

early stage, perhaps already in Apuleius' own time and in his entourage.<sup>17</sup> Could it be that his present complaint did not so much discourage as stimulate his excerptors?<sup>18</sup>

University of Nijmegen

VINCENT HUNINK

v.hunink@let.kun.nl

<sup>17</sup> However, the traditional division of the *Florida* into four books, as made in the MSS, remains a problem here. The awkward demarcation between books 1 and 2 after *Fl.* 9.14, in the middle of a coherent speech, would seem to point to editorial activities by others than Apuleius himself.

<sup>18</sup> I thank Dr H. C. Teitler and Dr S. J. Harrison, who kindly commented upon earlier versions of this notice. Of course they are not responsible for any of my arguments and contentions.

### THE *EPITOME DE CAESARIBUS* AND THE *CHRONICLE* OF MARCELLINUS

The anonymous *Epitome de Caesaribus* closes with an obituary notice on the Emperor Theodosius I, who died in Milan on 17 January 395.<sup>1</sup> The final sentence describes the transportation of his body to Constantinople for burial: *corpus eius eodem anno Constantinopolim translatum atque sepultum est*. The facts are correct. Theodosius's body was indeed laid to rest in Constantinople, to be precise in the Church of the Holy Apostles on 8 November 395, as reported by three later chronicles (Marcellinus, the *Chronicon Paschale* and the *Chronicon Edessenum*), the *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates, and a thirteenth-century list of the tombs and obits of the Byzantine emperors.<sup>2</sup>

What has not been noticed (it seems) is that the entry in Marcellinus's *Chronicle* is, with two minor variants (*adlatum* for *translatum* and the omission of the *est*),<sup>3</sup> identical to the final sentence of the *Epitome*: *corpus eius eodem anno Constantinopolim adlatum atque sepultum*.<sup>4</sup> There are three possible explanations: (1) mere coincidence; (2) Marcellinus drew on the *Epitome*; or (3) the final sentence of the *Epitome* is interpolated from Marcellinus.

(1) Coincidence can hardly be ruled out, but, simple as the sentence is, it was not inevitable that it should be expressed in precisely these words in this order. While *corpus* and *sepultum* may have been unavoidable, the same cannot be said of *eius* and *atque*, not to mention *eodem anno* (below). (2) Marcellinus used very few sources, most of them earlier chronicles.<sup>5</sup> Why would a chronicler bother with a work that gave no exact dates and only overlapped with his own chronicle for 16 years? In any case, the fact that there is a similar entry in both the closely related *Chronicon Paschale* and the much earlier Socrates, who regularly consulted a chronicle for dated information of

<sup>1</sup> The standard edition is by F. Pichlmayr (Teubner, 1911; corr. R. Gruendel, 1961). The fullest modern study is J. Schlumberger, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus: Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jhdts n. Chr.* (Munich, 1974), 245; see too T. D. Barnes, *CP* 71 (1976), 258–68 and P. L. Schmidt, *RE Suppl.* 15 (1978), 1671–6.

<sup>2</sup> P. Grierson, 'The Tombs and Obits of the Byzantine Emperors', *DOP* 16 (1962), 42–3. The Greek original of this list may be a lost chapter from Constantine Porphyrogenitus's *De Caerimoniis*, of which fragments can be recovered from a palimpsest manuscript in Istanbul: C. Mango and I. Sevckenko, 'Additional Note', *ibid.* 61–3.

<sup>3</sup> On which see below n. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Marcellinus s.a. 395.2 (Mommsen, *Chron. Min.* 2 [1894], 64).

<sup>5</sup> Listed in Brian Croke, *The Chronicle of Marcellinus: a Translation and Commentary* (Sydney, 1995), xxii–xxv.

this sort,<sup>6</sup> strongly suggests that Marcellinus's entry was simply copied from his main chronicle source.

There is one detail, I believe, that supports the hypothesis of interpolation: *eodem anno* fits the context in Marcellinus much better than the *Epitome*. It is one of the standard formulas with which chroniclers mark off successive events listed under the same year. In Marcellinus himself, for example, in addition to the entry in question (*s.a.* 395.2), we find *eodem anno* introducing subsequent events under three other years (*Is. a.* 382.2; 447.3; 547.6). Marcellinus also uses a number of slightly different formulas for the same purpose: *eodem tempore* (384.2), *per idem tempus* (389.2), *hoc anno* (499.2), *ipso . . . anno* (536.11), *hoc tempore* (439.3; 452.2). In the *Chronica Constantinopolitana* the stock formula is *ipso anno* (where *ipse* = *idem*, as often in late Latin), found sixteen times between the years 351 and 388.<sup>7</sup> It is one of the clearest proofs that Socrates drew directly on a chronicle that, when recording Theodosius's burial in Constantinople, he dates it 'in the same consulship' (τῇ αὐτῇ ὑπατείᾳ).<sup>8</sup> This too is a stock chronicler's formula (nineteen times between 395 and 467 in the *Chronicon Paschale*).<sup>9</sup>

The author of the *Epitome* regularly gives the exact duration of emperors' reigns (*X imperavit Y annos Z mensibus*), but never consular dates. It is clear that there was no chronicle or consular list among his sources. So if the final sentence is authentic, its *eodem anno* must be explained otherwise. It would most naturally be read as emphatic, 'in the very same year'. But why emphasize this point? Theodosius died on 17 January. Is it likely that his son and successor Honorius would wait nearly twelve months until the following year before dispatching the body to its final resting-place? The decision was surely made the moment the emperor died. The funeral cortège was on the point of leaving for Constantinople when Ambrose pronounced his funeral oration in Milan on 25 February (*De Ob. Theod.* 54–6). It might be added that nowhere else in the *Epitome* is there any reference to the burial of an emperor, not surprisingly in a work of such limited scope and brief compass.

How and why might such an interpolation come to be made? Here it is necessary to appreciate that the various late-antique historical epitomes (notably Eutropius and the *Epitome*) and chronicles (notably Jerome and Marcellinus) were regularly excerpted and recombined into new narratives by later historians and chroniclers. The earliest and most relevant example is the *Romana* of Jordanes, a summary history of the world from Adam to A.D. 551, consisting almost entirely of verbatim excerpts from surviving works.<sup>10</sup> Jordanes's main source up to the point his book gave out in 378 was the *Chronicle* of Jerome. He then turned to Marcellinus, but for some reason added a few items from the *Epitome* for the years 379–95 (*Rom.* 315–18). The last two sentences in 318 were identified by Mommsen as the last two sentences of the *Epitome*. If this is right, then as early as 551 Jordanes's copy of the *Epitome* ended with its current final

<sup>6</sup> Roger S. Bagnall, Alan Cameron, Seth R. Schwartz, and K. A. Worp, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (Atlanta, 1987), 89; R. W. Burgess, *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana* (Oxford, 1993), 197.

<sup>7</sup> Burgess (n. 6), 237–42. For *ipse* = *idem*, E. Loufstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Uppsala, 1911), 65–6.

<sup>8</sup> *HE* 6.1.3, having already cited the consuls of the year at the beginning of the chapter (*ibid.* 1.1), naturally from the same chronicle source.

<sup>9</sup> Alternating with ἐπὶ τούτων τῶν ὑπάτων, found thirty-four times in the same work over the same period.

<sup>10</sup> For a list and discussion of these sources, see T. Mommsen, *Jordanis Romana et Getica* (Berlin, 1882), xxiii–xxix.

sentence. Yet this sentence appears in Jordanes in the form in which it is transmitted in Marcellinus, with *adlatum* for *translatum* and no *est*. Furthermore, the next sentence in Jordanes is the immediately following sentence in Marcellinus. Indeed, virtually the whole of the rest of the *Romana* is an abridged selection of excerpts from Marcellinus.<sup>11</sup> In the circumstances it is surely preferable to draw the line between *Epitome* and Marcellinus one sentence earlier. If this is right, then the probability is that Jordanes's text of the *Epitome* lacked its current final sentence. With both texts open on his table in front of him, Jordanes turned from *Epitome* to Marcellinus for his sentence about Theodosius's burial.

A later example of both genre and method is Paul the Deacon's *Historia Romana*. Paul's history is in fact nothing more than an expansion and continuation of Eutropius's *Breviarium*, compiled some time between 761 and 774.<sup>12</sup> The *Epitome* was one of the sources he used, at this point copying the last four lines of its final chapter verbatim, this time in the *Epitome* form with *translatum* and *est*. Paul, it seems, had the final chapter of the *Epitome* in its present form, as in all surviving manuscripts. But we also have another witness, the *Historia Miscella* of Landolfus Sagax, an expansion and continuation of Paul's *Historia Romana* dating from the beginning of the eleventh century. One of the sources Landolfus used extensively was the *Epitome*, from which he added passages omitted by Paul, evidently drawing on an early and superior manuscript.<sup>13</sup>

Interestingly enough, after copying out most of the last page of the *Epitome* for his obituary of Theodosius, Landolfus did *not* include the final sentence. Nor did he turn to Marcellinus, a source apparently unknown to him. Instead he substituted the following: *igitur vi id. novembrii mensis eodem anno corpus Theodosii delatum est cum sollemni honore Constantinopolim et ab Archadio filio sepulture contraditur*.<sup>14</sup> This is the sentence of Socrates quoted above, as translated in the *Historia Tripartita* of Cassiodorus's disciple Epiphanius.<sup>15</sup> This work is a compilation from the overlapping ecclesiastical histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. It may just be that Landolfus preferred the additional detail supplied by the *Historia Tripartita*. But the more likely explanation is that his text of the *Epitome* lacked its current final sentence. We may compare an earlier passage in which he combined the same two sources for the death and burial of Constantine. In *HM* 11.16 (p. 328 Droysen = i. 281 Crivellucci), after copying several lines from the *Epitome*, Landolfus turned again to the *Historia Tripartita* (3.12) for the circumstances of Constantine's burial. The implication is that the *Epitome* lacked such information in both cases.

Clearly some medieval readers wanted a fuller account of Roman history than the laconic chroniclers and epitomes provided. So historians read more than one and added details from one to another.<sup>16</sup> In such a context it is hardly surprising that one

<sup>11</sup> Jordanes's sources are clearly indicated by the marginal notes in Mommsen's edition.

<sup>12</sup> *HR* 12.8 (A. Crivellucci, *Pauli Diaconi Historia Romana* 1 [Rome, 1914], 167.18–19).

<sup>13</sup> A. Crivellucci, *Landolfi Sagaxis Historia Romana* 1 (Rome, 1912), xxv; cf. Pichlmayr (n. 1), xx. The sources from which Paul and Landolfus drew can in fact be more clearly grasped from the marginal notes in H. Droysen's text of both in his wide-ranging edition of Eutropius, *Eutropii Breviarium cum versionibus et continuationibus* (Berlin, 1879).

<sup>14</sup> *HM* 13.18, p. 344. 1–5 Crivellucci.

<sup>15</sup> Cassiodorus–Epiphanius, *Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita* ed. W. Jacob and R. Hanslik (Vienna, 1952), 10.1 (translating ὑπάρχει as *anno*).

<sup>16</sup> To cite another example, in one family of manuscripts of the anonymous *De Viris Illustribus* some medieval reader inserted a series of interpolations from Eutropius. But he took them, not from an original text of Eutropius, but from the version cannibalized in the *Historia Miscella* of

early reader of the *Epitome*, dissatisfied with the writer's failure to make clear that Theodosius was not buried where he died in Milan, copied Marcellinus's entry into his text.<sup>17</sup> Since this was the very end of the work, he may well have written it in the space beneath the text instead of in the margin, thus encouraging the next copyist to identify it as part of the *Epitome*.

If this is what happened, it may have a minor consequence for the date of the *Epitome*. It has always been assumed that the work was completed not long after 395.<sup>18</sup> Hitherto the burial in Constantinople (8 November 395) has seemed the latest datable event mentioned.<sup>19</sup> But if the final sentence is interpolated, Theodosius's death on 17 January becomes the latest event. It is a work involving little research, based on only a handful of sources. Taking into consideration the fulsome panegyric of Theodosius that fills two out of its forty pages, nothing remains in the text itself to date it later than (say) mid-395.

Columbia University, New York

ALAN CAMERON  
adc1@columbia.edu

Landolfus, as shown by A. Momigliano, *Secondo Contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Rome, 1960), 152–4.

<sup>17</sup> As for the one variant (*adlatum/translatum*), Marcellinus's *adlatum* is the natural perspective of a chronicler writing in Constantinople; *translatum* is that of a westerner, perhaps a deliberate change once the interpolation had been incorporated into the text of the *Epitome*.

<sup>18</sup> H. Peter, *Die geschichtliche Literatur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius I* 1 (Leipzig, 1897), 156, n. 1; R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford, 1971), 102; Schlumberger (n. 1), 245.

<sup>19</sup> So Barnes (n. 1), 266.