

Ammianus Marcellinus's Use of *Exempla*

Roger Blockley

The Latin word *exemplum* is related to the verb *eximere* (“to take from” or “to take out of”) and in its literal sense indicates a sample that accurately represents the whole.¹ The force of “accurate representation” is extended to the ethical and educational use of an *exemplum* as an act or a saying (or a combination of both) that stands as an exemplar of an action or an attitude (usually reflecting a vice or a virtue) to be imitated or avoided. The Romans habitually taught by example and argued through example; and the strong ethical colouring, as well as the anecdotal structure, which this process imparts, comes through in many of their writings.²

In distinction from educators and philosophers, Roman lawyers often made use of *exempla* more neutrally, as precedents to support or undermine arguments. Oratorical theory, therefore, as represented by Cicero and the *Ad Herennium*, is concerned primarily with the marshalling of *exempla* for proof or persuasion. Nevertheless, oratorical theory does recognize the ethical content of *exempla* in all three categories of usage — ornamentation, clarification, and proof —, all of which have the ultimate goal of persuading the listeners.³ Cicero makes a clear distinction between anecdotes from Roman history and those from Greek history when he declares that the former illustrate *virtus*, the latter *doctrina*.⁴ Even when the *exemplum* is cited as a precedent, the material chosen usually has an ethical force.

Cicero expected his orator to cast his net wide for material for his speeches: “the records of antiquity, the authority of public jurisprudence, and the method and knowledge of public administration” (*De or.* 1.201). But *exempla* by preference should be drawn from Roman history. They should also be ancient and they should usually concern famous men and women, since they had to be recognizable and carry the authority to persuade.⁵ To Cicero the final purpose of *exempla*, whether they were used in judicial, deliberative, or epideictic oratory, was to persuade. This is clear from his placing of them in the parts of his speeches: some in the *exordium*, more in the *peroratio*, few in the *narratio*, most in the *argumentatio*.⁶

Roman historiography was conscious that it was the main source of *exempla*. Livy says directly, “The prime profit and utility of the study of historical events is that you may observe examples of every type of behaviour set down in a glorious record, from which you can select what you and your country might imitate and those of disgraceful inception and outcome which you can avoid” (*praef.*10).⁷ Although it was the main supplier of *exempla*, Roman historiography, unlike most other contemporary forms of literature, itself made little use of parallels drawn from outside its own text. Although Tacitus says (*Hist.* 3.51) that he will introduce *exempla recti* or *solacia mali* as the circumstance demands, he in fact makes little use of *exempla*. Other historians who make some use of them — Herodian, Agathias, Malchus, Zosimus, Theophylact — are all late and introduce them only occasionally.

Ammianus Marcellinus, a Greek residing in the city of Rome and writing in Latin, produced at the very end of the fourth century A.D. a History in thirty-one books beginning where Tacitus ended (that is, beginning with the accession of the emperor Nerva in 96 A.D.) and ending with the death of the emperor Valens at the battle of Adrianople in 378. Only the last part of the History (books XIV to XXXI) survives, in which Ammianus narrates events from 354 to 378, of which he was a contemporary. The History is written in great detail and with a thorough knowledge of most of the important Latin authors in prose and poetry who preceded him. Ammianus alone (and perhaps the now-fragmentary Eunapius of Sardis, who wrote in Greek a History which also dealt with fourth-century events) makes use of *exempla* on a large scale.

In over 110 places in his History Ammianus introduces *exempla*. Since in many places there are more than one *exemplum*, the actual number of *exempla* inserted is about 200.⁸ Roman *exempla* outnumber Greek (and other, of which there are very few) by about seven to every three; and amongst the

Roman *exempla* a small majority is drawn from the Republican period. The *exempla* themselves have various ostensible functions: to establish linkage between the present and the well-known past; on this basis to clarify present actions and characteristics of persons; to make the doubtful plausible by analogy; and in a few places to serve merely as ornaments. The relationship between the present and the *exemplum* can be simple comparison or contrast; sometimes the degree of comparison or contrast is said to be greater or less; and in places the ancient *exemplum* is said not to be known to the present person. But, whatever the relationship, the vast majority of *exempla* introduced by Ammianus carry an ethical force, being used to illustrate a virtue, vice, or skill.⁹

In all the above aspects Ammianus conforms to the conventional uses of *exempla* in various forms of poetry and prose; he is unconventional only in that he is writing history. What is of great interest, however, is the manner in which Ammianus deploys his *exempla*. For he sets them against only a small group of persons in his History; yet within this restricted range of applications he deploys them in very specific ways. Moreover, as I shall argue, Ammianus uses the vast majority in order to reinforce his own point of view and to convince his readers of it.

Sometimes this is very clear, when Ammianus in his own person introduces *exempla* directly in order to buttress his own argument. In some of these cases the *exempla* illustrate and support ethical arguments and observations,¹⁰ a function that is also found in the introduction of direct quotations (usually from Cicero), the majority of which also have an ethical purpose.¹¹ In other cases the function seems to be more purely forensic, that is, the *exempla* support an appeal to precedent. Thus, for instance, at xxv.9.10 Ammianus appeals first to the Senate's refusal of triumphs to P. Scipio, Fulvius, and Opimius and then to the repudiation of treaties with the Samnites, Numidians, and Numantines to support his contention that the cession of territory to the Persians in 363 A.D. was a disgrace and should have been repudiated. Again, at XXI.5.12 he cites the Teutonic and Cimbric invasions of the late second century B.C., the invasions of the Danubian provinces during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and the Gothic invasions during the reigns of Decius, Claudius II, and Aurelian to refute those who argued that the Gothic devastation of the Balkans during 376–78 A.D. was the greatest onslaught that the Roman world had ever suffered.

The vast majority of Ammianus's *exempla* are focussed on only seven subjects. Out of the 110 places in which *exempla* are introduced, 85 concern the emperors Julian, Constantius II, Valens, and Valentinian I, the Caesar

Gallus, the general Theodosius (the father of the emperor Theodosius I), and the people of the city of Rome. Within each of these seven groups the *exempla* are used in a rather consistent manner, whereas between the groups there are substantial differences.

The largest group of references to *exempla* concerns (directly or indirectly) Julian first as Caesar and then as Augustus: thirty-one places which comprehend about forty-five *exempla*. Of these places twenty-two deal with military activity, while only nine illustrate civil activity or personal characteristics.¹² All but two of these thirty-one places set Julian in an advantageous light, the exceptions being both at XXV.4.17, where Julian is compared first with the emperor Hadrian in his excessive superstition and then with Marcus Aurelius in his eagerness to offer large-scale animal sacrifices. In both cases the criticisms are comparatively minor, and it might appear that association of Julian with “good” emperors outweighs the negative element of the comparisons.

The *exempla* are grouped in three places in the narrative: the early chapters of book XVI, where Julian is introduced; those chapters of books XXIII–XXV that deal with the fighting in Persia during Julian’s invasion; and XXV.4, which is the author’s posthumous assessment of Julian.¹³ The civil and personal virtues cluster in the first and third groups, while the middle group is exclusively military. Most of the *exempla* that do not occur in these three groups concern Julian’s military activity as Caesar. Only one of them concerns his civil activity, XXII.9.9, where Julian as Augustus is said to be *iudicibus Cassiis tristior et Lycurgis*.

The range of *exempla* to whom Julian is compared, whom he himself evokes in his speeches, or with whom he is in some way associated, is comprehensive. In the account of his early career there are: the emperors Titus, Trajan, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius, to whom he is compared for various virtues (XVI.1.4); he surpasses Alexander the Great in his fortitude (XVI.5.4) and Cyrus, Simonides, and Hippias in the power of his memory (XVI.5); his moderation evokes the sumptuary laws of Lycurgus and Sulla (XVI.5); he is attacked by detractors as were other great men, Cimon, Scipio Aemilianus, and Pompey (XVII.11.3–4); his wars with the Alamanni are compared favourably with those of the Romans against the Teutons and Carthaginians (XVII.1.14).

In the narrative of Julian’s invasion of Persia, Pyrrhus, Scipio Aemilianus, the Fabricii, Trajan, Torquatus, Julius Caesar, and Epaminondas appear. Deeds of Julian’s soldiers conjure up the names of Sertorius, Mars, Luscinus, Achilles, and a number of lesser-known heroes. In his speeches

to his troops Julian himself (who is the only person in the History permitted by Ammianus to use *exempla*) invokes Lucullus, Pompey, Ventidius (the lieutenant of Marcus Antonius), and the emperors Trajan, Lucius Verus, Septimius Severus, and Gordian III (XXIII.5.16–17); the Curtii, Mucii, and Decii, the destruction of Carthage, Numantia, Fidenae, and Veii (XXIII.5.19–20); and Fabricius (XXIV.3.5).

The majority of the *exempla* have a clear ethical orientation, and the direct comparison of Julian with them (which is the predominating form of presentation) serves to cast him also as an *exemplum*, in the Livian manner. The range and selection of the *exempla* locate Julian firmly in the Roman historical tradition. His Greek background, which Ammianus acknowledges elsewhere, is relegated to a lesser role; even the prominence given to Alexander, who is introduced four times, is a Roman practice. Ammianus's overall purpose in his marshalling of *exempla* in these sections appears clearly to be to amplify his view of Julian's character and achievements as a great Roman military emperor, and to persuade his readers to this view. In short, the *exempla* are deployed in a manner that is epideictic, even panegyric.¹⁴

A second group of passages concerns the emperor Constantius II and the Caesar Gallus. Ammianus's method in deploying these is the inverse of that in dealing with Julian. In the narrative passages on Constantius there are twelve places which contain *exempla* that reflect upon him directly or indirectly.¹⁵ Some involve direct comparison with evil figures, such as Domitian, Croesus, Nero, Verres, and the Sicilian tyrant Dionysius, while another has Constantius surpassing Domitian, Caligula, and Commodus in wickedness.¹⁶ Still others contrast the emperor with virtuous rulers (the Decii, Julius Caesar, Claudius II, and Marcus Aurelius),¹⁷ while Constantius's soldiers — in contrast with those of Julian — are detrimentally compared with figures from the past.¹⁸ The *exempla* are spread fairly evenly through the narrative, but they are extremely restricted in their range: all illustrate vices, and of the nine places that concern Constantius directly (the other three concern his soldiers) all but one (XVI.10.3) illustrate his cruel suspicion and hatred of good men.

The *exempla* that concern Gallus follow the same usage as those that concern Constantius. There are nine places that contain *exempla*, seven of which illustrate Gallus's or his wife's cruelty and the general insecurity resulting from this.¹⁹ The eighth place, which is also the final passage of the section of the History on Gallus (XIV.11.30–33), follows the description of the Caesar's deposition and execution. In it examples are given of the fickleness of fortune, which appear to serve as a peroration emphasizing

the pathos surrounding Gallus's end. Indeed, throughout the narrative of Gallus's fall Ammianus marshals pathetic language, images of horror, and a cast of hypocritical and treacherous characters to arouse a certain sympathy for Gallus and also to deflect attention away from the fact that he thoroughly deserved his fate.²⁰ Ammianus's purpose in this seems clear: while Gallus has been drawn as an evil creature, his elimination must not reflect any credit on Constantius, who ordered his destruction but who is characterized also as wicked.

Ammianus's use of *exempla* in the first chapter of his narrative on Gallus (XIV.1.1) well illustrates how he is able to deploy them to manipulate his readers. In the whole of the chapter, which covers about four octavo printed pages, there is nothing of substance beyond the statements that the unjust death of a certain Clematius was secured by the empress Constantia, Gallus's wife, and that the praetorian prefect Florentius set out to provoke Gallus's rage by rebuking and opposing him when it was inappropriate to do so. The rest is a series of generalizations and reports of rumours concerning the cruelty, suspicion, and spying of Gallus and his wife, which are given the semblance of substance by *exempla*: the Fury Megaera, and the "bad" emperors Maximin Thrax and Gallienus.²¹ It has been argued that Ammianus's procedure here is perfectly appropriate and "exemplary" in the sense that his rhetoric reflects reality and that he has been severely selective in offering a few samples of the much greater amount of information that he chose not to include.²² A much more convincing interpretation is that the rhetoric constitutes a fabrication in lieu of facts and that, had he been in possession of facts, Ammianus would have set them down (as he seems to do elsewhere).²³ Indeed, Ammianus's procedure in this chapter seems to reflect the forensic advice offered by Cicero (*Part. Or.*40): *maximam autem facit fidem ad similitudinem veri primum exemplum, deinde introducta rei similitudo; fabula etiam nonnumquam, etsi est incredibilis, tamen homines commovet* ("The strongest corroboration of a probable truth is supplied first by an *exemplum* and then by a parallel. Sometimes, indeed, a story, even if it is a tall one, has an effect on people"). Certainly, whether or not Ammianus's narrative reflects accurately what happened, his method has proven successful in that his interpretation of Gallus's regime has always commanded broad acceptance.²⁴

The *exempla* so far discussed are in books XIV to XXV of the History, at which point Ammianus first terminated his work. In these books most of the *exempla* are used by Ammianus to illustrate a small number of imperial vices and virtues that he wished to emphasize. The method here is almost

identical to that recommended by writers on epideictic oratory, who were perhaps the initial source of Ammianus's inspiration.²⁵ In the remaining books of the History (XXVI–XXXI), however, Ammianus's method changes, becoming more varied.

Clearly panegyric is the group of five passages that concern the general Theodosius, the only non-imperial individual accorded a significant number of *exempla*, but also the father of Theodosius I, who was emperor while Ammianus was composing much or all of his History. Theodosius's successful campaign in Britain is likened to the wars of the Republican heroes Furius Camillus and Papirius Cursor (XXVIII.3.9); and in the narrative of his war in Africa against the rebel Firmus he is compared with the great generals Corbulo and Lusius Quietus; Curio; Fabius Cunctator; and Pompey (XXIX.5.4, 22–23, 32, 33). Ammianus's laudatory and very circumspect treatment of the elder Theodosius has often been noted, and his use of *exempla*, always in direct comparison, in this part of the History conforms to the epideictic, even panegyric, mode.

In his treatment of the emperors Valentinian I and Valens, Ammianus uses fewer *exempla*. For Valentinian there are six passages, in each of which the *exempla* point up a different aspect of his character and actions. Five of the six passages occur in the posthumous discussion of the emperor's virtues and vices (XXX.8 and 9).²⁶

The five passages that concern Valens fall into two distinct groups. The first three occur in Ammianus's account of the investigations and punishment of persons accused of plotting against the emperor and other treasonable activities. Two of the passages (XXIX.2.14 and 19) emphasize Valens's lack of mercy, while the third (XXIX.1.17) draws a parallel between Valens and the emperors Commodus and Septimius Severus in that all were the subjects of repeated plots. All three passages are part of direct interjections by the historian himself and are, therefore, introduced by him as part of his own argument, a procedure that is far commoner in books XXVI–XXXI than in the earlier books of the History.

The final two passages that concern Valens are found in book XXXI of the History and are both simple historical comparisons of the manner of Valens's death with those of the emperor Decius (13.13) and the Republican general Scipio Calvus (13.17); there is no suggestion that any aspect of Valens's character is to be compared with these *exempla*. The use of *exempla* without any specified or implied ethical connotation, which is rare in Ammianus's treatment of the emperors elsewhere in his History, becomes the rule in book XXXI. In two places the hordes of invading Goths are compared first with

the Persian invaders of Greece (4.7) and then with various other invaders of the Roman Empire (5.11–17); and in the third the Roman defeat at the battle of Adrianople is compared with the disaster at the battle of Cannae (13.19). In these three latter passages the historian again introduces the *exempla* as part of an argument against opinions that appear to have been different from his own.

The thirty-first book of Ammianus's History is unique within his work and a kind of writing uncommon in Roman historiography, that is a monographic study in which the phenomenon — the war — takes precedence over the characters involved and is set within the broader context in which it occurred.²⁷ Ammianus had clearly been moving toward this form (and away from a more purely annalistic structure, which is more or less abandoned in books XXVI–XXXI) earlier in his History. The invasion of Persia by Julian in books XXIII–XXV is treated as one continuous narrative, as are the revolt of Procopius (XXVI.6–10) and the campaigns of the elder Theodosius in Africa (XXIX.5). But in all these cases the events described are related to events that preceded them in the narrative, whereas the account of the events leading up to and including the battle of Adrianople in 378 A.D. is completely detached, even to the extent that western events are terminated at the death of Valentinian I in 375 and the events on the Persian frontier up to 377 (which interacted with the events in the Balkans) are telescoped into xxx.2.1–8. The thirty-first book is then equipped with an omen-filled preface and an account of the Hun-driven flight of the Goths into the Roman Empire, which makes no mention of Valens's earlier dealings with the Goths before the Huns appeared on the scene. The ethical concerns that predominate elsewhere in the History when Ammianus is dealing with the rulers of the Roman world (including Valens) recede, and ethically-oriented commentary, though still present, is subordinated; even the usual posthumous account of Valens's virtues and vices (XXXI.1.4) is rather dry and straightforward, lacking *exempla* and other forms of amplification. Appropriately, therefore, in this book the *exempla* that are introduced are not concerned with character but serve to fit the war within the broader context of Greek and Roman history and to provide perspectives for Ammianus's own interpretation of the events. In short, the use of *exempla* in the thirty-first book is analytic rather than epideictic.

The final grouping of *exempla*, and the second largest in the History, is in the so-called "Roman digressions" (XIV.6 and XXVIII.4) in which Ammianus discusses at length the vices of the populace of the city of Rome. In these two chapters there are seventeen passages in which *exempla* are introduced, and

they all concern the people divided into the upper and lower orders.²⁸ Of these seventeen passages, only three occur in XIV.6 and all introduce *exempla* in which there is simple contrast with figures from mythology and Roman republican history that is detrimental to the contemporary nobility, whose love of public statues, ostentation, and hostility to strangers are illustrated. The manner of usage in this chapter is the same as the majority of *exempla* that concern Constantius and Gallus, that is, they conform to Ammianus's usage in the early books of the History.

The deployment of the *exempla* in XXVIII.4 is very different from that found in both XIV.6 and elsewhere in the History. Of the fourteen passages which introduce *exempla* in this chapter, eleven concern the nobility, two the plebeians, and one the populace as a whole. Ten of these passages use ironical comparison, a mode found nowhere else in Ammianus's *exempla*. Thus, the Roman nobles revere a charioteer just as their ancestors worshipped Castor and Pollux (4.11); a nobleman after taking a short boat ride compares himself to the Argonauts (4.18); a dice-player, if his skills are not duly acknowledged, looks as sorrowful as Porcius Cato after losing an election (4.21); and a man who has achieved some middling honour (*dignitas*) is as proud as Marcellus after the capture of Syracuse (4.23). The *exempla* in this chapter are deployed in close succession; all concern contemporary vices; and their prevailing tone of irony sustains Ammianus's contention that the people of Rome are degenerate and have fallen far from the standards of their ancestors. As is Ammianus's common practice, the point that he wishes to make is introduced early in the chapter: at 4.5 the very first *exemplum* asserts that even the Cretan lawgiver Epimenides could not cleanse the sins of contemporary Rome. The ironical approach is important because it enables Ammianus to establish criteria for political and social judgements that are of use both in these chapters and elsewhere.²⁹ The use of *exempla* in close succession is strongly accusatory and its nature appears to be judicial rather than epideictic in this case.³⁰

Ammianus is a writer of both complexity and subtlety. In his exploitation of his literary predecessors in many genres beside historiography he turned derivativeness into high art.³¹ His use of *exempla* is in scale and range unprecedented in the Latin historical writing that survives; whether it was innovative is possible, but not clear. What is clear, is that Ammianus's deployment of *exempla* is not the random introduction of antique and mythological elements purely for ornamentation. In the first part of the History (XIV–XXV) the usages are consistent and are broadly epideictic. In

the second part (XXVI–XXX) they are more varied, ranging from epideictic to argumentative. In the final book they are consistently analytical.

Ammianus is one of the most rhetorical of the ancient historians. His purpose in his writing is primarily that of a rhetorician: to persuade his listeners and readers to his point of view, often argued in his own person. To this end he exploits all the literary devices available to him, of which the *exemplum* was one of the more powerful to a Roman. Models of usage were available to him in oratory, philosophy, and poetry, with all of which he was thoroughly familiar. The effectiveness of his deployment of *exempla* lay in his adaptation of them according to his various needs.³²

Carleton University

NOTES

¹ On origin and development see Kornhardt, pp. 1–9. For the purpose of this study I ignore another kind of *exemplum* adduced by historians, when they describe an action or actions of their subject in order to illustrate a group of like actions not described; in other words, a sample of their available historical data. On this usage in Ammianus, see Sabbah, pp. 416–19.

² On general studies, see Kornhardt, pp. 1–9; Alewell.

³ On legal precedent, see Kornhardt, pp. 65–85. On ornamentation, see Alewell, pp. 28–30. On clarification, see Kornhardt, pp. 34–35. On proof, see Kornhardt, pp. 11–13, 59–62.

⁴ Cicero *De or.* 3.137. Valerius Maximus divides his collection of *exempla* into domestic (Roman) and foreign (Greek and other). He does not make the Ciceronian distinction, but declares that foreign ones carry less authority (1.6 *externa* 1).

⁵ Cicero, *Or.* 169; Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* v.11.1; Apsines (ed. Spengel 1,2) 281.1.

⁶ Schoenberger, pp. 50–57.

⁷ Mythological *exempla* were used, although Apsines (at n.5) warns against them. They are introduced by Ammianus at times, although the great majority of his *exempla* are historical.

⁸ By “place” I mean a section of the text in which Ammianus introduces one or more *exempla* on the same topic. Where *exempla* illustrate different topics (e.g. XXVIII.1.39) I count the different topics as so many “places”.

⁹ For a general discussion of Ammianus’s use of *exempla*, see Naudé, pp. 73–87; Blockley, pp. 157–67. A list of the *exempla*, identified by various categories, will be found in Blockley, pp. 191–94.

¹⁰ Examples below, pp. 59–60.

¹¹ A list of the quotations will be found in Blockley, p. 195. Of the twenty-eight there listed, sixteen are from Cicero.

¹² On military activity, see XVI.5.4; 12.41; XVII.1.14; 11.3–4; XXI.8.3; 9.2; XXIII.5.11, 16–17, and 18–20; XXIV.1.3; 2.16–17; 3.5 and 9; 4.5, 24, and 27; 6.1, 7, and 14; XXV.2.3; 3.8 and 13. On civil activity, see XVI.1.4; 5.1 and 8; 7.9–10; XXI.9.9; XXV.4.2, 15, and 17(*bis*).

¹³ Formal, posthumous evaluations, which catalogue and illustrate virtues and vices, are furnished for Julian (xxv.4), Constantius II (xxi.16), Valentinian I (xxx.7–9), and Valens (xxxi.14). More perfunctory assessments are provided for the Caesar Gallus (xiv.11.27–29), the emperor Jovian (xxv.10.14–17), and the usurper Procopius (xxvi.9.11). The list of principal virtues with which Ammianus begins his discussion of Julian (xxv.4.1) is derived by him from *sapientes* (which may well mean Cicero: cf. *De off.* 1.15ff.; *Inv. rhet.* II.15.9). But the close parallels with panegyric usage (see Blockley, p. 93) suggest the epideictic orientation of this and the other posthumous discussions.

¹⁴ At the beginning of the section of his History on Julian, Ammianus says that his achievements as Caesar in Gaul are such that the narrative will almost enter the domain of panegyric: *quicquid autem narrabitur . . . ad laudativam paene materiam pertinebit* (xvi.1.3). That Ammianus is here concerned to assert the reliability of his factual statements is clear from his claim (xvi.1.3), *fides integra rerum absolvit, documentis evidentibus fulta*. His words could be interpreted to mean that Julian's achievements justify a panegyric treatment, which he in fact launches into immediately afterwards (xvi.1.4). On panegyric elements in Ammianus' narrative on Julian, see Gärtner.

¹⁵ xv.2.5; 3.3; 5.35 and 37; xvi.8.10; 10.3; xviii.3.7–9; xxi.16.8 and 11; xxii.4.5, 6 and 7–8.

¹⁶ Domitian: xv.3.35. Croesus: xv.5.37. Dionysius: xv.5.37 and xvi.8.10. Verres: xv.3.3. Nero: xv.2.5. Caligula, Domitian, and Commodus: xxi.16.8.

¹⁷ Decii, Caesar, Claudius II: xvi.10.3. Marcus Aurelius: xxi.16.11.

¹⁸ xxii.4.5, 6 and 7–8.

¹⁹ On cruelty see xiv.1.2, 7, 8 and 9; 11.22 and 28. Other *exempla* at xiv.11.10 and 30–33.

²⁰ On pathos see xiv.11.16–18 and 20–23; note esp. 23: *et ita colligatis manibus in modum noxii cuiusdam latronis, cervice abscisa, ereptaque vultus et capitis dignitate, cadaver est relictum informe, paulo ante urbibus et provinciis formidatum*. On horror see xiv.11.17, where the ghosts of Gallus's victims appear to him in nightmares. On treacherous characters (both of whom meet nasty ends): *Scudilo . . . velamento subagrestis ingenii, persuasionis opifex callidus*; 11.24, *Barbatio, qui in eum [sc. Gallum] iam diu falsa composuerat crimina*.

²¹ Megaera: xiv.1.2. Maximin: xiv.1.8. Gallienus: xiv.1.9.

²² Sabbah, p. 417, arguing against Thompson (next note).

²³ Thompson, pp. 59–60.

²⁴ There survives a historical tradition which is much more favourable to Gallus. For the sources see Thompson, p. 56.

²⁵ See Menander Rhetor, ed. Russell and Wilson, treatise II, pp. 84 and 92 (English trans., pp. 85 and 93).

²⁶ xxvii.6.16; xxx.8.4–5, 8, 10 and 12; 9.1.

²⁷ Sallust's monograph on the Jugurthian War immediately comes to mind, but that, of course, stands alone.

²⁸ xiv.6.8, 10–11 and 21; xxviii.4.5, 9, 11, 15, 18(*bis*), 21, 23, 27(*bis*), 32 and 34. Other *exempla* on persons at Rome: xvi.10.5; xxvi.3.5; xxvii.3.7; 9.10; xxviii.1.39 and 54.

²⁹ I intend to argue this in detail elsewhere.

³⁰ But see Woodman, pp. 95–98, who argues that the division between the characteristics of judicial and epideictic oratory is not as sharp as is often assumed.

³¹ See, most recently and persuasively, Salemme on Ammianus's creative use of words and phrases from earlier authors. Barnes argues that Ammianus's attitude toward his material is driven by nostalgia (see esp. p. 83). The whole context in which Ammianus, as a pagan in an age of dying paganism, wrote, could hardly be anything other than nostalgic. In such a context, the *exemplum*, which is essentially a nostalgic device, would have been a potent instrument for any writer. Even the Christians used it for their own purposes.

³² Sabbah, pp. 394–96, notes that the term *exemplum* and the *exempla* themselves are often used by Ammianus as a form of proof that evokes precedent. Ammianus uses the word "*exemplum*" thirty-five times. In fourteen of these cases the reference is either to a personal example being followed or set with no suggestion of intent to persuade. Of the other twenty one cases, sixteen refer to an example being offered with the intent either to persuade or to illustrate a point (ten of these by Ammianus himself), the remaining five to a person being persuaded by an example. Many of these cases do not involve a formal *exemplum* of the kind discussed in this paper.

WORKS CITED

- Alewell, K. *Über das rhetorische Paradeigma. Theorie, Beispielsammlungen, Verwendung in der römischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit*. Ph.D. diss. U of Leipzig, 1913.
- Barnes, T.D. "Literary Convention, Nostalgia and Reality in Ammianus Marcellinus." G. Clarke, ed., *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay: Australian National UP, 1990. 59–92.
- Blockley, R.C. *Ammianus Marcellinus. A Study of his Historiography and Political Thought*. Bruxelles: Latomus, 1975.
- Gärtner, H. *Einige Überlegungen zur kaiserzeitlichen Panegyrik und zu Ammians Charakteristik des Kaisers Julianus (Akad. der Wiss. und der Litt., Mainz, N.R. 10)*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1968.
- Kornhardt, H. *Exemplum. Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Studie*. Ph.D. diss. U of Göttingen, 1936.
- Menander Rhetor. Ed. D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.
- Naudé, C.P.T. *Ammianus Marcellinus in die lig van die antieke geskiedskrywing*. Leiden: Drukkrij 'Luctor et Emergo,' 1956.
- Sabbah, G. *La méthode d'Ammien Marcellin*. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1978.
- Salemme, C. *Similitudini nella storia: un capitolio su Ammiano Marcellino*. Naples: Loffredo Editore, 1989.
- Schoenberger, H. *Beispiele aus der Geschichte, ein rhetorisches Kunstmittel in Ciceros Reden*. Ph.D. diss. U of Augsburg, 1910.
- Thompson, E.A. *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1947.
- Woodman, A.J. *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. London: Croom Helm, 1988.