Classical Quarterly **47** (i) 239–252 (1997) *Printed in Great Britain*

THE ITINERARY OF ALEXANDER: CONSTANTIUS TO JULIAN

I

Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, bequeathed war against Persia to his son Constantius, a legacy which haunted the next two decades, culminating in Julian's debacle in 363. Much has been written on the timing, motives, and strategy of these campaigns but the same role model appears at their beginning and end: Alexander the Great. Here, I wish to re-examine the evidence for his presence: recent scholarship has minimized it at one end and maximized at the other.

Julian's allusions to Alexander are well known in his surviving writings and can be matched to the publicity of those around him. Constantius's concern is inferred from a less familiar source, a brief work of history which rehearsed in Latin the campaigns of the two great Eastern conquerors, Alexander and Trajan.[1] In the past, its author remarked, Varro had written Ephemerides for Pompey as he embarked on war in Spain: as a result Pompey could be forewarned of the movements of the ocean and the heavens and act accordingly.[2] The author of the text on Alexander and Trajan had a more positive aim, to urge the young Constantius to excel these conquerors' example. There were already similarities between them, at least in the author's view. Like Alexander, Constantius was attacking the Persians in order to avenge a previous wrong. He was of a similar age to Alexander. He could even be said to look like him.[3]

In 1817, part of this Latin work was published by Cardinal A. Mai from the *Codex Ambrosianus*, a manuscript now believed to be dated to the ninth or tenth century, which had been copied in Avignon and was preserved in Milan. This manuscript remains the only source for most of the text and has been edited several times since Mai's discovery.[4] The author of the text asserted that he intended to use only those sources which 'ancient criticism pronounced to be the greatest friends of the truth': for

[1] My greatest debt is to T. D. Barnes, whose work is the impulse for this article and who kindly read Part Two and improved it for me. I am also grateful to S. N. C. Lieu and E. D. Hunt for helpful comment on an earlier version and R. B. Smith for further discussion, reflected in his valuable study, *Julian's Gods* (London, 1995). A re-edited text of the first 22 sections of the 'Itinerary' is given by R. Tabacco, *Per Una Nuova Edizione Critica dell'Itinerarium Alexandri* (Bologna 1992); H. Volkmann, *Itinerarium Alexandri* (Landschule Pforta, 1871) and H.-J. Hausmann, *Itinerarium Alexandri* (Diss Köln, 1970) are particularly helpful studies. R. Herzog (ed.), *Restauration und Erneuerung*, = R. Herzog and P. L. Schmidt (edd.), *Handbuch der Lateinischeti literatut der Antike*, Fünfter Band (München, 1989), pp. 212–15 gives the full bibliography and a survey of the textual and literary issues which this text has raised. J.-P. Callu 'La Préface à *L'Itineraire d'Alexandre*' in *De Tertullien Aux Mozarabes: Mélanges Offerts à J. Fontaine* I (Paris, 1992), pp. 429–43 is a re-edition and commentary on the Preface of the text only. The most valuable survey, however, is by R. Tabacco, '*Itinerarium Alexandri*: Rassegna Critica degli Studi e Prospettive di Indagine', *Bollettino di Studi Latini* 17 (1987), 77–120, the essential starting point for future study of the work.

[2] *Itin. Alex.* 6; for Varro's work (written by 77 B.C.), see E. Rawson, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London, 1985), pp. 105, 164, 183, 265, 288. This Ephemeris Navalis should probably be identified with the 'libri navales' of Varro in Vegetius 4.41 and perhaps with his De Ora Maritima.

[3] *Itin. Alex.* 9 (revenge); 15 (similar physique).

[4] A. Mai, *Itinerarium Alexandri* (Milan, 1817); R. Tabacco, 'Studi Sull'*Itinerarium Alexandri* 1: I Codici', *Atti dell'Accademia di Torino* 122 (1988), 56–78 is fundamental with id. 'Studi Sull' *Itinerarium Alexandri* 2: Il Contributo al Testo del Codice Parisino 4880', ibid. 123 (1989), 58–97.

the career of Alexander, he used almost nothing but Arrian's history.[5] If an account of Trajan's Parthian War followed, as seems likely, he presumably used Arrian for it too, but the *Codex Ambrosianus* breaks off with the ending of Alexander's march and the Trajanic section does not survive.

Historians of Julian have not always emphasized this important text, now known as the Itinerary of Alexander, a precedent for their Emperor's own interest in the conqueror. However, in his recent study of Constantius and the Christians of Persia T. D. Barnes has made apt use of it, remarking how it is 'not adequately exploited by recent historians of the fourth century A.D.[6] In Barnes's view, the work should 'probably' be dated to spring 340, but the author was 'clearly not a man close to the court or attentive to Imperial etiquette and propaganda'. I wish to strengthen the case for this date, which has had many supporters since Grion proposed it in 1872,[7] but I wish to challenge Barnes's view of the author. If Barnes is right, the text is of less relevance to the milieu of Julian and the Imperial house. Its authorship, however, has been of major concern to more than a century of specialized scholarship on the Itinerary (not exploited by Barnes) whose main candidate would greatly enhance the text's importance.[8] I wish to survey the main arguments, reject Barnes's view of the author, and then relate the Itinerary, and a companion piece on Alexander, to the Alexander of Julian's writings. The Itinerary's authorship is not certain, but the favoured candidate is connected with yet more writing on Alexander: with or without the Itinerary he puts Julian's allusions in a more traditional light than the one preferred since Baynes's fundamental study in 1912.

II

The positive arguments for the Itinerary's authorship are technical, but they appeal to five main supports of varying strength: the copyist's own description of the work; its style and language; its use of sources; its manuscript tradition; and its dedication. The copyist's description poses a problem of translation which has sometimes been thought to decide the author's identity. The Itinerary (as we nowadays call it) occurs in the *Codex Ambrosianus* after the three books of Julius Valerius's Latin translation of the Greek Alexander romance. The third and last of Valerius's books concludes with the copyist's note: *Explicit obitus Alexandri. Incipit itinerarium eiusdem.* Does the word *eiusdem* refer to Alexander or to the author, Julius Valerius? If it refers to Valerius, it identifies the author of the Itinerary. This central question has been debated since 1817 and recent discussions, by D. Romano in 1970 and 1974, have turned against a reference to Julius Valerius.[9] There is a further counter-argument in the subscription which stands earlier in the same manuscript, at the end of the first book of Valerius's Romance: *Res Geste Alexandri Macedonis Translate Aesopo Liber Primus Qui Est Ortus Eiusdem Explicit. Incipit Liber Secundus . . .* '[10] Here, *eiusdem* refers unambiguously to Alexander, not to the

[5] *Itin. Alex* 2; H. Tonnet, 'L'"Anabase" D'Arrien Dans L'"Itinerarium Alexandri"', *Revue d'Histoires des Textes* 9 (1979), 243–54.

[6] T. D. Barnes, 'Constantine and the Christians of Persia', *JRS* 75 (1985), 126–36, at 135.

[7] G. Grion, *I Nobili Fatti di Alessandro Magno* (Bologna, 1872), pp. xxvi–xxxix.

[8] R. Tabacco (supra, n. 1), pp. 77–120.

[9] D. Romano, *Giulio Valerio* (Palermo, 1974), p. 92, developed in his article, 'La Questione della Paternità dell'Itinerarium Alexandri', *Atti dell Accad. di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti di Palermo* (1970–1), pp. 93–8: critical discussion by R. Tabacco (supra, n. 1), pp. 93–7, esp. p. 97 n. 63.

author Valerius: we should expect the same reference in its similar occurrence at the end of the third book, added by the same copyist's hand.

Without the support of *eiusdem* the main arguments for the author's identity have been literary. Both Mai and (in 1851) G. Berengo were convinced that the style of the Itinerary was quite unlike the style of Valerius's Latin Romance of Alexander: *Valerii elocutio satis mihi abhorrere videtur abs genere Itinerarii*;[11] 'manifesta diversità della lingua e dello stile'.[12] In 1852, however, Berengo changed his mind after editing Valerius, and in 1861 C. Kluge studied the two works' style and vocabulary systematically (without alluding to Berengo) and concluded that the Itinerary and Latin Romance were close in their idiosyncracies: they could even be by the same man.[13]

Manifestly, the two works are in different styles, the Romance being more florid, but this difference may be due only to their differing genres. The argument relies on syntax and language, and here enough similarities emerged to make Kluge's case extremely attractive.[14] They cannot be explained by arguing that the author of the Itinerary used Valerius's Latin Romance as its source.[15] That argument fails on two counts. The author of the Itinerary emphasizes that his sources are those *quos fidei amicissimos vetus censura pronunciat*.[16] That description cannot fit the extravagant Romance in its Greek or Latin version: the author of the Itinerary relied very properly on the best source, Arrian, for the bulk of his narrative. When he did deviate into details which we know in the Romance, he set almost all of them after the end of his serious narrative, when he had finished with Alexander's episodes of conquest against Persians. Significantly, these details include material known in the Greek Romance but not in Valerius's Latin translation.[17]

In 1954, R. Merkelbach developed an argument from details in the two sources which, he believed, settled the question.[18] When Alexander bathes in the river Cydnus before catching a fever in 333 B.C. both the Itinerary and Valerius's Latin Romance add the extraordinary detail that he jumped into the river in full armour. Merkelbach notes that later in the work, the Itinerary uses a Greek text of the Alexander Romance beside its Latin one. Merkelbach argues that the detail at the Cydnus river, common to both works, proves that the Itinerary and Valerius's Latin had used the same Greek text of the Alexander Romance. Valerius (he concludes) wrote the Itinerary too, using the same Greek text of the Romance as he used for his work of translation. Unfortunately, the argument is not conclusive. If Valerius wrote the Itinerary and used the same Greek text of the Romance, why does the Itinerary include episodes of the Alexander Romance which his Latin translation of the Romance omits?[19] The one shared detail of the jump into the Cydnus cannot settle the argument.

For Merkelbach, the conclusion that the Itinerary and the Latin Romance are by one and the same Valerius is 'gesichert'. The inference is not justified by the main

[10] Printed in B. Kuebler's Teubner edition, *Juli Valeri Res Gestae Alexandri* (Leipzig, 1888), p. 65.

[11] Mai (supra, n. 4), p. 68.

[12] G. Berengo (ed.), *Itinerario di Alessandro Magno* (Venice, 1851), p. xii.

[13] G. Berengo, *Le Imprese di Alessandro Macedone* (Venice, 1852); C. Kluge, *De Itinerario Alessandri Magni* (Diss., Breslau, 1861), pp. 34–55.

[14] R. Tabacco (supra, n. 1), pp. 84–90 for a full and cautious survey of the various scholarship on the matter since 1851.

[15] *R.-E.* 9.2 (1916), 2363, s.v. Itinerarium Alexandri (W. Kubitschek).

[16] *Itin. Alex.* 2.

[17] J. Zacher, *Pseudocallisthenes* (Halle, 1867), pp. 55 and 81 prints the texts for comparison.

[18] R. Merkelbach, *Die Quellen des griechischen Alexanderromans*[2] (München, 1977), pp. 179–82.

[19] Merkelbach (supra, n. 8), pp. 180 recognizes the difficulty.

example which he discusses, but it has gained support from ingenious studies by D. Romano which have also compared the contents of the Latin Romance and the Itinerary (Valerius's later work, he believes). Romano draws attention to the Paris Codex of the Latin Romance—a manuscript of thirteenth century date into whose text two bits of the Itinerary have been fitted coherently. The fitting, Romano suggests, was the work of the Romance's author, Valerius himself, working over his 'first edition' in the light of his later work, the Itinerary.[20] Like Merkelbach, he also points to similarities between bits of Valerius's Latin Romance and non-Arrianic bits of the Itinerary. In both, but not in Arrian, Olympias is said to have accompanied her son's invasion of Asia:[21] who else would add this bizarre detail to an Arrianic Itinerary except Valerius, who knew it from his Latin version of the Romance?

Between a thirteenth century codex, the shifting outlines of the Romance of Alexander, and the revisions of Valerius himself there are other possible links besides those which Romano has proposed. His case, however, is suggestive, and it ties up with the core of Kluge's linguistic argument. Computerized study of the two works' Latin may help to enlarge the argument but the case for Valerius's authorship can appeal to further supports. It is at least consistent with the idea of one author for the two works that our sole manuscript of the Itinerary, the *Codex Ambrosianus*, contains Valerius's Latin Romance, then the Itinerary and nothing else. Furthermore, the two works may both have been dedicated to the Emperor Constantius. Our texts of the Latin Romance lack the book's preface, but in 1629 G. Gaulmin referred to his knowledge of a 'codex of the most learned Salmasius' in which the Latin Romance was dedicated to Constantius.[22] No such codex survives and perhaps Gaulmin confused the Romance with the Itinerary; or perhaps he was simply wrong. But if the two Alexander books did share the same Imperial dedicatee, the chances that they are by the same author are even greater.

For the moment, the case for a common authorship is attractive, although the linguistic argument is not conclusive. If we follow its implications, where would it lead us? Unlike the Itinerary, the Latin Alexander Romance survives outside the *Codex Ambrosianus*: it is known in the Turin Palimpsest (T) which was copied in the seventh century and gives the identity of the Latin Romance's author in two of its subscriptions, *Julius Valerius Alexander Vir Clarissimus Polemius* and *Julius Valerius Alexander Polemius Vir Clarissimus*. A. Mai argued ingeniously, but wrongly, that Polemius was not a proper name, but a confusion by a Latin author: the Greek original (Mai suggested) had πόλεμοι as part of its title, agreeing with Ἀλεξάνδρου, but the Latin author turned the words into personal names.[23] The wording of the subscriptions refutes Mai's view: Polemius is certainly a person, an immensely distinguished *clarissimus*, right at the top of Roman society.

We know just such a person: Flavius Polemius, the consul in 338, the year of Constantius's accession, and most probably the same Polemius who is attested by a papyrus as a prominent courtier under Constantius in 345.[24] A recent study of the

[20] Romano (supra, n. 9; 1970–1), pp. 103–47 and ibid. (supra, n. 9; 1974), p. 112. Counter-arguments are given by Tabacco (supra, n. 4; 1989), pp. 58–97.

[21] Romano (supra, n. 9; 1970–1), p. 111 on Jul. Val., *Res Gestae* 1.47 with *Itin. Alex.* 18.

[22] G. Gaulmin, *De Vita et Morte Mosis* (Paris, 1629), p. 235, discussed by J. Zacher (supra, n. 17), p. 45. Gaulmin remarks, concerning Aesop (whom he presumed to be the translator of the Greek Romance, supposedly by Callisthenes): 'est autem hic Aesopus interpres Callisthenis antea laudati qui et versionem suam Constantio, Constantini M. filio, dicavit quam ex codice doctissimi Salmasii olim descripsimus'.

[23] A. Mai, *Vergilii Maronis Interpretes Veteres* (Milan, 1818), p. XXXVIII.

name-patterns of late-Roman dignitaries has warned us against 'playing fast and loose with what may have been widely observed rules',[25] but no pattern forbids a Flavius Julius Valerius Alexander Polemius. He was author of the Latin translation of the Alexander Romance in mixed verse and prose; he was consul in 338, the first year of Constantius's reign; he was undoubtedly *vir clarissimus*. Could he also be the author of the Itinerary of Alexander and Trajan? If so, he wrote it to encourage the new young Emperor whom he continued to serve and to whom (if Gaulmin was right) he also dedicated his Alexander Romance in Latin.

We know nothing about Polemius's earlier career, but three particular theories in recent scholarship on the Romance and the consul need attention because they would divide him from Valerius, the author: they concern Alexandria, Constantinus (Constantius's brother), and Christianity. D. Romano has compared a group of references to Alexandria in our Greek text of the Romance with their Latin versions in Valerius's translation.[26] He has pointed to Valerius's use of the first person pronoun, his own additions to the Greek text's topography of the city, and his inflation of the Greek text's praises of Alexandria's fame:[27] Valerius (he concluded) was an Alexandrian and so the equation with Polemius the consul must be abandoned.

This argument has won supporters, but it is not cogent. As H. Tonnet ably showed in 1973, the author of the Itinerary did not understand the niceties of Arrian's atticizing Greek and sometimes mistranslated it spectacularly.[28] His Latin, though florid, is much better turned. If Valerius was a literary Alexandrian, we would expect his Greek to have been rather better. His comments about Alexandrian customs and topography need only reflect a visit or a period of residence in the city: as it is, his geography of the city has not escaped query from P. M. Fraser.[29] We do not know whether Polemius grew up in Alexandria, visited it, or even served in it; there is always the possibility that his Greek text of the Romance (heavily coloured with Alexandrian details) had rather more such detail in it than the texts of our surviving tradition. Any of these probabilities would meet Romano's points without excluding Polemius the consul as Julius Valerius the author–translator.

If the Itinerary's author was Polemius the consul, he was very close to the court and well aware of Imperial etiquette and propaganda. However, T. D. Barnes has argued that the author of the Itinerary enjoyed neither of these advantages. If Barnes is right, the Polemius theory (which he did not consider) is wrong. Here, we can be more positive. The source of Barnes' belief is the favourable allusion to Constantinus, the dead brother of Constantius, which the author of the Itinerary sets in his preface.[30] Constantinus had been killed in battle by his other brother, Constans, near Aquileia in

[24] Evidence in A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale and J. Morris, *PLRE* I (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 709–10: I accept that most, probably all, of the evidence for their 'Flavius Polemius 4' concerns 'Julius Valerius Polemius 3', despite A. Stein, 'Zum Julius Valerius', *Berliner Philologische Wochrenschrift* 33 (1913) 1436–7.

[25] A. Cameron, 'Polyonymy in the Late Roman Aristocracy', *JRS* 75 (1985), 178.

[26] Romano (supra, n. 9), pp. 13–15.

[27] Jul. Val., *Res Gest.* 1.27 with Ps. Call. 1.32 imply to Romano 'in maniera irrefutabile che Giulio Valerio è egiziano', but the first paraphrase and the use of 'ad nos' and 'inter nostros Heroos' in this passage need only imply that Valerius knew Alexandria or that his text of the Romance differed slightly from ours at this point. Romano (supra, n. 9), p. 14 n. 6 lists the other 'Alexandrian' additions which he sees as significant too.

[28] H. Fuhrmann, in R. Herzog and P. L. Schmidt (edd), (supra, n. 1), p. 213; H. Tonnet (supra, n. 5), pp. 248–50.

[29] P. M. Fraser, *Ptolomeic Alexandria* II (Oxford, 1972), p. 5 on Jul. Val. 1.25.

[30] *Itin. Alex.* 4.

April 340.[31] Barnes believes that his memory was damned and goes on to argue that panegyrists of Constantius refrained from mentioning him, even giving the impression that Constantius had only ever had one brother.[32] In the light of these distortions a favourable allusion to Constantinus in a preface addressed to Constantius would seem very ill-informed: a consul, surely, could not have made it.

This argument, at least, can be countered decisively, although the mention of Constantinus bears on events of great obscurity. In spring 340, Constantinus died while leading an army on Constans's territory: Constantius was in the East, but which brother was the villain if seen from an eastern point of view? We have five main sources, but their evidence differs or is unspecific. The two who are hostile to Constantinus are the latest and use unknown authorities. Zonaras assumes that Constantinus began the quarrel and did not have justice on his side:[33] the *Epitome de Caesaribus* claims that Constantinus moved against Constans *latrocinii specie*.[34] However, Zonaras was far from the event and the Epitome's account of the two brothers is remarkably hostile throughout.

Neither of these authors was an alert contemporary, whereas Eutropius, who probably was, says nothing about the rights and wrongs of the conflict: he merely says that Constantinus died 'while waging war against his brother'.[35] Aurelius Victor certainly was a contemporary, yet he was non-committal: Constantinus, he wrote, was engaged in *fatale bellum*.[136] If the blackening of Constantinus's memory was so much to Constantius's liking, it is surprising that Victor let the opportunity pass. His work was only too willing to flatter Constantius openly on other points.[37] As for the fifth source, Zosimus, it is not quite clear what he wished to say: he probably muddled the names of Constantinus and Constans at 2.41. If we correct his error by transposing them (as his editor F. Paschoud thinks we certainly should), then the essence of Zosimus's source is that Constantinus marched against Constans while claiming that he was sending soldiers east to join Constantius in his Persian expedition.[38] If this correction is right, it makes it even easier to see how Polemius, an ex-consul in the East, could mention Constantinus favourably after his death while writing a work for Constantius's benefit.

It is particularly important that the surviving writings of Ammianus and the Emperor Julian do not conflict with this suggestion. At 21.6.2, Ammianus refers to a tribune, Amphilochius, who had served with Constans and had been held responsible for the discord *inter priores fratres*. Again, the text and translation have caused trouble (can *priores* mean 'deceased'),[39] but the allusion does seem to be to Constans's quarrel with Constantinus. To Ammianus's knowledge, therefore, Constans was not a totally innocent party: one of his minions had helped to provoke the quarrel which led to the war. Ammianus had a means of finding out: he had talked with a great survivor, the

[31] A. Piganiol, *L'Empire Chrétien* (rev. edn, Paris, 1972), p. 84.
[32] Barnes (supra, n. 6), p. 135 with nn. 65 and 66.
[33] Zonaras, *Epit.* 13.3 (ed. Büttner-Wobst, 1897); 13.13.
[34] *Epitome de Caesaribus* 41.21.
[35] Eutrop., *Brev.* 10.9.2.
[36] Aur. Victor, *Epit. de Caes.* 41.42.
[37] H. W. Bird, *Sextus Aurelius Victor* (Liverpool, 1984), pp. 10–11.
[38] Zosim. 2.41, with F. Paschoud, *Zosime: Histoire Nouvelle,* Tome I (Paris, Budé, 1971), p. 113 n. 54.
[39] J. C. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus* II (London and Harvard, Loeb, 1937), p. 116 n. 2.

eunuch Eutherius, who had served emperors from Constantine to Julian. Eutherius could have told him the inside story.[40]

In the wake of these uncertainties, there is a crucial problem of timing. The abolition of Constantinus's memory in the East is not securely dated by any surviving evidence. Its contemporary witnesses are a few widely scattered inscriptions and a single silver coin.[41] The relevant inscriptions are those on several milestones, found near Smyrna,[42] whose text appears to require that Constantinus's name has been erased, an inference which a recent re-reading of one of the stones has reinforced.[43] The abolition, however, was not universal and other inscriptions survive in Asia with Constantinus's name intact. The silver coin has recently been explained by H. A. Cahn:[44] evidently struck at Constantinople, it has lost a name, erased from its inscription. Numismatic 'abolitio nominis' is amply attested[45] and if the coin's accompanying portrait-head is to be referred to Constantinus, it is our one example of his 'abolition'. The reference is probable rather than certain, and the coin is a unique survivor. Cahn, however, has suggested that the bulk of the issue was called in and melted down after Constantinus had fallen from favour.

The key point in this uncertainty is that neither the coin nor the milestones give us an exact date for the 'abolition'. The first strong literary hint of it is Libanius's Oration 59, which Barnes rightly adduced for his argument: Constantinus is nowhere mentioned or assumed to have existed.[46] Barnes also adduces parts of Athanasius's Defence before Constantius, composed in 353:[47] the 'alert author', he infers, alluded indirectly to Constantinus by the vague phrase 'some others', never naming him openly or describing him as Constantinus's 'brother'.

Whatever we make of Athanasius's 'studious refraining', it needs to be emphasized that not every panegyrist observed it. In 355, Julian composed a panegyric for Constantius which referred openly and often to Constantius's 'brothers' in the plural and to the Emperor's good relations with both of them.[48] Unless we believe that Julian meant to be subversive, a notion which is hard to fit to the genre or content of the speech, we must accept that Constantius was not so sensitive about his 'brothers' as the 'alert' Athanasius (in Barnes's view) had perhaps suspected three years earlier. The difference between Julian's speech and Libanius's is not just one of date: unlike Julian, Libanius was addressing Constantius together with Constans. A reference to the third

[40] Amm. Marc. 16.7.3 with J. F. Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (London, 1989), p. 25.

[41] Barnes (supra, n. 7), p. 135 n. 65 cites E. Ferrero, 'Constantinus II', in E. de Ruggiero (ed.), *Dizionario Epigraphico* II (Rome, 1892–1900), p. 657: as he has kindly pointed out to me, the most recent discussion is H. A. Cahn, '*Abolitio Nominis* de Constantin II', *Mélanges de Numismatique Offerts à P. Bastien* (Welteren, 1987), pp. 201–2.

[42] G. Petzi, *Die Inschriften von Smyrna* II.1 (Bonn, 1987), nos 818 III, 815d, 812B, 813 (possibly the same text as 812B). The other Eastern inscriptions cited by Ferrero (supra, n. 41) are fragmentary or of uncertain relevance.

[43] By T. Drew-Bear and H. Malay, cited in Petzl (supra, n. 42) on no. 818 III.

[44] Cahn (supra, n. 41), pp. 201–2.

[45] R. Münsterberg, 'Damnatio Memoriae', *Monatsblatt der Numiscmatischen Gesellschaft in Wien*11 (1918), 32–7.

[46] Libanius, *Or.* 59.43, 59.73.

[47] Athanasius, *Apol. ad Constantinum* 4 with Barnes (supra, n. 7), p. 135 n. 66; Barnes *Athanasius and Constantius* (Harvard and London, 1993), pp. 51–52, 63–70 is now fundamental to the dating and interpretation.

[48] Julian, *Or.* 19B, 20A–B, 33B–C, 41B–C, 45C.

brother would have been tactless before Constans, the man who had attacked him and already declared him a public enemy.[49]

These texts are certainly not evidence that the Itinerary's kind allusion to Constantinus in a work addressed to Constantius could never have been risked by an informed courtier. There is also the element of timing. The earliest text to imply 'abolition' is Libanius's, but the date of his Oration 59 is keenly disputed. Scholars have often opted for 348, but W. Portmann has recently advanced a compelling case for placing it in winter 344/5.[50] Even if he is right (as I would accept), the speech still belongs four or five years after Constantinus's death. How soon had the 'abolition' of his name begun in the East? The coin and the erased inscriptions cannot decide the question for us: and meanwhile, we can assume an interval before Constantius in the East swung to Constans's brusque attitude in the West. Does the Itinerary belong in this interval, between spring 340 and a later change of mood at court?

Its author compliments Constantius on his 'successful beginning' and military readiness for a Persian expedition.[51] Barnes has explained the 'successful beginning' as the installation of a Roman nominee on the throne of Armenia, an event which can be dated to 338. The date of the Itinerary, he proposes, 'should probably be 340 precisely'.[52] The date can be supported from another angle: the author compliments Constantius for being of a similar age to Alexander when he invaded Asia: Alexander was twenty-two at the time, and as J.-P. Callu has observed, Constantius had been twenty-two since August 339.[33] The widely suggested date of 340 for this text seems likely.

The Itinerary's favourable mention of Constantinus is then no problem. In the East his name had not yet been abolished; an author could mention it before Constantius without being inept or out of touch; if he knew the Emperor's exact age, he was certainly not 'inattentive to Imperial etiquette and propaganda'. The mention of Constantinus does not disqualify Polemius as the author.

Is there, lastly, a problem with Polemius's religious alignment? In a separate study, not concerned with the Itinerary, Barnes has classed Flavius Polemius as certainly a Christian, one of Constantius's many Christian appointees.[54] He infers his Christianity from the mention of Polemius among the important persons who wrote to Athanasius at the Emperor's bidding in 345/6.[55] The author of the Romance, however, had faithfully translated the Greek original's long praises of Serapis into Latin verse without a qualm. Throughout, he retained the original's full pagan colour.[56] The author of the Itinerary was hardly less explicit. He began by contrasting Alexander's arrogant misconduct with Constantius and his *deus praeses*,[57] but this neutral phrase need be nothing more than a tactful reference to the Emperor's Christianity by an author who did not share it. His text then goes on to describe pagan

[49] *Cod. Theod.* 11.12.1.

[50] Barnes (supra. n. 47), p. 312 n. 19 for previous bibliography: he, too, accepts W. Portmann, 'Die 59 Rede des Libanios und das Datum der Schlacht von Singara', *BZ* 82 (1989),1–18.

[51] *Itin. Alex.*, *Praefatio* 1 with J.-P. Callu (supra, n. 1), pp. 440–3.

[52] Barnes (supra, n. 7), p. 135.

[53] *Itin. Alex.*, *Praefatio* 9 with J.-P. Callu, 'Aspects du Quadrimestre Monetaire', *MEFRA* 98.1 (1986), 196 n. 92.

[54] T. D. Barnes, 'Christians and Pagans under Constantius', *Entretiens Fondation Hardt* (1987), 313–5.

[55] Athanasius, *Hist. Arianorum* (ed. H. G. Opitz, 1935), 22.1.

[56] Jul. Val., *Res Gest.* 130–2.

[57] *Itin. Alex.*, *Praefatio* 9 for *deus praeses*; *Itin. Alex.* 49–53, 90, 107–8.

oracles, festivals, and sacrifices without any hesitation. A man of letters could perhaps have written in this way while being Christian, but neither the Latin Romance nor the Itinerary fits easily with Barnes view of Polemius's faith.

That view, however, is far from being solid. Those who wrote officially to Athanasius in 345/6 did not have to be Christians themselves, and even if they were, when had they become so in this age of transition? Here, too, D. Romano's textual studies have raised important questions. Once again, he has appealed to the shorter text of Valerius's Latin Romance in the Paris Codex of the thirteenth century and has observed, most acutely, that its omissions tend to excise the paganism of the longer text. He then argues (more questionably) that the excisions were Valerius's own work, his 'second thoughts' when he had changed to be a Christian in the 340s.[58] Whether the 'second edition' is correct or not, Romano does remind us that Polemius, like many, could have changed his views after 340 and veered towards Christianity by 345/6. His presence among the correspondents to Athanasius is then no problem: Flavius Polemius is not disqualified as author of one or both texts on Alexander on religious grounds.

From other evidence, Flavius Polemius can indeed be suspected of opportunism. In 1975, Barnes concluded an important study of the family tree and horoscopes of two senators under Constantine with a stimulating guess: 'at least one of the consuls who displaced Lollianus' (consul designate, but never consul, in 338) 'may be conjectured to be a general who played some part in disturbing Constantine's plans for the imperial succession'.[59] Barnes then hinted at the possible role of Flavius Ursus, active against a revolt in Phrygia in 336, consul in 338, and dedicatee of a veterinary work on horses.[60] His colleague, Polemius, now looks just as tantalizing: consul in 338, an Alexander enthusiast, translator of the Romance, and possible author of a work of military history for the benefit of the new Emperor. Perhaps, like Ursus, he was a general; certainly he would know from his historical studies how delicate a succession to the throne could be.

It is a pleasant possibility, that an author (twice over) on Alexander helped to frustrate Constantine's plans for his succession. Polemius the *clarissimus* translated the Romance into Latin; he or another, well placed at court, wrote a special Itinerary for the young Emperor as he prepared to go East in 340. As a role model, Alexander continued to be urged in the highest society, and neither religion, Alexandrian topography, nor a reference to Constantinus disqualify the consular Polemius as author of two such books in sequence.

III

If the arguments for the Itinerary's authorship carry weight, Julius Valerius Polemius wrote two books and retained a sense of the line between history and historical fiction. Like the late Mary Renault, he wrote a work of each on the same compelling subject, Alexander the Great. On one side he narrated Alexander's historical campaigns for the young Emperor, basing his work on those sources whom *vetus censura* approved as most 'friendly to truth'. The most recent commentator on Arrian's work has paid the Itinerary a very great compliment: he has used its text to

[58] Romano (supra, n. 9; 1970–1), p. 100 and (1974), p. 113.
[59] T. D. Barnes, 'Two Senators under Constantine', *JRS* 65 (1975), 40–9, esp. 49 with n. 109.
[60] T. D. Barnes, 'Another Forty Missing Persons', *Phoenix* 28 (1974), 226–7.

suggest a correction to Arrian's history and a supplement to Arrian's received text.[61] However, the compliment is too high and the method ill-advised: the author, like Mary Renault, also inserted details of dubious origin into his Arrianic narrative.[62] On the other side, he translated the Greek of the developed Alexander Romance: he even turned its verse into faithful metres, including Latin scazons.[63]

Whether the Itinerary is Polemius's or another courtier's, it is important to recognize that the author of the Itinerary's view of Alexander is two-sided. Alexander the conqueror of Persia is the model whom he urges on the young Constantius, whereas Alexander's personal habits and attitudes are another matter: Alexander 'boasted that he conquered only for himself and became fiercer to his friends, the more he succeeded in war', whereas Constantius is to fight altruistically for 'Roman safety'.[64] Alexander's conquests are narrated, but his Orientalizing and his cruelty are not played down: when he dies, the causes are drink and revelry (the 'cup of Hercules'), unlike the detail of Arrian's cautious account.[65]

This two-sided presentation is directly relevant to the next appearance of Alexander in Imperial literature. While the Itinerary was being written, yet another figure at court was concerning himself with Alexander: like Polemius, like the Itinerary, the young Julian had Alexander on his mind. His concern with this role model has been strongly emphasized, but if we view it against the Itinerary's recent example, it is not so idiosyncratic. In this concern, at least, he was not alone or unrealistic while beginning his literary studies at Nicomedia in the care of a Christian eunuch. 'For a long while I used to think that I was to rival Alexander and the emperor Marcus', Julian later wrote to Themistius, 'and anyone else of exceptional excellence . . .'[66] According to Libanius, a close contemporary, Alexander the Great was 'dear' to Julian:[67] how far did this kinship and rivalry extend?

In 1912, N. H. Baynes made no reference to the Itinerary's recent precedent and re-stated the case that the kinship went very deep.[68] Christian authors had stated as much, writing of Julian's wish to become the 'New Alexander' and his belief (according to the historian Socrates) that he was Alexander reincarnate in a new body. The theme has had a long life and has been placed at the centre of a recent study of Julian's ideals: for P. Athanassiadi-Fowden, Julian 'began consciously to imitate

[61] A. B. Bosworth, *Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* I (Oxford, 1980), p. 230, on Arr. 2.14.3 (already proposed by R. Merkelbach, supra, (n. 18), p. 128). At pp. 115–16, Bosworth argues that the 'confused and rhetorical narrative of the Itinerarium Alexandri 20' supports Diod. Sic. 17.19.1–3 in timing the Granicus battle at dawn. This is wrong: *sub luce* in *Itin. Alex.* 20 means 'in broad daylight'. There is no confusion: *Itin. Alex.* agrees (as we should expect) with Arrian 1.13, making Alexander delay only briefly (*paulisper*) before attacking. This version does not imply (despite Bosworth) that Diod. Sic.'s dawn battle was derived from a lost source rather than Diod's own error. On the general hazards of correcting Arrian from the *Itin. Alex.*, compare H. Tonnet (supra, n. 5), pp. 253–4.

[62] *Itin. Alex.* 34, not in Arrian but in Plutarch, *Alexander* 32.1, Diod. Sic. 17.56, Q. Curt. 4.13.17; Justin 11.13.1; Kluge (supra, n. 13), p. 8 n. 8.

[63] ed. Kuebler (supra, n. 10), 1.46. See also 1.23 (hexameters) and 1.31 (iambic trimeters); 1.52 is more desperate!

[64] *Itin. Alex.* 11.

[65] *Itin. Alex.* 118, with Diod. Sic. 17.117.1; Plut., *Alex.* 75.3–4 explicitly rejects the story, and Arr. *Anab.* 7.24–5 ignores it.

[66] Julian, *Epist. ad Themistium* 253B, with C. Lacombrade, 'L'Empereur Julien, Emule de Marc Aurèle', *Pallas* 14 (1967), 9, and my n. 85 below.

[67] Libanius, *Or.* 17.17.

[68] N. H. Baynes, 'Julian the Apostate and Alexander the Great', *EHR* (1912), 759–60, reprinted in his *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London, 1953), pp. 346–7.

Alexander' from 362/3 onwards.[69] The model became an 'obsession: increasingly mesmerized hy an Alexandrian vision of Persian conquest, Julian found it more and more difficult to maintain contact with reality, until at the last he became totally estranged from his own historical and human nature'.[70]

Baynes based his argument on two particular Christian sources: the historian Socrates and the *Passio S. Artemii*. According to the latter, Julian 'went out of his way' to camp at Issus, like Alexander in 333 B.C.; he even hoped 'through non-existent gods to become a new Alexander himself'.[71] According to Socrates, he had divined in his dreams that he would 'receive or even exceed the glory of Alexander'; he 'thought he had Alexander's soul or rather, that he himself was Alexander in another body'.[72] These sources are not to be trusted. The Passion of Artemius is a late and composite work, ascribed to 'John a monk of Rhodes' (although some scholars ascribe it now to John of Damascus).[73] It is dated not earlier than *c.* 600 and it worked together an 'old account' of Artemius's martyrdom with bits of Philostorgius's history and other unidentified sources. Bidez isolated the 'old account' of Artemius in a separate manuscript tradition: it has nothing to say about Julian's concern for Alexander.[74] Baynes, however, cited evidence from the longer, composite Passion, and here we can see how one of his two passages derived from a secondary history, probably Philostorgius's. When the longer Passion states that Julian camped deliberately at Issus, its geography promptly goes astray: it has to take him from Issus back to Tarsus, then back again to Antioch. It is plain from the surviving 'older account' (which begins at Tarsus) that the author of the longer Passion was trying to conflate two sources: one mentioned Issus (Philostorgius), the other mentioned only Tarsus (the older martyr-text).[75] By contrast, Ammianus passes no particular comment about a camp at Issus (which was anyway quite normal on the line of march) or suggests any undue respect for Alexander at this point.[76]

The second passage in the Passion alleged that Julian wished to be a 'new Alexander', but it is phrased in Christian language and can also be credited to Philostorgius. Like Socrates, who said much the same thing, Philostorgius was a Christian and was writing some eighty years after Julian's reign: Baynes's case for a deep rivalry with Alexander rests on two Christian authors, writing in the age of Theodosius II. By that time, too many hostile Christians had had their say. Their hostile views had been quick to start. In 363/4, soon after Julian's death, Gregory of Nazianzus was already alleging that the dying Julian had wished to throw himself into the Tigris in order to seem immortal, but that 'one of his eunuchs' had restrained him.[77] The plan was in imitation of Alexander, although only the most unreliable sources had ever credited Alexander himself with such an intention.

Gregory's allegation suited its hostile context and it, too, deserves no credit from

[69] P. Athanassiadi-Fowden, *Julian and Hellenism* (Oxford, 1981), p. 192.

[70] Athanassiadi-Fowden (supra, n. 69), 224–5: Alexander's importance is also emphasized by G. Wirth, 'Julians Perserkreig', in R. Klein (herausg.), *Julianus Apostata* (1978), pp. 455–68 and G. Wirth, 'Alexander und Rom', *Entretiens Fond. Hardt* (1973), pp. 203–10.

[71] *Passio S. Artemii*, *PG* 1273B and 1317B. [72] Socrates, *H. E.* 3.21.

[73] The classic study by J. Bidez, *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte* (G. C. S. 1913, 3rd edn, 1951), pp. XLIV–LXI with Anhang III. H. G. Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reiche* (München, 1959), p. 452 opts for John of Damascus.

[74] Bidez (supra, n. 73), Anhang III.

[75] Bidez (supra, n. 73), L. [76] Amm. Marc. 22.9.13.

[77] Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 5.14 with *Arr.* 7.27.3; J.-P. Callu, 'Les Constitutions d'Aristote', *REL* 33 (1975), 268–**00**, esp. 289 and n. 4 on Greg. Naz. and the dating.

historians. But it was a contemporary's allegation, unlike the statements in the Passion of Artemius, and it did not arise from nothing. Behind this contemporary Christian smoke lie a few contemporary sparks, thrown off by Julian's own publicity, and here our evidence is twofold: a medallion and Libanius. In 1962, A. Alföldi published a contorniate medallion which shows a portrait of Alexander dissimilar to the many other Alexanders in the series: the line of the nose and the presence of an Imperial collar (not the usual diadem) caused him to explain it as a head of Julian as Alexander the Great.[78] The case has been disputed, but the point about the diadem-collar still stands, and on Alföldi's view, contorniates of this type were made up for distribution as New Year gifts: an Alexander-Julian for New Year, 363, perhaps, although we do not know who the giver was to be.

Libanius's speeches support this possibility. In his Monody, he refers to Alexander as 'dear to Julian and not allowing him to sleep';[79] in the Funeral Oration, he claims that Julian had planned to return from Ctesiphon by marching to Gaugamela 'with or without a battle there so that his victory would be celebrated along with Alexander's': Julian's ideal, like Alexander's, was to conquer as far as India, but 'one of the gods deterred him'.[80] These speeches are highly rhetorical and were composed extravagantly after Julian's death: Libanius is not evidence for the emperor's inner motives. The fact remains that Gaugamela lay close to the Emperor's likeliest route of return, although Socrates later took up Libanius's theme and turned the 'ambition' into an infatuation.[81]

This contemporary pagan imagery prompted Gregory to allege that Julian had wished to kill himself like the Alexander of legend. Whatever courtiers may have said, we need to distinguish analogies between Alexander and Julian from a conscious imitation of him, deliberately pursued by Julian himself. The allusions to Alexander in Julian's writings are our only guide to the Emperor's personal convictions, but before we assess them, we must also give weight to another contemporary, Ammianus. Unlike Libanius, Ammianus never connects the aims of Julian's Persian campaign with Alexander's.[82] He mentions the two of them together four times, twice in terms of a model and imitation. One is a stock comparison (Julian's kindness to female captives, like Alexander's and Scipio's) and the other amounts to a single remark (Julian liked Alexander's saying that his treasures were to be found 'among his friends').[83] Otherwise, Ammianus is conspicuously restrained,[84] perhaps because Julian's enemies had pushed the theme too far, but also because he was writing history, not rhetoric.

His restraint on this theme is not inconsistent with our most important sources: the writings of Julian himself. Mentions of Alexander are well known, but the one in his letter to Themistius is not conclusive or the full story. 'For a long while I used to think that I was to rival Alexander . . .,' but also the emperor Marcus and 'anyone else of excellence'. E. D. Hunt has recently considered the 'rivalry with Marcus' and shown, acutely, that it is not to be over-estimated.[85] So, too, Julian implies in this same passage

[78] A. Alföldi, 'Some Portraits of Julianus Apostata', *AJA* 66 (1962), 404, not altogether overturned by P. Lévêque, 'De Nouveaux Portraits de L'Empereur Julien', *Latomus* 22 (1963), 82–3.

[79] Above all Libanius *Or.* 17.17, although 17.32 is more guarded about Alexander's merits.

[80] Libanius, *Or.* 18.260 and 261. [81] Socrates, *H. E.* 3.21.

[82] J. Szidat, 'Alexandrum Imitatus (Amm. 24.4.27)', in W. Will and J. Heinrichs (herausg.), *Zu Alexander d. Gr. Festschrift G. Wirth* (1988), pp. 1023–35, esp. pp. 1025–7.

[83] Amm. Marc. 24.4.27 and 25.4.15.

[84] Szidat (supra, n. 82), pp. 1027–35, with full discussion.

that the rivalry with Alexander was a thing of the past, given up as too demanding. His own writings show that his view of Alexander was not blinded by romance: Alexander (he knew) was corrupted by Fortune; he became conceited; he grew ever harsher after his victories; he was too prone to drink; the list of his victims among his own officers grew and grew.[86] Aware of this counter-evidence, Baynes put it down to rhetorical tradition, which (he thought) derived largely from Dio of Prusa and said nothing for Julian's personal views. Dio did indeed give Julian material,[87] and rhetorical commonplaces may indeed account for one or two of the references: in his panegyric on Constantius, for instance, Julian praises Constantius for excelling Alexander and his habits, but the compliment is dulled by its repetition in his letter to the philosopher Themistius, where Julian praises the philosopher Socrates in much the same way.[88] In these two instances the context and literary form may account for the allusion. But others are much more specific.

The most important belong precisely in winter 362/3 while the eastern campaign was being prepared at Antioch. In his letter to Nilus, Julian answers objections which are now lost to us, but his letter makes sense if Nilus himself had accused the Emperor of falling short of Alexander's standards.[89] The accusation suited some of the sparks from Julian's own publicity, but the important point is the manner of Julian's reply. At a date when a recent study has made Alexander into Julian's 'obsession' the Emperor answers the charge very sensibly: 'why do you rate Alexander so highly?', he replies, and then lists historical blots on the conqueror's record.[90] He lists Alexander's misdeeds with a grasp of historical detail which goes beyond mere rhetorical convention: he knows them through histories, not least through Plutarch's lives; at one point he knows more stories than we do.[91]

The same awareness runs through his witty and original sketch, the Caesars, which was also composed at Antioch in late 362.[92] Among the sketch's Roman contestants, Alexander has seemed an 'intruder',[93] reflecting Julian's personal preoccupations, yet the outcome of the sketch tells against any idea of the Emperor's undue obsession or passionate imitation. The winner is not Alexander but Marcus Aurelius; Alexander is stated not to have spared his friends, to have drunk too much, to have lacked self-control, and to have shown harshness to those who thwarted him.[94] G. W. Bowersock has related this criticism, nonetheless, to Julian's own predicament, his 'obsession with the problem of excessive severity' and his personal difficulties at Antioch:[95] it reads more like a group of honest comments from an Emperor who knew

[85] Julian, *Epist. ad Themist.* 253B where the force of πάλαι is relevant, and made sharper by the following sentence; on Marcus, E. D. Hunt, 'Julian and Marcus Aurelius', in D. Innes, H. Hine and C. Pelling (edd.), *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 287–98.

[86] Julian, *Epist.* 257B: *Or.* 45D–46A: *Caesars*, 330 B–C: *Epist.* 446.

[87] Baynes (supra, n. 68), n. 3; Julian, *Or.* 212C naturally cites Dio for a tale concerning Diogenes and Alexander.

[88] Julian, *Or.* 41C, 46A; *Epist. ad Themist.* 264C and *Or.* 96A–C.

[89] Julian, *Epist.* 443C, esp. 446A.

[90] Julian, *Epist.* 446A.

[91] At 446A, Julian implies two stories of the death of Hector, son of Parmenion. We know only one (the Nile version) and then only in Q. Curt. 4.8.7–9, 6.9.27. The Emperor knows more evidence than we now have.

[92] B. Baldwin, 'The Caesares of Julian', *Klio* 60 (1978), 449–66; Smith (supra, n. 1), p. 125 is excellent on the Caesars' tone.

[93] Matthews (supra, n. 40), pp. 137–8.

[94] Julian, *Caesars* 321C, 330C–331C.

[95] G. W. Bowersock, 'The Emperor Julian On His Predecessors', *YCS* 27 (1982), 161–2.

his sources for Alexander and retained his own realism. While on the verge of marching east, Julian had not lost a critical sense of Alexander's many failings.

At the end of the Caesars, Trajan goes and sits down by Alexander, the flawed military conqueror: the author of the Itinerary would have approved this ending, as he too had paired them some twenty years earlier. Even in the Caesars, Alexander's flaws are fully recognized. Without any loss of 'reality' or self-awareness, Julian had continued to admire Alexander the general, generous, victorious, and good (on occasion) to his friends:[96] as late as 362/3, however, he was still ready to cite Alexander's darker side: the conceit, the murders, the drinking.[97] This limited admiration was far from an obsession: not a word of it occurs in Ammianus's last speech for him or in Ephrem's exultation over his dead body.[98] Above all, it was no new idiosyncracy. Some twenty years earlier, the author of the Itinerary had urged it in much the same terms on Constantius, a 'new Alexander' in his youthfulness and very physique. Like Julian in his own writings, this author had separated Alexander the admirable conqueror from Alexander the man of disgraceful vices. The Itinerary's Alexander was Julian's too,[99] an accepted part of 'reality and historical and human nature' for educated men of the time. The Itinerary's author, probably a pagan, urged the model on Constantius, a Christian Emperor whom he wished to honour. Julian, a pagan, shared it too, although Christians who hated him then turned the role-model against him.

Once again, the last pagan Emperor was not nearly so novel or romantic as some modern scholars would have us believe: Christian exaggeration has helped to lead them astray. Opinions still differ on the planning of the last march eastwards, but as military history it is 'no Alexander-like rampage'.[100] Julian's limited admiration for Alexander had not 'inflamed an ambitious spirit'[101] and led it to disaster any more than it inflamed Constantius in 340. A young Emperor, invading Persia in 362/3, would expect the analogy and know it from the experience of his predecessor when also invading Persia as a young man. Julian was an educated, thoughtful man to whom aspects of Alexander evidently appealed; they were aspects, however, not the totality, and their appeal was not all-consuming. The courtier who had written the Itinerary, perhaps Polemius the ex-consul, would have understood. In the 360s a second edition of his book could have been usefully sent to the young Emperor whose views he had anticipated for his young predecessor more than twenty years ago.[102]

New College, Oxford R. J. LANE FOX

[96] Amm. Marc. 23.4.15 on Julians reputed remarks ('aliquotiens') about Alexander and his friends; compare Julian, *Or.* 86B (and in another sense, 43C). The saying was quite commonplace: Themistius, *Or.* 203C.

[97] Julian, *Epist. ad Nilum* 446; see also *Or.* 251 B–C (leaving open the possibility of blaming Alexander).

[98] Amm. Marc. 25.3.15: Ephrem, *Hymns Against Julian*, now translated in S. N. C. Lieu (ed.), *The Emperor Julian: Panegyric and Polemic* (Liverpool, 1986), pp. 91–124.

[99] *Itin. Alex.* 30 stresses Alexander's virtue to his friends (supra, n. 96) by transposing Arr. *Anab.* 2.4.11 to the start of the incident.

[100] R. T. Ridley, 'Notes on Julian's Persian Expedition', *Historia* 22 (1973), 317–26 esp. 326; for other views, A. Marcone, 'Il Significato della Spedizione di Giuliano Contro La Persia', *Athenaeum*, n.s. 57 (1979), 334–556, esp. 342–5 and the important study in Matthews (supra, n. 40), pp. 130–79.

[101] The phrase is E. Gibbons *Decline and Fall*, ed. J. Bury II (London, 1909), p. 506.

[102] L. Cracco Ruggini, 'Sulla Christianizzone della cultura pagana: ii mito greco e latino di Alessandro dell'età antonina al medio aevo', *Athenaeum* 43 (1963), 3–80 surveys earlier and later texts on Alexander's deeds. She discusses the Itinerary only in passing: 'sorta di guida anonima, pure esse certamente non cristiana' (op. cit., p. 5) and refers, without committing herself, to the view that Julius Valerius wrote it.