

REVIEW–DISCUSSION
THE DUTCH AMMIANUS
COMMENTARY COMPLETED

Jan den Boeft, Jan Willem Drijvers, Daniël den Hengst, and Hans C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXXI*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2017. Pp. xxv + 362. Hardback, €169.00/\$195.00. ISBN 978-90-04-35381-7.

Proverbially, all good things must come to an end. On reaching Book 31 of the *Res gestae*, this final volume of the *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus* concludes one of the most fruitful and highly regarded collaborative projects in the fields of Latin literature and late antique historiography. In prefatory remarks, the authors understandably acknowledge ‘a sense of melancholy’ that a congenial scholarly journey, over thirty years, has reached its ultimate destination. The project itself had begun half a century earlier, in 1935, when Pieter de Jonge (1903–93) published the first part of his commentary on *Res gestae* 14 (1–6), originating as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Groningen. Publication of the second part (14.7–11) followed in 1939.¹ War and work intervened. Subsequently, as Rector of the Gemeentelijk Gymnasium in Hengelo (1940–68), De Jonge revived this ambitious undertaking and, from 1948 to 1982, as a solo endeavour, succeeded in publishing a further five volumes of commentaries on Books 15 to 19, with the pace of production sharply accelerating in retirement. De Jonge’s mission was continued and, in several respects, expanded by a new generation of Dutch scholars. Initially, a trio, comprising Jan den Boeft, Daniël den Hengst, and Hans Teitler, produced commentaries on 20–1 (1987–91). Joined in 1991 by Jan Willem Drijvers, over more than two decades this quartet (aka *quadriga Batavorum*) accomplished another ten volumes on 22–31 (1995–2017). After a succession of Groningen-based publishers, from Book 24 (2002) the series found a home at Koninklijke Brill, with which it is now closely identified. In addition to changes of personnel and publisher, the *Commentary* has, unremarkably, seen shifts in format, focus, and textual foundation. Post-War, the language of comment changed to English, leaving the two half-volumes on

¹ P. de Jonge, *Sprachlicher und historischer Kommentar zu Ammianus Marcellinus XIV 1–7* [in fact, 14.1–6]; *XIV, 2. Hälfte (c. 7–11)* (Groningen: Wolters 1935, 1939; reprinted in a single volume: Groningen: Bouma’s Boekhuis 1972).

Book 14 alone in German, an early but prescient sign of expansive anglophony. Post-De Jonge, the commentary became more historical, but no less philological, reflecting both collective expertise and the general trajectory of scholarship. From Book 20 (1987) also, Wolfgang Seyfarth's more conservative Teubner edition of the *Res gestae* (1978) supplanted Charles Clark's (1910–15) as the lemma text. Inevitably, as studies and translations of Ammianus accumulated,² and research in late antiquity flourished, the challenges of incorporating bibliography increased, though progression through the *Res gestae* naturally facilitated economies of space and effort by cross-referencing prior discussions of wording and substance—even this last volume looks back to the first.³ Often cited collectively as 'the Dutch commentators', redolent of a pioneering humanist fraternity in the 'Gouden Eeuw', the series is distinguished for disciplined regularity of publication, lately averaging a volume every couple of years, when such ventures can so easily lose momentum, and for authoritative, well-organised, and insightful exegesis, which in turn digests a vast literature that few individuals could hope to assemble, let alone find time to read.

In comparison to the extant books of the *Res gestae* in general, and particularly the preceding five integrally linked post-Julianic books (26–30), the monographic character of 31 has long been recognised, whether or not its apparent autonomy can justify theses in favour of separate composition, either as a later supplement (thus Sabbah) or a prior monograph in Greek, translated and loosely appended (Kulikowski).⁴ The commentators (pp. ix, 258, 284, 291) explicitly contest the latter proposition on compositional and linguistic grounds, and generally accentuate cohesion between 31 and earlier books. Moreover, the philological commentary amply demonstrates the conceptual depth of Ammianus' engagement with Latin literature, beyond mere choice of language, and the unlikelihood of 'translation' from a Greek literary milieu. The historical narrative of 31 is tightly defined in terms of time and especially place. Chronologically, it runs from late spring/early summer 376 to late summer/early autumn 378. Geographically, departing from Ammianus' practice in 26–30 of alternately reporting events in western and eastern provinces, 31 focuses almost exclusively on the Diocese of Thrace, the arena for a momentous Roman-Gothic struggle, charting the entry of displaced Gothic population-groups into Roman territory, their ensuing revolt, and military operations culminating in the defeat and death of Valens at

² See the annotated bibliography on Ammianus-related scholarship compiled by Jenkins (2016).

³ E.g., the commentary *ad* 31.7.7 (p. 129) refers readers to De Jonge *ad* 14.7.5; *ad* 31.8.2 (p. 144) to 14.7.5; *ad* 31.15.9 (p. 269) to 14.6.2.

⁴ Sabbah (1997); Kulikowski (2012). More attractive is Blockley's ((1994) 60) perception of an evolving monographic form across the *Res gestae*.

Adrianople. Only chapter 10 reports western events, namely Roman-Alamannic hostilities on the upper Rhine from February to (it is argued) June/July 378, but even this sub-narrative is largely subordinated to events in Thrace, inasmuch as Gratian's campaign against the Lentienses delays his eastward march, intensifies Valens' envy-fuelled rashness, and provides a contrasting portrait of imperial conduct. Otherwise the sole digression is an extended ethnographic excursus on Huns and Alans (ch. 2), in Ammianus' view the primary instigators of the crisis, and one of the best-known parts of his work, even if its historical value has depreciated in recent decades.

Book 31 poses specific interpretative challenges, both philological and historical. The constitution of the text rests on somewhat slimmer foundations than those of preceding books. For the later books especially, editors can ordinarily draw on the testimony of two closely linked ninth-century Carolingian codices, the *Hersfeldensis* and *Fuldensis*.⁵ Dismembered and reused as archival binding material in the later sixteenth century, the *Hersfeldensis* now survives as sparse codicological wreckage, but its text is indirectly transmitted insofar as it was previously utilised by Sigismundus Gelenius, selectively and unsystematically, in his hastily prepared edition of 1533, more so for Books 27–30. Book 31, however, had already come adrift from the *Hersfeldensis* by the time it came into Gelenius' hands and his edition likewise terminates at 30.9.6.⁶ The text of 31 therefore depends on the surviving prototype, the often corrupt and lacunose *Fuldensis* or *Vat. lat.* 1873 (V) and, occasionally, on its earliest Renaissance descendants. A substantial lacuna in V (= 31.8.5 *paulatim*—31.10.18 *dictu est*), owing to the loss of a bifolium between current 200^v and 201^r sometime after the mid-fifteenth century,⁷ requires editors to resort to three apographs of V that predate this material damage: *Vat. lat.* 2969 (E), *Florent. S. Marc.* I V 43 (F), and *Paris. lat.* 6120 (N). Seyfarth's decision to fill this gap on the sole manuscript authority of E (or at least without indicating readings in F and N) leads to deficiencies certainly in his apparatus and potentially in the text, inasmuch as the unidentified 'brilliant but erratic scholar' who copied E introduced numerous corrections and conjectural emendations. Whatever the editorial merit of these interventions, shared (correct or corrupt) readings in FN against E, excluding fortuity, must represent a more faithful transcription of the text that was to be found in the now-missing bifolium of their common

⁵ Kelly–Stover (2016) reopen the debate concerning the interrelationship of the two Carolingian manuscripts, arguing that they descend independently from a common hyparchetype, against the long-term consensus that the *Fuldensis* is a copy of the *Hersfeldensis*. Theirs is the most important publication on this question in eighty years.

⁶ Den Hengst (2010) provides a clear account of Gelenius' editorial practice and tendencies (one hesitates to call it 'method') and the questions they raise.

⁷ Kelly–Stover (2016) 110 n. 8 clarify the precise nature of the physical loss from V, involving the innermost bifolium of a ternion.

parent V.⁸ As in previous volumes of the *Commentary*, discussion of textual difficulties is marked by diligence and clarity of exposition; departures from Seyfarth's text are mostly based on judicious review of conjectures proposed in other editions or text-critical studies (among which the ingenuity of Henri de Valois and Petschenig, even where rejected, is conspicuous), but the commentators also demonstrate their own editorial acumen and feel for Ammianus' language, style, and prose rhythm.

Historically, Ammianus' near-exclusive concentration on the Thracian theatre sometimes requires elaboration of concurrent but unmentioned developments elsewhere, known only from other sources, such as the shifting security threats—Armenia, Saracens, Isauria—that kept Valens in Oriens. Despite Ammianus' narrowly focused and episodically detailed treatment of events in the eastern Balkans, limited or imprecise indications of time and/or place permit multiple reconstructions of the movements of different Gothic groups and Roman military responses. The *miles quondam* feels entitled to editorialise this operational narrative, critiquing strategic situations and passing judgement on participants, decisions, and outcomes, to the extent that it is difficult to see past his hindsighted opinion—Valens' reputation suffers most, while Gratian benefits from the relative obscurity of his objectives, resources, and capabilities. Yet, especially in the climactic confrontation near Adrianople, the historian's preference for sensory and (melo)dramatic intensities over technical content in depictions of combat leaves many uncertainties with regard to the location, topography, and course of engagements. Occasionally we glimpse other dimensions of the Roman-Gothic struggle, most strikingly incidents of 'defectors' or 'traitors', military and civilian, who assist Goths in combat or pillage (31.6.5–6, 7.7, 11.3, 15.2, 4, 8–9), indicative of tensions within the Roman army and broader societal upheaval, beyond the scapegoating rhetoric of 'betrayal' that such crises perennially evoke. The commentators judiciously guide readers through the possibilities offered by the text and deduced or assumed in secondary literature, and they are admirably willing to admit *aporia* rather than force the evidence. Notable is a new chronology of Gratian's passage from Gaul to Illyricum in 378, outlined in an introductory section (pp. xix–xxi) and presented in detail in commentary to 31.10 and 31.11.6 (pp. 165–6, 168–9, 176–8, 192–3).⁹ The revised schedule, which has Gratian departing Trier shortly after 1 June (based on the received text of *CTh* 1.15.9, before Seeck's emendation) rather than 20 April (*CTh* 8.5.35), is tighter but internally coherent and persuasively argued. Other sections of the commentary are almost self-contained studies of intrinsic value, including: the Hunnic-Alanic excursus (ch. 2), in which contemporary sources

⁸ Clark (1904) 4–7, 58–67, quoting 64; Seyfarth (1962) esp. 65–7.

⁹ See also a separate treatment in Drijvers–Teitler (2019).

of information, inherent cultural chauvinism, and, above all, classical ethnographic tradition are important considerations; the concluding report of officially orchestrated massacres of Goths in eastern provinces (ch. 16), where a divergent account in Eunapius/Zosimus raises thorny questions about dating, intention, and even basic events; and Ammianus' succinct epilogue or 'sphragis', in which almost every word is multivalent and/or allusive.

There follow some additional observations, mostly historical, on a few selected passages, which are intended to signal interest rather than express criticism.

*

2.6–7 (pp. 21–2, 25–6): with regard to horse-bound Huns, living in the saddle and incapable of operating on foot (cf. 2.20 similarly Alans), in addition to cited Zos. 4.20.4 (presumably derived from Eunapius) and Priscus fr. 2, one could also note, e.g., Jer. *Ep.* 60.17 (396); Sid. Ap. *Carm.* 2.262–6; *Suda* α 1018–19: ἀκροσφαλεῖς (probably an excerpt from Eunapius).¹⁰ Cf. also Maurice, *Strat.* 11.2 (Dennis 364.67–70) on generic 'Hunnic races'. However, the fact that corresponding remarks on the Xiongnu occur in Han Chinese sources,¹¹ uncontaminated by Greco-Roman literary convention, nuances the notion of an ethnographic 'topos' as a statement that can be simultaneously clichéd and true.

2.9 (p. 26): *hostesque, ... contortis laciniis illigant, ut laqueatis resistentium membris equitandi vel gradiendi adimant facultatem*. Regarding Hunnic (and Gothic) military use of lassos, to the cited sources one might add that Vegetius (*Epit.* 3.23.3), arguably a contemporary of Ammianus, considers lassos (*laquei*) as a current hazard to cavalry (cf. 4.23.2 for *laqueus* in a poliorcetic context). Huns may have played a role in the diffusion of such weaponry to the Goths, as suggested (p. 26), but lassos had for centuries featured in the panoply of neighbouring pastoral peoples of the Pontic-Caspian steppe, including Alans (evidence cited *ad* 2.21 at p. 35) and Sarmatians (Hdt. 7.85.2; Paus. 1.21.5; Pomp. Mela 1.114; Val. Flac. *Arg.* 6.132–3); see also related martial-equestrian traditions of the Parthians (Arr. *Parth.* fr. 20 = *Suda* σ 278).

4.4 (pp. 60–64): *et pro militari supplemento, quod provinciatim annum pendebatur, thesauris accederet auri cumulus magnus*. Concerning the military-fiscal motives that governed Valens' decision to admit the Thervingi, the commentary provides a commendably clear and precise examination of evidence for '*aurum tironicum*',

¹⁰ Banchich (1988).

¹¹ Wright (2005) 19–20.

with relevant scholarship, particularly insofar as it concerns 31.4.4, and taking into account 19.11.7: *aurum quippe gratanter provinciales corporibus dabunt*. In this regard, a cited passage of anonymous *De rebus bellicis* (4.4: *tironum comparatio*) may acquire enhanced relevance in light of Fleury's recent attempt to narrow the compositional context of this treatise not merely to the joint rule of Valentinian and Valens, but specifically to the *pars orientis*, with the virtually Greekless Valens as the principal addressee.¹² The commentators correctly observe (p. 60) that '*aurum tironicum*' is a modern terminological coinage unattested in any ancient Latin text. One could also clarify that this 'tax in gold' was rated in gold (i.e., in *solidi*) but not necessarily paid in gold.¹³

4.5 (pp. 65–6): in relation to Valens granting permission to the Thervingi to settle on imperial soil, the commentary notes that, whereas Ammianus reports planned settlement only in the Diocese of Thrace, Jordanes (*Get.* 133) 'adds Dacia ripensis': *ipsi quoque, ut dictum est, Danubio transmeantes Daciam ripensem, Moesiam Thraciasque permissis principis* [scil. Valens] *insederunt*. Similarly, Eunapius (fr. 42 Blockley) implies accommodation across a broader zone: ἡ ... Θράκη πᾶσα καὶ ἡ συνεχῆς αὐτῆ ἡ χώρα Μακεδονία καὶ Θεσσαλία, though, given the imprecision of his account, he may simply record areas plundered during subsequent hostilities. On this basis, the commentators seem open to the possibility that Valens in 376, like Constantine in 334 (cf. Anon. Val. 32: [Sarmatas] ... *per Thraciam, Scythiam, Macedoniam, Italiamque divisit*), 'solved the problem by scattering the newcomers over a wide area'. Problematic, however, is that the named territories belonged to the *pars imperii* ruled by Gratian (and Valentinian II): Dacia Ripensis, a province of the Diocese of Dacia, and Macedonia and Thessaly (whether provincial or geographical designations), in the Diocese of Macedonia, all lay within the Praetorian Prefecture of Illyricum (or, more usually, of Italy, Africa, and Illyricum).¹⁴ Are we to believe that Valens authorised (*permissis principis*) barbarian settlements in provinces that were not under his jurisdiction or administration, or, given Valens' reported resentment towards his nephews, that he would wish to share with them the projected military-fiscal benefits? Presumably Jordanes, if not

¹² Fleury (2017) xxviii–xxxiii.

¹³ E.g., Symm. *Ep.* 6.64.2 (winter 397/8) refers to a commuted payment of five pounds of silver per recruit, which, at the recently adjusted rates prescribed in *CTh* 13.2.1 (19 Feb 397), equates precisely to the 25 *solidi* per recruit specified in *CTh* 7.13.13 (24 Sept 397).

¹⁴ The *PPO Illyrici* in 377/8, Iulius Ausonius (*PLRE I*, Ausonius 5), the father of Gratian's tutor (Ausonius 7), was clearly that emperor's appointee. In *CTh* 15.1.13 (364) the *dux Daciae ripensis* (*PLRE I*, Tautomedes) receives instructions issued from Milan.

entirely mistaken, refers to eventual (post-378) areas of Gothic settlement rather than those sanctioned by Valens in spring/summer 376.¹⁵

6.1 (p. 108), with a retrospective reference to 27.4.12, discusses alternative names for the city of Adrianople, noting that only Zon. 17.23.3 and SHA *Heliogab.* 7.6–8 record the city’s pre-Hadrianic appellation as Orestias. An additional witness—admittedly late and exceptionally obscure—is a reader’s notice inscribed in *Marc. gr. Z.* 398 (Procopius’ *Wars* 1–4), fol. 206^v, by Demetrios Laskaris Leontares in 1455: ἐν τῇ Ὀρρεστιάδῃ (= Adrianople/Edirne).¹⁶

7.12 (p. 135): *ad conferendas coiere minaciter manus et scutis in testudinum formam coagmentatis pes cum pede collatus est* (the lemma mistakenly reads *testitudinem*; see Seyfarth *testudinum*). One might consider here the influence of Livy 28.2.6: *cum ... densatis excepissent scutis, tum pes cum pede conlatus*, as previously adduced in the commentary to *Res gestae* 25.1.18 (pp. 34–5): *in conflictu artius pes pede collatus*. Certainly Ammianus’ description of a *testudo* at 26.8.9 is inspired by Livy 44.9.6, 9 (thus *Commentary ad loc.*, pp. 227–8). Additional bibliography might assist in differentiating Ammianus’ usage of *testudo* in reference to a range of close-order tactical deployments.¹⁷ When applied to the shed-like covering of interlinked shields typically employed in sieges, Ammianus simply terms this structure a *testudo* (20.11.8; 26.8.9; cf. 23.4.11 as a generic mantlet). In contrast, whenever *testudo* occurs in relation to a ‘shield-wall’ fronting a compact infantry formation, typical of the contemporary battlefield, it is invariably phrased ‘in the form—or manner—of a *testudo*’: thus the current lemma *in testudinum formam*; also 16.12.44: *in modum testudinis*; 29.5.48: *in testudinis formam*; and similarly in the context of a mounted escort at 20.7.2: *in modum testudinis*. At the risk of overinterpretation, one inference might be that, in the case of the poliorcetic mantlet, Ammianus recognises a classically mandated technical denomination, but for other contexts of shield-linkage, which only partly resemble or correspond to that arrangement, he prefers descriptive analogy. Already earlier Latin historians, including Ammianus’ known models, had used *testudo* in an analogous fashion: again Livy (32.17.13) could describe in Roman/Latin terms a closely arrayed Macedonian phalanx *velut in constructam densitate clipeorum testudinem* (perhaps seeking to render the vocabulary or

¹⁵ Amm. 31.11.6 indicates that bands of Alans were operating in western Dacia Ripensis by July/August 378. Colombo (2017) 216–17 wishes to relocate to Dacia Ripensis/Mediterranea also the combat operations conducted by Frigeridus against Greuthungi and Taifali in late summer 377, reported in Amm. 31.9.3–4, which are conventionally placed in (the province of) Thrace.

¹⁶ Mioni (1985) 151, with this reviewer’s autopsy (Sept. 2018).

¹⁷ See further Rance (2004) 300–4; Wheeler (2004a) esp. 350–3.

concept of *συνασπισμός* in the lost Polybian original). Parallel phraseology can also be found in imperial historiography in Greek: e.g., Cass. Dio 75(74).7.5: *ἐς χελώνης τρόπον*, of a ‘*testudo*-like’ deployment in battle.

9.4 (pp. 157–8): *vivosque omnes circa Mutinam Regiumque et Parmam, Italica oppida, rura culturos exterminavit*. Supplementary to informative commentary on Greuthungi and Taifali captured in Thrace in 377 and resettled around Modena, Reggio Emilia, and Parma: if one accepts an emendation to the *Notitia dignitatum* (*Oc.* 42.60) proposed by Seeck, it could be noted that Reggio Emilia was already the location of a prefectural ‘reservation’ of Sarmatians (*Sarmatae gentiles*), generally assumed to have been transplanted there by Constantine in *ca.* 334 (*Anon. Val.* 32).¹⁸ This collocation would reinforce the view that *agri deserti* around cities of the Po basin became a secure ‘dumping ground’ for such displaced groups, especially given the heightened military presence across Italia Annonaria from the late 360s/early 370s. The commentary draws attention to a more recent parallel of Alamanni captured beyond the Raetian *limes* in 370 and allocated cultivatable lands in the Po valley, as reported at 28.5.15: *ad Italiam iussu principis misit, ubi fertilibus pagis acceptis iam tributarii circumcolunt Padum*. In both cases, Ammianus implies resettlement purely as agricultural labour, but the possibility of incumbent military obligations cannot be entirely excluded. A law of 400, issued in Milan and addressed to Stilicho, distinguishes ‘*laetus*, Alamannus, Sarmatian’ among several internal socio-demographic categories then subject to conscription (*dilectus*) into regular units (*legiones*).¹⁹

10.4 (p. 164): *tendentes prope cum Petulantibus Celtae*. In February 378, aware that Gratian’s forces were moving eastward, the Lentienses attempt an opportunistic raid across the frozen Rhine, but their predatory bands run into two named Roman regiments, encamped in proximity to the river. The presence of these troops requires explanation. The *Celtae* and *Petulantes*, a well-attested regimental pairing or ‘Doppeltruppe’, were *auxilia palatina*, elite combat units of *comitatenses* (cognate English ‘auxiliary’ (as at pp. xiii, 161, 164: ‘auxiliary army units’), though widely used in this context, does not accurately convey their status or function, as the modern English usage denotes, on the contrary, non-frontline, reservist, or paramilitary forces). One would ordinarily expect such units to be quartered in urban billets, in cities of the interior, certainly during the winter, yet here they are apparently under canvas close (*tendentes*

¹⁸ Seeck (1875) 237–8. The MSS of *ND Oc.* 42.60 read *regionis samnitis*, for which no entirely satisfactory explanation has yet been proposed.

¹⁹ *CTh* 7.20.12.pr. (30 Jan 400): *Quisquis igitur laetus, alamannus, sarmata, vagus vel filius veterani aut cuiuslibet corporis dilectui obnoxius et florentissimis legionibus inserendus ...*

prope; cf. 31.7.5: *tendentibus prope*) to the frontier in freezing conditions. Either hostilities had been anticipated or, more likely, the *Celtae* and *Petulantes* were themselves among those units already en route to Thrace, initially by marching up the left bank of the upper Rhine, as the Lentienses had previously observed (10.4: *ipsi quoque haec quasi vicini cernentes*).

13.18 (p. 240): *inter hos etiam Promotorum tribunus Potentius cecidit*. The commentary notes that the *Notitia dignitatum* lists *Equites promoti seniores* among both eastern and western *vexillationes palatinae* (*Or.* 5.28, *Occ.* 6.3 = 44 = 7.160). One cannot exclude from consideration the *Equites promoti iuniores*, a *vexillatio comitatensis* also listed among eastern praesental forces (*Or.* 5.39), though we need not follow Hoffmann in insisting that this must be Potentius' unit, in accordance with Hoffmann's flawed assumptions about the origin of the regimental epithet *seniores/iuniores*.²⁰ In a similar vein, *ad* 13.8 (p. 231): *imperator ... ad Lancearios confugit et Mattiarios*: if here also Hoffmann's confident identification of a *iuniores*-*'Doppeltruppe'* is not conclusive,²¹ Valens' action acquires additional significance once it is appreciated that the *Lanciarum seniores* and *Mattiarii seniores* (*ND Or.* 5.2 = 42; 6.7 = 47) were no ordinary units but the most senior *legiones palatinae*—that is, the two highest-ranking infantry regiments—in the eastern empire, which, by the mid-fifth century, were accorded a special role in imperial accession ceremonies.²² Regimental precedence might therefore account for their implied proximity to the emperor and, in turn, his choice of refuge.

*

Mistakes are few and trivial. Strictly, Margus (Moesia I) is in the Prefecture of Illyricum not Illyria (p. 22). The eye colour *γλαυκόν* in Herodotus 4.108 (p. 31) is better rendered as 'light/bright blue' than 'dark blue' (= *κύανος*), while *πυρρόν*, it has been cogently argued, signifies reddish complexion rather than hair.²³ A reference to 'the *cohors quinta pedatura* of the *legio secunda Herculia*' (p. 84), headquartered at Axiupolis in Scythia (*ND Or.* 39.30), appears to misconstrue *pedatura* as an element of regimental titlature; the genitive phrase *pedaturae inferioris/superioris* indicates geographical deployment 'on the lower/upper stretch' of the riverbank.²⁴

²⁰ Hoffmann (1969–70) I.327, 456. On the significance of *seniores/iuniores* see Scharf (1991) with bibliography.

²¹ Hoffmann (1969–70) I.27–8, 328–30.

²² Rance (2007) 404–5.

²³ Sassi (1982).

²⁴ Dietz (1993).

Accepting that bibliography on some matters may have been cited selectively, one could suggest a few additions. On *cuneatim ad* 31.2.8 (p. 23) and *cuneus ad* 31.9.3: *congregatusque in cuneos* (pp. 155–6); 31.11.4: *vastatorios cuneos* (p. 190); 31.15.4: *conferti in cuneum* (p. 263); 31.16.5: *Saracenorum cuneus* (pp. 283–4), see the comprehensive survey of terminological usage in Janniard (2004) esp. 1001–12. To the evidence cited there should be added the rare comparative linguistic testimony of Ammianus' close contemporary Jerome, who in the Vulgate (*Iud.* 9.37 and *1 Sam.* 13.17–18) renders as *cuneus* the Hebrew פֶּרֶשֶׁת, pl. פְּרָשִׁים (*rosh, rashim*), with the generic meaning of a 'band' or 'company'; cf. the Septuagint's similarly neutral ἀρχή in both passages. On torcs as military decoration *ad* 31.10.21: *torquem obtulisse collo abstractam* (p. 179), see now Mráv (2015). Regarding the location and course of the battle of Adrianople, to the selection of extensive secondary literature cited *ad* 31.12.10–17 (p. 209) one might add Shchukin–Shuvalov (2007), which, though in some other respects eccentric, draws attention to the potential value of nineteenth-century cartography, particularly Russian military maps of 1827–9, for elucidating now-altered route networks and topography north of Edirne. On *equites promoti*, mentioned *ad* 31.13.18 (p. 240), Brennan (1998) is the most insightful.

It has long been obvious that the *Philological and Historical Commentary* will remain essential for as long as Ammianus has readers. In many respects, this final volume exemplifies the merits of the series: for historical research it becomes a starting point for future enquiry, while its philological component (with indices) exceeds the immediate purposes of lemma-based commentary by assembling a broader linguistic and editorial resource. Most impressive—and fundamental to Classics as an intrinsically multidisciplinary discipline—is the intersection and interdependence of literary, linguistic and historical expertise. If, inevitably, the earliest of the volumes produced by De Jonge alone will have to be revisited sooner, partly owing to methodological unevenness, but more simply because the late Roman world has since changed beyond recognition, a third generation will possess a fine exemplar of collaborative scholarship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Banchich, T. (1988) 'An Identification in the *Suda*: Eunapius on the Huns', *CPh* 83: 53.
- Blockley, R. C. (1994) 'Ammianus Marcellinus' use of exempla', *Florilegium* 13: 53–64.
- Brennan, P. (1998) 'Divide and Fall: the Separation of the Legionary Cavalry and the Fragmentation of the Roman Empire', in T. W. Hilliard et al., edd., *Ancient History in a Modern University: II. Early Christianity, Late Antiquity and Beyond* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge) 238–44.
- Clark, C. U. (1904) *The Text Tradition of Ammianus Marcellinus* (New Haven).
- Colombo, M. (2017) 'Note di critica testuale ad Ammiano Marcellino', *WS* 130: 201–43.
- Dietz, K. (1993) 'Cohortes, ripae, pedaturae. Zur Entwicklung der Grenzlegionen in der Spätantike', in K. Dietz, D. Hennig, and H. Kaletsch, edd., *Klassisches Altertum, Spätantike und frühes Christentum. Adolf Lippold zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet* (Würzburg) 279–329.
- Drijvers, J. W. and H. C. Teitler (2019) 'Gratian's Campaign Against the Lentienses and his Journey to Thrace (Ammianus Marcellinus 31.10 & 31.11.6): A New Chronology', *Historia* 68: 115–24.
- Fleury, P., ed. (2017) *De Rebus Bellicis. Sur les affaires militaires. Texte établi, traduit et commenté* (Collection Budé 416; Paris).
- Hengst, D. den (2010) 'Vir utriusque literaturae non vulgariter callens emunctaeque naris. Sur Ghelen, éditeur d'Ammien Marcellin', in L. Galli Milic and N. Hecquet-Noti, edd., *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Genevense in honorem F. Paschoud septuagenarii* (Bari) 153–63; repr. in id., *Emperors and Historiography*, edd. D. W. P. Burgersdijk and J. A. van Waarden (Leiden and Boston, 2010) 293–305.
- Hoffmann, D. (1969–70) *Das spätrömische Bewegungsheer und die Notitia Dignitatum*, 2 vols (Dusseldorf).
- Janniard, S. (2004) 'Les formations tactiques en éperon et en tenaille dans l'armée romaine', *MEFRA* 116: 1001–38.
- Jenkins, F. W. (2016) *Ammianus Marcellinus: an Annotated Bibliography, 1474 to the Present* (Leiden and Boston).
- Kelly, G. and J. Stover (2016) 'The Hersfeldensis and the Fuldensis of Ammianus Marcellinus: A Reconsideration', *Cambridge Classical Journal* 62: 108–29.
- Kulikowski, M. (2012) 'Coded Polemic in Ammianus Book 31 and the Date and Place of its Composition', *JRS* 102: 79–102.
- Mioni, E. (1985) *Bibliothecae Diui Marci Venetiarum codices graeci manuscripti. II: Thesaurus Antiquus. Codices 300–625* (Rome).

- Mráv, Z. (2015) ‘*Maniakion*—The Golden Torc in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine Army. Preliminary Research Report’, in T. Vida, ed., with P. Rance (Eng. ed.), *Romania Gothica. II. The Frontier World: Romans, Barbarians and Military Culture. (Proceedings of the International Conference at the Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, 1–2 October 2010)* (Budapest) 287–303.
- Rance, P. (2004) ‘The *fulcum*, the Late Roman and Byzantine *testudo*’, *GRBS* 44: 265–326.
- (2007) ‘*Campidoctores, vicarii vel tribuni*: the Senior Regimental Officers in the Late Roman Army and the Rise of the *campidoctor*’, in A. S. Lewin and P. Pellegrini, edd., *The Late Roman Army in the Near East from Diocletian to the Arab Conquest* (BAR int. ser. 1717; Oxford) 395–409.
- Sabbah, G. (1997) ‘Ammien Marcellin, Libanius, Antioche et la date des derniers livres des *Res Gestae*’, *Cassiodorus* 3: 89–116.
- Sassi, M. M. (1982) ‘Xenophan. B 16 e Herodt. 4, 108: una nota sul significato di *πυρρός*’, *RFIC* 110: 391–3.
- Scharf, R. (1991) ‘Seniores-iuniores und die Heeresteilung des Jahres 364’, *ZPE* 89: 265–72.
- Shchukin, M. and P. Shuvalov (2007) ‘The Alano-Gothic Cavalry Charge in the Battle of Adrianopole [*sic*]’, in S. Conti, B. Scardigli, and M. C. Torchio, edd., *Geografia e viaggi nell’antichità. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Certosa di Pontignano, 9–10 ottobre 2005)* (Ancona) 233–53.
- Seeck, O. (1875) ‘Zur Kritik der Notitia dignitatum’, *Hermes* 9: 217–42.
- Seyfarth, W. (1962) *Der Codex Fuldensis und der Codex E des Ammianus Marcellinus. Zur Frage der handschriftlichen Überlieferung des Werkes des letzten römischen Geschichtsschreibers* (Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1962 No. 2; Berlin).
- Wheeler, E. L. (2004a) ‘The Legion as Phalanx in the Late Empire’ (I), in Y. Le Bohec and C. Wolff, edd., *L’Armée romaine de Dioclétien à Valentinien I^{er} (Actes du Congrès de Lyon, 12–14 sept. 2002)* (Lyons) 309–58.
- (2004b) ‘The Legion as Phalanx in the Late Empire (II)’, *Revue des Études Militaires Anciennes* 1: 147–75.
- Wright, D. C. (2005) ‘Nomadic Power, Sedentary Security, and the Crossbow’, *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 58: 15–31.