.1-124.5: 142 n. 17
247-261: 142 n. 17
HE
1.1: 39, 44 n. 19; 65
1.1.1-2: 53
1.1.1: 65, 110
1.1.2: 65
1.1.3-5: 65
1.1.3: 50 n.1, 65-6
1.1.4: 66
1.1.8: 55
1.2.7: 73 n. 38
1.2.8: 55
1.2.13: 73 n. 38
1.2.19: 57
1.2.23: 57
1.4.12: 73 n. 38
1.4.15: 57
1.5.4: 73 n. 37
1.7.1: 73 n. 38, 81
1.7.2-16: 70 n. 25, 80
1.7.14: 74 n. 43
1.8.5: 73 n. 37
1.12.2: 130
1.13.5-10: 70 n. 25
1.13.5-8: 80
1.13.5: 73-4
1.13.6-8: 69
1.13.10: 69, 80
2.2.4: 73 n. 37
2.5.2: 73 n. 37
2.6.1: 73 n. 37
2.11.1: 73 n. 37
2.15: 118 n. 34
2.17.1: 78 n. 56
2.17.17: 116 n. 30
2.17.22: 73 n. 38
2.20.1: 73 n. 37, n. 38
2.26.1: 73 n. 37
2.26.2: 73 n. 37
3.1.3: 73 n. 37
3.2.1: 129
3.3.2: 112 n. 15
3.4.8: 131
3.5.5: 73 n. 38
3.7.3: 116 n. 30
3.9.5: 73 n. 38
3.10.8: 73 n. 38
3.13: 132
3.15: 132
3.19: 73 n. 37
3.21: 130, 132
3.22: 130
3.23.3: 73 n. 37
3.29.1: 73 n. 37
3.31.2: 70 n. 25, 71 n. 28
3.31.3: 70 n. 25, 80

3.31.5: 73 n. 37
3.32.3: 73 n. 37
3.32.7: 78 n. 56
3.36.2: 130
3.36.6: 70–73
3.36.7–9: 70, 80
3.36.11: 80
3.36.13–15: 80
3.36.13: 73 n. 38
3.39: 118 n. 34
4.1: 131
4.2.5: 73 n. 38
4.8.3–7: 80
4.8.7: 67 n. 16, 74, 115 n. 27
4.9.1–3: 80
4.13: 80
4.15.2–46: 80
4.15.15: 73 n. 37
4.22: 59
4.22.2–3: 126
4.23.5: 78 n. 56
4.23.10–11: 80
4.23.12: 75, 80
4.24: 115 n. 24
5.Pin.: 142
5.1.3–2.7: 80
5.2.1: 73 n. 38
5.2.4: 72
5.3–4: 142
5.4.1–2: 80
5.5.1–7: 151
5.5.5: 151
5.6: 132
5.6.1–2: 130
5.6.4: 130
5.7.3: 72
5.8.1: 116 n. 30
5.8.5: 74 n. 43
5.8.10: 73 n. 37
5.16.20–22: 116 n. 30
5.18: 74 n. 43
5.18.1: 73 n. 37, n. 38
5.19: 80, 111
5.20.2: 74
5.20.4–8: 67 n. 16, 80
5.24.1–8: 80
5.24.6: 78 n. 55
5.24.11: 73 n. 38
5.24.12–17: 80
5.25: 74 n. 43, 80
5.25.1: 73 n. 38
5.26.1: 72 n. 31
5.28.1: 75
5.28.2–3: 132
5.28.2: 73 n. 37
5.28.7: 73 n. 38
5.28.13: 78
5.28.15: 75–6
5.28.16–17: 76
5.28.16: 74 n. 43
5.28.18: 76
6.2.6: 73 n. 37
6.2.14: 78 n. 56
6.11.3: 73 n. 37, 80
6.11.5–6: 80
6.12.2: 113
6.12.3–6: 114–20
6.13.3: 78 n. 56
6.14.8–9: 80
6.18: 111 n .13
6.19.4: 73 n. 37
6.19.11–14: 80
6.19.17–18: 81
6.22.1: 73 n. 37, 78 n. 55
6.25.3: 78
6.31: 73 n. 39
6.33.1: 78 n. 56
6.34: 72
6.40: 81
6.41–42: 81
6.43.5–20: 81
6.43.15: 78 n. 56
6.44: 81
6.45: 81
6.46.4: 73 n. 38, 81
7.Pin.: 78 n. 55
7.5: 81
7.6: 74 n. 43
7.7: 81
7.7.4: 78 n. 56

7.8: 81
7.9: 81
7.10: 81
7.11.2-19: 81
7.11.20-25: 81
7.13: 67 n. 16, 81
7.20.1: 78 n. 55
7.21: 81
7.22: 81
7.23.1-4: 81
7.29: 63 n. 2
7.30.1-17: 81
7.30.3: 74 n. 43, 115 n. 27
7.30.6: 78 n. 56
7.32.9: 67 n. 13
7.32.13: 78 n. 55
8.10.1-10: 67-74, 82
8.10.1: 71
8.10.2-10: 71 n. 30
8.17.2-11: 82
9.1.2: 68 n. 18
9.1.3-6: 67 n. 16, 68 n. 18, 82
9.7.2: 74 n. 43
9.7.14: 72
9.8.14: 72
9.9.10: 73 n. 38
9.9a: 74 n. 43
9.9a.1-9: 67 n. 16, 82
9.10.6: 74 n. 43
10.4: 67 n. 13, 87 n. 9
10.5.1: 74 n. 43
10.5.2-14: 67 n. 16
10.5.15-17: 67 n. 16, 82
10.5.15: 74 n. 43
10.5.18-20: 82
10.5.18: 74 n. 43
10.5.21-24: 82
10.5.21: 74 n. 43
10.6: 82
10.6.1: 74 n. 43
10.7.1: 74 n. 43, 82

LC
8: 104 n. 82
18.3: 102 n. 76

Onomast.
2.3-20: 88 n. 13
2.5-17: 88 n. 14
2.11-12: 100 n. 66
2.17-18: 91 n. 26
2.18-20: 87 n. 5
2.23-24.25: 91 n. 31
4.9: 97 n. 54
6.2: 97 n. 54
6.5: 97 n. 54
6.8-9: 92 n. 33
6.8: 97 n. 54
6.11: 92 n. 33
6.12-14: 93 n. 37
6.12-13: 96 n. 51, 101 n. 69
6.20: 94 n. 43
8.1: 97 n. 54
8.12: 97 n. 54
8.19: 97 n. 54
10.17: 99 n. 60
10.18: 97 n. 54
10.19-20: 94 n. 43
12.3: 97 n. 54
12.5: 97 n. 54
12.7: 99 n. 60
14.2: 97 n. 54
14.23: 97 n. 54
16.4: 93 n. 36
16.19: 97 n. 54
18.2: 97 n. 54
18.21-22: 92
20.3: 97 n. 54
20.11: 96 n. 51
20.19: 92 n. 33
22.26: 95 n. 48
24.10-11: 94 n. 43
26.13-14: 96 n. 49
30.7: 95 n. 48
32.15-7: 95 n. 48
38.2: 99 n. 60
38.20-21: 96 n. 49
38.21: 99 n. 60
40.1-4: 87 n. 6, 93 n. 38, 96 n. 49
42.1-5: 95
42.3-4: 94 n. 43

42.4-5: 95 n. 48
42.11-12: 96 n. 50
42.12: 99 n. 60
44.22: 95 n. 48
46.18: 93 n. 36
46.20: 99 n. 60
48.22-4: 93
50.3: 94 n. 43
52.1-5: 96 n. 49
52.25: 95 n. 48
58.13-14: 96 n. 49
58.15-26: 97-8
58.15-17: 96 n. 49, 96 n. 52
58.18-20: 93 n. 38, 96 n. 49
62.26: 97 n. 54
64.9: 93
64.25-66.1: 91 n. 28
68.21: 93 n. 37
70.8: 92 n. 33
70.19-21: 96 n. 50
70.24-25: 96 n. 50
74.13-15: 96 n. 49
74.16-18: 96 n. 49
74.19-21: 96 n. 49
76.1-3: 93 n. 37
76.14: 97 n. 54
82.13: 96 n. 50
84.12: 97 n. 54
94.21: 93 n. 37
96.20-1: 94 n. 43
96.25: 97 n. 54
98.1-12: 86
102.4-5: 92
104.30-1: 99 n. 62
104.31: 97 n. 54
106.20: 92 n. 33
108.1-4.: 93-4
108.2-3: 96 n. 49
112.10-11: 91 n. 28
112.16-17: 96 n. 49
114.17-18: 96 n. 50
116.18-19: 93 n. 40
116.18: 94 n. 43
116.23: 93 n. 36
118.7: 94 n. 43
118.11: 93
124.15-6: 94 n. 44
124.20: 97 n. 54
128.22: 94 n. 43
136.18: 93 n. 36
142.14: 94 n. 43
152.11: 97 n. 54
154.7: 93 n. 36
158.28: 93 n. 36
172.21-22: 94 n. 43

PE
1.10.29: 99 n. 60
2.2.48: 99 n. 60
3.10.21: 99 n. 60
10.9.28: 67 n. 14

VC
1.28-29: 139
3.3: 157
3.25-53: 103 n. 79
3.26-40: 87 n. 9
3.26: 103
3.26.3: 104 n. 81
3.28: 102 n. 76, 104 n. 82
3.30.1: 102 n. 76
3.30.4: 102 n. 75, n. 76
3.33: 104 n. 83
3.51-53: 93 n. 37, 104 n. 82
3.53: 101 n. 69
3.53.4: 104 n. 84
3.54-58: 103 n. 79, 104 n. 82
4.15.1: 148

Eutropius
10.15: 179 n. 7

Galenus
7.417: 78

Gellius
1.5.tit.: 218
1.11.tit.: 218
1.15.11: 218
3.1.10: 218
4.1.1: 218
6.16.1: 218

Gregorius Nazianzenus
Or.
4.47: 201 n. 32, n. 35

Hermog.
Prog.
2.16.10.1: 229 n. 13

Hieronymus
Chron.
s.a. 361: 202 n. 38
De Vir. Ill.
1: 112 n. 15
41: 112 n. 15
Ep.
42.17: 202 n. 38
In Chr.
PL 29.423: 87 n. 4
Praef. in Paralip.
PL 29.401a: 99 n. 61

Homerus
Od.
12.47-8: 166 n. 19
12.173-7: 166 n. 19

Ignatius Antiochenus
Rom.
4.3: 132
4.5: 71 n. 26

Iosephus
AJ
1.35.2: 99 n. 59
1.90-95: 91 n. 31
1.92.6: 99 n. 59
1.125.4: 99 n. 59
1.131.2: 99 n. 59
1.138: 99 n. 59
1.203.7: 99 n. 62
10.10.3-11.1: 142 n. 18
BJ
3.8.9: 143

Iren. Lugd.
Ep. Pol.
7.2.: 128 n. 25
Haer.
1.9.4: 118
2.26.1-2: 118
2.31.2: 72
3.1.1: 118
3.3.3: 130, 132
3.11.8: 118

Julianus
Ep.
84.429c: 199 n. 22
Or.
1.31c-d: 240 n. 46
7.228d: 205 n. 45
Ep. ad Ath.
269d: 201 n. 31
286b: 181

Julius Obsequens
68: 140

Justinus
Epit.
15.4.2-10: 155 n. 53

Justinus Martyr
1Apol.
60: 55
Dial.
35.6: 115 n. 24
106.3: 118 n. 34

Lactantius
De Mort. Pers.
44.4-5: 139

Libanius
Or.
12.62: 181 n. 12
18.40: 197 n. 12
18.104: 185 n. 19
18.111: 201 n. 31
18.154: 240 n. 50

Longinus
De sublimitate
4: 115 n. 23

Lucianus
Hist. Conscr.
51: 233 n. 25

Martyrium Polycarpi
9.3: 133 n. 45

Notitia Dignitatum
Oc.
5.252: 178
7.150: 178
32.32: 179 n. 8
32.35: 179 n. 8
32.49: 183 n. 16
32.50: 183 n. 16
32.54: 183 n. 16
Or.
5.42: 180 n. 11
5.47: 180 n. 11
6.42: 180 n. 11
6.47: 180 n. 11

Origenes
Com. in Io.
6.41-2: 86 n. 4
Com. in Mt. 10-17
10.17: 112 n. 15
Hom. 1-39 in Lc.
SCh 87.145: 129

Origo Gentis Romanae
16-18: 181 n. 13

Orosius
7.35.16: 187 n. 22

Panegyrici Latini
3.9.1-2: 197 n. 12
7.21: 139, 150
10.4-5: 197 n. 12
10.14: 140 n. 7
11.6.2: 201 n. 31
11.7.2: 201 n. 33

Pausanias
1.4.5: 98 n. 57
1.19.5: 98 n. 57
1.30.4: 98 n. 57
1.35.3: 98 n. 57
2.15.2: 98 n. 57
7.2.9: 98 n. 58

Petronius
126.3: 164 n. 11

Philippus Sidetes
Fr. 4.4: 112 n. 15

Plato
Tim.
28C: 55

Plinius Maior
HN
2.99: 140 n. 5
35.92: 154 n. 50

Plutarchus
Alex.
4.3: 154 n. 50
Cat. Min.
23.3: 63 n. 2
Mor.
335A: 154 n. 50

Porphyrius
FGrHist 260 F 32: 142 n. 17

Posidippus historicus
31: 153 n. 49

Pseudo-Callisthenes
1.6-7: 158
1.32.5-7: 158 n. 67
1.32.10-13: 158 n. 67

Quintilianus
1.10.22: 218 n. 38
4.2.63-64: 231 n. 21
6.2.32: 229 n. 14
8.3.61: 229 n. 14
9.2.40-41: 231 n. 21
9.2.40: 229 n. 14

Scriptores Historiae Augustae
Aurel.
22.5-24.9: 143 n. 21
24.4: 151 n. 42
25.3-6: 143
Gall.
16.4: 147 n. 28
18.2: 147 n. 28
Tac.
13.2-3: 144 n. 24

Socrates Scholasticus
2.47.4: 202 n. 38
3.1.1: 202 n. 38

Sozomenus
5.1.6: 202 n. 38

Strabo
7.7.1: 158 n. 66

Suda
δ 1140: 90 n. 21

Suetonius
Vesp.
5.143: 143

Symmachus
Or.
3: 170 n. 40

Tertullianus
Praescr.
32: 127 n. 15

Theodoretus Cyrensis
Haer.
2.2: 112 n. 15

Themistius
Or.
13: 170 n. 40

Theon
2.118.7-8: 229 n. 13

Thucydides
1.22: 63
8.53.3: 64 n. 5

Valerius Maximus
8.10.1: 218 n. 38

Zonaras
12.28: 144 n. 24

Zosimus
HN
1.63.1: 144 n. 24
3.10.3: 201 n. 31
2.54.1: 185 n. 19
2.49-50: 181 n. 13

Biblical and Apocryphal Texts
Vetus Testamentum
Gen.
14.2: 95 n. 47
18.1-33: 93 n. 37
19.1: 56
32.30: 56
Josh.
5.15: 56
Prov.
8.22-24: 56
8.27: 56
Dan.
5.6: 164

Novum Testamentum
Mt
12.32: 76 n. 47
16.17-19: 128
Mc
3.29: 76 n. 47
Lc
12.10: 76 n. 47
Io
1.28: 86-7
Gal.
2.11: 130
Apoc.
1.11: 133 n. 43
2.8: 133 n. 43

Gospel of Peter
2.3-5: 112 n. 18
14.60: 112

Inscriptions
AE
1968, 631: 199 n. 21
ILS
771: 172 n. 46
772: 172 n. 45
773: 172 n. 45
778: 173 n. 47

Papyri
P. Cair.
10759: 111-3
P. Egerton
2: 112 n. 18
P. Oxy.
2949: 112 n. 18
4009: 112 n. 18
P. Vindob.
G 2325: 112 n. 18
Ostrakon Van Haelst
Nr. 741: 112 n. 18

Coins
RIC
V/1
106, 1: 146
VII
572-3, 19-28: 155
VIII
195, 236-238: 201 n. 29
229, 313-317: 201 n. 29
337, 242-243: 201 n. 29
380, 411-413: 201 n. 29
380, 417-419: 201 n. 29
392, 105-107: 201 n. 29
423, 222-226: 201 n. 29
462, 161-164: 201 n. 29
483, 118-122: 201 n. 29

List of illustrations

Fig. 1. Tacitus, antoninianus, first half of 276, Serdica. 145

Fig. 2. Tacitus, antoninianus, 276 Antioch. 145

Fig. 3. Tacitus, bronze medallion, 276. 146

Fig. 4. Gallienus, bronze medallion. 146

Fig. 5. Constantine I, silver medallion, 315, Milan, electrotype held in the Staatliche Münzsammlung in Munich. 148

Fig. 6. Constantine I, gold medallion, 326-327, Siscia. 149

Fig. 7. Alexander the Great, gold medallion from Abu Qir, 220-225? 150

Fig. 8. Trajan Decius, bronze coin, 249-251, Maeonia (Lydia). 152

Fig. 9. Ptolemy III, bronze coin, 246-221 BC, Alexandria. 153

Fig. 10. Alexander III, The Great, silver dekadrachm, 336-323 BC, Babylon. 154

Fig. 11. Constantine I, nummus with reverse legend SPES PVBLIC-A, c. 330, Constantinople. 156