

ON THE DATE OF THE *KAISERGESCHICHTE*

R. W. BURGESS

THE *KAISERGESCHICHTE* (*KG*) was first postulated in 1883 by Alexander Enmann.¹ He noticed that the epitomators Aurelius Victor (writing in mid-361)² and Eutropius (ca. 369)³ wrote (especially about the third century) in such a way as to necessitate a single common source: they make the same mistakes, they often share similar wording and phraseology as well as extended verbal parallels and echoes, and they generally recount the same selection of events in much the same order. Victor wrote first, hence he could not be copying Eutropius, and since Victor's own opinions and peculiar style, vocabulary, and tone have no reflection in Eutropius and since Eutropius is often fuller in content than Victor, it is unlikely that Eutropius could have copied Victor. Enmann therefore concluded that they must have shared a now lost common source. He also saw that the *Historia Augusta* (now dated ca. 395–99)⁴ must also have had access to this unknown common source, which he called simply a *Kaisergeschichte*, a name that has

I should first of all like to thank the two anonymous referees for their extensive and insightful comments. I owe whatever success my conclusions may have to them. I should especially like to thank Harry Bird and Tim Barnes for their comments on earlier drafts. Tim Barnes has informed me that the arguments for 357 "have become very hard to evade—perhaps impossible."

1. Alexander Enmann, "Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser und das buch *de viris illustribus urbis Romae*. Quellenstudien," *Philologus*, Supp. 4 (1883): 335–501 (on which, see J. F. Gilliam, "Rostovtzeff's Obituary of Enmann," *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium* [hereafter *BHAC*] 1977–78 [1980], 105). For the *KG* in general, see *HLL* §536 (= Reinhart Herzog and P. L. Schmidt [eds.], *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, vol. 5 [Munich, 1989] = *Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine*, vol. 5 [Turnhout, 1993]). Sometimes it will be necessary to cite page references in *HLL* and they will be in the form "German ed. pages = French ed. pages."

2. *HLL* §537. The most recent evaluation of the date is C. E. V. Nixon, "Aurelius Victor and Julian," *CP* 86 (1991): 113–25. For Victor and the *KG*, see H. W. Bird, "The Sources of the *de Caesaribus*," *CQ* 31 (1981): 457–63, and idem, *Sextus Aurelius Victor: A Historiographical Study* (Liverpool, 1984), 16–23. For the dependence of Victor and all of the authors listed below upon the *KG*, see, e.g., *HLL*, pp. 197, 200, 204, 209, 210 = pp. 227, 230, 231, 235, 236, 241, 242; Sir Ronald Syme, *Historia Augusta Papers* (Oxford, 1983), 30, 49, 140, 151 (hereafter *HAP*); T. D. Barnes, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Brussels, 1978), 90–97; idem, "The Lost Kaisergeschichte and the Latin Historical Tradition," *BHAC* 1968–69 (1970; reprinted in *Early Christianity and the Roman Empire* [London, 1984]), paper IV, 17–30; and idem, "The *Epitome de Caesaribus* and its Sources," *CP* 71 (1976): 259–65 (reprinted in *Early Christianity*, paper XIII).

3. *HLL* §538. See now the new translation and commentary by H. W. Bird, *Eutropius: Breviarium*, *Translated Texts for Historians*, 14 (Liverpool, 1993), esp. xlvii–xlix. H. van Oosten ("Keiserdatums in Eutropius," *Aclass* 32 (1989): 59–78) argues that Eutropius used Marius Maximus directly, rather than the *KG*. Hardly a supportable argument since both works are lost (see n. 13, below).

4. In spite of various attempts to move the date into the fifth century I am still convinced by this date (cf. Barnes, *Sources*, 18). For the *HA* and the *KG*, see also, e.g., Barnes, "Lost Kaisergeschichte," 28–33, 39–42; idem, *Sources*, 95–97 (esp. 96); Syme, *HAP*, 13–14, 30, 50–51, 53, 60–61, 136, 140; J.-P. Callu, *Histoire Auguste*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1992), xxxv–xxxvi, lii; and André Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste. Les empereurs romains des II^e et III^e siècles* (Paris, 1994), lxix–lxxi.

stuck (though it often used to be referred to as a *Kaiserchronik*). At the same time Arthur Cohn postulated a "Suetonius auctus" to account for similarities in the first eleven books of Aurelius Victor and the *Epitome de Caesaribus*,⁵ but this was later shown to be simply the first part of Enmann's *KG*.⁶ Since 1884 other scholars have postulated that the *KG* was also used as a source, either at firsthand or later, by Festus, writing ca. 369;⁷ by Jerome, for his additions to his translation of Eusebius of Caesarea's *Chronici canones* in 380–81;⁸ by Ausonius, for his verse account of the usurpers between Decius and Diocletian, written sometime in the 380s;⁹ by Ammianus Marcellinus writing in the late 380s;¹⁰ by the author of the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, writing some time shortly after 395;¹¹ and probably at a number of removes by Polemius Silvius, for the list of emperors and usurpers in his *Laterculus*, written 448–49.¹² In all this, it is generally (and correctly) believed that Eutropius most closely mirrors the original *KG*, which must

5. A. Cohn, *Quibus ex fontibus S. Aurelii Victoris et 'Libri de Caesaribus' et 'Epitomes' undecim capita priora fluxerint* (Berlin, 1884).

6. Cf. Barnes, "Lost Kaisergeschichte," 14–15; Bird, "Sources," 457; Jörg Schlumberger, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus: Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Munich, 1974), 9–11, 17–62; Pierre Dufraigne, *Aurelius Victor: Livre des Césars* (Paris, 1975), xxv–xxvi; and Enmann, "Geschichte," 396–432.

7. *HLL* §539.1. For Festus and the *KG*, see also J. W. Eadie, *The Breviarium of Festus: A Critical Edition with Historical Commentary* (London, 1967), 70, 88, 97–98; and Barnes, "Lost Kaisergeschichte," 21.

8. For Jerome's use of the *KG*, see Rudolf Helm, "Hieronymus und Eutrop." *RM* 76 (1927): 138–70 and 254–306, esp. 303–5; Barnes, "Lost Kaisergeschichte," 21; idem, *Sources*, 94; H. W. Bird, "Further Observations on the Dating of Enmann's *Kaisergeschichte*," *CQ* 23 (1973): 377; J. F. Gilliam, "Ammianus and the *Historia Augusta*: The Lost Books and the Period 117–285," *BHAC* 1970 (1972), p. 135, n. 26 and p. 145, n. 46; and R. W. Burgess, "Jerome and the *Kaisergeschichte*," *Historia* (forthcoming), where I offer 47 sets of parallel passages between Jerome and other sources that used the *KG*. The *locus classicus* for Jerome's sole use of Eutropius is Th. Mommsen, "Über die Quellen der Chronik des Hieronymus," in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 7 (Berlin, 1909 [reprint, 1965]), 609–10, 620–21 (the article first appeared in 1850). This standard account of Jerome's sources is reflected by Lietzmann's article in *RE* 8.2 (1913): 1574. André Chastagnol (*BHAC* 1971 [1974], p. 56, n. 14) claimed that Jerome used Victor and Eutropius directly, quoting Jerome *Ep.* 10.3, written ca. 376, in which Jerome requests from Antioch (it would seem) a copy of Victor's history from Paulus of Concordia "propter notitiam persecutorum." But we have no proof that he actually received Victor's history or had it at hand in Constantinople five years and many hundreds of miles later. Certainly his accounts of the persecutors owe nothing to Victor, and there are no obvious traces of Victor's style, vocabulary, or tone in the *canones*, as Chastagnol has since admitted (see his *Histoire Auguste*, lxxii—"il ne l'a pas reçu à temps puisqu'il n'a pas utilisé Victor dans ses notices"—where he also admits the possibility of Jerome's use of the *KG* in addition to Eutropius). Jacques Schwartz claims that Jerome took his account of Aurelian from Eutropius "avec peu de modifications dans l'ordre des mots" (*BHAC* 1977–78 [1980], p. 225, n. 2). *HLL*, sure to be an influential arbiter, states that Jerome was dependent on Eutropius, not the *KG* (§536, Lit. 2 and §538, Lit. 5); cf. T. D. Barnes, "Latin Literature between Diocletian and Ambrose," *Phoenix* 45 (1991): 347. For some others who claimed that Jerome never consulted the *KG* and an early believer in a common source for Eutropius and Jerome (Franz Rühl in 1892), see Barnes, "Lost Kaisergeschichte," p. 21, n. 50, and Helm, "Hieronymus," 138–39.

9. See R. W. Burgess, "*Principes cum Tyrannis*: Two Studies on the *Kaisergeschichte* and its Tradition," *CQ* 43 (1993): 495–99.

10. For Ammianus and the *KG*, see, for example, John Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus* (London, 1989), 29–30, 244–45, 457; Gilliam, "Ammianus and the *Historia Augusta*," p. 145, n. 46; Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, p. 138, n. 27, p. 182, n. 36; and my "Jerome and the *Kaisergeschichte*," nos. 36 and 37. One therefore suspects that Ammianus' lost books were heavily dependent on the *KG* for their account of the third century (this is strongly implied by Barnes, "Lost Kaisergeschichte," 22–23). For the date, see Matthews, *Roman Empire of Ammianus*, 20–27, and C. P. T. Naudé, "The Date of the Later Books of Ammianus Marcellinus," *AJAH* 9 (1984): 70–94.

11. Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, passim (see index entry on p. 269 and esp. p. 234, n. 8), and Barnes, "*Epitome*," 259–60, 261–62, 263–65.

12. See note 9.

therefore have been a set of short imperial biographies extending from Augustus.¹³ The evidence of Ausonius and Polemius Silvius suggests that much attention was also given to usurpers in its pages, and it has recently been postulated that the *KG* was in fact written by an historian named Eusebius Nanneticus (of Nantes) and that the work was, like that of Eutropius, large enough to have been divided into a number of “libri.”¹⁴

When Enmann first postulated the *KG*, he believed that it originally concluded in 284. This was because there was abundant evidence that it had been used by the six authors of the *Historia Augusta*, who claim to have been writing in the late third and early fourth centuries. However, the similarities that he could trace in Eutropius that Aurelius Victor continued down to 357. Enmann concluded, therefore, that there had to be a continuation to that date.¹⁵ We now know that the *HA* was written by a single author at the end, not the beginning, of the fourth century, and so there is no need to suppose a continuation by a different author after 284. Enmann’s terminal date of 357 seemed reasonable enough, given the similarities in the passages that he quoted in support, but in 1890 Otto Seeck discounted these similarities and stated that the common source of Eutropius, Victor, and the *Epitome* did not extend beyond 337.¹⁶ Seeck’s view was restated more forcefully and given its final form in 1970 by T. D. Barnes in a paper given to the Bonner *Historia-Augusta Colloquium*:

Victor and Eutropius inevitably produce accounts of the reign of Constantine’s sons . . . which are factually similar. Writing as they were in 359/60 and 369/70, it was hard to do otherwise: both were compressing the same series of recent events into a very brief compass. But after 337 they exhibit no example of either close verbal similarity or common error or shared idiosyncrasy. The *KG*, therefore, finished with the death of Constantine, and was composed not long afterwards, presumably no later than 340.¹⁷

Then in 1973 H. W. Bird produced a fully documented paper championing Enmann’s date of 357.¹⁸ Bird offered a number of telling verbal similarities and brought both the *Epitome* and the *Chronicle* of Jerome into the argument. By 1978, under the influence of Bird’s article, Barnes had slightly tempered his earlier views:

The latest case which seems to me to satisfy the criteria needed to infer a common source is the comet which foretold the death of Constantine (Victor, *Caes.* 41. 6; Eutropius, *Breu.* X. 8). After 337, I can find no concurrence in error, no distinctive selection of facts common to both Victor and Eutropius, and no similarities of expression close enough to

13. It is also believed—and rightly, as far as I can tell from comparisons of the *HA* with other works that used the *KG*—that the *KG* depended heavily on the biographies of Marius Maximus: see H. W. Bird, “A Strange Aggregate of Errors for A.D. 193,” *CB* 65 (1989): 95–98, esp. 95 and the references there; Syme, *HAP*, 37; and J.-P. Callu *Histoire Auguste*, xi–xii, xxxv.

14. Burgess, “*Principes cum Tyrannis*,” 491–500. For its size, cf. Bird, “Aggregate of Errors,” 95: ca. 35 Teubner pages, which is perhaps a bit short.

15. Enmann, “Geschichte,” 432–33, 443–60.

16. *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie* 141 (1890): 638, quoted by T. D. Barnes (see next note).

17. Barnes, “Lost Kaisergeschichte,” 20. Barnes was followed by Syme (e.g., *HAP*, 31, 50, 151).

18. “Further Observations,” 375–77. See also his *Sextus Aurelius Victor*, 17, where he offers both dates, while favoring 357. In his most recent work (*Eutropius*) Bird offers both dates without preference in his preface (pp. xlvii–xlviii), but comes out strongly in favor of 357 in his notes (pp. 157–60).

necessitate prolonging the KG any further. I conclude, therefore, *albeit tentatively*, that the KG ended in 337.¹⁹ [italics mine]

Representing the latest scholarly consensus, the *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur/Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine* (see n. 1, above), indicates in its main text a date of 337–61 (p. 197 = p. 227)—the widest possible range since Victor completed his history in mid-361²⁰—but clearly favors a date of 337 (§536, Lit. 2).²¹ However, a fresh examination of the problem reveals further arguments in favor of Enmann and Bird's dating of 357, especially when all the evidence of Jerome is included.

Before embarking upon my analysis of the KG and the histories that used it as a source, let me briefly state the methodological principles of my examination. First of all, I adhere to a minimalist view of source criticism (firmly applying Occam's Razor) that Late Roman historians rarely used a great number of sources at any one time (that is, for a single section of narrative) and did not closely interlace these sources within a single sentence. One must not postulate two sources when one will do.

Second, I believe that in source criticism one must think not only in terms of individual parallel passages but of entire blocks and pages of text as well. It is a simple matter to dismiss an individual set of parallel passages and offer alternative solutions, but one must take all of the parallels as a whole and test hypotheses and draw conclusions only upon the totality of the evidence. This is particularly important in this case, since we are dealing with only fifty-seven lines of Eutropius and eighty-five lines of Victor, a tiny fraction of these works. A single parallel, no matter how exact, need not mean anything on its own, since it is possible that such factors as common education, popular stories, or memories of well-known written accounts or text books are involved, but a great number of parallels, even apparently minor or inconclusive ones, especially within the extremely short space of fifty-seven or eighty-five lines, is highly indicative of a relationship between two authors.²² Conversely, differences in wording do not automatically disprove a common source, since one would not normally expect independent authors to slavishly copy their written source(s) and change nothing. Individual authors must be allowed some independence

19. Barnes, *Sources*, 94; cf., however, the strongly worded statements on p. 92. Barnes cites Bird's 1973 article ("Further Observations") on p. 94, n. 23. On the comet, see also Barnes, "Lost Kaisergeschichte,"

20. The importance of the comet is not its absence from other sources as Barnes states (it in fact appeared in the *Continuatio Antiochiensis Eusebii*: see §20 of the text in my forthcoming work on this source, cited below at n. 42), but the fact that both Eutropius and Victor mention it in the same terms, immediately after Constantine's death, when it actually appeared more than a year earlier, from 16 February 336 (Ho Peng Yoke, "Ancient and Mediaeval Observations of Comets and Novae in Chinese Sources," *Vistas in Astronomy* 5 [1962]: 159, no. 168; and V. Grumel, *La Chronologie*, *Traité d'études Byzantines*, vol. 1 [Paris, 1958], 469). This entire entry on the death of Constantine is, in fact, the strongest evidence for Victor and Eutropius' use of the KG for the entire reign of Constantine; earlier parallels are less conclusive.

20. For the date, later than spring 361, see Nixon, "Aurelius Victor," 113–25.

21. P. L. Schmidt (the author of the entry) comes out more strongly in favor of 337 in his article in *RE Supplementband* 15 (Munich, 1978), 1668. The date of 337 is also accepted by, for example, Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, 56, 93, 183, 200 n. 82, 202, and 234; Callu, *Histoire Auguste*, xxxv; and, most recently, Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste*, lxx.

22. This argument is made at greater length and in greater detail in my paper cited above in n. 8.

and originality, both in their selection of material from their common source and in their changes to it (see my comments just below).²³

Third, the problem of ascertaining the date of the conclusion of the *KG* is inherently difficult, since no matter whether the *KG* ended in 337 or 357 both Victor and Eutropius would have had knowledge and opinions of recent history, and these would influence and alter their narratives, whatever was in any written source they may have been following. This would be especially true if the terminal date of the *KG* was 357, since the personal knowledge of Victor or Eutropius would then blend imperceptibly with the narrative of the common source, rendering such things as common wording and shared idiosyncrasy less likely. From a comparison of Victor and Eutropius we can see that this is in fact true. If we take the period from 284 to 337, we can see that the two works exhibit the characteristics of a common source less often and less conclusively as we progress through the narratives, especially in the reign of Constantine (see n. 19, above). Of the two, I believe that Victor was the more likely to add material. So the question of deciding between 337 and 357 is very much akin to deciding where day ends and night begins. Until now (see below) there have been no other arguments that came into play in deciding between the two dates—no date was any more inherently plausible or implausible than the other—it all came down to what one considered significant evidence of a common source. And if it is accepted that the evidence presented by Enmann and Bird does in fact continue the less frequent and weaker parallels in Victor and Eutropius seen in the decades immediately before 337, then they must both still be using a common source and that source must be the *KG* (see my first point above).

Fourth, there is no evidence that Eutropius, Jerome, or the *Epitome de Caesaribus* made use of the history of Aurelius Victor for the period under discussion, as some have stated.²⁴ The arguments against Eutropius and Jerome's use of Victor here are the same as those against their use of Victor before 337 (see above, p. 111 and n. 8). Though the author of the *Epitome* used Victor for chapters 2–11 (Tiberius to Domitian), there are only two important later parallels (concerning Claudius Gothicus and Constantine). It seems unlikely that the author of the *Epitome* would have kept Victor's history around in order to use it for these two isolated passages (though it is certainly possible). They can therefore probably be attributed to the

23. For differences between Victor and Eutropius, see Barnes, "Lost Kaisergeschichte," 17–18, especially: "[W]hen they are writing of the fourth century, wide divergences between Victor and Eutropius need not imply that they do not both depend on the same written source."

24. For Eutropius' use of Victor after 337 as an attempt to explain the verbal similarities presented by Bird, see *HLL*, §536, Lit. 2: "Auf dem Abschuß mit dem Tode Konstantins, für eine Biographiensammlung ein logischer Abschuß, insistiert jetzt Barnes . . . Sofern Parallelen Victor/Eutrop über 337 hinaus . . . schlüssig sind . . . , sollte eine punktuelle Benutzung Victors durch Eutrop, der von seinem Kollegen als literarischem Vorgänger gewußt haben muß . . . , nicht ausgeschlossen werden." For the use of Eutropius and Victor to explain the parallels in the *Epitome*, see Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, p. 202, n. 87: "Auch in der *Epitome* sind nach dem Anfang des Constantinkapitels (41, 1 ff.) keine direkten Spuren der gemeinsamen EKG-Tradition mehr auszumachen. Doch dürften Victor und Eutrop selbst weiterhin in die *Epitome*vorlage eingegangen sein."

KG.²⁵ Consequently, if there are parallels to Victor in these authors after 337, there is no *a priori* reason why they should be treated any differently from such parallels before 337 and not be attributed to the KG.²⁶ To argue otherwise, that parallels to Victor before 337 derive from the KG and those after derive from Victor himself, is circular, since it assumes what is trying to be ascertained, that is, the date of the KG (see n. 24, above, for two arguments that admit parallels after 337 but deny the extension of the KG).

Barnes rightly states that to claim a common source for Eutropius and Victor one needs "close verbal similarity or common error or shared idiosyncrasy." He claims that Victor and Eutropius exhibit none of these characteristics. However, he omitted the works of Jerome and the Epitomator from consideration, authors who would have been less prone to subjectively altering the narrative after the death of Constantine than Victor and Eutropius. Bird admitted that "Victor and Eutropius exhibit no 'common error or shared idiosyncrasy' in their accounts of the years 340–57";²⁷ but using Eutropius, Victor, the *Epitome*, and Jerome he went on to show a number of close verbal similarities. Careful scrutiny of these four histories reveals not only that Bird is correct in identifying the verbal similarities, but that there are also shared idiosyncrasies and a common error that have been missed. Study of Jerome and his use of sources reveals yet more important support for the date of 357. Over the following pages I shall set forth the evidence for 357 in four categories: I. specific evidence against completion in 337; II. common error; III. parallels of wording, sentence structure, and content; and IV. the evidence of Jerome's *Chronici canones*. The evidence of shared idiosyncrasy that I noted above concerns common narrative structure, relative proportion of space allotted to particular reigns, and common treatment of persons, events, and details. It is rather complicated and lengthy, and because it is only suggestive of a common source, not conclusive, I have elected to omit an analysis of it here. The following sections (I–IV) progress from

25. See Barnes, "*Epitome*," 262 ("The resemblances . . . to Aurelius Victor suddenly cease with the accession of Nerva [12.1]. Subsequently, only a very few passages exhibit any close similarity to Victor"), and Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, 195–96 and 234 (the author of the *Epitome* used "die Caesares des Aurelius Victor für meist kürzere Passagen der Viten von Tiberius bis Domitian und später noch einmal für eine Szene aus dem Leben Constantins vor seiner Thronbesteigung"). The passage on Claudius Gothicus (*Epit.* 34.3 and Victor 34.3–5) is attributed by both Barnes ("*Epitome*," 265: "appears to provide incontrovertible proof"; and "Lost Kaisergeschichte," 22: "seems decisive") and Schlumberger (*Epitome de Caesaribus*, 155) to the KG. The passages on Constantine (*Epit.* 41.2–3 and Victor 40.2–4) are virtually identical, but the *Epitome* contains information not found in Victor or Zosimus (2.8–9). Though Schlumberger believes that the *Epitome* is here copying Victor, Barnes states that "Victor and the *Epitome* do here derive independently from the same source" ("Lost Kaisergeschichte," 26). If the arguments used by Barnes and Schlumberger in favor of the KG as the source for the passages concerning Claudius are cogent (and I believe they are), then there is no reason why the passage on Constantine should not derive from the KG as well, since it fulfills the same criteria ("the wording runs closely parallel," the *Epitome* supplies details not in Victor, and "the content and the observable techniques of the *Epitome* render derivation from Victor improbable" [Barnes, "*Epitome*," 265]).

26. For instance, the section of the *Epitome* under discussion (41.18 to 42.14) seems to depend upon Zosimus (2.41–43.5.3 = Eunapius), Eutropius, Victor, Jerome, and an unknown source. Given that the KG is regarded as the common source of Eutropius, Victor, Jerome, and the *Epitome* before 337, logically it must be admitted that we are still dealing with the KG, along with Eunapius, after 337. For Eunapius and possibly Ammianus as sources of the *Epitome*, see Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, 12, 14, 235; Barnes, "Lost Kaisergeschichte," 22; idem, "*Epitome*," 265–67; and idem, *Sources*, 119–20.

27. "*Sources*," 376.

the suggestive to the more conclusive, and as I noted above, my argument is not to be taken section by section, or parallel by parallel, but as a whole.

I. SPECIFIC EVIDENCE AGAINST COMPLETION IN 337

A survey of universalizing histories and chronicles from the fourth century to the Middle Ages, in Latin and in Greek, shows that the size and detail of written accounts usually grow as the authors approach the contemporary period.²⁸ We can see this in the *Epitome*, for example, which devotes increasing space per decade as the narrative progresses from 314 to 395, showing an overall increase of almost 125 percent by the reign of Theodosius.²⁹ Eutropius' average for the period 253–357 is twenty-three lines per decade (ranging from a high of forty-eight to a low of fourteen) and he jumps to seventy lines per decade for the immediately contemporary period of 357–64. However, both Victor and Eutropius, and to a lesser extent the *Epitome*, show a massive drop in detail devoted to the period 314–37, a fact that strongly militates against 337's being the terminal date of their common source, the *KG*. Eutropius grants forty-eight lines per decade to the tetrarchy (285–313), yet only fourteen per decade to the period 314–37 (which is only twenty-nine percent of the previous total of forty-eight per decade). Victor drops from 85.5 to 27 lines per decade (31.5 percent of 85.5; note the similarity to Eutropius). The *Epitome*, which was also relying on the history of Eunapius,³⁰ falls from thirty-two to only twenty-three lines (seventy-two percent of thirty-two). In all three cases this drop in detail is, in fact, staggered, with less space devoted to the period 325–37 than to 314–24. If the *KG* had concluded in 337, we should expect an increase in detail leading up to that date, not a decline that becomes even more precipitous after 324. Given that one expects a contemporary narrative to increase in size and detail, this huge drop after 313 argues strongly against the possibility that the *KG* could have ended in 337.³¹

28. For example, the chronicles in *MGH: Scriptores* (I have not checked every single one) and Momm-
sen's *Chronica minora* volumes, Jerome's *Chronici canones*, Ammianus, and many later Latin and Greek
histories and chronicles such as the *Chronicon Paschale*, Fredegarius, Sigeber, Malalas, Theophanes, and
others. This is not true, however, of the *KG*, which, on the evidence of Victor and Eutropius, granted pro-
portionally less space to the period 337–57 than to the late third and early fourth centuries (see n. 31 below).

29. In order to compare the lengths of historical narratives with any accuracy one must compare an av-
erage of lines per decade by taking the number of lines devoted to a reign or a number of reigns lasting be-
tween fifteen and twenty-five years (to help even out anomalies caused by short reigns) and dividing by one
tenth of the years covered. Thus the *Epitome* allots twenty-three lines per decade for the period 314–336/7,
thirty-three lines per decade for the period 337–57, eighty-six lines per decade for Julian and Jovian between
357 and 363 (an abnormal peak because of the attention devoted to Julian by Eunapius), forty-seven lines
per decade to the period 364–78, and fifty-one lines per decade to 379–95.

30. See above, n. 26.

31. I can think of no ancient historical account that devotes to contemporary events a quarter or third of
the space that it devotes to events twenty and thirty years earlier, except in cases of continuation chronicles
where a few recent events were often tacked on to the end of a preexisting account to bring the chronology
up to date. Though the *KG* seems to have granted proportionally rather less space to contemporary events
than to those of the tetrarchy, even the edited narratives of 337–57 in Victor and Eutropius are still consid-
erably longer than the narrative of 314–37: in Eutropius the ratio of the latter to the former in lines per de-
cade is 14:27 (the latter being 193 percent of the former) and in Victor it is 27:40.5 (150 percent). For
Eutropius, the account of Julian and the Battle of Strasbourg (see conclusion, below) involves ten percent
of the entire narrative from 337 (six of fifty-seven lines). Victor plays down the victory (see n. 38, below),
but still grants six of eighty-five lines to these recent events. Both Victor and Eutropius devote increasing

There is also an error in Eutropius that renders a terminal date of 337 for the *KG* less likely. After the defeat and death of Licinius Eutropius says “Eo tempore res Romana sub uno Augusto et tribus Caesaribus, quod numquam alias, fuit, cum liberi Constantini Galliae, Orienti Italiaeque praeessent” (10.6.2). The context makes it clear that the three Caesars, the *liberi Constantini*, are Crispus, Constantine II, and Constantius II in 324–25 (Constantius was proclaimed the third Caesar on 8 November 324); the subordinate *cum* clause, however, in fact refers to Constantine II, Constantius, and Constans in the period after 9 September 337, when they proclaimed themselves Augusti and divided the empire amongst themselves, for the provinces are listed not in geographical order (west to east), but according to the ages of these three brothers, eldest first. The division of 337 was a modification of the five-way split among Constantine II, Constantinus, Constans, Dalmatius, and Hannibalianus (as *nobilissimus*) arranged by Constantine after the proclamation of his half-nephew Dalmatius as the fourth Caesar on 18 September 335.³² Thus we have a number of compounded errors: the division of the empire among four Caesars first made in September 335 and lasting exactly two years is attributed to the three Caesars of 324/25 and is described in terms of the split amongst the three Augusti of September 337. The main clause is paralleled by Victor, which shows that it derives from the *KG*: “Eo modo res publica unius arbitrio geri coepit, liberis Caesarum nomina diversa retentantibus” (41.10). Victor then breaks off to add a comment on the proclamation of *noster Constantius*. The natural conclusion is to attribute the error of the *cum* clause to the *KG* as well,³³ though it must be admitted that the comment could be Eutropius’ own, since it appears in no other witness to the *KG*, but I do not rate Eutropius’ originality very highly in the non-contemporary sections of the narrative and do not see him adding such a comment on his own. Such an error could easily have been made by someone writing twenty years later in 357, but it could hardly have been made by someone writing in 337 or just after, when the division of 335–37 was so new and unusual (*quod numquam alias*).³⁴ This error, therefore, suggests that the *KG* did not conclude in 337.

II. COMMON ERROR

There is one common error that marks out a common source behind Victor, Eutropius, and the *Epitome*. This is the chronology of the usurpation and

detail per decade to their narratives throughout the third century and reach a peak under the tetrarchy (to 313). This narrative structure, followed by the tremendous drop under Constantine that rises to a lesser peak, strongly suggests that there could have been an earlier history/epitome/biography that concluded in ca. 313 and provided the author of 357 with his material for the third and early fourth century. This work could have been an earlier recension of the *KG* or the major source for his text to 313. idem, *The New Empire of Constantine and Diocletian* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 84–87, 198.

33. The *KG* still made reference to the division of 335: cf. Eutropius 10.9.1 and *Epit.* 41.19–20 (which would seem to be a combination of the lists in the *KG* and Eunapius), and Burgess, “*Principes cum Tyrannis*,” 494 (where I suggest that the *Origo Constantini imperatoris* (Anon. *Valesiani pars prior*) 6.35 may be related to the *KG*).

34. The division was unusual enough to be commented upon in detail by a number of the literary sources for the period, especially Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 4.51.1, *Origo* 6.35, *Epitome* 41.20, Zosimus 2.39.2 (from Eunapius), and *Chron. Pasch.* s.aa. 335 and 337 (Bonn, 532.1–3, 13–21).

death of Nepotianus, which is placed after the deposition of Vetranio and just before the battle of Mursa (Victor 42.6–8, Eutr. 10.11.2, *Epit.* 42.3). Vetranio was proclaimed on 1 March 350 and deposed on 25 December of the same year. The battle of Mursa took place on 28 September 351. Victor specifically states that Vetranio's usurpation lasted ten months and that after his deposition winter had closed off the Alps and prevented Constantius from heading for Italy against *hostes alii*.³⁵ Interim Nepotianus usurped power in Rome (42.1.5–6). Victor therefore implies a date of early 351 for the usurpation of Nepotianus. Eutropius and the *Epitome* on the other hand imply a date of summer 351, since both link the battle of Mursa closely with the usurpation: “Non multo post [i.e., the death of Nepotianus], Magnentius apud Mursam profligatus acies est” (10.12.1) and “Hoc tempore [i.e., of the usurpation] Constantius cum Magnentio apud Mursiam dimicans vicit” (42.4). Victor omits the battle of Mursa from his narrative, so neither Eutropius nor the *Epitome* can be following Victor. Nepotianus was in fact proclaimed on 3 June 350 and killed twenty-eight days later on 30 June.³⁶ Eunapius narrated these events in the correct order (cf. Zosimus 2.43–44), but the *Epitome*, even though using the wording of Eunapius, chooses to follow the alternative chronology instead. Jerome does not repeat this error because he had the day and consular dates from the *Consularia* (on which, see below, Section IV).

III. PARALLELS OF WORDING, SENTENCE STRUCTURE, AND CONTENT

There are a surprising number of exact verbal and structural parallels among our four sources, given the short narratives. Most were noted by Enmann and Bird in their papers cited above, but a few others were not. It would be very hard to account for such parallels without accepting the continuation of the *KG* to 357. Those involving the evidence of Jerome will be presented below (IV.1–3, 5–6). This section reports those involving Victor, Eutropius, and the *Epitome*, and in both sections I have marked the evidence of Enmann with an † and that of Bird with an *.³⁷ As well, in these tables the following abbreviations are used: AV – Aurelius Victor; E. – Eutropius; Jer. – Jerome; *Epit.* – *Epitome*; Amm. Marc. – Ammianus Marcellinus.

1. E. 10.9.3: valetudine inprospera . . . uteretur.
Epit. 41.24: Hic fuit debilis pedibus manibusque articularum dolore, fortunatus caeli temperie, fructuum proventus.

This is not a verbal parallel, but a case of common reporting of an obscure and minor fact; it is not in Zosimus. Constans seems to have been suffering from arthritis, hardly the sort of ailment one would have expected epitomators to comment upon (and so far as I know it is not mentioned by any

35. Though I have a sneaking suspicion that this is a misplaced comment added by Victor himself in justification of Constantius' actions and that the *hostes alii* he is referring to include Magnentius, who established himself in Italy after the battle of Mursa in 351 (which Victor omits).

36. Vetranio: *Cons.* 350.3, 351.2; Victor 42.1; Mursa: *Cons.* 351.1; Nepotianus: *Cons.* 350.4; Eutr. 10.11.2; Victor 42.8; *Epit.* 42.3.

37. For Bird I include the commentary to his *Eutropius*, 158–61.

other source, including Victor). Eutropius is obviously not the source for the *Epitome*.

- 2.* AV 41.23: ministrorum *pravitate* execrabilis.
E. 10.9.3: amicis *pravioribus* uteretur.
- 3.* AV 41.23: Magnentii scelere circumventus est.
E. 10.9.3: factione Magnentii occisus est.

This is a case of similar verbal structure (cf. the very different description in *Epit.* 41.23, from Eunapius). Note that Eutropius goes on to include numerous details concerning Constans' death not found in the account of Victor, who discusses Constans' sexual depravity instead, so Victor cannot be his source.

- 4.* AV 41.26: *litterarum* prorsus *expers* et ingenio stolidior idcircoque agresti vecordia pessimus.
E. 10.10.2: [Vetranionem] . . . omnium liberalium artium *expertem* adeo ut ne elementa quidem prima *litterarum* nisi grandaevus et iam imperator acceperit.
Epit. 41.25: Fuit prope ad stultitiam simplicissimus.

Vetranio's intelligence is not commented upon by Zosimus. Again we find a minor fact commented upon in rather great detail by the three authors. What was it that made such information worth mentioning, given the contracted nature of the narrative and the minor importance of Vetranio? Again Eutropius provides information not in Victor (*nisi grandaevus et iam imperator*), so Victor cannot be his source.

- 5.* E. 10.10.2: grandaevum/grandaevus.
Epit. 41.25: grandaevae aetati.

This is not in Zosimus.

- 6.* AV 42.6: Nepotianus . . . armata *gladiatorum manu* imperator fit.
E. 10.11.2: Nepotiano . . . per *gladiatoriam manum* imperium vindicante.

A fact perhaps known to everyone (though it is not in Zosimus), but it is the structure and wording that suggest the *KG* here. Each author has further details not found in the other, especially Eutropius' "caput eius pilo per urbem circumlatum est gravissimaeque proscriptiones et nobilium caedes fuerunt" (10.11.2), of which the last part parallels Victor's more vivid "cuius stolidum ingenium adeo plebei Romanae patribusque exitio fuit, uti passim domus fora viae templaque cruore atque cadaveribus opplerentur bustorum modo" (42.7), which may be his own expansion.

- 7.† AV 42.10: Ipsi inter se acrioribus *proeliis* . . . congressi.
E. 10.12.2: Magnentius diversis *proeliis* victus . . .

It is not so much the wording as the similar compression used to describe a number of important battles over the years 351–53, including, most surprisingly, the final victory over Magnentius, that makes this parallel noteworthy.

8.†* AV 42.13: Ita longo intervallo annum fere post septuagesimum *relata ad unum cura reipublicae*.

E. 10.13: Solus imperio Romano eo tempore Constantius princeps et Augustus fuit.

Epit. 43.1: *redacta ad unum se orbis Romani curatione*.

The link between Victor and the *Epitome* is unmistakable, in spite of the different application, Victor to Constantius after the death of Gallus and the *Epitome* to Julian after the death of Constantius. Since Eutropius refers it to Constantius after the death of Silvanus, it would seem that each author applied it to whatever situation he thought it was best suited, a sign of the individualizing that makes comparisons so difficult. However, that this observation originally appeared in a common source, the *KG*, is indicated even more strongly by the fact that these parallels form part of a pattern of commentary extending back perhaps as far as 305. After the death of Galerius, Eutropius makes a very similar comment to the one above, “ita respublica tum a novis quattuor imperatoribus tenebatur, Constantino et Maxentio, filiis Augustorum, Licinio et Maximiano, novis hominibus” (10.4.2; 10.1.1 may be the first of this series, though it is rather different in structure and vocabulary from this and the following examples); after the death of Maximinus Victor states, “ita potestas orbis Romani duobus quaesita” (41.2; cf. *Epitome* 41.1); after the death of Licinius Victor and Eutropius make very similar comments, “Eo modo respublica unius arbitrio geri coepit, liberis Caesarum nomina diversa retentantibus” (41.10) and “Eo tempore res Romana sub uno Augusto et tribus Caesaribus, quod numquam alias, fuit” (10.6.2; cf. *Epitome* 41.11); the *Epitome* also makes a similar comment upon the deaths of Constantine and Dalmatius, using a parallel to Victor’s “potestas orbis Romani” of 41.2 and his own “orbis Romani curatio” in 43.1, “Ita ad tres orbis Romani redacta dominatio est . . .” (41.19; cf. Eutropius 10.1.1 [“Romanus orbis”] and 10.9.1); and Eutropius makes a similar comment on the death of Constantine II, using exactly the same participle and structure as the *Epitome* in 41.19 and 43.1 (“ad tres . . . redacta,” “redacta ad unum”), “ita respublica ad duos Augustos redacta” (10.9.3). No such comment is made by Eutropius upon the death of Constantius. Taken altogether, these passages reveal a pattern of commentary at important shifts in the number of emperors from 311 to 355. It would seem that this pattern was a characteristic of the author of the *KG* rather than simply the product of the sporadic and independent comments of three epitomators.

9.†* AV 42.15: Silvanus in Gallia . . . [additional material]. . . octavum circa ac vicesimum diem trucidatus est.

E. 10.13: Silvanus quoque in Gallia res novas molitus ante diem tricesimum extinctus est.

Epit. 42.10: Silvanus imperator effectus die imperii vicesimo octavo perimitur.

See also IV.6, below, for further parallels. Again this is a case of parallel structure. The *Epitome* reflects the structure of Eutropius and shows no knowledge of the great detail in Victor (which I have omitted above and which is probably Victor’s own, inserted into the middle of the sentence), but does know the exact length of Silvanus’ usurpation, which is only in Victor.

10.* AV 42.17: is nationes feras brevi subegit *captis famosis regibus*.³⁸

E. 10.14.1–2: a quo [Iuliano] modicis copiis apud Argentoratum, Galliae urbem, ingentes Alamannorum copiae extinctae sunt, *rex nobilissimus captus* . . . et finibus suis Romanum imperium restitutum.

Epit. 42.14: Iste in campis Argentoratensibus apud Gallias cum paucis militibus infinitas hostium copias delevit . . . *captus rex nobilis* Nodomarius . . . redditus limes Romanae possessionis.

The parallels here are both verbal and structural. Neither Eutropius nor the *Epitome* can derive from Victor, and the appearance of *Nodomarius* in the *Epitome* cannot derive from Eutropius, though the structure of Eutropius shows that the name could easily have appeared in Eutropius' source and been omitted by him as superfluous.

11.* AV 42.20: At Iulius Constantius . . . cum externis motibus, modo civilibus exercetur, aegre ab armis abest . . . 23: Placidus . . . litterarum ad elegantiam prudens atque orandi genere leni iocundoque; laboris patiens ac destinandi sagittas mire promptus; cibi omnis libidinis atque omnium cupidinum victor.

E. 10.15.2: Constantius . . . placidus . . . uxoribus deditior . . . cuius in civilibus magis quam in externis bellis sit laudanda fortuna.

Epit. 42.18–19: Felix bellis civilibus, externis lacrimabilis; mirus artifex in sagittis; a cibo vinoque et somno multum temperans, patiens laboris, facundiae cupidus, quam cum assequi tarditate ingenii non posset, aliis invadebat. Spadonum aulicorumque amoris deditus et uxorum.

Amm. Marc. 21.16.4: Doctrinarum diligens affectator, sed, cum a rhetorice per ingenium desereretur obtusum, ad versificandum transgressus nihil operae pretium fecit . . . 5: in vita parca et sobria edendi potandique moderatione . . . 6. somno contentus exiguo . . . per spatia . . . longissima impendio castus . . . 7: maxime perite dirigendi sagittas . . . 15: in externis bellis hic princeps fuit saucius et afflictus, ita prospere succedentibus pugnis civilibus tumidus . . . 16: Uxoribus et spadonum gracilentis vocibus et palatinis quibusdam nimium quantum addictus.

One should also compare Eutropius' "familiarium etiam locupletator neque inhonoros sinens, quorum laboriosa expertus fuisset officia" with the rather more lengthy passage in Ammianus 21.16.3, and his "ad severitatem tum propensior, si suspicio imperii moveretur" with Ammianus 21.16.9–11. It is possible that the *Epitome* is copying Ammianus or that they both derive from Eunapius,³⁹ but the parallels with Victor and Eutropius suggest that they all derive from the *KG*, which Ammianus used as a template for his expanded comments and descriptions.

IV. THE EVIDENCE OF JEROME'S *CHRONICI CANONES*.⁴⁰

At first glance, many of Jerome's historical additions to his translation of Eusebius' *Chronici canones* seem to be based upon Eutropius, yet in these

38. On Victor's use of the plural here, see Nixon, "Aurelius Victor," 120–21. Acting out of excessive deference to Constantius, Victor would seem to have condensed and edited this portion, and added a disclaimer: "quae quamquam vi eius, fortuna principis tamen et consilio acciderent" (42.18).

39. See above, n. 26.

40. For what follows, see my "Jerome and the *Kaisergeschichte*." To the discussion there of just how *tumultuarium* Jerome's *opus* really was (see below) the following discussion should be added: Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. 2: *Historical Chronology* (Oxford, 1993), 574–79.

"Eutropian" entries his deviations from Eutropius mirror the work of Suetonius (*de vita Caesarum*), Victor, Festus, the author of the *Chronica urbis Romae*,⁴¹ Ammianus Marcellinus, the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, and the *Historia Augusta*. Of these, Ammianus' history, the *Epitome*, and the *HA* had not even been written when Jerome was working on the *canones* and these pagan authors are hardly likely to have even known about his Christian chronicle, let alone used it, especially since it provided no pertinent or useful information that was not easily available in other secular sources, that is *consularia/fasti* and, as we shall see, the *KG*. The key point, however, is that in his preface Jerome describes the *canones* as a *tumultuarium opus* and says, *notario . . . velocissime dictaverim*. Such conditions were hardly conducive to the use of multiple sources for single entries. He obviously had no time to peruse four or five works at a time and combine bits and pieces from a number of them for each of his brief notices. The conclusion must be that for these entries Jerome was using the *KG* alone, not a combination of Eutropius and seven other works, three of which had not even been written, since the *KG* is acknowledged to derive ultimately from Suetonius in the early lives (see above, p. 112) and to have been a source used by six of the remaining seven. Although the author of the *KG* did not use the *Chronica urbis Romae*, the two authors appear to have drawn on the same sources for their information on buildings.

For the period from the late third century to 337 Jerome's sources for non-religious information were, then, Eusebius' *Chronici canones* to 325, the *KG*, an early recension of the *Consularia* to 370, and a now lost Antiochene continuation of Eusebius that extended from 326 to 350 (the *Continuatio Antiochiensis Eusebii*).⁴² Usually the material copied from these sources is separate and discrete, but on the odd occasion when two sources gave different information for the same or a related event Jerome did combine them, but almost always in separate blocks.⁴³ In only two cases is there complicated and intricate interlace: 226^e (= A.D. 298), concerning Diocletian's actions taken against Egypt, where material from the *KG* was interpolated into an entry from Eusebius, and 228^d (= A.D. 305), where, influenced by the *Consularia*, Jerome changed *imperium* to *purpuram*.⁴⁴ After the conclusion

41. Part of the famous *Chronograph of 354*, ed. Th. Mommsen, *Chron. min.* 1:145–48, a pagan work concluding with the death of Licinius in 325, yet pointedly omitting Constantine. On this work, see now Michele Renee Salzman, *On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1990), 52–56.

42. What follows derives from my "Jerome's *Chronici canones*: Sources, Chronology, and Composition, A.D. 282–378," which is in preparation. For Eusebius, see R. W. Burgess, "The *Chronici canones* of Eusebius of Caesarea: Content and Chronology, A.D. 282–325" (forthcoming); for the *Consularia*, see idem, *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana: Two Contemporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1993), 175–209, esp. 196–97; for the *Continuatio Antiochiensis*, see idem, *The Continuatio Antiochiensis Eusebii. A Mid-Fourth Century Antiochene Continuation of Eusebius' Chronici canones* (forthcoming), which includes a text and translation of the hypothetical reconstruction.

43. Entry 225^d (= A.D. 287), of which the first sentence is from Eusebius and the second from the *KG*; 229^c (= 308), where *Carnunti* has been added from the *Consularia* to the *KG*; 229^h (= 311) and 229^k (= 312), where *apud Tarsum* and *iuxta pontem Miluium* have been added to Eusebius from the *KG*; and 231^e (= 326) of which *Vicennalia . . . acta* is from Eusebius and *et . . . edita* is from the *Consularia*.

44. 226^e: (Alexandria cum) omni (Aegypto per Achilleum) ducem (a Romana potestate desciscens) [octavo obsidionis mense a Diocetiano] capta est. Itaque (plurimi) per [totam Aegyptum gravibus proscriptionibus exiliisque vexati (interfectis)] his, (qui auctores perduellionis extiterant); 228^d: (Secundo anno

of Eusebius, between 326 and 337, there are no examples of similar combinations of sources.⁴⁵ Thus to 337 Jerome's method of compilation is quite clear and consistent, and all his historical material is completely accounted for.

However, if one assumes that the *KG* concluded in 337 and that Jerome replaced it with Eutropius (since his similarity to Eutropius continues), in the period after 337, where he should only be using the *Continuatio Antiochiensis*, Eutropius, and the *Consularia* as nonreligious sources, one suddenly finds him providing details that cannot be attributed to any known or postulated source, often simply the geographical location of an event.⁴⁶ Some of these details appear in Aurelius Victor or the *Epitome*, two works that also used the *KG*. Furthermore, Jerome's apparent combining of Eutropius, the *Consularia*, and this unknown source is unusual and rather complex.⁴⁷ A number of Jerome's deviations from Eutropius find parallels in the *Epitome*, a work that would not have used Jerome as a source and that provides in close association with the parallels to Jerome additional information not contained in Jerome or other extant sources.⁴⁸ One is faced with a choice: either Jerome drastically changed his method of composition when the *KG* ran out in 337; he began copying Eutropius; he obtained another, unknown source that he used sparingly; and his chronicle was later used as a source by the pagan author of the *Epitome*, who possessed another unknown source that provided information very similar to but fuller than the material in Jerome, or Eutropius, Jerome, and the *Epitome* were still using the *KG*. The choice seems obvious.

In most cases below Jerome seems to be copying Eutropius but includes material that does not derive from Eutropius, or his other two nonreligious

persecutionis) [Diocletianus Nicomediae, Maximianus Mediolanii] (purpuram [deposuerunt]). KEY: (Eus.), [KG], (Cons.). The *capta est* derives from Eusebius but is not verbally dependent upon it.

45. Unless one counts 233' (= 334), where Jerome seems to have added information based on personal knowledge to an entry taken from the *Consularia*.

46. For these additional details, see below, IV.2–4. This is not to say that Jerome did not add such small details before 337 when they were missing in his main source. Three examples are quoted above in n. 43 and some earlier examples are listed in my "Jerome and the *Kaisergeschichte*" (nos. 6, 9, 10, 27). The difference in these cases is that the source for these additions is either known or can be postulated (i.e., the *KG*). A good example of an earlier instance where a geographical location appears in Jerome that does not appear in any other known source is 230^d, where Eutropius has *in villa* (9.28) and Jerome has *in villa sua Spalato* (for the correct reading of this entry, the *lectio difficilior*, against Helm's *in villae suae Palatio*, see J. K. Fotheringham's text and apparatus [London, 1923], 312). In such instances as these where Jerome is using the *KG* and none of the other witnesses to the *KG* preserves what Jerome records we have two options: the source is either the *KG* or a "locations" source (since it is only geographical locations that we are dealing with here). Victor and Eutropius simply did not copy every location from the *KG*.

47. Entry 237^c: (Magnentio) (apud Augustodunum arripiente imperium) [Constans haut longe ab Hispania in castro, cui Helenae nomen est, interficitur anno aetatis XXX], (quam ob rem turbata re publica) ([Vetratio]) (Mursae), ([Nepotianus Romae]) (imperatores facti); 238^b: ([Magnentius Lugduni]) (in Palatio propria) (se) (manu) (interficit et Decentius) [frater eius, quem ad tuendas Gallias Caesarem miserat, apud Senonas] ([laqueo] vitam explet). KEY: (?), [Eutr.], (Cons.). For the second example, see IV.2, below.

48. Schlumberger, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, does in fact invoke another now lost source, the *Annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus (e.g., pp. 12, 172–82, 205 n. 100, 240–44), but this is otiose (since we do not know the exact content of the *KG* or anything about the *Annales*) and multiplies unknowns beyond any reasonable control: see the comments of Matthews, *Roman Empire of Ammianus*, 10, 476–77 n. 6 and 479 n. 7, and Barnes, "Epitome," 267–68.

sources, the *Consularia* and the *Continuatio Antiochiensis*. Entries from the *Consularia* have been added below for illustrative purposes where they parallel Jerome; they are not related to the *KG*.⁴⁹

1. E. 10.12.1: Non multo post [i.e. after the death of Nepotianus] Magnentius apud Mursam profligatus acie est ac paene captus. *Ingentes Romani imperii vires ea dimicatione consumptae sunt*, ad quaelibet bella externa idoneae, quae multum triumphum possent securitatisque conferre.
J. 238^d: Magnentius Mursae victus, in quo proelio Romanae vires conciderunt.
Epit. 42.4: Hoc tempore [i.e. upon the death of Nepotianus] Constantius cum Magnentio apud Mursiam dimicans vicit, in quo bello paene nusquam amplius Romanae consumptae sunt vires totiusque imperii fortuna pessumdata.

If the *KG* ended in 357, then nothing more complex need be hypothesized than all three authors' drawing independently on a common source. To accept a date of 337, however, means that Jerome copied and modified Eutropius, and that the *Epitome* then copied and combined both Eutropius and Jerome in the same sentence (but to what advantage?). Note that the *Epitome* has *vicit, in quo bello . . .* and *Romanae vires* (cf. Eutropius' *ingentes Romani imperii vires*) in common with Jerome, and *dimicans* and *consumptae sunt* in common with Eutropius. From a comparison of the *Epitome*, Eutropius, and Zosimus at this point in the narrative, it is clear that there are no other instances in the *Epitome* of such close interlace of sources. Victor completely omits the disastrous battle of Mursa from his narrative, including it amongst the *acriora proelia* of 42.10.⁵⁰ Once again, Occam's Razor urges 357.

2. *Consularia* 353.2: *Decentius frater Magnentii laqueo se suspendit*.
E. 10.12.2: frater quoque eius [sc. vim vitae suae attulit] Senonis, quem ad tuendas Gallias Caesarem miserat.
J. 238^h: *Decentius frater eius, quem ad tuendas Gallias Caesarem miserat, apud Senonas laqueo vitam explet*.
Epit. 42.8: *Decentius laqueo fascia composito vitam finivit*.

Jerome adds to Eutropius (who for some reason completely omits Decentius' name and the verb in this sentence, thus removing any further possible parallel) with a parallel to the *Epitome*, which itself adds a detail not found in any earlier author. The simple explanation is that Eutropius, Jerome, and the Epitomator copied the *KG*, each selecting different details. The alternative is that Jerome has combined and modified Eutropius and the *Consularia*, and that the *Epitome* has combined Jerome with an unknown but closely parallel source. Again, a common source is the most economical

49. On the sources of the *Consularia* (for this period, mostly official proclamations and calendars, with some contemporary private additions), see Burgess, *Chronicle of Hydatius*, 178–207. The author of the *KG* may have had access to similar sources as well, since both works may derive from a northwestern Gallic milieu (see *ibid.*, 193–94 and below at nn. 54 and 56).

50. In a personal communication to me, Harry Bird has questioned this omission, "Why Eutropius (10.12) makes so much of [the battle of Mursa] whereas Victor glosses over it mystifies me. . . . It stands out like a sore thumb, and the Epitomator (42.4) has the same feelings about it as Eutropius. Because of the massive losses was it still too hot a potato to handle in 360? Was it known that Constantius was still uncomfortable with the cost?"

hypothesis. Victor is of no use here, for he simply says “Constantius . . . vario ambos supplicio semet adegit interficere” (42.10).

3. E. 10.9.2: Constantinum porro bellum fratri inferentem et apud Aquileiam inconsultius proelium adgressum Constantis duces interemerunt.
J. 235^a: Constantinus bellum fratri inferens iuxta Aquileiam *Alsa* occiditur.
Epit. 41.21: Constantinus latrocinii specie dum incautus foedeque temulentus in aliena irrui, obruncatus est proiectusque in fluvium, cui nomen *Alsa* est, non longe ab Aquileia. [Not from Eunapius; cf. *Epit.* 41.21–23 with Zosimus 2.41.1].

The additional detail in Jerome cannot derive from Eutropius or Victor (*fatali bello Constantinus cadit* [41.22] is all he says) and the *Epitome* is not copying Jerome since it includes additional information not found in Jerome or Zosimus. Note also the similar material in Jerome that does not appear in Eutropius or any other source known to have been used by Jerome: 237^c *apud Augustodunum, Mursae*; 238^c *apud Naissum*; 238^h *in Palatio*; and 240^a *Mediolanii*. Mursa appears in the *Epitome* (41.25) but it probably derives from Eunapius (= Zosimus 2.43.1).

4. *Cons.* 350.5: pugna magna fuit cum Romanis et Magnentianis.
AV 42.6–7: Romae corrupto vulgo . . . [Nepotiani] stolidum ingenium adeo plebi Romanae patribusque exitio fuit, uti passim domus fora viae templeque cruore atque cadaveribus opplerentur bustorum modo. Neque per eum tantum, verum etiam advolantibus Magnentianis, qui . . . hostem perculerant.
E. 10.11.2: Romae quoque tumultus fuit . . . (Nepotianus) a Magnentianis ducibus oppressus poenas dedit . . . gravissimaeque proscriptiones et nobilium caedes fuerunt.
J. 238^a: Romae populus adversum Magnentiacos rebellans *ab Heraclida senatore proditur*.

Victor’s detail suggests that the episode could have been similarly detailed in the *KG* and therefore could have contained the reference to Heraclides. His account though may simply derive largely from personal knowledge. Otherwise Jerome’s reference is of unknown derivation, which is unusual for his nonreligious material. See also the Patricius mentioned by Victor in the next passage for a similar brief appearance of a named individual.

- 5.* AV 42.11: Et interea *Iudaeorum* seditio, qui Patricium nefarie in regni speciem sustulerant, *oppressa*. [Not in Eutropius]
J. 238^f: Gallus *Iudaeos*, qui interfectis per noctem militibus arma ad rebellandum invaserant, *oppressit* . . .

Although the wording is slightly different, the structure of both entries is identical. Jerome’s *interfectis per noctem militibus* cannot derive from Victor. Each seems to have edited a longer narrative. Entry 238^g, *Nonnulli nobilium Antiochiae a Gallo interfecti*, probably derives from the *KG* as well, since it is to this incident that Eutropius’ *multis incivilibus gestis* . . . *ad tyrannidem pronior* (10.13) and Victor’s *ob saevitiam atque animum trucem* (42.12) refer, it is so closely linked with 238^f in Jerome (who tends to copy his sources in blocks for each year), and is misdated in Jerome by two years (a rare, large error that suggests an undated narrative source; cf.

Ammianus 14.7.1–20, 9.4–9; *PLRE* 1.262, s.v. Domitianus 3; 535–36, s.v. Montius Magnus; 907, s.v. Theophilus 1).

6.* AV 42.14–16: Silvanus in Gallia . . . *octavum circa ac vicesimum diem* trucidatus est.

E. 10.13: Silvanus . . . in Gallia res novas molitus *ante diem tricesimum* extinctus est.

J. 239^d: Silvanus in Gallia res novas molitus *XXVIII die* extinctus est.

Epit. 42.10: Silvanus imperator effectus *die imperii vicesimo octavo* perimitur.

If Jerome were simply copying Eutropius, there is no reason why he should not have simply left his account as it was. There was no advantage in adding the specific details from elsewhere (Victor?). It is also of some importance to note that the phrase *res novas molitus* seems to have been frequently used by the author of the *KG* in the earlier sections of his work.⁵¹

In conclusion I believe that accepting 357 as the date for the terminus of the *KG* is the simplest and easiest explanation for all the features and characteristics that I have presented above. The characteristics of parallelism are no different after 337 than they are before that date. I also think that 337 is an unlikely date for the *KG* to have concluded, given the dearth of detailed narrative covering the years immediately before that date and perhaps the error of attributing the division of empire of 335–37 to 324–25. The date of 337 has nothing intrinsic to recommend it; it is simply the year in which Seeck and Barnes—scholars whose hypotheses rightly command great respect—saw the last significant parallel among Victor, Eutropius, and the *Epitome*. I hope that I have shown above that there are equally significant parallels among these three and Jerome after 337 as well. To continue to accept the date of 337 one would have to resort to an enormous number of ad hoc hypotheses to account for the evidence I have compiled above, chiefly the use of Victor by Eutropius and Jerome, and the use of Victor, Eutropius, Jerome, and another unknown source by the Epitomator.

If the *KG* did indeed end in 357, the last episode of the narrative portion of the work probably would have been Julian's restoration of Gaul and the Roman frontier in the spring and summer of 357 after the battle of Strasbourg.⁵² The *KG* then probably concluded with a lengthy (for the context) encomium on the reigning emperor, Constantius, since he had received rather short shrift in the preceding narrative.⁵³ There is no reason to place the date of completion of the *KG* any later than the end of 357, especially if, as I believe (see below), the author had been working on the history for some time before the final events related. This allows plenty of time for his work to get into the hands of Victor, who completed his version of it in Sirmium in mid-361.

51. Burgess, "*Principes cum Tyrannis*," 498.

52. For the date, see T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993), 227.

53. On this, see Bird, *Eutropius*, p. 161, n. 32.

In a recent paper I suggested that the *KG* was written by Eusebius Nanneticus, a Gallic writer, and that he was particularly interested in usurpers.⁵⁴ If it is accepted that the *KG* did continue to 357, all these hypotheses fall neatly into place. Eusebius Nanneticus would appear to have had written sources as far as ca. 313 or some early recension of the history as we have it now to the same date. From that point he was on his own. Writing in Gaul in 355–57 he was chiefly dependent on his own memory for the events of Constantine's reign. He knew something of Constantine's civil wars with Licinius, but remembered little else in detail of the period to the 340s and knew little about Constantius' activities in the East, though he knew something about Constantius himself. He was more interested in the usurpations of Magnentius, Decentius, Vetrano, Nepotianus, Patricius, and Silvanus;⁵⁵ the murders of Dalmatius, Constantine II, and Constans; and the tyranny of Gallus. Indeed, I would suggest that it was this rash of tyranny and death in the space of five years (350–55) that prompted him to write his history, with its unusual stress on the rôle of usurpers in Roman imperial history. His account of contemporary history was short and choppy, rather like the short, factual entries of the new genre of *consularia*, not a detailed recounting of emperors in the style or structure of the earlier biographies.⁵⁶ Most likely this was a result of his lack of sources, but perhaps his interests were in the past and its precedents, not the present, which he would have expected his readers to know all too well. As a Gaul, he was naturally impressed by the victories of Julian and concluded his work on an optimistic note with these victories and Julian's restoration of the frontiers, an otherwise unusual point for a series of biographies.

The result of his labors was the most important and useful history in the fourth century, though within fifty years it seems to have vanished, probably rendered superfluous by that very usefulness that had prompted so many others to copy it.

University of Ottawa

54. Burgess, "*Principes cum Tyrannis*," 495–500. Enmann, too, believed that the writer of the *KG* was from Gaul ("Geschichte," 434–36). See also *HLL* §522.9 for a reference to Eusebius Nanneticus that I missed in my *CQ* paper, though there is absolutely nothing to connect these two Eusebii apart from the similarity of names and it is hardly a rare name: there are more than 42 of them in *PLRE* 1 (pp. 301–9) and 24 in *PLRE* 2 (pp. 429–33).

55. All of whose names should now be added to the list of usurpers at the end of my *CQ* paper, as should the name of Aper (cf. Eutropius 9.18.2; *Epit.* 38.5), which I also missed. Like so many other usurpers mentioned by the *KG*, Patricius is an obscure figure (*PLRE* 1.673, s.v. Patricius 2). Neither Vetrano nor Patricius appears in Polemius' list.

56. See n. 49, above. For *consularia*, see Burgess, *Chronicle of Hydatius*, 178–86, 191–97. For the underlying structure of the earlier biographies, see Enmann, "Geschichte," pp. 417–21, 437–42, and W. H. Fisher, "The Augustan *Vita Aureliani*," *JRS* 19 (1929): 126, 129–38 (a reconstruction of the *KG*'s life of Aurelian).