

A COMMON SOURCE FOR JEROME, EUTROPIUS, FESTUS,  
AMMIANUS, AND THE *EPITOME DE CAESARIBUS* BETWEEN  
358 AND 378, ALONG WITH FURTHER THOUGHTS ON THE  
DATE AND NATURE OF THE *KAISERGESCHICHTE*

R. W. BURGESS

IN 1850 A THIRTY-TWO-YEAR-OLD Theodor Mommsen published an article on the sources used by Jerome when he augmented and continued his translation of Eusebius' *Chronici canones* in 380–81. More than 150 years later, Mommsen's name has ensured that this article is still cited and accepted.<sup>1</sup> A better and more acute analysis appeared in 1927 from the pen of Rudolf Helm, the editor of the now-standard edition of the *Chronici canones*, but it is long and involved (and written in German), and therefore often overlooked. Since then, a number of important advances have been made, particularly involving Jerome's use of the *Descriptio consulum* (Mommsen's unwieldily named *Consularia Constantinopolitana*) and the *Continuatio Antiochiensis*, a Greek continuation of Eusebius to 350,<sup>2</sup> and refinements have been made to the proof that he used the *Kaisergeschichte* (hereafter *KG*), a now-lost epitome of imperial biographies starting with Augustus that enjoyed a remarkable popularity in the second half of the fourth century, being used by every Latin historian to survive from that period.<sup>3</sup> Most questions involving Jerome's sources have been settled,<sup>4</sup> though probably not to everyone's satisfaction, but a few remain.

The most difficult remaining problem is Jerome's source for secular events after his most important source, the *KG*, concluded. Many of these entries and partial entries to about 375 can be attributed to an early recension of the *Descriptio consulum*, but that still leaves over twenty entries without an obvious source. Surprisingly, there have been several recent analyses of this problem (recent, at least, in relation to Mommsen and Helm). The earlier of

1. Jeanjean and Lançon 2004, 47–53, is the most recent example that I know of.

2. Burgess 1993a, 196–97; 2002, 27–28; 1999, 114–22, 129–32, 152–61.

3. For this and the background to this particular problem, see Burgess 1995a. The authors and works that are believed to have used the *KG* are Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Festus, Jerome, Ammianus Marcellinus, the *Historia Augusta*, the *Epitome de caesaribus*, and Polemius Silvius (another author is added below).

4. See Burgess 2002, 27–28, though I would now argue that Jerome had a single source for Roman history, which he himself calls a *Latina historia* (77<sup>c</sup>), composed of a source like the *Origo gentis Romanae* (for early Rome), an epitome of Livy, and the *KG*. For this, see Enmann 1884, 489–99; Helm 1927, 303–5; and p. 190 below. A study on the chronicle of Jerome that I am currently preparing (along with introductions to, translations of, and commentaries on all Latin chronicles to the early sixth century) will set out a general account of Jerome's sources (similar to that found in Burgess 2002) as well as a detailed analysis of the sources for all his entries from the end of the third century.

these (Schwartz 1980, 225–30) shows that there are certain unavoidable similarities among Jerome, Ammianus, the *Historia Augusta* (hereafter *HA*), and the *Epitome de caesaribus* between 364 and 378 that indicate that a common source must have been used. Unfortunately, Schwartz knows nothing of Helm and follows Mommsen in believing that Jerome used Eutropius, and therefore his conclusion that this source must have been a “Eutropius auctus” (pp. 229, 230) cannot stand, since Jerome did not use Eutropius, he used the *KG*. Although another source must therefore have been involved, Schwartz’s general conclusion and his secondary description of this source as “le Bréviaire de 378” are still valid. I shall expand upon Schwartz’s analysis below.

The later analyses come from the pen of Stéphane Ratti, of which the latter (Ratti 2001) is a revision of an earlier paper (Ratti 1997a). These concern Jerome’s secular source for the period 357 to 364. Ratti concludes that Jerome could not have used Eutropius as a source between 357 and 364 and demonstrates that a single pagan Latin source must lie behind Eutropius, Festus, Jerome, and Ammianus, one that must have gone through several different editions. As will be seen, I come to the same conclusions (though independently) and expand upon them below.

The core of Ratti’s 1997 paper, however, was an attempt to demonstrate that this common source, also used by the *Epitome de caesaribus* and later Greek historians such as Zonaras, was the *Annales*, a lengthy classicizing Latin history written by Nicomachus Flavianus.<sup>5</sup> Although the more recent paper appears to deemphasize Flavianus in its conclusion (p. 450), he is still identified as the common source. The question of Nicomachus Flavianus and his relationship to all these histories must therefore be evaluated, but I must first comment on a number of Ratti’s other arguments that bear on what follows.

While Ratti correctly concludes that Jerome did not use Eutropius between 357 and 364, it is strange that he claims that he used Eutropius in addition to the *KG* before that<sup>6</sup> for it has been demonstrated by Helm and by me that Jerome used only the *KG*, not Eutropius, which is generally agreed to be little more than an epitome of the *KG*.<sup>7</sup> If Eutropius was not Jerome’s source between 357 and 364, as Ratti argues, then he cannot be his source before 357 either, since the parallels are of exactly the same nature.

It is empirically demonstrable that from 291 until 370 Jerome follows an early recension of the *Descriptio consulum* that mirrors ours. Since both the *Canones* and the *Descriptio* survive, the comparison of content, chronology, and wording is simple, and the fact cannot be denied. Ratti admits a

5. *PLRE* 1:347–48, s.v. “Flavianus” 15.

6. Ratti 1997a, *passim* (esp. 479 for use of *KG*); 1997b, 270–72; 1999, 867–71; and 2001, pp. 434, n. 4, 449. Ratti 1999 wisely drops two of three supposed proofs of Jerome’s use of Eutropius from Ratti 1997b (pp. 271–72), since they are classic evidence for the existence of the *KG* (see Bird 1984, 19; 1993, p. 128, n. 46; and 1994, p. 100, n. 3, and p. 101, n. 8). The remaining proof—Atella as Augustus’ place of death in Jerome and Eutropius, but Nola in Victor—is explained by Victor’s knowledge of Roman history and his other sources; see Bird 1984, 20–23; 1994, xiii–xiv.

7. See, e.g., Bird 1993, xliv–xlix. Under the circumstances, Ratti ought to have explicitly set out a method by which one could detect the difference between Jerome’s use of the *KG* and his use of Eutropius.

connection from 365 only.<sup>8</sup> He gives no serious reasons for denying Jerome's dependence on the *Descriptio* and simply seems not to have compared the two for himself before 357.

On the basis of Gratian's antipagan legislation and Jerome's numerous comments about the Vestal virgins, Ratti argues that Jerome completed the *Canones* in Rome at the end of 382.<sup>9</sup> This provides him with an opportunity for Jerome to have become acquainted with Flavianus' history. Unfortunately, all but one of the eight Vestal entries that Ratti cites are from Eusebius—they are not the work of Jerome—and the ecclesiastical details of the *Canones* demonstrate conclusively that it was completed some months before the opening of the Council of Constantinople in May 381.<sup>10</sup>

We must now return to Nicomachus Flavianus. In spite of a small cottage industry that has grown up around Flavianus' history, perpetuated by a few European scholars,<sup>11</sup> we know only three facts about this work: its name (*Annales*), its date (390 or later), and the fact that Theodosius I requested that it be dedicated to him. Nothing else.<sup>12</sup> We do not know if it was a history of the Republic or the Empire (or both); we do not know when it began or ended; we do not know if it was long or short; we do not know the attitudes or approaches that Flavianus took towards the history he narrated or the people he described. Nothing.<sup>13</sup> He is not mentioned by any surviving

8. Ratti 1997a, 489, 501, 506; 2001, 436, 438, 445.

9. Ratti 2001, 447-49.

10. The Council of Constantinople took place between May and July of 381. Jerome's comments in 232<sup>e</sup> and 234<sup>a</sup> that the Arians still possessed the churches show that they were written before the Council. He classes Cyril of Jerusalem as an Arian (237<sup>b</sup>), yet Cyril was vindicated at the Council as orthodox. And finally, he writes as if Meletius is still bishop of Antioch (esp. 232<sup>c</sup>), and Meletius died during the Council. Jerome was in Constantinople to support Paulinus, who had consecrated him priest and who was vying with Meletius to be selected by the Council as the single orthodox bishop of Antioch, and Jerome's attacks on Meletius and his support for Paulinus in the *Canones* (232<sup>c</sup>, 241<sup>i</sup>, 242<sup>e</sup>, 243<sup>d</sup>, and 246<sup>a</sup>) only make sense in the immediate lead-up to that Council. The other evidence for dating the *Canones* is best set out by Donalson (1996, 4-6).

11. Chiefly François Paschoud, Bruno Bleckmann, and Michel Festy. All the works by these scholars concerning Flavianus are cited by Ratti in his notes (1997a). Note, too, the numerous encouraging letters and personal communications between these three and Ratti (1997a, p. 479, n. 1, p. 480, n. 7, p. 481, n. 15, p. 482, n. 22, p. 488, n. 54, p. 496, n. 101, p. 500, n. 123; 2001, 428-29, 430, 434, 443). The hypothesis linking Flavianus to so many later Latin and Greek histories was first proposed by von Domaszewski in 1918 and expanded by Hartke in 1940, but the recent resurgence in interest is due to Paschoud. See Barnes 1976, p. 267, n. 33; Ratti 1997a, 507; and Birley 2003, 130-31 for full references.

12. Everything we know about it is contained in a single clause in an inscription erected to his son's memory in 431 (*CIL* 6:1783 = *ILS* 2948): *Annalium quos [Theodosius] consecrari sibi a quaestore et praefecto suo voluit*. This probably also means that Theodosius commissioned the work. Flavianus was quaestor in 389/90 and praetorian prefect from 390, though his modern proponents are forced to propose a date of 383 for the quaestorship since Ammianus and Eunapius, two supposed major witnesses to the *Annales*, concluded their works before 390. For Flavianus' career, see *PLRE* 1:347-48; Barnes 1976, 267-68; and Matthews 1989, 10, pp. 476-77, n. 6, and p. 479, n. 7, with their further comments on the impossibility of knowing whether Flavianus was a source for anything. See also in particular Barnes 2004, an important reply to a recent attempt by Paschoud to defend his hypothesis. In addition, Birley (2003, 132) shows that Flavianus was not the rabid pagan he is claimed to be, thus severing an important link with the common source.

13. Recently, Guy Sabbah has said, "no more than conjecture is possible [on the *Annales*]" (2003, p. 61, n. 63); A. R. Birley, "All this is speculation, to be sure" (2003, 131); and Wolf Liebeschuetz, "we know nothing at all [about the subject matter of the *Annales*]" (2003, p. 198, n. 110). But guesses can be made, of course. To judge from *Epit.* 48.11-12, Theodosius liked republican history, and, as noted above, he probably commissioned the work. Flavianus' son (*PLRE* 1:345-47) edited (along with Q. Aurelius Symmachus) the

historian as a source, or even as an historian, and since we know nothing about his history it is impossible to connect it with any surviving history, Greek or Latin, or any hypothetical history established by *Quellenforschung*. The only reason that Flavianus' history has been identified as a source for other surviving histories is that its existence is known. A source was needed, no other histories were known, and the inscription provided a name. There is nothing more to it than that. Yet many senators devoted their spare time to writing, often letters, poetry, or history; that Flavianus did so should come as no surprise, but just because we know that he wrote a history is no reason for identifying that history as the source for any other later history. The arguments that have been made concerning Flavianus and the *Annales* are all either circular or hypothetical, based either on the histories that he was supposedly the source for and/or on what it is assumed that Flavianus should or would have written.

But since Jerome completed the *Canones* in early 381, and Eutropius and Festus wrote in 369/70, it is impossible for them to have used a work that was not completed until 390 or even 383 (see n. 12). It is this necessity that should have forced Ratti to abandon Flavianus and suggest a different common source. Instead he redates the *Annales* to 364/369, claiming that the history mentioned in the inscription was a "second edition."<sup>14</sup> In an argument that builds so much on hypothesis, it is unwise to abandon one of only three facts on offer, facts that have now become so nebulous and dispensable that they can be reshaped at will.

*Quellenforschung* must begin with the evidence and proceed from that point. The facts must speak for themselves and we must follow them wherever they lead, however perplexing or distressing the conclusions may be. Let us begin.

My analysis takes as its starting point my introduction and conclusions in Burgess 1995a, and I assume what is said there as an introduction here. Jerome's secular entries from 357, the point at which I stopped my analysis in 1995a (see Burgess 1995b), are as follows:

- 236<sup>l</sup>: summary of Constantius' Persian war
- 240<sup>i</sup>: Constantius in Rome and the relics of Andrew and Luke arrive in Constantinople
- 241<sup>a</sup>: earthquake in Nicomedia
- 241<sup>c</sup>: Evanthius and Chrestus, *grammatici*
- 241<sup>e</sup>: Honoratus as first prefect of the city
- 241<sup>f</sup>: birth of Gratian
- 242<sup>b</sup>: death of Constantius
- [243<sup>a</sup>: death of Aemilianus]

---

whole of Livy (Reynolds 1983, 207). The title itself (if it is, in fact, a title and not just a description) may imply noncontemporary history (Potter 1999, 10–11 [citing Aulus Gellius, *NA* 5.18.1–6, who is citing Verrius Flaccus]; and Sabbah 2003, 36–37). And we are told that about one hundred years later a descendant, Q. Aurelius Memmius Symmachus (*PLRE* 2:1046), wrote a *Historia Romana* in seven books, in imitation of his *parentes*, who probably include Flavianus (in comparison, Eutropius' history is ten books and Ammianus' was thirty-six [Barnes 1998, 20–31]). None of this remotely supports the sort of massive classicizing history involving the late fourth century that is claimed for Flavianus.

14. Ratti 1997a, 507–8; 2001, 429–31, 446–47, 449, 450.

- 243<sup>b</sup>: death of Julian, accession of Jovian
- 243<sup>c</sup>: Jovian's forced peace
- 243<sup>c</sup>: Jovian's death, accessions of Valentinian and Valens
- 244<sup>a</sup>: Valentinian and Aurelian
- 244<sup>c</sup>: earthquake and tsunami
- 244<sup>d</sup>: usurpation and death of Procopius
- 245<sup>b</sup>: accession of Gratian
- 245<sup>c</sup>: hailstones in Constantinople
- 245<sup>d</sup>: raining wool in Atrebatæ
- 245<sup>f</sup>: earthquake in Nicaea
- 245<sup>g</sup>: Libanius
- 245<sup>h</sup>: *agon* restored
- 245<sup>m</sup>: famine in Phrygia
- 246<sup>b</sup>: Maximinus in Rome
- 246<sup>c</sup>: Valentinus tries usurpation in Britain
- [246<sup>d</sup>: Death of presbyter in Sirmium]
- 246<sup>f</sup>: Probus, prefect of Illyricum
- 246<sup>h</sup>: Saxons slaughtered
- 247<sup>a</sup>: Burgundians on the Rhine
- 247<sup>b</sup>: Clearchus, prefect of the city
- 247<sup>g</sup>: Sarmatian invasion and postconsulate
- 247<sup>h</sup>: death of Valentinian
- 248<sup>c</sup>: death of Theodosius
- 248<sup>f</sup>: Alamanni slaughtered
- 248<sup>h</sup>: background to Gothic rebellion
- 249<sup>a</sup>: Roman defeat
- 249<sup>c</sup>: defeat and death of Valens

Of these a number can be set aside immediately. Three entries can be removed because they derive from Jerome's own knowledge: 241<sup>c</sup> (Evanthius and Chrestus *grammatici*, from his student days in Rome), 245<sup>d</sup> (raining wool in Atrebatæ, from his time in Trier), and 245<sup>g</sup> (Libanius, from his time in Antioch). His own knowledge also appears in 244<sup>c</sup> regarding the earthquake and tsunami of 365. Another group clearly derives from an early recension of the *Descriptio consulum* and so can be set aside: 240<sup>i</sup> (Constantius in Rome and the relics of Andrew and Luke arrive in Constantinople = s.a. 357.2, 1), 241<sup>a</sup> (an earthquake in Nicomedia = s.a. 358.2), 241<sup>e</sup> (Honoratus as first prefect of the city = s.a. 359.2), 241<sup>f</sup> (birth of Gratian = s.a. 359.1), 244<sup>c</sup> (earthquake and tsunami = s.a. 365.1), 245<sup>c</sup> (hailstones in Constantinople = s.a. 367.1), 245<sup>b</sup> (accession of Gratian = s.a. 367.2), 245<sup>f</sup> (earthquake in Nicaea = s.a. 368), 245<sup>h</sup> (*agon* restored = s.a. 369.2), and 245<sup>m</sup> (famine in Phrygia = s.a. 370.1). The length of the emperors' reigns that are noted in the rubrics (Julian, p. 242 and Jovian, p. 243) derive from the same source, calculated from the dates of accession and death.<sup>15</sup> A variety of other imperial entries derive only their chronology or a few words from Jerome's recension of the *Descriptio* and they will be noted below in the main analysis. One further entry (247<sup>b</sup> [Clearchus, prefect of the city, builds an aqueduct

15. Though for Julian, since there is no entry for his promotion to augustus, Jerome counted from Constantius' death.

for Constantinople in 373)) probably also derives from this source. Jerome's recension ceases to parallel the surviving version in 370 with the famine in Phrygia,<sup>16</sup> but a number of characteristics suggest that this entry derives from a short continuation of the *Descriptio*: it is accurately dated, yet almost nothing from the secular source is (see below), the subject matter is of the same nature as other entries found in the *Descriptio* (s.aa. 369.1 and 375.1),<sup>17</sup> and it differs considerably from the obvious Western interests displayed in the secular source (see below). The death of Valentinian perhaps also appeared in this continuation (cf. *Descriptio* s.a. 375.2), since it too is accurately dated, though Jerome may have known the year of this important recent event himself.

Two entries in the list above appear in square brackets. I have done this because they include references to Christianity or involve Christianity, yet are quite unlike Jerome's other Christian entries, which concentrate chiefly on apostolic succession, Church leaders, and the orthodox struggles against the Arians. The death of the presbyter in Sirmium (246<sup>d</sup>) also appears in Ammianus, whose history is related to Jerome's secular source (see below), and this suggests that the other entry (243<sup>a</sup>) may have appeared in this source as well. Since we have no way of knowing the religious content of Jerome's source or whether Christians or references to them were avoided, we cannot a priori exclude these entries from the analysis.

I shall follow the pattern that I established in my 1995a paper, adding to my present analysis parallels among other relevant sources that do not involve Jerome, noted in roman rather than arabic numerals. The abbreviations are as follows: Jer. = Jerome, *Chronici canones*; Eutr. = Eutropius; *Epit.* = *Epitome de caesaribus*; Amm. Marc. = Ammianus Marcellinus; *Descr.* = *Descriptio consulum*.

- 1.<sup>18</sup> **Jer. 236<sup>l</sup>:** Bellum Persicum nocturnum apud Singaram, in quo haut dubiam victoriam militum stoliditate perdidimus. Neque vero ullum Constantio ex VIII<sup>o</sup> gravissimis proeliis contra Persas bellum fuit <gravius>. Nam, ut alia omittam, Nisibis obsessa, Bizabde et Amida captae sunt. (348)

**Descr. s.a. 348:** Bellum Persicum fuit nocturnum.

**Eutr. 10.10.1:** Diversa Constantii fortuna fuit. A Persis enim multa et gravia perpressus, saepe captis oppidis, obsessis urbibus, caesis exercitibus, nullumque ei contra Saporem prosperum proelium fuit, nisi quod apud Singaram haut dubiam victoriam ferocia militum amisit, qui pugnam seditiose et stolide contra rationem belli die iam praecipiti poposcerunt.

**Festus 27.1:** Praeter leves excubantium in limite congressiones acriori Marte noviens decertatum est . . . et cum Amida capta est, grave sub eo principe res publica vulnus accepit. Ter autem a Persis est obsessa Nisibis . . . Nocturna vero Eliensi prope Singaram pugna . . . omnium expeditionum compensatus fuisset eventus, si locus et nocte adversantibus, percitos ferocia milites ab intempestivo pugnandi tempore imperator ipse adloquendo revocare potuisset . . . [description

16. Note that in our version the years 371 to 374 are empty.

17. This entry mentions the construction of baths that were associated with and followed the completion of the aqueduct in 373 (see Socrates [*Hist. eccl.* 4.8.8], who attributes the aqueduct to Valens and the baths to Clearchus).

18. See Helm 1927, 298 and 301.

of actions during battle] . . . cum a proelio respirantes praetentis luminibus reptariae inhiarent aquae, nimbo sagittarum obruti sunt, cum stolide ad dirigendos certius in se ictus lumina ipsi per noctem accensa praeberent.

Although Jerome dates this entry to 348 on the basis of his recension of the *Descriptio* (which also provides him with the text of the first three words, although something very similar appears in Festus), it contains an overview of Constantius' Persian wars. The siege of Nisibis to which he refers is the third of 350 (he mentions the other two at 234<sup>d</sup> and 236<sup>h</sup>, from the *Continuatio Antiochiensis*<sup>19</sup>). Bezabde was captured in 360 and Amida in 359, both being dates after the end of the *KG*. The source, therefore, must post-date the capture of Bezabde and probably the death of Constantius in 361 as well: such a summary of Constantius' Persian war would seem most appropriate as part of a summary of Constantius' reign at his death. This summary and the texts cited above, therefore, cannot have appeared in the *KG*, in spite of the references to the battle of Singara in 344. Jerome's entry either is a combination of Eutropius, Festus, and an unknown source, or derives from a common source used by all three.

- i. **Eutr. 10.15.2:** [Constantii] in civilibus magis quam in externis bellis sit laudanda fortuna.  
**Amm. Marc. 21.16.15:** Ut autem in externis bellis hic princeps fuit saucius et afflictus, ita prospere succedentibus pugnis civilibus tumidus.  
**Epit. 42.18:** Felix bellis civilibus, externis lacrimabilis.

The short comments in both the *Epitome* and Ammianus could derive directly from Eutropius, though there is no evidence that either consulted his work. A similar antithesis appears in Aurelius Victor (*cum externis motibus, modo civilibus exercetur, aegre ab armis abest*, 42.20), though with a positive interpretation, as one might expect since Constantius was still alive. This suggests that the basic form derived from the *KG* (since none of the above authors consulted Victor, but did consult the *KG*), but the negative tone of the above texts suggests a common source that was written after Constantius' death. This putative common source, therefore, would appear to have had some connection to the *KG*.

- ii. **Jer. 240<sup>g</sup>:** Magnae Alamannorum copiae apud Argentoratum oppidum Galliarum a Caesare Iuliano oppressae. (356)  
**Eutr. 10.14.1–2:** a [Iuliano] modicis copiis apud Argentoratum, Galliae urbem, ingentes Alamannorum copiae extinctae sunt, rex nobilissimus captus. . . et finibus suis Romanum imperium restitutum.  
**Epit. 42.13–14:** [Iulianus] in campis Argentoratensibus apud Gallias cum paucis militibus infinitas hostium copias delevit . . . captus rex nobilis Nodomarius . . . redditus limes Romanae possessionis.

Although there is nothing interesting in Jerome here, the parallels between Eutropius and the *Epitome* are most important. First, the name Chnodomarius in the *Epitome* cannot derive from Eutropius and, second, Eutropius shows that the restoration of the frontier mentioned by both works occurred as a

19. See Burgess 1999, 111–305, esp. nos. 27 and 43, 232–38, and 272.

result of Julian's campaigns in 358. Here is a parallel extending beyond the earlier hypothesized date of 357.<sup>20</sup> Either Jerome is copying Eutropius and the *Epitome* is copying Eutropius and an unknown source, or all three depend upon a common source.

- 2.<sup>21</sup> **Jer. 242<sup>b</sup>:** Constantius Mopsocrenis inter Ciliciam Cappadociamque moritur anno aetatis XLV. (361)  
**Eutr. 10.15.2:** Constantius . . . obiit inter Ciliciam Cappadociamque anno . . . aetatis quinto et quadragesimo.  
**Descr. s.a. 361.1:** Diem functus Constantius Aug. Momsucrenas in fines Ciliciae Fenitiae provinciae III non. Nov.

Jerome's entry appears to be a combination of Eutropius and the *Description*. The *Epitome* (42.17) here is following Eunapius, Ammianus' source (= Amm. Marc. 21.15.2), and so is of no value.

3. **Jer. 243<sup>a</sup>:** Aemilianus ob ararum subversionem Dorostori a vicario incenditur. (363)  
 No parallel.

The *Chronicon Paschale* (s.a. 363; see Whitby and Whitby 1989, p. 40, n. 124), Theophanes (*Chronographia* AM 5855 = 363; see Mango and Scott 1997, p. 83, nn. c and 4), and Theodoret (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.7.5) all refer to this event in much the same way. These works derived their information from the so-called Arian historiographer,<sup>22</sup> but Jerome is unlikely to have used this source. The *Canones* shows no sign of other material from this now-lost work and it is a priori unlikely that Jerome, with his virulently anti-Arian bias, would have used it anyway. But there are important diagnostic differences among the passages as well: the Arian historiographer related this death as a martyrdom along with many others as part of a general Julianic persecution, while Jerome refers to this only as a death and notes an "imminent persecution" that was expected after Julian's return from his Persian expedition (next entry). Furthermore, the Arian historiographer named Capitolinus, who was the vicar of Thrace (see *PLRE* 1:180, s.v. "Capitolinus" 2), called the city Dorostolon, not Jerome's correct Durostorum (*BA* 22 E4), and did not mention the destruction of the altars. The incident is certainly gruesome enough to have been the subject of public gossip and outrage (whether Christian or pagan) long after Julian's reign.

- 4a.<sup>23</sup> **Jer. 243<sup>b</sup>:** Julianus in Persas profectus . . . Ubi a quodam simulato perfuga ad deserta perductus, cum fame et siti apostatam perdidisset exercitum et inconsultus a suorum erraret agminibus, ab obvio forte hostium equite conto ilia perfosus interiit anno aetatis XXXII. (363)  
**Eutr. 10.16.2:** remeans victor, dum se inconsultus proeliis inserit, hostili manu interfectus est . . . anno . . . aetatis altero et tricesimo.  
**Festus 28.3:** a transfuga . . . inductus . . . cum incautus per agmen erraret . . . ab

20. I included these passages in my article that dated the *KG* to 357 (Burgess 1995b, 122, no. 10) not realizing the date of the events Eutropius was narrating. For Julian's actions in 357 and 358, see Bowersock 1978, 39–43, and Bird 1994, 203.

21. See Helm 1927, 301.

22. See Burgess 1999, 122–26, esp. nn. 24 and 37, for bibliography and background.

23. See Helm 1927, 301.



obvio hostium equite conto per ilia ictus . . . vulneratus est.

*Epit.* 43.1–3: in Persas proficiscitur . . . illic a transfuga quodam in insidias ductus . . . cumque inconsulto ardore nititur ordines ad proelium componere ab uno ex hostibus . . . conto percutitur.

*Amm. Marc.* 24.7.3 and 5 describe the deceptions of “perfugae” (plural); 25.3.6: cum Iulianus cavendi immemor . . . audenter effunderet semet in pugnam . . . subita equestris hasta . . . , costis perfossis, haesit in ima iecoris fibra.

- iii. *Eutr.* 10.16.1: Iulianus . . . ingenti apparatu Parthis intulit bellum . . . aliquot oppida et castella Persarum in deditionem accepit vel vi expugnavit; 10.16.3: gloriae avidus.

*Festus* 28.1: Is . . . ingenti apparatu . . . infesta in Parthos signa commovit . . . multa Persarum oppida et castella aut suscepit dedita aut manu cepit; 29.2: cupidor regni quam gloriae.<sup>24</sup>

*Epit.* 43.1, 7, 8: gloriae nimis cupidus, cupido laudis immodica, cupido gloriae flagrantior.

The parallels among Jerome, Eutropius, Festus, and the *Epitome* presented above in 4a and iii are obvious. To this must be added the fact that Jerome includes a clause that is not mentioned by any of the parallel sources, *cum fame et siti apostatam perdidisset exercitum*. This must be related to the provisioning problems mentioned by Ammianus in 24.7.7, 25.1.10, and 25.2.1–2. But it may be that Jerome himself has added this, as well as *ad deserta*, from his own faulty knowledge, since the hunger was caused not by deserts, as Ammianus makes clear, but by the Persians’ scorched-earth tactics.

Two solutions present themselves here. Either all three sources are relying independently on the same account, or Jerome copied Festus and added small details from Eutropius and another unknown source; the *Epitome* copied Jerome (altering his *perfuga* to *transfuga*, a common synonym, rather than relying on Festus for the word) and Eunapius, who provides details before, within, and after the above-quoted passage; and Eutropius and Festus are either relying on a common contemporary source or one is relying on the other and an unknown source.

- 4b. *Jer.* 243<sup>b</sup>: Post quem sequenti die Iovianus ex primicerio domesticorum imperator factus est. (363)

*Eutr.* 10.17.1: Iovianus, qui tunc domesticus militabat, ad obtinendum imperium consensu exercitus lectus est.

Jerome’s reference to the next day for Jovian’s accession derives from the dates in his recension of the *Descriptio*. Jovian’s rank does not derive from Eutropius, and neither Festus nor the *Epitome* mentions it. Either Jerome is noting something in more detail from a common source (copied incompletely by Eutropius) or he is following Eutropius and an unknown source, though why he would bother resorting to another source when Eutropius had all he really needed is unknown.

5. *Jer.* 243<sup>c</sup>: Iovianus rerum necessitate compulsus Nisibin et magnam Mesopotamiae partem Sapori Persarum regi tradidit. (364)

24. This is said of Jovian, but from what is said in Eutropius and the *Epitome* it clearly seems to be a comparison with Julian, even though Festus never says this about him.

**Eutr. 10.17.1:** Iovianus . . . uno a Persis atque altero proelio victus pacem cum Sapore, necessariam quidem, sed ignobilem, fecit, multatus finibus ac nonnulla imperii Romani parte tradita. . . . ea pacis conditio non penitus reprehendenda foret, si foederis necessitatem tum cum integrum fuit mutare voluisset. . . .

**Festus 29.2:** . . . tanta reverentia Romani nominis fuit, ut a Persis prius sermo de pace haberetur ac reduci confectus inedia exercitus sineretur condicionibus . . . dispendiosis Romanae rei publicae inpositis ut Nisibis et pars Mesopotamiae traderetur . . .

Again, either Jerome is combining material from Eutropius and Festus, or all three are relying on a common source.

- iv. **Eutropius** (10.17.2), **Festus** (29.2), and **Ammianus** (25.9.9) state that such a surrender of territory as Jovian's to the Persians had never occurred before in all Roman history (*quod ante . . . numquam accidit*, Eutropius; *quod numquam antea accidit*, Festus), and Eutropius and Ammianus (25.9.11) give exactly the same three examples of instances of earlier potential losses of territory through shameful treaties that were made up through immediately renewed war: the Caudine Forks,<sup>25</sup> Numantia, and Numidia (*confestim bella inlata sunt neque pax rata fuit*, Eutropius [10.17.3], and *icta . . . foedera . . . repetitione bellorum ilico dissoluta*, Ammianus). Zosimus (3.32), copying Eunapius, who was also the major source for Ammianus at this point, presents the same attitude towards this loss of territory by Jovian, but his approach and examples are quite different. Lenski sees this negative attitude as an official position promulgated by Valens during his reign (2002, 190–91).

- 6a.<sup>26</sup> **Jer. 243<sup>e</sup>:** Iovianus cruditate sive odore prunarum, quas nimias adoleri iusserat Dadastanae moritur anno aetatis XXXIII. (364)

**Eutr. 10.17.3–18.1:** . . . in Galatiae finibus repentina morte obiit. . . . Multi exanimatum opinantur nimia cruditate . . . alii odore cubiculi, quod ex recenti tectorio calcis grave quiescentibus erat, quidam nimietate prunarum, quas gravi frigore adoleri multas iusserat. Decessit . . . aetatis . . . tertio et tricesimo anno. . . .

**Epit. 44.4:** Hic a Perside . . . Constantinopolim accelerans, cruditate stomachi, tectorio novi operis gravatus repente interiit, annos gerens proxime quadraginta.

**Amm. Marc. 25.10.13:** Fertur . . . recenti calce cubiculi illiti ferre odorem noxium nequivisse, vel extuberato capite perisse succensione prunarum immensa, aut certe ex colluvione ciborum, avida cruditate distentus. Decessit autem anno tricensimo aetatis et tertio.

Helm's text (1956) gives thirty-four for Jovian's age, but manuscripts OMLPXC (which include the best manuscripts) and Fotheringham (1923, 326), as well as Eutropius and Ammianus, give thirty-three, which should be taken as correct.

Jerome has badly excerpted his source here. For it was the smell of the fresh plaster of his room (*odor cubiculi*), not the smell of the coals (*odor prunarum*, instead of *nimitas/succensio immensa prunarum*), that was said to have killed him. He has attached the genitive of the third explanation to the ablative of the second to create a hybrid. It is another example of the sort of error that arose from the celerity with which he dictated his work.<sup>27</sup> Jerome has added

25. As Enmann (1884, 491) notes, Eutropius provides information here that he does not include when he describes this episode at 2.9.

26. See Helm 1927, 301–2.

27. For another example of this sort of error, see Burgess 1999, 218–19 (Eustathius, 233<sup>n</sup>).

the location of Jovian's death from the *Descriptio* (Ammianus knows it from another source).

Note the parallels between Eutropius and the *Epitome* (*repentina morte obiit* and *repente interiit*, and *quod ex recenti tectorio calcis grave quiescentibus erat* and *tectorio novi operis gravatus*) and the parallels between Eutropius and Ammianus (*odore cubiculi . . . ex recenti tectorio calcis* and *recenti calce cubiculi illiti . . . odorem*, and *Decessit . . . aetatis . . . tertio et tricesimo anno* and *Decessit autem anno tricensimo aetatis et tertio*).

The close relationship of all four sources not only in their wording, but especially in their offering of the same three instances of contemporary speculation (the *Epitome* omits the charcoal, the most likely cause) is a result of two possibilities: a common source used by all four authors or the use of Eutropius by the other three. No author other than Eutropius could have served as a source for any other. These passages must all reflect an original collection of gossip made by a single individual. Later writers reported some, but not all, of the same causes, and dug up or fabricated other possibilities such as poison or illness.<sup>28</sup> No official report of Jovian's death would have included such hearsay, and, in fact, the existence of so many rumors and the dearth of information contained in the *Descriptio*, which is a collection of such official pronouncements, indicate that there was no officially reported cause of death.

- 6b. **Jer. 243<sup>e</sup>:** Post quem Valentinianus tribunus scutariorum e Pannonia Cibalensis apud Nicaeam augustus appellatus fratrem Valentem Constantinopoli in communionem regni adsumit. (364)  
No parallels.

Jerome's information on Valentinian's rank and origin has no parallel in Eutropius or Festus, because they close with the death of Jovian. The loss of these two sources makes the following analyses extremely difficult, because the author of the *Epitome* tends to rely more and more on his other source, Eunapius, and historical details such as the ones that Jerome narrates are rare, replaced by descriptions of and personal comments about the emperors. But clearly, Jerome shows no change in detail or wording with the death of Jovian, as one would expect if he were following Eutropius and Festus for the earlier material. Ammianus is the only other source to give us Valentinian's rank (26.1.5), but he only describes Valentinian as *agens scholam Scutariorum secundam*, and does not name the office of tribune. Apart from this entry, Valentinian's origin is otherwise noted only by Greek sources.<sup>29</sup> The locations of Valentinian's and Valens' accessions were probably taken from Jerome's recension of the *Descriptio*.

- v. **Epit. 45.2:** Huius pater Gratianus, mediocri stirpe ortus apud Cibalas, Funarius appellatus est, eo quod venalicium funem portanti quinque milites nequirent extorquere.  
**Amm. Marc. 30.7.2:** Natus apud Cibalas, Pannoniae oppidum, Gratianus maior ignobili stirpe, cognominatus est a pueritia prima Funarius, ea re quod nondum

28. See Lenski 2002, p. 19, n. 36, who lists all sources and causes.

29. Lenski 2002, p. 49, n. 204, though Ammianus does not say explicitly that Cibalae was Valentinian's birthplace.

adultus, venalem circumferens funem, quinque militibus eum rapere studio magno conatis, nequaquam cessit.

Both Ammianus and the *Epitome* provide this anecdote about Valentinian's father, Gratian.<sup>30</sup> It clearly derives from a common source, which could be Eunapius. However, there is no sign of the anecdote in other witnesses to Eunapius (Zosimus 3.36.2, Philostorgius 8.16).

7.<sup>31</sup> **Jer. 244<sup>a</sup>:** Valentinianus egregius alias imperator et Aureliano moribus similis, nisi quod severitatem eius nimiam et parcitatem quidam crudelitatem et avaritiam interpretabantur. (365)

**HA, Aurelian 31.4:** Crudelitas . . . Aureliani vel, ut quidam dicunt, severitas eatenus extitit ut . . . ; **49.3:** Servos et ministros peccantes coram se caedi iubebat, ut plerique dicunt, causa tenendae severitatis, ut alii, studio crudelitatis.

**Epit. 45.5:** Hic Valentinianus fuit . . . severus . . . infectus vitiis maximeque avaritiae . . .

**Amm. Marc. 30.8.8:** Aviditas plus habendi . . . exundavit in hoc principe flagrantius adulescens. Quam quidam praetendentes imperatorem Aurelianum purgare temptabant, id affirmando quod ut ille . . . torrentis ritu ferebatur in divites, ita hic . . . crudelitati cupiditatem opes nimias congerendi miscebat . . . (chapters 29.3 and 30.8 are given over to examples of Valentinian's cruelty).

Because of the way Jerome's entry is written it is difficult to determine whether the *eius* refers to Valentinian or Aurelian: a natural reading suggests that it refers to Valentinian, and Paul the Deacon (*Hist. Rom.* 11.6), Donaldson (1996, 52), and Ratti (1997a, 480–81), for example, take it this way. However, a number of facts militate against this. First and most important, Aurelian had a general reputation for cruelty, especially in the *KG* and the works that depended upon it.<sup>32</sup> This understood, the passage can hardly be translated, "Valentinian was an outstanding emperor and was like Aurelian [i.e., he was cruel], except that some people interpreted his [Valentinian's] severity as cruelty." A simple comparison to Aurelian could only be negative, yet the connection of *egregius* to *Aureliano similis* indicates quite the opposite. In this context, then, the next clause must be there to explain and justify the comparison: "Valentinian was an outstanding emperor and was like Aurelian [i.e., he was severe], except that some people interpreted his [Aurelian's] severity as cruelty." Second, works that relied on the *KG* show exactly this dichotomy when discussing Aurelian's character: Victor 35.12 (severity); Eutropius 9.13.1, 14 (cruelty); *Epitome de caesaribus* 35.4, 9 (cruelty); Ammianus Marcellinus 31.5.17 (severity); *HA Aurelian*, 6.1, 7.3, 8.2–5, 23.1, 38.2 (where the *HA* has *severissime* and Eutropius (9.14) has *ultima crudelitate*), 39.3, 39.8, and especially 31.4, 36.2–3, and 49.3, where the same dichotomy appears, "some call it cruelty, some call it severity." Finally, Ammianus shows that the common source made the comparison to exonerate Valentinian of the charge of cruelty by saying he was like Aurelian, that is, he was not cruel, he was just excessively severe.

30. Lenski 2002, 46.

31. See Schöne 1900, 205–19; Helm 1927, p. 302, n. 1; Schwartz 1980, 225–26; Ratti 1997a, 479–82.

32. For Aurelian's cruelty, see Watson 1999, 94, 104, 159–63. While he knows of the *KG*, Watson has not factored its bias into his account.

The proof of a common source here is not just that Valentinian and Aurelian are compared, but that they are compared with regard to exactly the same traits, cruelty and greed, especially the former. The comments of Jerome and Ammianus, and the fact that the *Epitome* describes Valentinian as *severus* indicates that the common source attempted to defend Valentinian against allegations of cruelty and greed by comparing him to Aurelian, who suffered from the same “misinterpretation.” The passages from the *HA* appear to have been inspired by this defense.<sup>33</sup> Jerome did not mention such traits when he was copying the *KG* for his material on Aurelian, so the comparison cannot be his.

As noted above, it is clear from the surviving works that relied on the *KG* that Aurelian’s cruelty was an important feature of the original biography. Eutropius (9.13.1, 14) and the *Epitome* (35.4, 9) stress his *crudelitas*, and also describe him as *saevus*, *sanguinarius*, and *trux*. The author of the *HA*, clearly inspired by the later comparison with Valentinian, goes to town with the dichotomy. For a joke he counts himself among those who saw excessive severity rather than cruelty and makes Aurelian’s excessive *severitas* a theme of his life (cited above). He does slip thrice, however, and towards the end the *KG*’s original *crudelitas* and *inmanitas* descriptions slip in (31.4, 31.10, 39.8). Interestingly, Aurelius Victor presents a positive account of Aurelian, and so refers to this character trait only once, calling it *severitas* (35.12). Ammianus describes him as *severissimus* (31.5.17).

- 8.<sup>34</sup> **Jer. 244<sup>d</sup>:** Procopius, qui apud Constantinopolim tyrannidem invaserat, apud Frygiam salutarem exstinctus et plurimi Procopianae partis caesi atque proscripti. (366)

**Descr. s.a. 365.2:** Latro nocturnus hostisque publicus intra urbem Constantinopolim apparuit . . . 366.2: idem hostis publicus et predo intra Frygiam salutarem et in Nacoliensium campo ab Aug. Valente oppressus atque extinctus est.

**Epit. 46.4:** Procopius tyrannidem invadens exstinguitur.

Jerome combines two entries from his recension of the *Descriptio*, though only the chronology and the place names remain. The parallel with the *Epitome* is very close and none of the wording common with Jerome appears in the *Descriptio* except the verb. Either Jerome used his recension of the *Descriptio* and an unknown source, and the *Epitome* is copying Jerome, or they both depend upon a common source.

9. **Jer. 246<sup>b</sup>:** Maximinus praefectus annonae maleficos ab imperatore investigare iussus plurimos Romae nobilium occidit. (371)  
No parallels (other than the lengthy account in Ammianus 28.1.5–40).

Maximinus is known from laws to have been prefect of the *annona* on 19 March 370 (*Cod. Theod.* 14.17.6), then vicar of Rome during the city prefecture of Ampelius (after 21 August 370 and between 5 July and 22 August 372; *Collectio Avellana* 11–12), and finally praetorian prefect of Gaul by 14 November 374 (*Cod. Theod.* 9.24.3). Ursicinus was prefect of the

33. “Die Ähnlichkeit [of *HA Aurelian* 31.4] mit dem Satze der Hieronymus-Chronik ist evident, und so groß, dass sie unmöglich als zufällig angesehen werden kann” (Schöne 1900, 205–6).

34. See Helm 1927, 303.

*annona* on 22/23 February 372 (*Cod. Theod.* 14.3.14). Olybrius, whose illness allowed Maximinus as prefect of the *annona* to undertake such investigations, was prefect of the city from the autumn of 368 until the summer of 370, and his illness is attested by a law on 19 March 370 (*Cod. Theod.* 11.31.3).<sup>35</sup> The possibilities for Maximinus' activities as prefect of the *annona* are therefore 369/70 to 371/2, so Jerome's chronology could be correct, but in view of Olybrius' career and illness, 370 is more likely.

10. **Jer. 246<sup>c</sup>:** Valentinus in Britannia antequam tyrannidem invaderet, oppressus. (371)  
No parallels (other than the account in Ammianus 28.3.3–6, 30.7.10).

I have followed Fotheringham's text here for the name of the usurper, *Valentinus*, which the manuscript evidence shows is clearly the correct reading (Helm's apparatus is incomplete and inaccurate here).<sup>36</sup> Jerome's chronology is two years late here (371 instead of 369; 28.5.1 is Ammianus' transition to 370: Barnes [1998, 221] incorrectly states 369).

11. **Jer. 246<sup>d</sup>:** Presbyter Sirmii iniquissime decollatur, quod Octavianum ex proconsule apud se latitantem prodere noluisse. (371)  
**Amm. Marc. 29.3.4:** Epiroten aliquem ritus Christiani presbyterum acceptum Octaviano ex proconsule . . . [lacuna].

This incident is otherwise unknown except for a corrupt sentence in Ammianus that clearly refers to the same episode. In Ammianus' narrative the event must date to 372 or 373, since the transition to 370 occurs at 28.5.1 and to 374 at 30.3.1. Furthermore, Ammianus attributes the action to Valentinian's increased cruelty after the arrival in Gaul of Maximinus as prefect (see no. 9 above), therefore beginning sometime between 372 and 374.<sup>37</sup> Jerome's chronology is therefore one or two years too early.

12. **Jer. 246<sup>f</sup>:** Probus praefectus Illyrici iniquissimis tributorum exactionibus ante provincias quas regebat quam a barbaris vastarentur erasit. (372)  
No parallels (except for the mention of these increased taxes and tributes by Ammianus 30.5.5–10).

Sex. Claudius Petronius Probus was praetorian prefect of Illyricum, Italy, and Africa between 368 and 375. The barbarian devastations mentioned here are invasions by the Sarmatians and Quadi in 373 and 374 (see no. 15, below), prompted by the assassination of Gabinius, king of the Quadi, by Marcellianus, son of Maximinus.<sup>38</sup> Late in 374 Probus reported to Valentinian on the devastations caused by these invasions and in the spring of 375 Valentinian arrived in Carnuntum, where he learned both of the harsh taxes that Probus had imposed and of his oppression of the people of Illyricum (Ammianus 30.3.1–2, 5.1–10, esp. 5.6–10). Jerome has simply backdated this entry a few years on the basis of the dated entry in 375, which mentioned the invasions of 374 and the consuls of 375. Any date in the early 370s would have been correct.

35. Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* 4.29.6; *PLRE* 1:56–57, 577–78 (incorrect chronology), 987 (Ursicinus 6 and 7 are the same person); Barnes 1998, 241–46 (corrects chronologies and identifications).

36. See *PLRE* 1:935, s.v. "Valentinus" 5 (wrong date).

37. *PLRE* 1:637; see Barnes 1998, 241–42, for correct date.

38. *PLRE* 1:282, 377, 543–44, 736–40, 904–5; *Amm. Marc.* 29.6.1–16.

13. **Jer. 246<sup>b</sup>:** Saxones caesi Deusone in regione Francorum. (373)  
No parallels (other than the lengthy account in Ammianus 28.5.1–7, 30.7.8).

This slaughter of the Saxons belongs securely to 370. Jerome's chronology is therefore three years late. He, does, at least, provide the location of the slaughter,<sup>39</sup> which Ammianus does not do.

14. **Jer. 247<sup>a</sup>:** Burgundionum LXXX ferme milia, quod numquam antea, ad Rhenum descenderunt. (373)  
No parallels (other than the lengthy account in Ammianus 28.5.8–13).

As does Ammianus, Jerome narrates the arrival of the Burgundians right after the defeat of the Saxons; therefore this entry should be dated to 370, three years earlier than Jerome's chronology.

15. **Jer. 247<sup>b</sup>:** Quia superiore anno Sarmatae Pannonias vastaverant, idem consules permansere. (375)  
No parallels (other than the lengthy account of the invasion in Ammianus 29.6.1–16).

This invasion has been mentioned above (no. 12). Jerome's chronology is correct because of the reference in his source to the postconsulate.

- 16.<sup>40</sup> **Jer. 247<sup>b</sup>:** Valentinianus subita sanguinis eruptione, quod Graece apoplexis vocatur, Brigitione moritur. (375)  
*Descr. 375.2:* . . . diem functus Valentinianus senior . . . in castello Virgitione.  
*Epit. 45.8:* Valentinianus apud Bergentionem legationi Quadorum respondens . . . impetu sanguinis voce amissa, sensu integer, exspiravit.  
**Eutr. 8.10.3:** Verus . . . obiit . . . subito sanguine ictus, casu morbi, quem Graeci apoplexin vocant.  
*Epit. 16.5:* [Verus] ictu sanguinis, quem morbum Graeci ἀπόπληξιν vocant . . . exstinctus est.  
**HA Verus 9.11:** [Verus] morbo, quem apoplexin vocant correptus . . . periit.

Jerome's chronology is perhaps from his continuation of the *Descriptio*, whence also, perhaps, the name of the city (the difference in the spellings in the *Descriptio* and the *Epitome* may not be original).

Jerome's description of this attack ultimately derives from the account of the death of Lucius Verus in the *KG*. However, his own description of Verus' death does not contain the explanation or description: *Lucius . . . apoplexi extinctus est* (205<sup>k</sup>). It would be odd if at this point Jerome had gone back to the *KG* to copy a description that he had not included when he first came across it. It therefore seems more likely that it derives from his source and that he copied it out here without really thinking about or remembering what he had said about Verus. Again, either the *Epitome* is copying Jerome, or both rely on a common source.

17. **Jer. 248<sup>c</sup>:** Theodosius, Theodosii postea imperatoris pater, et plurimi nobilium occisi. (376)  
No parallels.

39. Location unknown, but probably Diessen in Noordbrabant, a southern province of modern Netherlands, south-east of Tilberg (BA 11 E–F1). See Stolte 1957.

40. See Helm 1927, 303.

Jerome is the only dated source for the death of Theodosius and only Orosius (7.33.7) provides any additional details. If we are to judge from Jerome's other secular entries, the date of this entry is almost certainly incorrect.<sup>41</sup> It could date anywhere between the death of Valentinian (or even just after the defeat of Firmus, which must be 373/74, not 374/75 as in *PLRE* 1:340) and the spring of 378. Unusually, Ammianus says nothing.<sup>42</sup>

18.<sup>43</sup> **Jer. 248<sup>f</sup>:** Alamannorum XXX circiter milia apud Argentariam oppidum Galliarum ab exercitu Gratiani strata. (377)

*Epit.* 47.2: [Gratianus] apud Argentariam oppidum Galliae triginta Alamannorum milia in bello exstinxit.

Again it looks as though the *Epitome* has copied this entry from Jerome. Ammianus (31.10.1–17) dates this battle to the spring of 378 (shortly after February), when Gratian was moving east to assist Valens against the Goths in Thrace.<sup>44</sup> Jerome has therefore dated this entry a year early. Ammianus says that out of 40,000 (though some claimed that the army amounted to 70,000) only 5,000 Alamanni survived the slaughter. This highlights the close relationship between Jerome and the *Epitome*, who agree on the figure of 30,000.

19. **Jer. 248<sup>h</sup>:** Gens Hunnorum Gothos vastat. Qui a Romanis sine armorum depositione suscepti per avaritiam Maximi ducis fame ad rebellandum coacti sunt. (377)

No parallels (other than the lengthy account in Ammianus 31.1–5.8).

Jerome here seems to be condensing a longer narrative that described the lead-up to the battle of Adrianople, starting with the Hunnic attacks that forced the Goths to ask to settle in Roman territory in 376. In 31.5.1–8 Ammianus narrates the actions of Lupicinus (not Maximus, though he is mentioned earlier) that finally drove the Goths to rebel in 377. It is not known why Jerome or his source chooses to single out Maximus while Ammianus singles out Lupicinus.<sup>45</sup> The revolt does date to 377, so Jerome has at last straightened out his chronology, probably just because he knew that the rebellion took place the year before Adrianople.

20. **Jer. 249<sup>a</sup>:** Superatis in congressione Romanis Gothi fundantur in Thracia. (377)

No parallels (other than the account in Ammianus 31.5.9).

The ablative absolute phrase is probably a reference to the defeat of Lupicinus by the Goths, nine miles from Marcianopolis, though there were many other lesser Roman defeats in 377.

21.<sup>46</sup> **Jer. 249<sup>c</sup>:** Lacrimabile bellum in Thracia. In quo deserente equitum praesidio Romanae legiones a Gothis cinctae usque ad internecionem caesae sunt. Ipse imperator Valens, cum sagitta saucius fugeret et ob dolorem nimium saepe equo

41. *PLRE* 1:903–4. There has been considerable speculation regarding Theodosius' death, but if Jerome's date is incorrect, as it almost certainly is, much of that speculation is worthless.

42. Matthews 1989, 211, 382, p. 511, n. 14, p. 519, n. 38.

43. See Helm 1927, 303.

44. *PLRE* 1:539, s.v. "Mallobaudes," and 615–16, s.v. "Nannienus."

45. *PLRE* 1:519–20, s.v. "Lupicinus," and 585, s.v. "Maximus" 24.

46. See Helm 1927, 303.



laberetur, ad cuiusdam villulae casam deportatus est. Quo persequentibus barbaris et incensa domo sepultura quoque caruit. (378)

*Epit.* 46.2: Hic Valens cum Gothis lacrimabili bello commisso sagittis saucius in casa deportatur vilissima; ubi supervenientibus Gothis ignique supposito incendio concrematus est.

*Amm. Marc.* 31.13.12, 14–17 reports the same story: sagitta . . . saucius; ad agrestem casam relatum; flamma supposita; Illud . . . certum est nec Scipioni nec Valenti sepulturam . . . contigisse.

Again we are faced with the possibility of the *Epitome*'s having copied Jerome. Ammianus agrees with Jerome that Valens had been wounded with a single arrow, but his *flamma supposita* seems linked to the *Epitome*'s *igni supposito*, even in its grammatical form. In addition, both Jerome and Ammianus comment on Valens' lack of a grave. *Lacrimabilis* appears once in Eutropius, applied to civil war (6.19.1), and the *Epitome* uses it to describe Constantius' luck in foreign wars (see no. 1 above).

In summary, these are the parallels that Jerome exhibits with the relevant works (not including his recension of the *Descriptio*) listed in order of importance, as well as (following the slash) other works that share parallels of their own:

1. Constantius' battles: Jer. = Eutr. + Festus + unknown / Eutr. = Festus
- i. Constantius' fortunes in war: Eutr. = Amm. = *Epit.*
- ii. battle of Strasbourg: Jer. = Eutr. / *Epit.* = Eutr. + unknown
2. Constantius' death: Jer. = Eutr.
3. Aemilianus: unknown
- 4a. Julian's death: Jer. = Festus + Eutr. + unknown / *Epit.* = Jerome + Eunapius
- iii. Julian's Persian war: Eutr. = Festus / Eutr. = Festus = *Epit.*
- 4b. Jovian's accession: Jer. = unknown
5. Jovian's peace: Jer. = Festus + Eutr.
- iv. Eutr. = Festus = Amm. / Amm. = Eutr.
- 6a. Jovian's death: Jer. = Eutr. / *Epit.* = Eutr. / Amm. = Eutr.
- 6b. Valentinian's accession, rank, origin: Jer. = unknown
- v. Gratian: Amm. = *Epit.* ≠ Eunapius
7. Valentinian and Aurelian: Jer. = Amm. = *HA*
8. Procopius: Jer. = unknown / *Epit.* = Jer.
- 9, 10. Jer. = unknown
11. presbyter: Jer. = unknown / Amm. = Jerome + unknown
- 12, 13, 14, 15. Jer. = unknown
16. Valentinian's death: Jer. = *KG* (= Eutr., *Epit.*, *HA*) + unknown / *Epit.* = Jer. + *KG* + Eunapius
17. death of Theodosius: Jer. = unknown
18. Alamanni: Jer. = unknown / *Epit.* = Jer.
- 19, 20. Jer. = unknown
21. Adrianople: Jer. = unknown / Amm. = Jerome + Eunapius / *Epit.* = Jer. + Eunapius + unknown

The analysis of these comparisons can be made under seven separate points. First of all, we must keep in mind the conditions under which Jerome was working on the *Canones*. He says himself he dictated it *velocissime* (2.20).

The close correlation between the wording and content of his entries and those of his sources (where they or witnesses to them survive) shows that he did not recite his texts from memory, but read them from previously composed notes. Just from a practical standpoint, this would have been necessary, since Jerome added and altered around five hundred entries. Most additions are very infrequent for the early part of the chronicle, averaging only one entry per page, but they pick up quite considerably from 106 B.C.E., where the average jumps to over five per page in the first ten pages. From about 285 C.E. he added even more entries per page than before and, of course, from 325 everything is his. And Jerome needed to keep track of not only the wording for each entry but also the correct chronology, which had to be translated from the consuls and years A.U.C. used by his sources to regnal years, years of Abraham, and/or olympiads. These five hundred entries must have been selected and written beforehand on separate sheets of papyrus or wax tablets with numbers keyed to the appropriate spots in the Greek text, ready to be dictated at the appropriate moment.

It is important to realize that in the midst of all this effort of reading, chronological calculation, copying, sorting, and dictating, Jerome was interested solely in filling out Eusebius' patchy Roman history with the minimum of effort and bother. He was no academic historian; he just needed a collection of facts, any facts, and he needed them in an easily discoverable and concise form.<sup>47</sup> This is why, when his sources are considered, there is so much stress on the minimum number of sources (the standard guideline of Occam's razor counts for much as well). The task that Jerome had set for himself was complicated enough without the added effort of reading and comparing the accounts of the same event in multiple sources—Eusebius, the *Descriptio*, Eutropius, Victor, Festus, and other unknown works—and then combining their distinct versions into a three- or four-line hybrid. He would have been faced with the potential of doing this for almost 370 imperial entries! And to what purpose? There is no reason for him to have mixed and matched and compared each entry, striving for the most complete or accurate account in the smallest amount of space. The source he had, the *Latina historia* (see n. 4 above), alone was just about sufficient for the task at hand, which was filling up the blank spaces in Eusebius and bringing it up to date, and he had no interest in enormously multiplying his effort for no good reason. His other major secular sources, the *Descriptio* and the *Continuatio Antiochiensis*, provided him with events, locations, and particularly chronologies that his *Latina historia* lacked.

Where we can see how Jerome has combined entries in earlier sections of his work, we do not normally see a minute interweaving of the texts of two or more sources. Usually he just drops a place or name from one source into another, or follows a section of one with a section of another. There is only one instance before 357 where Jerome can be shown to have interwoven more than two sources: entry 228<sup>d</sup>, where he has combined Eusebius, the

47. He may even have been working to a deadline, hoping to finish the work before the Council of Constantinople in May of 381 in order to influence the outcome of the choice between Paulinus and Meletius.

*KG*, and the *Descriptio*. Entry 226<sup>c</sup>, a detailed interweaving of Eusebius and the *KG* on the rebellion of Achilles, is so surprising because its complexity is so unusual. These two unusual entries should not be taken as a paradigm for the rest of the work.<sup>48</sup>

Second, there is general scholarly agreement that there was a common source between Jerome and Ammianus for the comparison between Valentinian and Aurelian. It also seems most probable that the author of the *HA* was aware of this source as well.

Third, the parallels among the above-listed works between 357 and 364 are no different from the parallels that exist before 357 with respect to type, pattern, or distribution. Jerome still seems to be using Eutropius on its own or to be combining Festus and Eutropius; he still exhibits additional facts that do not appear in either Eutropius or Festus; the *Epitome* appears to be copying Jerome or Eutropius; and histories other than Jerome exhibit verbal parallels amongst themselves, in particular the *Epitome* and Ammianus (where the agreements cannot be explained by the common use of Eunapius) and Eutropius and Festus (who wrote their histories at the same time from the same commonly available sources<sup>49</sup>). This was exactly the same pattern of parallels that appeared in my 1995 paper, a pattern that indicated the use of a common source, the *KG*. In addition, the parallels set out in i–v above show the same types of parallels that we see with Jerome among Eutropius, Festus, the *Epitome*, and Ammianus, authors that we know used the *KG* before 357. Indeed, without Aurelius Victor there is absolutely nothing that would indicate that the *KG* concluded before 364.

Fourth, in four cases (parallels no. i, ii, iii, and 6a) the *Epitome* appears to be following Eutropius; in five cases (nos. 4a, 8, 16, 18, and 21) it appears to be following Jerome. It would make some sense if the author of the *Epitome* had followed Eutropius until it concluded (at no. 6a) and then Jerome, but no. 4a is clearly closer to Festus and Jerome than Eutropius. It is possible that the author of the *Epitome* used Eutropius,<sup>50</sup> but since it is generally agreed that he used the *KG* there was hardly any need for Eutropius. It is unlikely that a pagan like the author of the *Epitome* would have sought out and consulted Jerome's *Canones* for just these five short entries, but given the obvious parallels and the lack of any other obvious source, Schlumberger was forced to posit Jerome as a direct or indirect source for some of them.<sup>51</sup> More conclusive, however, is the entry in the *Epitome* concerning Firmus, the only historical event provided for Valentinian and Valens that has not been mentioned above. It is written exactly like the other historical entries that parallel Jerome and Eutropius—*Firmus apud Mauritaniam regnum invadens exstinguitur*—yet it does not appear in either. Must yet another source be postulated?

48. See Burgess 1999, 91–98, for an analysis of how Jerome combined his sources with Eusebius between 284 and 325, esp. 92, for entry 226<sup>c</sup>, and 94, for 228<sup>d</sup>.

49. For the fact that Eutropius and Festus wrote their histories at the same time (possible since Eutropius was not *magister memoriae* at the time), see Burgess 2001.

50. Barnes 1976, 262–63 and 264–65.

51. Schlumberger 1974, p. 218, n. 46, p. 220, n. 54; see also pp. 158 and 201, n. 86. In Burgess 1995a, p. 355, n. 32, certain that the *KG* ended in 357, I overconfidently proclaimed the common source to be a recension of the *Descriptio*.

Fifth, the dichotomy between Constantius' civil war success and foreign war failure in no. 1, the back reference to Aurelian's cruelty in no. 7, and the reference to apoplexy in no. 16 are related to the earlier narrative of the *KG*. In addition, it strikes one as odd that in no. 7 Jerome refers to character traits that he did not mention in his earlier account. The same is true in no. 16, where earlier Jerome did not copy out the full description of apoplexy when describing the death of Verus. This suggests that it was Jerome's source that made the back references to the *KG*, not Jerome himself.

Sixth, the material that does not relate to imperial deaths and accessions (which dates Jerome found in his recension of the *Descriptio*) is not well dated. Jerome's dates can be late as well as early, sometimes by several years. This indicates a narrative source, not consularia (or another chronicle), and probably an epitome, not a classicizing history, since Jerome was in a hurry and would not have had the time to peruse and summarize a normal history for the brief notes that he was making.

Seventh, Jerome's secular entries, excluding his imperial notices, for the most part concentrate on the Balkans and the Rhine-Danube frontier of the Western empire: parallel no. 3, above, Durostorum (on the Danube in Moesia Inferior); 9, Rome; 10, Britain; 11, Sirmium; 12, Pannonia; 13, Deuso (Diessen?, upper Rhine); 14, on the Rhine; 15, Pannonia; 17, Carthage; 18, Argentaria in Gaul (west of the Rhine and south of Strasbourg); 19, the Rhine and Thrace; 20, Thrace near Marcianopolis; 21, Adrianople. There is nothing from the empire east of Thrace or south of the Rhine, apart from Carthage and Maximinus in Rome, which, of all the events that took place in Rome between 357 and 378, is a strange choice. One suspects that it was included as a prelude to something else that Jerome did not choose to include, perhaps Maximinus' later reign of cruelty as praetorian prefect of Gaul. Certainly Maximinus can be linked in one way or another to nos. 9, 10, 11,<sup>52</sup> 12, 15, and perhaps 17. This consistent focus strongly indicates that Jerome derived all the above entries from a single source. None of this material relates in any way to people or places that Jerome himself had known or visited in the 370s or 380s when he was in Aquileia, Antioch, Chalcis, and Constantinople, so these entries certainly have not been added from his own knowledge. The complaint about Probus in no. 12 and the belief that the Sarmatian invasions of Pannonia were to blame for the postconsulate of 375 in no. 15 certainly arise from a local inhabitant, not someone in Gaul, Italy, Constantinople, or the East, who would never have associated an invasion in the Balkans with the lack of consuls.<sup>53</sup>

I must here present a useful digression. The chapter headings in Ammianus, which are agreed to be the work of a later editor and not Ammianus himself, on occasion present verbal parallels with Eutropius, Jerome, and the *Epitome*, and include information found in Eutropius and Jerome that

52. For his connection to this passage (Octavian and the presbyter), see Amm. Marc. 29.3.1–4.

53. This invasion as an explanation for the postconsulate is accepted by some modern scholars (see *CLRE* p. 285), but it is hardly credible, since the consuls for 375 would have been designated on 1 July 374, when Valentinian was involved in routine campaigning (Amm. Marc. 30.3.1–3) and Valens was in Antioch (Barnes 1998, 253). The cause of the lack of consuls that year is therefore unknown.

does not appear in Ammianus. Why anyone should have looked outside the text of Ammianus for summaries of Ammianus is unknown, but the fact of these additions remains. There are twelve examples between 355 and 375 that I have set out here. Some are less diagnostic than others, but I present them all:

22. Amm. Marc. heading 15.5: Silvanus . . . XXVIII imperii die . . . opprimitur (cf. 15.5.1: eventu celeri).  
 Aur. Vict. 42.16: Silvanus . . . octavum circa ac vicesimum diem trucidatus est.  
 Eutr. 10.13: Silvanus . . . ante diem tricesimum extinctus est.  
 Jer. 239<sup>d</sup>: Silvanus XXVIII die extinctus est.  
 Epit. 42.10: Silvanus . . . die imperii vicesimo octavo perimitur.
23. Amm. Marc. heading 16.2: apud Argentoratum (cf. 16.12.1: prope urbem Argentoratum, 70: Ab Argentorato cum pugnaretur . . . disparatus, 17.1.1: post Argentoratensem pugnam)  
 Eutr. 10.14.1: apud Argentoratum  
 Jer. 240<sup>e</sup>: apud Argentoratum
24. Amm. Marc. heading 24.2: Imperator castellis et oppidis aliis intentatis, aliis, quae deserta erant, incensis Pirisaborum in deditionem accipit succeditque (cf. 24.2.1: castra, munimentum, castra; 3: civitas, oppidum; 6: vicus; 7: civitates; 9: civitas; 21: pace foederata).  
 Eutr. 10.16.1: [Iulianus] aliquot oppida et castella Persarum in deditionem accepit vel vi expugnavit.
25. Amm. Marc. heading 25.3: dum . . . temere se proeliis inserit (cf. 25.3.4: sine respectu periculi sui; 5: principe volitante inter prima discrimina proeliorum; 6: cum Iulianus cavendi immemor . . . audenter effunderet semet in pugnam).  
 Eutr. 10.16.2: dum se inconsultius proeliis inserit.
26. Amm. Marc. heading 25.5: primicerius domesticorum protectorum (cf. 25.5.4: domesticorum ordinis primus; 8: adhuc protectorem adscitum)  
 Jer. 243<sup>b</sup>: ex primicerio domesticorum
27. Amm. Marc. heading 25.7: Iovianus Augustus pacem cum Sapore necessariam sed turpissimam facit.<sup>54</sup>  
 Eutr. 10.17.1: Iovianus . . . pacem cum Sapore, necessariam quidem, sed ignobilem, fecit.
28. Amm. Marc. heading 26.1: scholae secundae scutariorum tribuno (cf. 26.1.5: agens scholam scutariorum secundam)  
 Jer. 243<sup>c</sup>: tribunus scutariorum
29. Amm. Marc. heading 26.2: Valentinianus . . . augustus appellatus (cf. 26.2.3: augustus nuncupatus)  
 Jer. 243<sup>c</sup>: Valentinianus . . . augustus appellatus.
30. Amm. Marc. heading 26.4: Valentinianus Valentem fratrem suum . . . apud Constantinopolim . . . consortem imperii constituit (cf. 26.4.3: augustum pronuntiavit . . . et . . . in eodem vehiculo secum reduxit participem quidem legitimum potestatis).  
 Jer. 243<sup>e</sup>: Valentinianus . . . fratrem Valentem Constantinopoli in communionem regni adsumit.
31. Amm. Marc. heading 26.10: multi Procopianarum partium  
 Jer. 244<sup>d</sup>: plurimi Procopiae partis

54. This heading is particularly interesting since as far as Ammianus was concerned the treaty was not necessary and could have been avoided (25.7.7–11).

32. Amm. Marc. heading 28.5: Saxones in Gallia . . . a Romanis insidiis circumventi (cf. 28.5.1: Saxonum multitudo et Oceani difficultatibus permeatis, Romanum limitem gradu petebat intento; 30.7.8: maritimas tractus).  
Jer. 246<sup>b</sup>: Saxones caesi Deusone in regione Francorum.
33. Amm. Marc. heading 30.6: dum legatis Quadorum populares suos purgantibus respondet, [Valentinianus] iratus ictu sanguinis exstinguitur (cf. 30.6.3, 6: ad haec [the excuses of the “Quadorum legati”] imperator ira vehementi percussus et inter exordia respondendi tumidior increpabat . . . nationem omnem. . . tamquam ictus e caelo vitalique via voceque simul obstructa, suffectus igneo lumine cernebatur et repente cohibito sanguine, letali sudore perfusus . . . ad conclave ductus est intimum. . . animam diu colluctatam efflavit).  
Jer. 247<sup>b</sup>: Valentinianus subita sanguinis eruptione . . . moritur.  
*Epit.* 45.8: [Valentinianus] legationi Quadorum respondens . . . impetu sanguinis voce amissa, sensu integer expiravit.

While it is true that the parallel between Ammianus heading 25.3 and Eutropius (no. 25) seems to clash with the parallel between Jerome and Festus—no. 4a, *cum* . . . *inconsultius a suorum erraret agminibus* and *cum incautius per agmen erraret*—Eutropius and Jerome are referring to different actions, described as such by Ammianus, and the original would have included both *dum inconsultius se proeliis inserit* and *cum a suorum erraret agminibus*, Eutropius and the headings writer choosing the first clause, Jerome and Festus, the second. On this interpretation Festus would have combined the two to produce his *cum incautius per agmen erraret*. Although it is possible that the headings writer and the author of the *Epitome* summarized their sources (Ammianus and Eunapius, respectively) in a similar way in no. 33, *exstinguitur* appears twice in this same part of the *Epitome* (45.7, 46.4), and *ictu sanguinis* derives not from Ammianus (where it is a participle from *icere*), Jerome, or the *Epitome*, but from the description of the death of Lucius Verus found originally in the *KG*, whence Eutropius and the *Epitome* (Eutr. 8.10.3: *subito sanguine ictus* and *Epit.* 16.5: *ictu sanguinis*; no. 16, above). I noted above how strange it was that Jerome chose to return to this passage of the *KG*; it is stranger still that the headings writer should do so as well.

Two conclusions are possible. First, the headings writer, in addition to Ammianus, used Eutropius, Jerome, and perhaps the *Epitome* to produce his headings. It seems strange, to say the least, that he would have used any supplementary source at all, and his use of two or three is seriously stretching credibility. Second, the headings writer used a common source that lay behind Eutropius, Jerome, and the *Epitome*. This would seem the most logical solution in an illogical situation.

Just as there are two explanations for the parallel passages in the chapter headings to Ammianus, so there are two explanations for the parallels among the other sources. The first is that Eutropius, Festus, Jerome, Ammianus, the author of the *HA*, and the author of the *Epitome* all used each other's works and other unknown works to complete their own histories: Eutropius used Festus and an unknown source, or Festus used Eutropius and an unknown

source; Jerome used Eutropius, Festus, and an unknown source; Ammianus used Eutropius, Jerome, and an unknown source or sources of which at least one was the same as that used by Jerome; the author of the *Epitome* used Eunapius, Eutropius, Jerome, and an unknown source; and the chapter headings author used Eutropius, Jerome, and perhaps the *Epitome* along with Ammianus. This interpretation is complicated by the following: Eutropius and Festus were writing at the same time, Jerome wrote quickly and the above method contradicts the way he worked in the rest of the *Canones*, it is unlikely that Ammianus or the author of the *Epitome* would have used a Christian chronicle as a source, and it is unlikely that the headings writer would have used two or three sources to supplement Ammianus.

The other possibility is that these authors are all witnesses to a single common source. It must be stressed again that since exactly the same pattern, type, and distribution of parallels is indicative of the use of a common source before 357, it must be similarly indicative after 357 as well.

Finally, at least one of the unknown sources, or the single common source, must be related to the *KG* since three passages—nos. i, 7, and 16, above—depend upon accounts found in the *KG*.

The simplest solution to account for all the above observations is that a common source was used by all seven authors (including the author of Ammianus' chapter headings) and that source was the *KG*. This solution is simple only up to a point, however. Eutropius and Festus concluded their histories over the winter of 369–70 and could not have used a work that concluded in 378. Again there are two possibilities.

The first is that Eutropius, Festus, and the author of the 378 continuation of the *KG* independently used the same source for the 357 to 364 material, whatever that was. This is not impossible, though the identification of this source is difficult to imagine, since it was clearly not a classicizing source, but an epitome, and epitomes covering but seven or eight years do not, and indeed cannot, exist.

The second possibility arises from this observation and from the nature of the *KG*. The *KG* was obviously very popular. It lies behind Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Festus, Jerome, Ammianus, the *Historia Augusta*, the *Epitome*, the chapter headings to Ammianus, and Polemius Silvius. Although it was an epitome, it was an early epitome, and it was much longer than epitomes produced in the second half of the fourth century. Eutropius' shorter, more compact version had edged the *KG* out of its preeminent position by the fifth century. Eutropius' history was later continued and expanded by Paul the Deacon, whose work was later continued and expanded again by Landolfus Sagax in the *Historia miscella*. The result is that Eutropius survives in many manuscripts, of which twenty-four were used in the most recent Teubner edition by Carlo Santini, while the *KG* survives in none.

It could be that in some cases, instead of completely reworking the *KG* to make it their own, as Victor, Eutropius, and Festus did, some would-be historians were satisfied with simply modifying and updating it. Eutropius, consularia like the *Descriptio*, and later Christian chronicles went through exactly this process of recopying and continuation, so a precedent exists for

this type of treatment. Since the surviving fourth-century epitomes were based on the *KG*, it is not unreasonable to assume that others that do not survive used it as well. In fact, the *KG* itself as we understand it could already have been the result of such augmentation. As a result there may have been a number of differing versions of the *KG* in circulation, concluding in different years (even before 357), some even, perhaps, circulating under different names, as lazy senators and civil servants eager for promotion tried to pass another's work off as their own. And if this is the case, then the text of the *KG* could vary slightly from recension to recension as well, further muddying the waters for modern scholars. If true, this would mean that Eusebius Nanneticus, whom I posited as a possible author of the *KG*,<sup>55</sup> could be nothing more than a later continuator or reworker of the *KG* material, not the original author.

A further digression must now intrude. The fact that the parallels among Eutropius, Festus, and Jerome continue well past the end of Aurelius Victor throws into doubt the date of 357 for the conclusion of the *KG*, since it was the parallels with the account of the battle of Strasbourg in Jerome, Eutropius, and the *Epitome* in particular that pinpointed that date (no. ii above), both for me and for Harry Bird in his earlier formulation of the hypothesis.<sup>56</sup> But the parallels between Eutropius and the *Epitome* in that same passage continue into 358, indicating that the passage as a whole was written after 358 (see note 20).

The latest event in Victor that shows any certain sign of deriving from a common source is the description of Julian's capture of Chnodomarius at Strasbourg in 357: *rex nobilissimus captus* (Eutr. 10.14.1), *captus rex nobilis* (*Epit.* 42.14), and *captis famosis regibus* (Aur. Vict. 42.17), where Victor's plural results from his knowledge of the capture of Vadomarius in the spring of 361. *Nobilis* and *famosus* are synonyms and the change is exactly what one would expect from Victor. The problem is that Victor's account of Julian's successes in Gaul is severely truncated, thus obscuring any sense of where his version of the *KG* actually ended.

It seems to me that the accounts of Julian's campaigns in Gaul to 358 form a single unit in Eutropius and the *Epitome*; there is no obvious "splice" between 357 and 358. After the mention of the restoration of the frontier in 358 (*finibus suis Romanum imperium restitutum*), Eutropius says *neque multo post* and jumps to Julian's promotion to augustus in 360 (10.15.1). After stating *redditus limes Romanae possessionis*, the *Epitome* says *ac postmodum* and jumps to the capture of Vadomarius in 361 (42.14). Julian's promotion follows. Victor combined the two kings of 357 and 361, and omitted Julian's illegitimate promotion. If it is the case that these two passages are a unity and therefore part of the earlier recension of the *KG* and not the later one of 364 (this is far from certain, but I am inclined to accept it), then the

55. Burgess 1993b, 495–500. See also Green 1999.

56. For all parallels, see Bird 1973 and Burgess 1995b, 120–22, nos. 7–10, and 127, no. 6.



*KG* that was used by Victor was completed in late 358 or early 359, rather than 357, and it closed with Julian's restoration of the Gallic frontier in the autumn of 358 on a suitably triumphant note.

And finally, having considered the conclusion (or rather conclusions) of the *KG*, we must now consider its beginning. Both Jerome and Eutropius used the *KG*. They also shared a common source for the Roman Republic.<sup>57</sup> As noted above (n. 4), Jerome had a source that he referred to as a *Latina historia*, which I, following Enmann and Helm, believe was a single unified history of Rome from its earliest origins, of which the *KG* was only the imperial section. We think of the *KG* only in terms of an imperial history because its modern discovery grew out of comparisons of the imperial biographies presented by Eutropius, Festus, Victor, the *Epitome*, and the *Historia Augusta*. Its name has insured that we continue to think of it that way. But Helm's 1927 study demonstrated the essential unity of the common source shared by Eutropius and Jerome. I would argue, therefore, with Enmann and Helm, that what we call the *KG* is in fact merely the imperial section of a comprehensive history of Rome from its origins (thus going back even further than Eutropius) to the time of its latest writers, the sort of narrative that later scribes tried to create when they linked the *Origo gentis Romanae*, the *De viris illustribus*, and Victor's *Liber de caesaribus* in the same manuscript.

If we apply the rules and procedures established for identifying the *KG* up to 358 to the material after 358, we are forced to posit three different known recensions of the *KG*: one concluding in 358, used by Victor in 361; one concluding in 364, used by Eutropius and Festus in 369/70; and one concluding in 378, used by Jerome, Ammianus, the *HA*, the *Epitome*, the author of the chapter headings in Ammianus, and (one assumes, though it cannot be determined) Polemius Silvius. This is not a conclusion I adopt lightly. It is awkward, to say the least. But the alternative is an improbable and contradictory mess. And as I noted above, one must follow the sources wherever they lead. No one was looking for the *KG* after the conclusion of Victor, myself included, so no one found it. It is as simple as that.<sup>58</sup>

*University of Ottawa*

57. For the first two parts of this source, see the careful analysis in Helm 1927: 138–55, 158–66, 268–77, especially the examples on pp. 154 (death of Caesar), 162 (Gallic sack), 164 (Lucullus), 268–77 (all), where Jerome mirrors sources other than Eutropius in his wording, facts, or details. This Latin history probably also provided some if not all of the material that is chiefly paralleled from Cassius Dio (156<sup>d,k</sup>, 157<sup>d,f</sup>, 158<sup>c,f,g,h</sup>). This seems certain for 157<sup>d,f</sup>, and probable for those on p. 156, but the exact verbal parallel with Dio 48.34.5 suggests that at least one of the entries on p. 158 may derive originally from Eusebius and is just missing from the Armenian translation for some reason. On the other hand, Dio also used Livy (Millar 1964, 34, 84), so it may just be Livy showing through in both places. On this, see also Puccioni (1956, 195–98), who, however, presents a much wider range of sources than I accept, chiefly Livy (directly, not through an epitome), Florus, and Eutropius.

58. Enmann (1884, 443–60) believed in a continuation of the *KG* (but only because he dated the *HA* to the early fourth century).

I would like to thank the two anonymous referees for advice and assistance.

## LITERATURE CITED

- BA. Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, ed. R. J. A. Talbert (Princeton, N.J., and Oxford, 2000).
- CLRE. Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, ed. R. S. Bagnall et al. (Atlanta, 1987).
- PLRE. The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, ed. J. R. Martindale, vol. 2. (Cambridge, 1980).
- Barnes, T. D. 1976. The *Epitome de Caesaribus* and Its Sources. *CP* 71:258–68. Later published as paper 13 in *Early Christianity and the Roman Empire* (London, 1984).
- . 1998. *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality*. Ithaca, N.Y., and London.
- . 2004. The *Historia Augusta*, Nicomachus Flavianus, and Peter the Patrician. Review of *Histoire Auguste*, vol. 5, part 2, by François Paschoud. *CR* 54:120–24.
- Bird, H. W. 1973. Further Observations on the Dating of Enmann's *Kaisergeschichte*. *CQ* 23:375–77.
- . 1984. *Sextus Aurelius Victor: A Historiographical Study*. ARCA, 14. Liverpool.
- . 1993. The “*Breviarium ab Urbe Condita*” of Eutropius. *Translated Texts for Historians*, 14. Liverpool.
- . 1994. “*Liber de Caesaribus*” of Sextus Aurelius Victor. *Translated Texts for Historians*, 17. Liverpool.
- Birley, A. R. 2003. The *Historia Augusta* and Pagan Historiography. In *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, ed. G. Marasco, 127–49. Leiden and Boston.
- Bowersock, G. W. 1978. *Julian the Apostate*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Burgess, R. W. 1993a. The “*Chronicle*” of Hydatius and the “*Consularia Constantinopolitana*.” Oxford.
- . 1993b. *Principes cum Tyrannis*: Two Studies on the *Kaisergeschichte* and Its Tradition. *CQ*, n.s., 43:491–500.
- . 1995a. Jerome and the *Kaisergeschichte*. *Historia* 43:349–69.
- . 1995b. On the Date of the *Kaisergeschichte*. *CP* 90:111–28.
- . 1999. *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*. *Historia Einzelschrift*, 135. Stuttgart.
- . 2001. Eutropius v.c. *Magister Memoriae*? *CP* 96:76–81.
- . 2002. Jerome Explained: An Introduction to His *Chronicle* and a Guide to Its Use. *Ancient History Bulletin* 15:1–29.
- Donalson, M. D. 1996. *A Translation of Jerome's “Chronicon” with Historical Commentary*. Lewiston, N.Y., Queenston, Canada, and Lampeter, Wales.
- Enmann, A. 1884. *Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser und das Buch “De viris illustribus urbis Romae”*: *Quellenstudien*. *Philologus Supplementband* 4, Heft 3, 335–501. Leipzig.
- Fotheringham, J. K. 1923. *Eusebii Pamphili “Chronici canones”: Latine vertit, adauxit, ad sua tempora produxit S. Eusebius Hieronymus*. London.
- Green, R. P. H. 1999. Ausonius' *Fasti* and *Caesares* Revisited. *CQ*, n.s. 49:573–78.
- Helm, R. 1927. Hieronymus und Eutrop. *RhM* 76:138–70 and 254–306.
- . 1956. Die “*Chronik*” des Hieronymus (*Hieronymi “Chronicon”*)<sup>2</sup>. *Eusebius Werke*, 7; Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, 47. Berlin (the 3d ed. [1984] is an unchanged reprint of the 2d, with added bibliography).
- Jeanjean, B., and B. Lançon. 2004. *Saint Jérôme, “Chronique”: Continuation de la “Chronique” d'Eusèbe années 326-378*. Rennes.
- Lenski, N. 2002. *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.* Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.

- Liebeschuetz, W. 2003. Pagan Historiography and the Decline of the Empire. In *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, ed. G. Marasco, 177–218. Leiden and Boston.
- Mango, C., and R. Scott. 1997. *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284–813*. Oxford.
- Matthews, J. 1989. *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*. London and Baltimore.
- Millar, F. 1964. *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford.
- Mommsen, T. 1850. Über die Quellen der “Chronik” des Hieronymus. *Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 2:669–93. Later published in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 7 (Berlin, 1909), 606–32.
- Potter, D. S. 1999. *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian*. London and New York.
- Puccioni, G. 1956. Il problema delle fonti storiche di S. Gerolamo. *Annali della scuola normale superiore di Pisa, classe di lettere e filosofia*, 2d ser., 25:191–212.
- Ratti, S. 1997a. Jérôme et Nicomaque Flavien: Sur les sources de la *Chronique* pour les années 357–64. *Historia* 46:479–508.
- . 1997b. La lecture chrétienne du *Bréviaire* d’Eutrope (9.2–5) par Jérôme et Orose. *Latomus* 56:264–78.
- . 1999. La *Chronique* de Jérôme: *Opus tumultuarium*? *Latomus* 58:861–71.
- . 2001. Les sources de la *Chronique* de Jérôme pour les années 357–64: Nouveaux éléments. In *L’historiographie de l’Église des premiers siècles*, ed. Bernard Pouderon and Yves-Marie Duval, 425–50. Paris.
- Reynolds, L. D., ed. 1983. *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford.
- Sabbah, G. 2003. Ammianus Marcellinus. In *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, ed. G. Marasco, 43–84. Leiden and Boston.
- Schlumberger, J. 1974. *Die “Epitome de Caesaribus”*: Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. Munich.
- Schöne, A. 1900. *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus*. Berlin.
- Schwartz, J. 1980. À propos d’une notice de la chronologie de Jérôme. In *Bonner Historia-Augusta Colloquium 1977–1978*, ed. J. Straub, 225–32. Antiquitas, Reihe 4, Beiträge zur Historia-Augusta-Forschung, 14. Bonn.
- Stolte, B. H. 1957. Deusone in regione Francorum. *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 70:76–86.
- Watson, A. 1999. *Aurelian and the Third Century*. London and New York.
- Whitby, Michael, and Mary Whitby. 1989. *Chronicon Paschale, 284–628 A.D.* Translated Texts for Historians, 7. Liverpool.