Finally, the association of *Anth. Pal.* 10.92 and 9.175 in the context of an appeal might explain the curious use of an iambic prologue to introduce a single epigram. As noted at the outset, this sort of prologue (although usually longer) typically introduces a long hexameter poem. Iambic trimeter, however, was employed for this purpose precisely because it was the metre of straightforward communication. In the case of *Anth. Pal.* 10.92, therefore, Palladas offers in unambiguous language a *captatio* for the judge, suggesting that the man's verdicts and lectures are the products of inspiration, no less than the epigram that he is about to present in return. And he concludes the prologue with a sort of apology for omitting conventional platitudes, as well as a statement of the grounds for his confidence. *Anth. Pal.* 9.175, then, is a sample of his craft (he was primarily an elegiac poet) that by clever turns exposes the injustice and calls on his addressee to intervene. I would imagine that this pair was composed first for oral delivery before the judge and only later included in a written collection, but that is frankly a guess.

The textual emendation proposed at the beginning of this article, in my opinion, must be accorded a very high degree of likelihood. At least, it is more economical and generates better sense than any reading hitherto suggested. Once *Anth. Pal.* 10.92 is properly understood, its association with *Anth. Pal.* 9.175 also seems quite likely. At any rate, 9.175 is a far better candidate than any other extant epigram ascribed to Palladas. The identification of his addressee – the judge and 'Friend of God' – as Constantine is naturally somewhat more speculative, but it fits very well with the emerging picture of Palladas' place in the early decades of the fourth century.

University of Toronto KEVIN W. WILKINSON
kw.wilkinson@utoronto.ca
doi:10.1017/S0009838814000937

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS 15.5.22 AND EUTROPIUS 10.16.1: AN ALLUSION

In *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, John Marincola downplays the importance of an historian's choice to use first-, rather than third-, person verbs to represent his actions as an historical protagonist within his narrative.[1] Marincola's justification for this rests on the incongruous groupings that arise if one divides first-person narrators from third: among the former we find Velleius, Eutropius and Ammianus representing Latin historians of the Empire.[2] However, as part of a wider study which examines Ammianus' nuanced use of allusion to earlier Latin authors, Gavin Kelly has recently argued for a series of close intertextual relationships between Eutropius and Ammianus.[3] I argue here that Ammianus' relationship with Eutropius also extends

[1] J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997), 179.
[2] Marincola (n. 1), 79 and 179. Such over-simple categorization can be problematic: Chris Pelling's recent analysis of Caesar's narrative demonstrates that, in texts where the author appears as a character, the use of the third person does not exclude some of the aspects, particularly focalization, more commonly associated with first-person narration. C.B.R. Pelling, 'Xenophon's and Caesar's third-person narratives – or are they?', in A. Marmodoro and J. Hill (edd.), *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2013), 39–76.
[3] G. Kelly, *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian* (Cambridge, 2008), 240–53.

to their personal roles within their narratives, and that Ammianus' use of the first person singular makes a bold statement about his historiographical programme.

In an allusion which has not previously been noted (by Kelly or any other scholar), Ammianus' initial use of the first person singular to refer to himself as an historical actor in the extant portion of his *Res Gestae* alludes to the same practice in Eutropius. In A.D. 355 Ammianus (who held the rank of *protector domesticus*) accompanied his commander, the *magister militum* Ursicinus, to Cologne on the orders of the emperor Constantius II to suppress the rebellion of the Frankish *magister peditum* Silvanus.[4] Ammianus notes his presence among Ursicinus' retinue:

inter quos ego quoque eram (15.5.22).

In similar language, Eutropius records his presence on the emperor Julian's Persian expedition in A.D. 363:

cui expeditioni ego quoque interfui (10.16.1).

Both authors set the indication of their presence on their respective expeditions within relative clauses; both combine the emphatic *ego* with *quoque*; although Ammianus uses the first singular imperfect of *esse* uncompounded with *inter*, he uses *inter* as a preposition to the relative.[5] In Eutropius this is the only use of the first person by the narrator, in Ammianus it is the first use in the extant portion of his work.[6]

In a phrase which has the outward aim of establishing the historian's authority based upon his eyewitness credentials, Ammianus also alludes to the same practice in his recent predecessor Eutropius.[7] Does the allusion to Eutropius aid or compromise Ammianus' authority, especially since, together with Velleius, Ammianus and Eutropius are so unusual in being first-person participant narrators within the genre of Latin historiography?[8]

Ammianus was certainly aware of Eutropius' career and work. He refers to Eutropius by name, though in the latter's role as proconsular governor of Asia rather than as an

[4] For the episode see J.F. Drinkwater, 'Silvanus, Ursicinus and Ammianus Marcellinus: fact or fiction?', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VII* (Brussels, 1994), 568–76 and D. Hunt, 'The outsider inside: Ammianus on the rebellion of Silvanus', in D. Hunt and J.W. Drijvers (edd.), *The Late Roman World and its Historian* (London, 1999), 51–63. For Ammianus' first-person narrative here and elsewhere, see Kelly (n. 3), 38–41.

[5] It seems to be a feature of Ammianus' style to split *inter* from *esse*, especially in relative clauses, e.g. 14.11.2, 14.11.14, 15.5.4, 16.12.7, 21.14.4, 23.6.69, 25.4.20, 30.1.2. He only once uses *interesse* in the sense of 'to be among', and this does not occur in a relative clause: *ne feruentibus proeliis interesset* (31.7.5). It may be the case that **intereram* was not an available option on stylistic grounds, even though it would have further aided the identification of the allusion.

[6] Ammianus has used the first person to refer to his presence with Ursicinus in Antioch in Book 14. However, there he only uses the first person plural (14.11.5). Ammianus was a junior *protector domesticus* (a mid-ranking staff officer) in 357 (16.10.21). It seems unlikely that he played a major part in any event in the lattermost of the lost books, which narrated the years leading up to 353. Ammianus had already avoided the first person singular in Book 14, and so it seems likely that 15.5.22 is the first use of the first person singular in the whole work.

[7] For autopsy as a means of constructing authority, see A.J. Woodman and R.H. Martin, *The Annals of Tacitus, Book 3* (Cambridge, 1996), 168–70 and Marincola (n. 1), 79.

[8] Velleius' presence in his narrative has prompted criticism of his lack of objectivity as an historian: see A.J. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus: The Tiberian Narrative* (Cambridge, 1977), 43–5 and Marincola (n. 1), 198.

historian (29.1.36). Additionally, Kelly has recently demonstrated that by deploying close lexical allusions to Eutropius in, for example, his narration of the final days of Jovian's short reign, Ammianus strives 'to use the language of breviary to make Jovian's death seem a triviality'.[9] Alluding to Eutropius thus also brings to mind the genre of breviary history: Eutropius provides not just a source of information for Ammianus, but a genre and historiographical practice with which to engage.[10]

Something similar, I argue, occurs at 15.5.22. Book 15 begins with a preface in which Ammianus outlines his programme: *tunc enim laudanda est breuitas, cum moras rumpens intempestiuas nihil subtrahit cognitioni gestorum* 'for brevity is only then to be praised, when breaking untimely delays, it subtracts nothing from the understanding of events'. Scholars have argued that Ammianus here disparages the current trend of breviary history proffered by Eutropius, Aurelius Victor and Festus in the 360s.[11] Why does Ammianus allude to Eutropius so soon after condemning the latter's chosen genre?

One possible answer may lie in the only substantial alteration that Ammianus has made to Eutropius' text, from the perfect *interfui* to the imperfect *eram*. In historical narrative, verbs in the imperfect tense establish a background of events upon which verbs in the perfect tense carry the narration forward in the foreground.[12] These roles are determined, however, not so much by tense, but by aspect. The perfect is a past perfective, representing complete, bounded action in the past, and the imperfect a past imperfective representing on-going, unbounded action also in the past.[13] Eutropius mentions his presence in Persia just once and as a single, complete event, whereas Ammianus goes on to include himself in the actions of Ursicinus' mission to depose Silvanus by the use of a further four first-person plural verbs (*mirabamur*, *festinamus*, *inuenimus*, *scrutabamus*).[14] Ammianus seems to establish his presence, as well as his procedure for recording it using the first person, as a far more pervasive feature of his narrative than Eutropius does.

[9] Kelly (n. 3), 252.

[10] All the passages of Eutropius that Kelly identifies as sources for allusion in Ammianus also appear in the final chapters of the *Breviarium*, e.g. Amm. Marc. 25.10.12 ~ Eutr. 10.17.3, Amm. Marc. 25.9.9 ~ Eutr. 10.17.1. Kelly (n. 3), 240–50. The allusion at Amm. Marc. 15.5.22 also follows and corroborates the pattern.

[11] G. Sabbah, 'Ammianus Marcellinus', in G. Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity* (Leiden, 2003), 43–84, at 62, and Kelly (n. 3), 240.

[12] See H. Pinkster, *Latin Syntax and Semantics*, trans. H. Mulder (London, 1990), 237–9 for 'foreground' and 'background' tenses. In their survey of the use of 'narrative' tenses in Books 22 and 23 of the *Res Gestae*, Kroon and Rose confirm that Ammianus' use of the perfect, imperfect and historic present follows the practice of Classical Latin narrative: C. Kroon and P. Rose, 'Atrociter corruptus? The use of "narrative" tenses in Ammianus Marcellinus' *Res Gestae*', in R. Risselada and J.R. de Jong (edd.), *On Latin: Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honour of Harm Pinkster* (Amsterdam, 1996), 71–89.

[13] B. Comrie, *Aspect* (Cambridge, 1976), esp. 13, 71 and 83 for references to Latin, *pace* H. Pinkster, 'Tempus, aspect and Aktionsart in Latin (recent trends 1961–1981)', *ANRW* 2.29.1 (1983), 270–319.

[14] Eutropius favours the perfect throughout his chapter on Julian's Persian expedition and death (10.16), reflecting the nature of breviary history which demands a compressed series of successive events, without the 'backgrounding' created by the imperfect. Ammianus uses a combination of imperfect verbs and historic presents during the narration of his mission (15.5.22–31). The historic present essentially functions as an alternative for the perfect within historical narrative, albeit with a heightened emotional intensity: see Pinkster (n. 12), 239–40, Kroon and Rose (n. 12), 76. It is a curious phenomenon, and one whose investigation is beyond the scope of this note, that the densest pockets of the historic present in Ammianus, according to Ehrismann's list, cluster around the sections of extensive first-person narrative in Books 15, 18 and 25: see H. Ehrismann, *De temporum et modorum usu Ammianeo* (Strasbourg, 1886), 9.

Ammianus' autoptic presence will recur in two further extensive sections of narrative: the fall of Amida in Books 18 and 19, and, as in Eutropius, Julian's Persian expedition in Books 23–5.

Following Ammianus' wider intertextual engagement with Eutropius (in which he employs close but subtly varied lexical allusion, drawn from the final chapters of Book 10 of the *Breviarium* and which comments on Eutropius' historiographical practice), this allusion may thus further exemplify Ammianus' objections to breviary history. Ammianus will not refer to his presence in a breviary fashion as a single event, but as an on-going feature of his narrative. The allusion strengthens his opposition to Eutropius' genre and sets out his programme for self-presentation. First-person narration in Ammianus can be seen as a response to contemporary historiographical practices.[15] It is neither incidental nor merely a straightforward statement of eyewitness authority.[16]

Howard College, University of KwaZulu-Natal ALAN J. ROSS
alan.ross@wolfson.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838814000731

[15] *Pace* J. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (London, 1989), 162, who suggests that 'Eutropius' book will have held scant interest for Ammianus'. Ammianus viewed it as both a precedent and a rival.

[16] I would like to thank Rhiannon Ash, Gavin Kelly and Chris Pelling for reading and commenting on earlier versions of this note, and especially Chris for sending me a pre-publication copy of Pelling (n. 2).

IN HECATE'S REALM: A NOTE ON SOZOMEN, *HIST. ECCL.* 7.23*

> 'Can you tell me, Philocles, what in the world it is that makes many men so fond of lying that they delight in telling preposterous tales themselves and listen with especial attention to those who spin yarns of that sort?'
> (Lucian, *Philops*. 1)

In the seventh book of his *Historia Ecclesiastica* the church historian Sozomen[1] provides us with a detailed account of the social and political climate and subsequent motives which precipitated the outbreak of the Riot of the Statues in Antioch A.D. 387. According to his version 'on the night before the sedition occurred, a spectre was seen in the form of a woman of prodigious height and terrible aspect, pacing through the streets of the city, lashing the air with an ill-sounding whip, similar to that which is used in goading on the beasts brought forward at the public theatres. It

* My gratitude goes to Mr Mark Hunter, Dr Peter Van Nuffelen, Dr Iveta Adams, Dr Manuel García Teijeiro and the anonymous referee for their kind suggestions. I would also like to thank for their support the Secretaría de Estado de Universidades e Investigación del Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia de España, and the research groups 'Diversidad cultural, paz y resolución de conflictos en el cristianismo antiguo' (HUM2006-11240-C02-02), Head Director Dr Fernández Ubiña, and HUM 404 'Tradición y Pervivencia de la Cultura Clásica', Head Director Dr Calvo Martínez.

[1] On his life and work, see J. Bidez, B. Grillet, G. Sabbah and A.-J. Festugière, *Sozomène: Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1983–2005), 9–26; G.F. Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret and Evagrius* (Paris, 1977), 192–200; P. Van Nuffelen, *Un heritage de paix et de piété: étude sur les histoires ecclésiastiques de Socrate et de Sozomène* (Leuven, 2004), 46–61.