



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Brian Croke Theodor Mommsen and the Later Roman Empire

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **20 • 1990**

Seite / Page **159–190**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1133/5500> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1990-20-p159-190-v5500.1

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

BRIAN CROKE

Theodor Mommsen and the Later Roman Empire*

Towards the end of his long and productive life THEODOR MOMMSEN (1817–1903) confessed to some of his closest academic friends that if he could be granted another lifetime he would devote it entirely to the field of late antiquity: to the period from Diocletian to Justinian he told the British scholar Sir WILLIAM RAMSAY (1851–1939);¹ to the transformation from the ancient to the medieval world he told Monsignor LOUIS DUCHESNE (1843–1922).² Had it been possible to offer MOMMSEN a fresh start we can be fairly confident that late Roman studies, including much of what now falls under the rubric of 'Byzantine studies',³ would be in a far more advanced condition than they are at present. Fantasy aside, it is worth recalling what MOMMSEN actually did manage to contribute to late Roman studies in the course of a single lifetime. For instance, it is to him or his influence that we owe those magnificent editions of the codes of Justinian (1877) and Theodosius (1905), not to mention the Digest (1872) and the Novels of Justinian (1904). Then there are the thirteen volumes comprising the single most important modern collection of sources for late antiquity – the

* I am grateful to Professor E. A. JUDGE (Macquarie University, Sydney) for igniting and helping to sustain my interest in MOMMSEN; Professor WILLIAM M. CALDER III (University of Illinois) not only for helpful advice but also timely encouragement; both GERALDINE HERBERT-BROWN (Oxford) and Professor ALEXANDER DEMANDT (Berlin) for research assistance, and the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek/DDR (Berlin) for the use of letters to MOMMSEN from HAVERFIELD, PELHAM, RAMSAY and DUCHESNE.

The following abbreviations are used throughout:

CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (1863–)
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (1866–)
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller (1897–)
MOMMSEN/JAHN	TH. MOMMSEN/O. JAHN, Briefwechsel 1842–1868, ed. L. WICKERT (Frankfurt a. M. 1952)
MOMMSEN/WILA-MOWITZ	MommSEN und Wilamowitz; Briefwechsel 1872–1903, ed. F. and D. HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN (Berlin 1935)
MGH.AA	Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores Antiquissimi (1877–1898)

¹ Pauline and other Studies in Early Christian History (London 1906), 393.

² Diary of L. von PASTOR, 20 March 1902, in: W. WÜHR (ed.), L. von Pastor, Tagebücher – Briefe – Erinnerungen (Heidelberg 1950), 385.

³ Explained more fully in B. CROKE, Mommsen and Byzantium, *Philologus* 115, 1985, 274–285.

Auctores Antiquissimi section (1877–1898) of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* which MOMMSEN planned and brought to completion, contributing no less than five volumes himself. Normally any one of these accomplishments would have secured for its editor a lasting reputation. Together they epitomise the method and discipline of German philology in its golden era.

Massive and fundamental as MOMMSEN's contribution to late Roman studies was it has largely been ignored in research, even the extensive recent research, on the scholar and his impact.⁴ Most disappointing of all is that this facet of MOMMSEN's work was completely overlooked by WICKERT in his monumental four-volume biography.⁵ The following study therefore sets out to rectify a significant omission by outlining and analysing what MOMMSEN said needed to be done in the study of the late Roman empire, what he encouraged others to take on and what he himself produced. The resultant picture helps make sense of MOMMSEN's agenda for reincarnation. It should also facilitate understanding and appreciation of his lectures on the later Roman empire which are soon to be published.⁶ Above all, this study provides a contribution to the history of historical scholarship by demonstrating that organisation, energy, and the methods of scholarly communication and congress play an influential role in shaping the direction and nature of a subject. What Germany had to teach other nations in the later nineteenth century was not merely the methodology of historical research but also the importance of its structure and organisation. MOMMSEN's involvement in late Roman studies exemplifies what a commitment to scholarship as a planned co-operative enterprise could achieve.

I. Mommsen's Approach to Late Roman Studies

There has always been a tendency to concentrate on MOMMSEN as a historian of the Roman republic, notwithstanding his extensive and basic research on the imperial period. At the same time his involvement in later Roman history in particular is of-

⁴ To my mind the best short introduction to MOMMSEN's work remains G. P. GOOCH, *Mommsen and Roman Studies*, in: *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*² (London 1953), 459–477; plus K. CHRIST, *Von Gibbon zu Rostovtzeff* (Darmstadt 1972), 84–118. See also A. WÜCHER, *Theodor Mommsen. Geschichtsschreibung und Politik* (Göttingen 1956), and A. HEUSS, *Theodor Mommsen und das 19. Jahrhundert* (Kiel 1956).

⁵ L. WICKERT, *Theodor Mommsen. Eine Biographie* (Frankfurt a. M.) vols. 1 (1959), 2 (1964), 3 (1969) and 4 (1980) with the critical observation of K. CHRIST, *Theodor Mommsen und sein Biograph*, *HZ* 223, 1981, 386.

⁶ By C. H. BECK, Munich. The lectures are the spectacular find of A. DEMANDT for which see his: *Mommsens ungeschriebene Kaisergeschichte*, *Berliner Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch* 1983, 147–161, and: *Die Hensel-Nachschriften zu Mommsens Kaiserzeit-Vorlesung*, *Gymnasium* 93, 1986, 497–519; also W. M. CALDER III, *Mommsen's History of the Empire*, *Classical World* 76, 1982/3, 295–296.

ten regarded as a new preoccupation of the ageing scholar.⁷ Both these tendencies are deceptive because MOMMSEN could claim, perhaps more than anyone else in his day, to have mastered the whole span of Roman history from the foundation of the city to its demise. Not only that, his grasp of the totality of Roman history is evident from his earliest research and he continued until his death to work on all periods and problems simultaneously. For exemplification, it will suffice to point out that (1) studies of Diocletian's Edict on Maximum Prices appeared in 1851 and 1890; and (2) the *Römisches Strafrecht* and both the edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* and the final volume of the *Chronica Minora* appeared in successive years (1898/1899), just as his groundbreaking studies of both Oscan dialects and the *Chronographer of 354* had appeared side-by-side almost half a century before, in fact some years before the *Römische Geschichte* (1854–1861). Furthermore, it must be remembered that although MOMMSEN did not resume his *Römische Geschichte* beyond the time of Julius Caesar until 1886 he continued to lecture at the University of Berlin on the Roman empire up to the fifth century.

One of the essential features of MOMMSEN's approach to the imperial period was his appreciation of the unity and continuity of Roman history.⁸ Indeed it was part of his genius that from the earliest he saw the field of Roman history as transcending academic boundaries. What he practised from the outset (and preached from time to time) was that History, Law and Philology (in the broad German sense of the word) were complementary and integral fields of research.⁹ So to be an historian one needed to be solidly grounded not so much in history as in law and languages; for the Roman historian therefore – Greek, Latin and Roman law.¹⁰ From his days as a student of law at Kiel (1838–42) MOMMSEN saw that

⁷ E.g. K. CHRIST, *Römische Geschichte und deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft* (Munich 1982), 68–69.

⁸ V. EHRENBURG, Theodor Mommsens Kolleg über römische Kaisergeschichte, in: K. STROHEKER-A. GRAHAM (eds.), *Polis und Imperium* (Zürich/Stuttgart 1965), 618. Surviving notes and transcripts of MOMMSEN's Berlin lectures on the empire are set out by EHRENBURG, to which should now be added the version of the Winter semester 1863/4 lectures by ETTORE DE RUGGIERO (for which: S. MAZZARINO, *Antico, Tardoantico ed era costantiniana* vol. 1 [Rome 1974], 23f. and vol. 2 [Rome 1980], 167 ff.), the version of the Winter Semester 1868/9 lectures summarised by ULRICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF (for which: W. M. CALDER III–R. SCHLESIER, *Wilamowitz on Mommsen's Kaisergeschichte*, *Quaderni di storia* 21, 1985, 161–163); plus the forthcoming lectures (n. 6).

⁹ Antrittsrede (8 July 1858), in: *Monatsberichte der kgl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* 1858 = *Reden und Aufsätze*, ed. O. HIRSCHFELD (Berlin 1905), 36; *Römisches Strafrecht* (Berlin 1899), vii–viii; WÜCHER (n. 4), 34; WICKERT (n. 5), 1959, 166–172; 1964, 198–199, and: *Drei Vorträge über Theodor Mommsen* (Frankfurt a. M. 1970), 37–39; HEUSS (n. 4), 33–56, 99–127, and especially his: *Niebuhr and Mommsen, Antike und Abendland* 14, 1968, 1–18.

¹⁰ Rede bei Antritt des Rektorates (15 October 1874), in: *Reden und Aufsätze*, 3–16. MOMMSEN's views so outraged many historians that he felt obliged to suppress this speech, hence the difficulty in locating a copy for his *Reden und Aufsätze* (see editor's note, page 3, and U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Erinnerungen 1848–1914*² [Leipzig 1929], 175).

the primary task of the historian of the Roman world was to gather and study the literary texts in editions based on the latest critical methods, at the same time as systematically collecting and analysing all the known inscriptions and coins. Even then he had in mind several of the projects that only came to fruition decades later: the *Römisches Staatsrecht* (1871–88), the editions of the Digest (1872) and other legal collections as well as the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (1863–) which was planned under the tutelage of his teacher OTTO JAHN (1813–1869).¹¹ A corollary of this wide-ranging view of the sources for Roman history was MOMMSEN's breadth of vision when it came to establishing the chronological and geographical parameters of Roman studies. By focussing on law he could see the underlying continuity of Roman history, even if he did overschematise it at times. He simply took for granted that a student of the Roman world should not hesitate to concern himself with the ongoing Eastern (Byzantine) world and with the barbarian kingdoms of the west, for in terms of law and administration they were essentially Roman.¹² There is no better evidence of the implications of this perspective than his *«Ostgotische Studien»* (1889).¹³

Despite the underlying continuity, MOMMSEN perceived a rupture in form during the reign of Diocletian (A. D. 284–305). The so-called *«dyarchy»*, the joint government of emperor and senate which MOMMSEN saw originating with Augustus, gave way to the absolute supremacy of the emperor. This *«Dominate»* began under Diocletian. In terms of public law its structures and processes differed considerably from the principate.¹⁴ Although he saw collections of sources such as the CIL as embracing the period right up to the sixth century, in works of detailed and systematic analysis the periods before and after Diocletian needed separate treatment. Consequently, works such as the *Staatsrecht* and *Die Provinzen* (or vol. 5 of the *Römische Geschichte*, 1885) did not incorporate material beyond Diocletian. So too, when it came to his lectures at Berlin MOMMSEN ended one set and began another with the reign of Diocletian. In fact there were three series of lectures he used to give on the Roman Empire: (1) the period up to Vespasian; (2) from Vespasian to Diocletian; and (3) from Diocletian to Honorius.

¹¹ WICKERT (n. 5), 1964, 107; 1969, 655 (letter to GUSTAV FREYTAG, 13 March 1877).

¹² *Römisches Strafrecht*, vii; Rede zur Feier des Geburtstages des Kaisers, 19 March 1885, in: Sb. kgl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. (1885) = *Reden und Aufsätze*, 141; *Das theodosische Gesetzbuch*, ZRG 21, 1900, 149 = *Ges. Schr.* 2, 371; E. SCHWARTZ, Rede auf Theodor Mommsen (1904), *Nachrichten kgl. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, 1904 = SCHWARTZ, *Ges. Schr.* 5 (Berlin 1938), 292; O. HIRSCHFELD, Theodor Mommsen, *Abh. kgl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* (1904), 1044 = *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin 1913), 949.

¹³ *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 14, 1889, 225–249, 453–544; 15, 1890, 180–6 = *Ges. Schr.* 3, 362–484.

¹⁴ J. BLEICKEN, *Verfassungs- und Sozialgeschichte des Römischen Kaiserreiches*² (Paderborn/Munich/Vienna/Zürich 1981), 254, 258, 261; M. GELZER, *Altertumswissenschaft und Spätantike*, HZ 135, 1927, 177 = *Kleine Schriften* 2, 1963, 391 and W. KUNKEL, *MommSEN als Jurist*, *Chiron* 14, 1984, 374–375.

The forthcoming publication of MOMMSEN's lectures on the period from Diocletian to Honorius will give us greater insight into his mature understanding of the later Roman empire, and will enable us to form a clearer idea of the way in which his views influenced those of his students, such as OTTO SEECK (1850–1921) and LUDO HARTMANN (1865–1924). It is interesting, for example, to see how highly MOMMSEN regarded Diocletian and Constantius II as the instrumental figures in shaping the structure and character of the late Roman state, as well as his high opinion of the workings of the government apparatus in general. It is interesting too to note how he handled a field of history long since dominated even in the German states by a single great work – the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* of EDWARD GIBBON (1737–1794).¹⁵ MOMMSEN knew GIBBON's work intimately and fully appreciated it. Even in 1886 he could describe the *Decline and Fall* to his students as «still the most significant work which has been written about Roman history».¹⁶ Eight years later, on the occasion of the centenary of GIBBON's death, a special exhibition of his books, papers and other relics was staged at the British Museum in London, and in conjunction with the exhibition a public celebration was held on Thursday 16 November 1894 to which all the leading scholars were invited. Although too old and too busy to make the trip to London, MOMMSEN's response to the invitation (in which he explained his critical admiration for GIBBON) was read out because MOMMSEN was regarded as the most distinguished of all the invited guests.¹⁷ Yet his attitude to GIBBON was ambiguous. On the one hand, he admired the range of GIBBON's work, his style and his interpretation of the course of events; on the other hand, however, he was deeply conscious of GIBBON's philological limitations, especially as judged by modern standards, and advised against overrating GIBBON in that respect.¹⁸

This probably explains why GIBBON is never used by MOMMSEN in his published research. As indicated in the preface to his *Provinzen* if a new history of the Roman empire is to be written it will have to be «carried out in the large spirit and with the comprehensive glance of Gibbon, but with a more accurate understanding of details».¹⁹ The details lacking in GIBBON could be found in the works of S. LE NAIN DE TILLEMONT (1637–98) on whom GIBBON depended for so many

¹⁵ J. BERNAYS, *Edward Gibbons Geschichtswerk*, in: *Ges. Abh.*, ed. H. USENER, 2 (1885), 206–254; J. IRMSCHER, *Edward Gibbon und das deutsche Byzanzbild*, *Klio* 43/5, 1965, 537–559.

¹⁶ DEMANDT (n. 6), 157.

¹⁷ F. HARRISON, *An Address delivered on the Occasion of the Gibbon Centenary Commemoration*, *TRHS* n. s. 9, 1895, 34 with further details in *Royal Historical Society; Proceedings of the Gibbon Commemoration 1794–1894* (London 1895). MOMMSEN's tribute was read by HENRY PELHAM (1846–1907) who had invited him. For documentation see B. CROKE, *MommSEN on Gibbon*, *Quaderni di storia* (forthcoming).

¹⁸ L. HARTMANN, *Theodor Mommsen* (Gotha 1908), 148, and G. W. BOWERSOCK, *Gibbon's Historical Imagination*, *American Scholar* 57, 1988, 46–47.

¹⁹ *Das Weltreich der Caesaren* (Vienna 1933), 11.

points of chronology and philology, so it is TILLEMONT rather than GIBBON who inhabits MOMMSEN's footnotes. Not being blinded by GIBBON, therefore, MOMMSEN could foresee the enormous philological challenge presented by the inadequately edited and studied sources for later Roman history. «The dark transition between antiquity and modern history must be illustrated from both sides», according to him, «and science stands before it as engineers before a mountain tunnel».²⁰ When the tunnelling began and progressed rapidly it was usually MOMMSEN who was showing the way. Indeed his special contribution to later Roman history was the preparation of critical editions of texts and the organisation and development of basic research tools at a time when such work was precisely what was required. These are the very aspects of his work explicated in this study.

Immersion in the sources of Roman law at Kiel impressed on the young MOMMSEN the need for modern editions of the Digest and the Codes then available only in uncritical and inadequately annotated versions, except (as GIBBON had emphasised) for the Theodosian Code of J.G. GODEFROY (1587–1652) which, incidentally, may explain why it was the last of the legal collections to which MOMMSEN turned his hand. Yet his command of the late Roman texts was not confined to the legal compilations, nor was it only acquired later in life. Throughout his *Wanderjahre*, mainly in Italy, MOMMSEN deepened his knowledge of the history, law and topography of the Roman world across its vast range including the late Roman period. As early as December 1844 he could be found in the Laurentian library at Florence searching out a manuscript of Ammianus Marcellinus²¹ and not long afterwards he was engaged in detailed analysis of fifth century documents like the *Notitia Dignitatum* and *Laterculus* of Polemius Silvius,²² while contemplating an edition of Aurelius Victor.²³ The subsequently published study of the *Laterculus* demonstrated his familiarity with not only the historians (Zosimus, Eutropius, Aurelius Victor) but also the proceedings of the early church councils,²⁴ while his still important presentation of the *Chronogra-*

²⁰ Die Bewirthschaftung der Kirchengüter unter Papst Gregor I, ZSWG 1 (1893), 44 = Ges. Schr. 3, 177–178.

²¹ Travel Diaries, 23 December 1844, in: G. and B. WALSER (eds.), Theodor Mommsen: Tagebuch der französisch-italienischen Reise 1844/5 (Bern/Frankfurt a. M. 1976), 112.

²² MOMMSEN/JAHN No. 117 (J. to M., 22 February 1853), p. 137; No. 119 (M. to J., 15 March 1853), p. 140; No. 121 (M. to J., 3 April 1853), p. 146. It is difficult to document MOMMSEN's philological researches in Italy. To judge from the MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ correspondence, most of the material for the later Roman empire has been omitted from MOMMSEN's published correspondence with OTTO JAHN as a result of WICKERT's infuriating decision to excise «Fragen und Antworten speziell philologischer Richtung, Berichte über die Kollation von Handschriften und sonstige Bibliotheksarbeiten» (MOMMSEN/JAHN, 367).

²³ Indicated in letters to WILHELM HENZEN (1816–1887) of 17 and 18 October 1849, quoted in: WICKERT (n. 5), 1969, 618–619.

²⁴ Polemii Silvii *Laterculus*, Abh. kgl. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss. 3, 1857, 231–277 = Ges. Schr. 7, 632–667.

pher of 354 showed his command of all the late Roman and Byzantine chronicles.²⁵ Throughout the ensuing years MOMMSEN continued his work of editing and elucidating late Roman documents. His classic analysis of Cassiodorus' chronicle, which remains the most important discussion of the subject, appeared in 1861, articles on the texts of Vegetius and Eutropius were published in 1866 and a whole series of studies on the text of Ammianus Marcellinus emerged in the 1870s and 1880s. So too when new documents were discovered or published MOMMSEN was soon flooding them with light. His commentary on the fragments of John Malalas and John of Antioch contained in the Escorial manuscript of the *de insidiis* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, for instance, remains important.²⁶

Of particular interest, however, is MOMMSEN's approach to the series of imperial biographies known generally as the *Historia Augusta* (HA). In the course of his researches on the Roman empire MOMMSEN had been continually confronted with this enigmatic source. Although cautious in his use of the HA, he had taken every opportunity to propose improvements in the text. Ultimately it was MOMMSEN's pupil HERMANN DESSAU (1856–1931) who made the breakthrough in 1889 while working on another MOMMSEN-inspired project, the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*. In his now celebrated paper on the names in the *Historia Augusta* DESSAU came to the conclusion that the biographies were not written in the late third and early fourth centuries, but by one author at the end of the fourth century. MOMMSEN was not persuaded. In fact he was stimulated to reply to DESSAU by arguing for six authors from the time of Diocletian and Constantine but with an editor in the time of Theodosius I. That, to MOMMSEN, was the explanation for the anachronisms detected by DESSAU. Despite the fact that MOMMSEN was wrong about the HA, he was correct to insist that the most urgent need in order to advance the study of the HA was a reliable critical text, a concordance and a full commentary.²⁷ Yet he never involved himself in any major work on the HA. There was always too much else to be done.

II. Production of the *«Auctores Antiquissimi»* (MGH)

While engaged from the 1850s in preparation of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* MOMMSEN developed his remarkable talent for planning and prosecuting large-scale philological projects. He was especially capable of organising and di-

²⁵ Über den Chronographen vom J. 354, *Abh. kgl. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* 2, 1850, 547–693 (partially reprinted in *Ges. Schr.* 7, 536–579) with appendix, Über die Quellen der Chronik des Hieronymus, 669–693 = *Ges. Schr.* 7, 606–632.

²⁶ Bruchstücke des Johannes von Antiochia und des Johannes Malalas, *Hermes* 6, 1872, 323–383 = *Ges. Schr.* 7, 710–750.

²⁷ Die *Scriptores historiae Augustae*, *Hermes* 25, 1890, 228–92 = *Ges. Schr.* 7, 302–352, with J. BÉRANGER, Mommsen et l'Histoire Auguste, *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium* 1976–78 (Bonn 1980), 17–34.

recting the work of other scholars, of enlisting their contribution to a joint enterprise and of utilising their knowledge and skills in his own work. MOMMSEN was quite happy to collaborate with others when that was the most efficient way forward; indeed he considered it his duty to share his knowledge, ability and will for the achievement of the goal in view and he demanded the same cooperation from his collaborators.²⁸

As far as the inadequate state of the sources for the period of the later Roman empire was concerned, by 1857 he felt bound to point out that for the Byzantine sources at least there was need for modern critical editions which would be of the same quality as those for western medieval works then appearing under the direction of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*.²⁹ The MGH had been established to collect together and publish in critical editions all the literary sources for German history, including sources related to the Franks, Goths and Lombards. Whether MOMMSEN then (late 1850s) had in mind a similar enterprise for the sources of Byzantine history, or for the sources for the Western Roman empire from the fourth to the sixth century, is not clear. At any rate he eventually came to the conclusion that the collection of modern editions of all the important non-theological literary texts for the late Roman period should in fact be part of the MGH itself. With the reorganization of the MGH as an imperial enterprise in 1874/5 MOMMSEN, as secretary of the Berlin Academy, took up a position on its *Zentraldirektion*. At the first general meeting of the *Zentraldirektion* in April 1875 he foreshadowed his plan for a collection of sources covering the period of the transition from Roman to medieval Germany and the following year he laid out the detailed program of texts and editors.³⁰

It is not clear how MOMMSEN managed to persuade the *Zentraldirektion* that sources like the fourth century aristocrat Symmachus, the history of Eutropius and the panegyrics of the African Corippus were documents of vital relevance to German history, except that he dominated and out-schemed his colleagues. He

²⁸ MOMMSEN's organisational talent is discussed more fully in: J. KUCZYNSKI, *Theodor Mommsen: Porträt eines Gesellschaftswissenschaftlers* (Berlin 1978), 263–270, and HARTMANN (n. 18), 82–96; while it is singled out by O. HIRSCHFELD (n. 12), 961, and T. SCHIEDER, *Organisation und Organisationen der Geschichtswissenschaft*, HZ 237, 1983, 265–288. Subsequently scholarship has suffered from the lack of such powerful organizers cf. A. MOMIGLIANO, *Epilogo senza conclusione*, in: *Fondation Hardt. Entretiens* 26, 1980, 316: «La tirannia di un Mommsen non sarebbe superflua oggi», and C. JULLIAN, *Mommsen*, *Rev. Hist.* 84, 1904, 119.

²⁹ *Zur byzantinischen Chronographie*, RhM 11, 1857, 625–626 = *Ges. Schr.* 7, 753–754.

³⁰ F. HIRSCH, *Theodor Mommsen und die Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, *Korrespondenzblatt d. Gesamtver. d. deutschen Geschichts- u. Altertumsver.* 52, 1904, 79–82; HARTMANN (n. 18), 89–92; O. REDLICH, *Mommsen und die Monumenta Germaniae*, *Z. f. d. österr. Gymn.* 67, 1916, 865–875; W. D. FRITZ, *Theodor Mommsen, Ludwig Traube und Karl Strecker als Mitarbeiter der Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, *Das Altertum* 14, 1968, 235–244.

did record, looking back over the project when all the texts were completed a quarter of a century later, the difficulty he had found in drawing the line between what to include and what to exclude.³¹ Certainly Tacitus' Germania and the history of Ammianus were more patently relevant to German history but, as he observed, they were already satisfactorily edited, although approval was later given for an MGH edition of Ammianus which eventually came to nothing.³² He went on to remark, in his 1898 Schlussbericht, that he felt his choice of texts reflected the right balance and he gives the impression that the Zentralkommission virtually left him to his own devices once they had agreed in principle. Perhaps, as we shall see, they did not seriously believe the project would materialize. Anyway he obviously felt free to put the broadest possible interpretation on German history and give greatest weight to the need for proper editions of extant texts. So he felt no uneasiness in justifying the three volumes of the *Chronica Minora* on the ground that it was something that only the resources of the MGH could make possible, irrespective of their relevance to German history. The only obstacle MOMMSEN appears to have encountered was the refusal of the Zentralkommission in 1893 to accept his proposal to include among the *Auctores Antiquissimi* an edition of the third and fourth century panegyrics by KARL BRANDT (Heidelberg).³³

Once the proposed venture was approved MOMMSEN's organisational energy came into play as he pressed on with the task of encouraging and supporting the editors he had chosen, and with the collation of material for the volumes he had reserved for himself (Jordanes and the *Chronica Minora*). By April 1877 he could report that his Jordanes should be ready by the end of the year and that the Eutropius entrusted to HANS DROYSSEN (1851–1918), son of the famous Hellenistic historian J. G. DROYSSEN (1808–1884), was under way. What MOMMSEN had done was concentrate first on the shorter works, those either based on one manuscript or at least with a clearly defined and limited manuscript tradition and he assigned them to experienced editors with reputations long since secured in other fields and well known to himself. KARL HALM (1809–1882) who was the guiding hand behind the Vienna collection of Latin patristic texts (CSEL) and who had launched that series in 1866 in a similar way with his edition of Sulpicius Severus, was given Salvian the first volume to appear in 1877. There followed in 1877 the Eugippius of HERMANN SAUPPE (1809–1893) and in 1879 the second of HALM's commissions, Victor of Vita's history of the Vandal persecution in Africa, plus the Corippus of J. PARTSCH and DROYSSEN's Eutropius which

³¹ Schlussbericht über die Herausgabe der *Auctores Antiquissimi*, Sb. Berl. Akad. 1898, 287–290 = Ges. Schr. 7, 691–694. For MOMMSEN as 'master schemer' of the MGH: D. KNOWLES, *Great Historical Enterprises* (London 1964), 87.

³² H. BRESSLAU, *Geschichte der Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (Munich 1921), 651–652.

³³ BRESSLAU, *ibid.* 535.

included not only the Greek translation of Paeonius but also the continuation of the history by Paul the Deacon and Landolfus.

By July 1879 MOMMSEN was still working on his *Jordanes* and was gathering material for the *chronica*. In Florence he was collating manuscripts of Prosper and Bede and it is evident that he was working on all three volumes at the same time.³⁴ Indeed he was already discussing the contribution of HERMANN USENER (1834–1905) which did not appear until almost twenty years later.³⁵ By the end of the year MOMMSEN was in a position to send half his *Jordanes*, presumably the *Romana*, to the MGH and hoped that this would convince them that he was not just interested in the title of 'Section Leader' but that he did intend to produce the planned volumes.³⁶ The fire which destroyed his library on 12 July 1880 swallowed up many of his notes and some valuable manuscripts he had on loan at a time when libraries used to let manuscripts be borrowed. He was especially embarrassed by the destruction of the *Jordanes* manuscript lent him with special permission by Breslau City Library.³⁷ Since the *Jordanes* was soon ready for publication it looks like his work on the chronicles, including the loss of USENER's contribution,³⁸ suffered most.

One of the problems which MOMMSEN had already encountered was securing the agreement of those scholars whom he particularly wanted to contribute. When Venantius Fortunatus, the sixth century writer, presented a problem MOMMSEN wrote to his new son-in-law ULRICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLEN-DORFF (1848–1931) at Göttingen for advice on a suitable editor. The reply indicated that young FRIEDRICH LEO (1851–1914) was the man for the job, but LEO took a lot of cajoling with WILAMOWITZ acting as intermediary.³⁹ Over eighteen months later LEO was still on the verge of making up his mind when MOMMSEN

³⁴ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 59 (W.-M., 8 July 1879), p. 69–70.

³⁵ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 65 (M.-W., 6 November 1879), p. 76–78, with H. DIETRICH/F. VON HILLER, *Usener und Wilamowitz: ein Briefwechsel 1870–1905* (Leipzig/Berlin 1934), p. 8 (Letters 6 and 7).

³⁶ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 67 (M.-W., 6 December 1879), p. 79–82.

³⁷ WICKERT (n. 5), 1980, 52 ff.: Although grateful for the subsequent help he received (*Jordanes*, LXXIII) not everyone was prepared to forgive MOMMSEN for lost manuscripts (WICKERT [n. 5], 1980, 255).

³⁸ A. MOMIGLIANO, *New Paths of Classicism in the Nineteenth Century* (Middletown 1982), 41. This is very likely in view of USENER's anxiety (see letters 16 and 17 [July 1880] in: DIETRICH/HILLER [n. 35], 15–17) and in view of the fact that MOMMSEN had already arranged USENER's contribution (MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ, No. 65 [M.-W., 6 November 1879], p. 76–78). That the preparation of the *chronica* was set back is indicated in MOMMSEN's later comment that «... wegen der Chroniken will ich auch auf dieser Reise sehen, das Verlorene wieder zu decken, soweit es angeht» (MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 114 [M.-W., 18 February 1882], p. 136).

³⁹ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 16 (W.-M., 15 May 1875) p. 21–22; No. 18 (M.-W., 10 June 1875) p. 23–25; No. 23 (M.-W., 7 January 1877), p. 25; No. 24 (W.-M., 8 January 1877) p. 25–26.

wrote to WILAMOWITZ that the student of Terence and Seneca may well find Venantius an unpleasant chore but such chores can do a man a power of good,⁴⁰ and in a striking letter to LEO himself pointed out the need for a philologist to branch out, citing no less an example than KARL LACHMANN (1793–1851).⁴¹ Of course once LEO set about his task the definitive text of Venantius was brought to completion in no time at all. Indeed on the very night before his wedding LEO received a large batch of proofs with a covering note «By return of post please! Cordial greetings, Mommsen.» We are assured that LEO complied.⁴²

While LEO had been responsible for Venantius' poetry another young scholar BRUNO KRUSCH (1857–1940) was assigned Venantius' prose works, the lives of saints, and thereafter the editing of Merovingian texts became his life's main work. When the Venantius appeared in 1881 MOMMSEN was finishing off the very useful indices to his Jordanes, a task he found understandably time-consuming⁴³ and his unsurpassed edition appeared the following year (1882). KARL SCHENKL (1827–1900) of Vienna had been made responsible for Ausonius, and the works of Avitus of Vienne fell to the Breslau gymnasium teacher and erst-while pupil of MOMMSEN, RUDOLF PEIPER (1834–1898), who had come to master the domain of medieval Latin poetry.⁴⁴ Both editions, with due acknowledgement to MOMMSEN's assistance, appeared in 1883 along with the solid one of the letters and speeches of Symmachus by OTTO SEECK then thirty-two years of age.

Unlike WILAMOWITZ who always found SEECK's work disappointing,⁴⁵ MOMMSEN expressed great confidence in him. Yet he apparently regarded SEECK's grasp of Latin and Greek as very limited although on being presented with the first chunk of his Symmachus did acknowledge that his Latin was «improving»!⁴⁶ The reason for SEECK's relatively limited command of the classics was that his original interests had been in the physical sciences. In fact he had left school at an early

⁴⁰ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 25 (M.-W., 10 January 1877), p. 26. MOMMSEN was always keen to set young scholars to work on a particular project. For other examples see WICKERT (n. 5), 1980, 213 (Letter of H. DESSAU, 1 November 1903), and R. T. RIDLEY, *Ettore Pais*, *Helikon* 15/16, 1975/6, 505 (recollection of PAIS).

⁴¹ Letter quoted in: F. LEO, *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, ed. E. FRAENKEL (Rome 1960) XVII.

⁴² LEO, *ibid.* XVII. LEO married CÉCILE HENSEL, daughter of the SEBASTIAN HENSEL whose transcriptions of MOMMSEN's lectures on the fourth century were discovered by DEMANDT (n. 6). Incidentally, LEO's copy of the proofs is now held in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

⁴³ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 107 (30 November 1881), p. 124–125.

⁴⁴ On PEIPER: L. TRAUBE, *Rudolf Peiper*, *Jb. f. Altertumswiss.*, 1901, 14–27.

⁴⁵ E.g. MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 107 (M.-W., 30 November 1881), p. 124–125; No. 116 (W.-M., 24 February 1882), p. 139: «Seeck war mir durchaus als Träumer erschienen»; No. 229 (W.-M., 29 November 1886), p. 276–277 (highly critical of SEECK's *Odyssey*), cf. the judgement of A. MOMIGLIANO: «that great but erratic scholar Seeck», *Studies in Historiography* (London 1966), 144.

⁴⁶ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 90 (M.-W., 1881) p. 106.

age and had subsequently taught himself sufficiently to gain matriculation in Natural Sciences at Dorpat. He was concentrating on chemistry when, as happened to WILAMOWITZ, he was captivated and inspired by MOMMSEN's *Römische Geschichte*. Thereafter his burning ambition was to do research and to write like MOMMSEN, so he abandoned chemistry and went to Berlin to sit at MOMMSEN's feet. In his new mentor SEECK found something of a kindred spirit. At Dorpat he had quite a reputation – 'der wilde Seeck'; he was a very fast worker, slept little, was fond of carousing, possessed an extensive knowledge of foreign literature (especially Shakespeare) and eventually became an outstanding lecturer. In addition he was a great traveller, a tireless walker and a respected expert on art history.⁴⁷ Under MOMMSEN's tutelage at Berlin the young SEECK made rapid progress and with considerable encouragement and assistance from the maestro eventually produced in 1876 his edition of the *Notitia Dignitatum* which he dedicated to MOMMSEN. It was just at this point that the program for the *Auctores Antiquissimi* was being assembled and so SEECK was set to work on his admirable *Symmachus*.

In the short space of six years (1877–1883), therefore, MOMMSEN brought together more than half of his planned series – *Salvian*, *Eutropius*, *Corippus*, *Ausonius*, *Jordanes*, *Venantius Fortunatus*, *Victor of Vita*, *Avitus* and *Symmachus*. It was a phenomenal rate of progress. The next volume to appear was the *Ennodius* of F. VOGEL in 1885 by which time MOMMSEN himself was continuing to forge ahead with the chronicles. Almost all the volumes that now remained were those he had set himself to do, except for *Claudian* and *Sidonius Apollinaris*. The edition of *Sidonius* would already have appeared but for the untimely death of its editor CHRISTIAN LÜTJOHANN (1846–1884). MOMMSEN himself with the help of other scholars stepped into the breach but the job of finalising the work proved a protracted one and it eventually appeared in 1887.⁴⁸ The final product was a real team effort: MOMMSEN finished the letters (with the help of LEO and WILAMOWITZ), plus the part of the introduction relating to the author, while LEO took the poems (with the assistance of MOMMSEN, FRANZ BÜCHELER [1837–1908] at Bonn and WILAMOWITZ) and the rest of the preface.

Why the *Claudian* (1892) of THEODOR BIRT (1852–1933) took so long, or was started so late, is not apparent. Originally, in 1875, MOMMSEN wrote from Rome to LUDWIG JEEP (1846–1911) at Leipzig inviting him to edit *Claudian*. JEEP had been working on the text of *Claudian* for many years under the guidance of his

⁴⁷ On SEECK and his relations with MOMMSEN: O. SEECK, *Zur Charakteristik Mommsens*, *Deutsche Rundschau* 118, 1904, 75–108; L. RADERMACHER, O. Seeck, *Biog. Jb. f. Altertumskunde* 46, 1926, 50–60; W. WEBER, *Otto Seeck*, *Enc. Soc. Sci.* 13, 1934, 642; CHRIST (n. 7), 69–70.

⁴⁸ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ, Nos. 150–179 (p. 171–192), 192 (p. 239), 193 (p. 241), 218 (p. 267), 226 (p. 274), 250 (p. 320), plus No. 181 a in: J. MALITZ, *Nachlese zum Briefwechsel Mommsen-Wilamowitz*, *Quaderni di storia*, 1983, 138.

mentor FRIEDRICH RITSCHL (1806–1876). However since JEEP had already agreed to do Claudian for the Teubner series (2 vols. 1876 and 1879) he rejected MOMMSEN's offer. But JEEP's edition turned out to be careless and unreliable. With no other obvious candidate available MOMMSEN may have begun to work on Claudian himself. At any rate he seems to have informed himself and by 1885 he was studying Claudian with one of his promising students⁴⁹ and had been arranging for the collation of manuscripts on behalf of the new editor THEODOR BIRT who had also been a pupil of RITSCHL at Leipzig but had now settled at Marburg. Although renowned as an indefatigable worker Claudian took BIRT ten years to complete during which MOMMSEN's advice was extensive and constant.⁵⁰ As for the *Variae* of Cassiodorus, it was originally assigned to W. MEYER (1845–1917) of Speyer, but he gave up in 1886. Motivated by duty rather than sense, MOMMSEN set about completing the *Variae* himself, enlisting the aid of numerous scholars particularly KRUSCH and LUDWIG TRAUBE (1861–1907).⁵¹ Even though it was not published until 1894 the *Variae* was all but complete in 1890 and even then MOMMSEN expected it would already be finished except that he found his advance slowed by Cassiodorus' «gottverfluchtes Latein» which he considered could be paralleled only by «the worst French», presumably meaning the sort of style modern French bureaucracies have made their own.⁵²

As WILAMOWITZ insisted, the three volumes of the *Chronica Minora* deserve to rank alongside the *Staatsrecht* and the *CIL* as an equally masterful and lasting achievement.⁵³ They took the best part of a quarter of a century to complete and MOMMSEN was always busy with them. His earlier editions of the chronicle of Cassiodorus (1861) and the *Chronographer of 354* (1850) had taught him just how complex the editing of such apparently straightforward documents could be. The key to understanding the nature of these annalistic chronicles and to preparing a definitive text was to be found in the realisation that every single manuscript is potentially a unique chronicle in itself; that is to say the very format of the chronicles made them always open to the inclusion of extra notices from some other source and to the omission of genuine original entries – in textual terms they represent uncontrollable «horizontal contamination». To begin with, the chronicles were intended to be practical documents and medieval copyists

⁴⁹ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ, No. 218 (M.-W., 28 November 1885), p. 268. The student in question was G. WENTZEL (1862–1919) who passed from Berlin to Göttingen where he became a notable protégé of WILAMOWITZ (W. M. CALDER III/R. L. FOWLER, *The Preserved Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Eduard Schwartz*, with Introduction and Commentary, SBAW Philos.-hist. Kl. [Munich 1986], Heft 1, 25 n. 87).

⁵⁰ MGH.AA X, CCIII; on BIRT: E. LOMMATZSCH, *Theodor Birt*, *Jb. f. Altertumswiss.* 262, 1938, 29–49.

⁵¹ MGH.AA XII, CLXXIX.

⁵² MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ, No. 286 (M.-W., 25 April 1889), p. 370.

⁵³ WILAMOWITZ (n. 10), 302.

were not averse to inserting portions of one within another, or supplementing them in places. In the case of the chronicles the <stematic> method of textual criticism is almost useless. One cannot avoid the thorough investigation and collation of every single manuscript.

For a man to embark on this sort of work at what we have come to regard as the normal retiring age is exceptional, but MOMMSEN now set out on journeys all over Europe, including two trips to England (1885, 1889) where he had never been before, locating and collating manuscripts of the chronicles. In the period from March to October 1885, for example, he visited Vienna, Rome, Milan, St. Gallen, Brussels, Paris, Leiden, London, Cambridge, Oxford and Cheltenham (where the Phillipp collection then was).⁵⁴ Despite journeys like these, there was no earthly way one man could cover so many manuscripts and extracts which explains why the three chronicle volumes (1892, 1894, 1898) are littered with the names of scholars in many places who collated or checked manuscripts on his behalf. The rather daunting <conspectus codicum> at the end of the third volume (MGH.AA 13) is the best indication of the work involved. Yet MOMMSEN did not stop at providing a definitive text. He also sought to investigate the sources of the different chronicles and the overall particular viewpoint and context of each, bearing in mind that a great number of them are anonymous. Although a good deal of pioneering work was being done in the 1870s and 1880s, notably by the youthful scholars BRUNO KRUSCH and OSWALD HOLDER-EGGER (1851–1911), MOMMSEN's command of the manuscripts and his deep knowledge of the chronological problems involved gave him a superior advantage. Where HOLDER-EGGER (originally a pupil of MOMMSEN) was obsessed with establishing the idea of a late Roman <Ur-Chronik> known as the <Ravenna Annals> MOMMSEN could see that the matter was more complex and variegated, and that chronicle writing in late antiquity was a widespread and spontaneous activity.⁵⁵ It was quite possible, for example, for chroniclers as far apart as Toledo and Constantinople to record an emperor's death independently in much the same terms without needing to resort to a common literary source. His lesson has not always been heeded.

As the editor of the chronicles MOMMSEN possessed a further advantage that needs to be stressed, namely his familiarity with the full range of Byzantine sources for late antiquity. He realized, for instance, that there was a direct textu-

⁵⁴ BRESSLAU (n. 32), 649. One could only admire the astonishing amount of work involved, as did K. J. NEUMANN, Theodor Mommsen, HZ 92, 1904, 231. MOMMSEN himself readily admitted that <haec quoque volumina ut alia a me edita non tam mea opera facta sunt quam mea amicorumque, quorum multi me adiuverunt tam in patria quam in Italia Gallia Anglia degentes> (MGH.AA, XIII. VI).

⁵⁵ E.g. MGH.AA IX, 253, with B. CROKE, *City Chronicles of Late Antiquity*, in: G. CLARKE/B. CROKE/A. EMMETT NOBBS/R. MORTLEY, *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity* (Canberra 1990), 165–203.

al relationship between the seventh century *Chronicon Paschale* and both the chronicle of Marcellinus and the *Fasti Hydatiani*. So alongside the relevant portions of the Latin chroniclers he printed in his edition corresponding sections of the *Chronicon Paschale* in Greek merely to illustrate the textual affinities.⁵⁶ Several scholars have taken these to be part of the original text of the *Fasti Hydatiani* or Marcellinus, not having bothered to read MOMMSEN's introductions. Indeed, while it may not always be necessary to familiarise oneself with the textual introduction to editions of classical historians, the same cannot be said for the chronicles where the text usually only makes sense in the light of the arrangement derived from an analysis of all the manuscripts involved. All this work was certainly tiring for an elderly man increasingly blind in one eye. Uncharacteristically, MOMMSEN complained frequently about the enormity and drudgery of the task but he persevered.⁵⁷ At one stage WILAMOWITZ tried to encourage him to give up or start taking short-cuts, and even argued that the chronicles were not worth all the time and effort his father-in-law was putting into them.⁵⁸ But still MOMMSEN pressed on with what he came to call his «chronische Krankheit».⁵⁹ The first volume appeared in 1892, followed soon after by the *Variae* and the second volume in 1894. The third and final volume did not appear until 1898 for the British documents it contained (Bede, Gildas, Nennius) proved particularly demanding. As with all the chronicles, MOMMSEN was not content with an exhaustive analysis of the manuscripts, he also wanted first-hand knowledge of all the previous editions of the various documents. In his correspondence with WILAMOWITZ, for instance, we can follow his attempts to secure access to the second edition of Gildas' *de excidio Britanniae* which he finally located in Heidelberg.⁶⁰

MOMMSEN's editions of the chronicles will probably never be superseded as a collection. Admittedly a new edition of Hydatius was called for once COURTOIS had unravelled the dating discrepancies in the manuscripts⁶¹ but even then the resultant edition is not at all satisfactory,⁶² while recent research has made neces-

⁵⁶ MGH.AA IX, 205–245; XI 64–90; cf. XIII, v–vi.

⁵⁷ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 316 (W.-M., 29 November 1890), p. 390–391; No. 328 (M.-W., 30 March 1891), p. 406; and WILAMOWITZ (n. 10), 182 (suggesting that MOMMSEN wrote *Die Provinzen* [1885] as a diversion that «gave him pleasure and restored his feelings of unbroken creative power» while absorbed with the laborious chronicle work).

⁵⁸ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 360 (W.-M., 21 January 1892), p. 455–456.

⁵⁹ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 379/380 (M.-W., 16 July 1893), p. 473.

⁶⁰ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 342 (M.-W., undated), p. 422; No. 343 (M.-W., 17 September 1891), p. 425; No. 358 (M.-W., 5 January 1892), p. 453–454.

⁶¹ C. COURTOIS, *Auteurs et Scribes: Remarques sur la chronique d'Hydace, Byzantion* 21, 1951, 23–51.

⁶² A. TRANOY (ed.), *Hydace: Chronique*, 2 vols. (Paris 1974), with E. A. THOMPSON, *Barbarians and Romans* (Madison 1982), 227–229. The necessary new edition is being prepared by R. W. BURGESS, as noted in his: *A New Reading for Hydatius' Chronicle* 177 and the Defeat of the Huns in Italy, *Phoenix* 42, 1988, 357–363.

sary a fresh edition of the so-called Chronicle of 452.⁶³ There have been more recent editions of some of the chronicles (or at least of what MOMMSEN printed under that label), such as the *de excidio* of Gildas (by M. WINTERBOTTOM, 1978) and the Anonymous Valesianus (by J. MOREAU and V. VELKOV, 1968), but it has generally not been necessary. Indeed in one case where a fresh edition was anticipated – that of Bede's Chronicle in the *Corpus Christianorum* series – the editor, C. W. JONES, decided merely to reprint MOMMSEN's version with some minor amendments.⁶⁴ Ultimately, therefore, MOMMSEN could feel that all the time and tedium had been worthwhile.

By 1898 MOMMSEN regarded the *Auctores Antiquissimi* of the MGH as complete. Of the original plan only Merobaudes remained. He and Dracontius, together with Aldhelm, were added in two subsequent volumes; while new manuscript discoveries forced MOMMSEN himself to produce a superior edition of Eugippius (1898) to replace that of SAUPPE. The whole enterprise had been a truly co-operative project. Some straightforward texts could be handled by a single editor while others (e.g. Sidonius, Cassiodorus) required a team working in close collaboration and under MOMMSEN's direction. All in all the thirteen volumes constituted a colossal achievement and stand as a symbol of the heyday of scholarly organisation and productivity in Germany. Furthermore these were the years of rapid growth in the facilities for research – the establishment of specialist seminars and journals. It was also the time of expansion in the numbers of students and teachers in universities and in the level of state financial support for them. Moreover, many of the most able students could be attracted to fields like philology and trained by their prestigious masters in increasingly narrow areas. Scholars were encouraged to engage in systematic research, to work together on large-scale scientific projects, to correspond with each other and to travel – all in the cause of 'Wissenschaft'. The *Auctores Antiquissimi* simply illustrate the confident philological profession of imperial Germany in full swing.⁶⁵ Indeed critics of this new ideology of scientific research could find all its vices summed up in MOMMSEN.⁶⁶

⁶³ M. E. JONES and J. CASEY, *The Gallic Chronicle Restored: A Chronology for the Anglo-Saxon Invasions and the End of Roman Britain*, *Britannia* 19, 1988, 367–398.

⁶⁴ *Bedae Venerabilis Opera* VI.2, C. Ch. 123B (Turnhout 1977).

⁶⁵ C. E. McCLELLAND, *State Society and University in Germany 1700–1914* (Cambridge 1980), K. JARAUSCH, *Students, Society and Politics in Imperial Germany* (Princeton 1982), and P. LUNDGREEN, *Differentiation in German Higher Education*, in: K. JARAUSCH (ed.), *The Transformation of Higher Learning 1860–1930* (Cologne 1982), 149–169 (especially Tables 8, 12 and 14b).

⁶⁶ F. STERN, *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study of the Rise of the Germanic Ideology* (Berkeley 1974), 71–81, 126.

III. Contribution to Patristics Projects

A preoccupation with the emendation and publication of texts was something MOMMSEN shared with his contemporaries who all seemed to recognise that particular task as the fundamental prerequisite for a deeper investigation of the late Roman period, or any period for that matter. At the same time, the new critical standards of philology were being brought to bear increasingly on the study of the New Testament and early church history and literature. Setting the pace were HERMANN USENER at Bonn and then ADOLF VON HARNACK (1851–1930).⁶⁷ MOMMSEN, who had always regarded theology and theologians with disdain was impressed by the new potential for analysing the historical development of Christianity and its dogmas within the context of the history of the Roman empire, a theme ignored in his volume on the provinces (1885) and in his Berlin lectures.⁶⁸ When, therefore, amid great controversy HARNACK was called to Berlin late in 1888 MOMMSEN wasted little time in securing his election to the Academy. That HARNACK was only the second theologian in living memory to join the «Philological-Historical Section» of the Academy (of which MOMMSEN was then secretary) highlights the changing attitude to this kind of work.⁶⁹ He had already demonstrated width of knowledge and his capacity for executing vast and detailed projects, hence MOMMSEN apparently expected increased involvement in new enterprises.⁷⁰ At least that seems to have been the tenor of his welcoming remarks, choosing an analogy especially appreciable in Wilhelmine Berlin, that large-scale scholarship is like heavy industry – it needs considerable planning and co-operative labour, plus a solid financial base.⁷¹ No sooner was HARNACK in-

⁶⁷ Note especially H. USENER, *Philologie und Geschichtswissenschaft* (1882) in: *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Leipzig/Berlin 1907), 1–35.

⁶⁸ MOMMSEN's attitude to Christianity is discussed in: A. VON ZAHN-HARNACK, *Adolf von Harnack* (Berlin 1951), 195–196; WÜCHER (n. 4), 143–144; SCHWARTZ (n. 12), 292, and WICKERT (n. 5), 1980, 180 ff., to which may be added the uncompromisingly Gallic perspective of H. LECLERCQ, *Mommsen*, *DACL* 11: 2 (1934), 1760–1774.

⁶⁹ For the background: VON ZAHN-HARNACK (n. 68), 191 ff. For HARNACK as organiser: R. VIERHAUS, *Adolf von Harnack als wissenschaftlicher Organisator*, *Jahrbuch der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft* 1980, 95–108 (non vidi).

⁷⁰ The «Wahlvorschlag» for HARNACK's election to the Academy states: «... dürfte Harnack ganz als der geeignete Mann erscheinen, um eine umfassende Publikation der griechischen Kirchenväter in die Hand zu nehmen...», quoted in: C. KIRSTEN (ed.), *Die Altertumswissenschaften an der Berliner Akademie 1799–1932, Studien zur Geschichte d. Akad. Wiss. DDR* (Berlin 1985), 106.

⁷¹ Printed in: A. VON HARNACK, *Antrittsrede in der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1890), in: *Ausgewählte Reden und Aufsätze* (Berlin 1951), 8 = MOMMSEN, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 209–210: «... wie der Großstaat und die Großindustrie, so ist die Großwissenschaft, die nicht von Einem geleistet, aber von Einem geleitet wird, ein notwendiges Element unserer Kulturentwicklung, und deren rechte Träger sind die Akademien oder sollten es sein... Die Großwissenschaft braucht Betriebskapital wie die Großindustrie, und wenn dies

stalled in the Academy than he laid before it the proposal, first formulated by MOMMSEN, for a collection of texts of the ante-Nicene Greek church fathers designed to complement the CSEL.⁷² The founder of the CSEL JOHANNES VAHLEN (1830–1911) had been professor of Classical Philology at Berlin since 1874 and would have provided a valuable fount of advice for the plan which was eventually approved in 1891 whereupon its future was secured by a timely bequest. To implement the project the Academy set up what was called the *«Kirchenväterkommission»* consisting originally of HARNACK and MOMMSEN, plus experts in Greek philosophy such as USENER's pupil, HERMANN DIELS (1848–1922) and in church history such as FRIEDRICH LOOFS (1858–1928) as well as OSKAR VON GEBHARDT (1844–1906). To this core later were added WILAMOWITZ and SEECK, in addition to MOMMSEN's protégé the Roman historian OTTO HIRSCHFELD (1843–1922) and the ecclesiastical historians ADOLF JÜLICHER (1857–1938) and KARL HOLL (1866–1926).⁷³

MOMMSEN never really appreciated the philosophical and religious dimension of Roman civilization, as indicated by the fuss over his persistent refusal to read the *Cité Antique* of FUSTEL DE COULANGES (1830–1889). For Christianity he had even less sympathy. It must have appeared odd therefore that such an anti-clerical atheist should become so prominent in a patristics project. The irony did not escape him either. Likening his role to *«Saul among the prophets»* (cf. 1 Sam. 10:11 *«People who had known him before saw him doing this and asked one another, «What has happened to the son of Kish? Has Saul become a prophet?»»*) he explained it on the grounds that it was valuable for the Kommission to have a devil's advocate who knew nothing about such a field.⁷⁴ Despite his reticence MOMMSEN did know a great deal about the area and was able to make an active contribution to the Kommission; indeed among his colleagues he was regarded as *«der Führer»*. More importantly, the collaboration and close friendship with HARNACK which resulted from the Kommission (and which sparked off such envy in WILAMOWITZ) led MOMMSEN to revise his opinion of the church fathers and of theology. He grew to admire HARNACK greatly and to appreciate his concept of an

versagt, so ist die Akademie eben ornamental . . .»; cf: *Der Großbetrieb der Wissenschaft*, in: A. VON HARNACK, *Reden und Aufsätze* 2 (Giessen 1904), 214.

⁷² VAHLEN's position in the Academy should also have helped expedite the establishment of the Kommission. The reasons for undertaking the CSEL, which apply equally to the GCS, can be found in: J. VAHLEN, *Zum Wiener Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, *Sb. Wiener Akad.* 45, 1864, 385–388 = *Gesammelte Philologische Schriften* I (Leipzig/Berlin 1911), 647–651.

⁷³ A. VON HARNACK, *Die Ausgabe der griechischen Kirchenväter der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, *Sb. kgl. Preuss. Akad.*, 1916, 104–112 = *Kleine Schriften zur Alten Kirche* (Leipzig 1980), 348–356; J. IRMSCHER, *Das Corpus der GCS – Historie, Gegenwart, Zukunft* in: J. IRMSCHER/K. TREU (eds.), *Das Corpus der Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller* (Berlin 1977), 1–6; and: *Kommission für spätantike Religionsgeschichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Oikoumene* (Catania 1964), 419–438.

⁷⁴ VON ZAHN-HARNACK (n. 68), 286.

historical/philological approach to Christianity in the Roman empire.⁷⁵ In fact he went so far as to say that had he known HARNACK earlier in his life he would have been able to complete his *Römische Geschichte* because he would have understood Christianity and its role in the Roman world.⁷⁶ MOMMSEN came to depend on HARNACK, «rerum ecclesiasticarum imprimis peritus et adiutor acerrimus studiorum etiam a suis alienorum»,⁷⁷ and HARNACK on MOMMSEN. As indicated by HARNACK, his *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums* (1902) «was read chapter after chapter by Mommsen who communicated his opinions to me by word and letter.⁷⁸ When he finished it he remarked (on 27 October 1902) to me that it contained a serious indictment of Christianity. Christianity first destroyed the empire; then thereby it destroyed nationality – in that sense it is indeed to be understood as the «third race». All the distinctions created by the state and nationality were to be overthrown, and only religious distinctions were now to be valid. It meant the setting up of a theocracy or rather – as Mommsen finally put it – «the Centre [= Catholic] party was founded even at that period.» HARNACK replied by agreeing with this proposition but pointed out that the church in fact «fostered the Hellenizing and Romanizing process, and that the state would have been unable to carry it on in the fourth century had it not been for the church. The church was only responsible to a slight degree, if at all, for the weakness of [the state] during the third century.»⁷⁹ HARNACK's remarkable photographic memory may have helped keep the full range of patristic literature in his head but that did not necessarily make him a good philologist. To compensate he turned frequently to MOMMSEN as evidenced by the use of epigraphic material in the *Mission und Ausbreitung* and by their joint article on *stratopedarches/princeps peregrinorum*.⁸⁰

As long as he felt that his views on Christianity would not be appreciated in

⁷⁵ WICKERT (n. 5), 1980, 195–196. For HARNACK's historical theology: G. W. GLICK, *The Reality of Christianity: A Study of Adolf von Harnack as Historian and Theologian* (New York 1967), 87–111; and for MOMMSEN's erratic relationship with his son-in-law: J. MALITZ, *Theodor Mommsen und Wilamowitz*, in: W. M. CALDER III, *Wilamowitz nach 50 Jahren* (Darmstadt 1983), with the letter from WILAMOWITZ to WERNER JAEGER, December 1917, quoted in: W. M. CALDER III, *The Correspondence of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff with Werner Jaeger*, HSCP 82, 1978, 320–321 = CALDER III (ed.), *Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: Selected Correspondence 1869–1931* (Naples 1983), 184–185.

⁷⁶ SEECK too (n. 47), 106, detected an increasing appreciation of Christianity on the part of MOMMSEN but attributed it to USENER. It looks, therefore, as if by 1888 MOMMSEN was open to the sort of influence HARNACK was able to exert.

⁷⁷ MGH.AA XIII (Chron. Min. III), 424.

⁷⁸ Despite their proximity there was a considerable correspondence between MOMMSEN and HARNACK. In fact there are 93 surviving letters from MOMMSEN to HARNACK (J. HÖNSCHIED/M. SCHWABE, *Kurzgefaßtes Verzeichnis der Korrespondenz Adolf von Harnacks*, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 88, 1977, 294).

⁷⁹ *Mission und Ausbreitung*, in English translation as: *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity* (London 1908) II, 333 n. 1.

⁸⁰ *Zur Apostelgeschichte* 28.16 (*stratopedarches/princeps peregrinorum*), Sb. kgl. Preuss.

Berlin's Protestant circles, MOMMSEN was disinclined to take up his *Römische Geschichte* once again. Yet it was never too late to be planning new ventures based on the co-operative efforts of scholars and made possible only by the sort of resources available to an institution like the Berlin Academy. So it was that in 1900 he submitted to his colleagues on the *Kirchenväterkommission* plans for a continuation of the recently completed *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* down to the end of the sixth century – in effect a *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* to include both secular and ecclesiastical officials. MOMMSEN's idea was carried at the *Kommission's* Christmas 1901 meeting on the support of HARNACK and SEECK. WILAMOWITZ, however, who had been invited to join the *Kommission* in 1897 proved an obstacle. To begin with he regarded the very idea of a late Roman prosopography as premature. Then he thought it was ridiculous to include ecclesiastics in such a work – there would be far too many Johns to cope with for one thing.⁸¹ Still work commenced on the *Prosopography* in the winter of 1901/2 and was soon costing HARNACK a great deal of time and anxiety, while the 84 year-old MOMMSEN was busy excerpting prosopographical notices from the Codes of Theodosius and Justinian plus the histories of Ammianus Marcellinus and Zosimus. Although planned as a single work the project was divided for research purposes into secular and ecclesiastical components. JÜLICHER pushed on with the prosopography of the church officials, and SEECK supervised the secular side. The reading and excerpting of texts was undertaken by a variety of scholars and proceeded steadily with annual progress reports published in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy. As the material accumulated it became evident that a series of *Vorarbeiten* would be both necessary and possible. It was work on the prosopography which gave rise to many biographical entries written by SEECK for the early volumes of the PAULY/WISSOWA *Realencyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, in addition to his *Die Briefe des Libanius zeitlich geordnet* (1904) and the planned imperial and papal *Regesten* up to the time of Justinian (actually to 600).⁸² Only the period to 476 was covered in the one published volume (*Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste*, 1919), but its continuation to Justinian has been taken up in recent years at Ioannina by E. CHRYSOS.

With the death of SEECK in 1921 the secular arm of the prosopography began

Akad. 1895, 491–503 = A. VON HARNACK, *Kleine Schriften zur Alten Kirche* (Leipzig 1980), 234–246.

⁸¹ For details F. WINKELMANN, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani saec. IV, V, VI*, in: J. IRMSCHER (ed.), *Adolf Harnack und der Fortschritt in der Altertumswissenschaft: zu seinem 50. Todestag* (Berlin 1981), 29–34. Note WILAMOWITZ (n. 10), 306, and for the original *Prosopography*: K-P. JOHNE, *100 Jahre Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, *Klio* 56, 1974, 21–27.

⁸² See especially SEECK's letters to HANS LIETZMANN in: K. ALAND (ed.), *Glanz und Niedergang der deutschen Universität: 50 Jahre deutscher Wissenschaftsgeschichte in Briefen an und von Hans Lietzmann (1892–1942)*, (Berlin/New York 1979), 414 and 428.

to wither; JÜLICHER, however, who originally predicted the completed work for 1918 continued with the ecclesiastical component but it too lost momentum when he went blind in 1925 and was discontinued after his death in 1928. Despite the enormous amount of work that had been accomplished by the 1930s, which was bolstered by the donation in 1940 of the prosopographical files of JOHANNES SUNDWALL (b. 1877), in the end «collegial difficulties» (uncooperative contributors), financial and other problems culminating in the war-time destruction of portion of its files and the structural changes in the Academy in 1946 combined to sabotage the prosopography. The idea was reborn under A. H. M. JONES (1904–1970) and JOHN MORRIS at University College, London after the Second World War, was prosecuted at Cambridge and volume 1 (A.D. 276–395) of the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire appeared in 1971, having been able to utilise the substantial remaining files of the original Berlin prosopography. Vol. 2 (395–527) was published in 1980. Vol. 3 is now well advanced and two Byzantine extensions are underway.⁸³ The Christian prosopography, meanwhile, was restarted at Paris by HENRI MARROU (1904–1977) with its first volume, covering North Africa, appearing only in 1982.⁸⁴ Had MOMMSEN lived even longer we would possibly not have had such a lengthy wait for these basic scholarly tools.

The main task of the Kirchenväterkommission, however, was the publication of texts – Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten (drei) Jahrhunderte, GCS for short. There were the usual difficulties of establishing priorities and signing up the right people, that is editors who were as at home in theology and church history as in philology. Sometimes, however, the work was more or less finished and it was merely a matter of steering it in the direction of the GCS. This was what happened for instance with Eusebius' «Life of Constantine» and his speech «In Praise of Constantine» which had been edited by a young Finnish scholar, IVAR HEIKEL (1861–1952). He had shown WILAMOWITZ his Eusebian material on a visit to Göttingen in 1895 and indicated that he was looking for a publisher.⁸⁵ WILAMOWITZ later suggested the GCS as the place for his edition of Eusebius' Constantinian writings,⁸⁶ and wrote accordingly to HAR-

⁸³ Berlin: Bulletin d'information et de coordination. Association internationale des études byzantines 13, 1986, 107; London: Bulletin of British Byzantine Studies 15, 1989, 24–25.

⁸⁴ A. MANDOUZE, Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne 303–533 (Paris 1982), with the review of W. ECK, Gnomon 57, 1985, 719–725.

⁸⁵ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ, No. 401 (W.-M., 1 June 1895), p. 502–504.

⁸⁶ Letter from HEIKEL to WILAMOWITZ, 18 August 1895, in: F. WINKELMANN, Zur Vorgeschichte von I. A. Heikels Edition der Vita Constantini, Eirene 3, 1964, 121; cf. id., Die Textbezeugung der Vita Constantini des Eusebius von Caesarea (Berlin 1962), 5–6, and: id., Ivar August Heikels Korrespondenz mit Hermann Diels, Adolf Harnack und Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Klio 67, 1985, 571.

NACK.⁸⁷ He could therefore claim credit for the inclusion of HEIKEL's work in the GCS.⁸⁸ Indeed, WILAMOWITZ provided valuable help for HEIKEL to eventually complete the publication in 1902 of an edition which had been dogged by ill health: The works of Eusebius were an all-consuming interest for HEIKEL. He had originally (1888) presented an *Habilitationschrift* on the *Praeparatio Evangelica* of Eusebius and had gathered material for an edition. When he discovered that EDUARD SCHWARTZ (1858–1940) a pupil of USENER, WILAMOWITZ and MOMMSEN, had been engaged to edit the *Praeparatio* for GCS he responded by passing his material over to SCHWARTZ.⁸⁹ It is not clear whether MOMMSEN was responsible for SCHWARTZ's taking on the *Praeparatio* but funds were provided by the Kommission to help expedite collation of manuscripts and he set to work.⁹⁰ Unfortunately he moved slowly and HEIKEL, so it would appear, still hankered after this particular assignment. On more than one occasion he wrote to HARNACK volunteering to undertake the work if, as HEIKEL surmised, SCHWARTZ had lost interest and shelved it.⁹¹ At this stage HARNACK was not at all well-disposed to SCHWARTZ and his supporter WILAMOWITZ,⁹² still HEIKEL was unsuccessful although his judgment of SCHWARTZ's attitude was probably correct, for by 1916 the *Praeparatio* had been handed over to the versatile and learned Austrian KARL MRAS (1877–1962). Even then, however, it was to take another forty years (vol I: 1954, II: 1956) for MRAS to complete the task.⁹³

Instead of the *Praeparatio* HEIKEL turned his attention to Eusebius' companion work the *Demonstratio Evangelica*. Having begun work on it in 1904 he was making solid progress when in 1909 there appeared a damaging review of his Constantine edition by young GIORGIO PASQUALI (1887–1952), who had studied under LEO and SCHWARTZ at Göttingen. HEIKEL was mortified and wrote a rather apologetic letter to HARNACK.⁹⁴ For the most part, PASQUALI's criticisms were substantial and justified. The Kommission, now without MOMMSEN, became very nervous and lost confidence in HEIKEL's editorial abilities. «There are people who are very learned but are unable to collate. Perhaps Heikel is one of them», so HARNACK wrote to his colleagues.⁹⁵ They eventually resolved to instruct HEIKEL

⁸⁷ Letter from WILAMOWITZ to HARNACK, 11 October 1895, in: J. DUMMER, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf und die Kirchenväterkommission der Berliner Akademie, *Studia Byzantina II* (eds. J. IRMSCHER/P. NAGEL) = *Berliner Byzantinische Arbeiten* 44 (1973), 360.

⁸⁸ WILAMOWITZ (n. 10), 226.

⁸⁹ Letter HEIKEL to DIELS, 6 March 1893: WINKELMANN (n. 86), 1985, 569. On SCHWARTZ: A. MOMIGLIANO, *Premesse per una discussione su Eduard Schwartz*, *ASNP* n. s. 3.5, 1979, 999–1011.

⁹⁰ Letter WILAMOWITZ to HARNACK, 25 January 1904: DUMMER (n. 87), 373.

⁹¹ Letter HEIKEL to HARNACK, 8 March 1904: WINKELMANN (n. 86), 1985, 580.

⁹² CALDER/FOWLER (n. 49), 23–35: Letters 4 and 5 of WILAMOWITZ to SCHWARTZ.

⁹³ On MRAS: R. HANSLIK, *Karl Mras*, *Gnomon* 35, 1963, 107–110.

⁹⁴ Letter HEIKEL to HARNACK, 25 April 1909: WINKELMANN (n. 86), 1985, 502.

⁹⁵ Circular letter from HARNACK, 30 April 1909: WINKELMANN (n. 86), 1985, 553.

to cease work on the *Demonstratio*.⁹⁶ What happened subsequently is not clear but there was obviously a change of heart. Again bedevilled with poor health HEIKEL pressed on and the GCS edition of the *Demonstratio* was published in 1913, but it was not until 1962 that HEIKEL's imperfect Constantine was replaced by the edition of FRIEDHELM WINKELMANN.

The work of Eusebius which HEIKEL had originally intended to edit was the *Ecclesiastical History*. When he saw it announced in the GCS series in 1893 he wrote to ascertain whether he could be the one to undertake it, only to discover that it had been taken by SCHWARTZ perhaps on the prompting of MOMMSEN.⁹⁷ Although SCHWARTZ was then at Strasbourg and MOMMSEN in Berlin they collaborated closely on the edition, as MOMMSEN's letters to SCHWARTZ show.⁹⁸ SCHWARTZ was responsible for the majority of the work, that is the Greek text of Eusebius, while MOMMSEN took charge of the Latin text of the translation and continuation of the *Ecclesiastical history* by Rufinus of Aquileia and enlisted the help of other scholars as usual.⁹⁹ Like the late Roman chronicles, Eusebius' *History* is a document whose manuscripts reflect a variety of versions – four separate editions have been identified¹⁰⁰ – so that here too a stemmatic approach to recension is quite an invalid method of coping with such extensive 'horizontal contamination'. When the edition of SCHWARTZ (and MOMMSEN) appeared (Three volumes: 1903, 1908, 1909) it revealed his total scepticism about the principle of stemmatic recension.¹⁰¹ It is not difficult to appreciate how he was driven to this extreme view, just as it is not difficult to see how he came to adopt such an esoteric and desperate view of the text of Eusebius' *Chronicle* as he did.¹⁰²

The *Chronicle* is one of the most important and textually complex of late Roman documents. It would be perfectly fair to suggest that MOMMSEN had been working with the *Chronicle* longer, and understood it better, than anyone else in his day; yet it is not a text he himself chose to edit. When MOMMSEN began his various researches he had to rely on using the evidence of the *Chronicle* scattered

⁹⁶ WINKELMANN (n. 86) 1985, 585.

⁹⁷ Letter HEIKEL to DIELS, 6 March 1893: WINKELMANN (n. 86) 1985, 570–571.

⁹⁸ There is a letter and four postcards from MOMMSEN in the SCHWARTZ Nachlass, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich. They are all related to details of the Eusebius edition, especially the Rufinus part and are dated 9 December 1900–17 February 1902.

⁹⁹ For example, while in Rome in 1900 KARL HOLL was collating Rufinus manuscripts for MOMMSEN: H. KARPP (ed.), *Karl Holl. Briefwechsel mit Adolf von Harnack* (Tübingen 1966), 29.

¹⁰⁰ T. D. BARNES, *The Editions of Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History*, GRBS 21, 1980, 191–201.

¹⁰¹ G. PASQUALI, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*² (Florence 1971), 135–141; E. J. KENNEY, *The Classical Text* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1974), 138–139.

¹⁰² A. A. MOSSHAMMER, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg/London 1979), 52.

through several versions: Greek, Latin, Armenian and Syriac.¹⁰³ Comparing and evaluating the various witnesses to the Chronicle, and fully understanding the particular traditions and difficulties of each, was precisely the sort of problem MOMMSEN was best equipped to master. His editions of the Chronographer of 354 (1850) and the Chronicle of Cassiodorus (1861) provide ample proof of this. Although there does not appear to be any evidence to suggest that MOMMSEN did contemplate undertaking the modern edition of Eusebius' Chronicle that had become so necessary by the 1850s he was certainly keen that somebody should do so. By 1862 he apparently understood that LUCIAN MÜLLER (1836–1898) in the Hague had the task under control or at least Jerome's Latin translation of the <Canones> or chronicle proper continued to his own day (A. D. 378); for that was when he first heard that an industrious young Dresden scholar ALFRED SCHÖNE (1830–1892) – again due to RITSCHL's influence¹⁰⁴ – was involved in preparatory research for an edition, at least of Jerome's part.¹⁰⁵ MOMMSEN ended up contributing a great deal to SCHÖNE's 1864 dissertation on certain aspects of Jerome's chronicle and subsequently to the two-volume edition (in collaboration with HANS PETERMANN) which proved such an advance in its time and indeed is still a convenient one. The first volume which appeared in 1866 (the second volume: 1875) was dedicated to MOMMSEN and RITSCHL.

Throughout the next quarter-century MOMMSEN's interest in the chronicle did not slacken. The new research facilitated by the SCHÖNE/PETERMANN edition, including the important review by another MOMMSEN pupil ALFRED VON GUTSCHMID (1831–1887), gradually made it look less adequate so that by 1889 WILAMOWITZ was able to propose to MOMMSEN that another edition of the Chronicle was now necessary and it would be opportune to include it among the MGH.AA.¹⁰⁶ In fact it was MOMMSEN's own research on the newly discovered Bodleian manuscript of Jerome's Chronicle and on the Armenian manuscripts which did most to render the SCHÖNE/PETERMANN edition obsolete.¹⁰⁷ SCHÖNE

¹⁰³ MOSSHAMMER, *ibid.* 42–48.

¹⁰⁴ Bearing in mind RITSCHL's decisive influence in the work of ALFRED SCHÖNE, LUDWIG JEEP, THEODOR BIRT and LUDWIG MENDELSSOHN (1852–1896) all of whom studied under him at Leipzig in the 1860s and 1870s, not to mention the CSEL, one can see what WILAMOWITZ meant by highlighting RITSCHL's contribution as an influential teacher rather than a scholar in his: *History of Classical Scholarship*, trs. A. HARRIS/ed. H. LLOYD JONES (London 1982), 134–5.

¹⁰⁵ MOMMSEN/JAHN No. 230 (J.-M., 25 July 1862), p. 276, cf. M.-J., 27 July 1862, in: B. RINK/R. WITTE, *Einundzwanzig wiederaufgefundene Briefe Mommsens an Jahn*, *Philologus* 127, 1983, 277.

¹⁰⁶ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 289 (W.-M., 12 May 1889), p. 373–374.

¹⁰⁷ Die älteste Handschrift der Chronik des Hieronymus, *Hermes* 24, 1889, 393–401 = *Ges. Schr.* 7, 597–605; Die armenischen Handschriften der Chronik des Eusebius, *Hermes* 30, 1895, 321–338 = *Ges. Schr.* 7, 580–596, with MOSSHAMMER (n. 102), 49–50. The 1895 article and its central proposition that all the Armenian versions derived from manu-

successfully reactivated his interest in the chronicle but, now towards the end of his labours on the *Chronica Minora*, MOMMSEN had neither time nor inclination for the work required. Instead, he urged others to take on the job, and his involvement with the GCS doubtless suggested to him that the GCS was the proper outlet for such a text. He was interested therefore when FRANCIS HAVERFIELD (1860–1919) of Oxford inquired about the edition of Eusebius on behalf of a potential editor, JOHN KNIGHT FOTHERINGHAM (1874–1936). The young FOTHERINGHAM himself sought MOMMSEN's advice on the matter but, meanwhile, HAVERFIELD had satisfied himself that FOTHERINGHAM would not measure up to MOMMSEN's standards.¹⁰⁸ Yet FOTHERINGHAM did eventually produce an edition of Jerome's chronicle, while the definitive GCS edition of the Armenian version (in German translation) of Eusebius, by JOSEPH KARST, appeared in 1911 and that of Jerome, by WILAMOWITZ's Berlin colleague RUDOLF HELM (1872–1966), in 1913.

The other patristics project which MOMMSEN seems to have been involved in was that inspired by RITSCHL, namely the CSEL in Vienna.¹⁰⁹ In 1888 at least he was scouting around for a replacement for PAUL EWALD (1851–1887) to undertake the collection of letters to and from popes, known as the *Collectio Avellana*. He proposed the eventual editor, OTTO GÜNTHER, on the strength of his dissertation on Ammianus.¹¹⁰ At the same time he asked WILAMOWITZ for any suggestions as to who should continue EWALD's MGH edition of the letters of Gregory the Great.¹¹¹ Now MOMMSEN's involvement with the CSEL, from 1892 under the direction of WILHELM VON HARTEL (1839–1907), one of its most productive contributors, makes even more puzzling the organisational anomaly that surrounds the volumes put together for the *Auctores Antiquissimi* section of the MGH. Given the urgent need for proper editions of late Roman texts and the relative

script E was not utilised by JOSEPH KARST the editor of the Armenian text. He was embarrassed to have to confess that MOMMSEN's article had escaped his notice (*Theologische Literaturzeitung* 23, 1911, 827–8).

¹⁰⁸ Letters, as follows: (1) HAVERFIELD to MOMMSEN, 8 November 1899 (*Deutsche Staatsbibliothek/DDR*); (2) MOMMSEN to HAVERFIELD, 13 November 1899 (Ashmolean); (3) HAVERFIELD to MOMMSEN, 17 November 1899 (*Deutsche Staatsbibliothek/DDR*).

¹⁰⁹ For an outline of the development of the CSEL: R. HANSLIK, *100 Jahre Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, *Österr. Akad. der Wiss. Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1964, 21–35, and: *To the Hundredth Anniversary of CSEL*, *Studia Patristica* 7, 1966, 71–74.

¹¹⁰ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ No. 265 (13 February 1888), p. 343.

¹¹¹ MOMMSEN/WILAMOWITZ, *ibid.* At the same time MOMMSEN wrote to J. R. SEELEY (1834–1895) at Cambridge as follows: «It is a heavy loss to his friends and to our studies. Inhabiting the border country, I am not fully able to appreciate his literary merits; but I know enough of his researches to be testimony to a peculiar union of philological acuteness and historical views: It is a sad proof of his merits as an editor that hitherto none of us has been capable to propose any one able to succeed him» (*EHR* 3, 1888, 295–296). The commission fell to his pupil HARTMANN.

shortage of qualified philologists, it is odd that within just a few years of each other there should appear two editions of Corippus (PARTSCH, MGH: 1879 ~ PETSCHENIG, CSEL: 1886), Ennodius (VOGEL, MGH: 1885 ~ HARTEL, CSEL: 1885), Eugippius (SAUPPE, MGH: 1877 ~ KNÖLL, CSEL: 1885), Salvian (HALM, MGH: 1877 ~ PAULY, CSEL: 1881) and Victor Vitensis (HALM, MGH: 1879 ~ PETSCHENIG, CSEL: 1881) – with the CSEL edition often based on the MGH one (e.g. PETSCHENIG's Corippus). MOMMSEN had always been in close contact with the founding fathers of the CSEL: JOHANNES VAHLEN who was called to Berlin in 1874 and had been a loyal ally of MOMMSEN in the academy, plus CARL HALM. In fact it was HALM, by now in Munich, who contributed the first volume (Salvian) to the MGH.AA. Yet, rather than rationalise efforts it must have been agreed that some duplication was necessary in order to preserve the coherence and design of each series.

One must assume much the same explanation for the fact that MOMMSEN himself invested considerable time and energy in preparing for the MGH an edition of the *Liber Pontificalis*, the biographies of the Popes, at the same time as another scholarly edition was being undertaken by LOUIS DUCHESNE. Both scholars were well aware of their mutual endeavours and continued to work independently. Although in the MOMMSEN/DUCHESNE correspondence there is only a passing mention of the *Liber Pontificalis*, they will probably have discussed the book when MOMMSEN called on DUCHESNE in Paris in 1885.¹¹² DUCHESNE's definitive edition which included a full discussion of the manuscripts and the complex question of sources and composition of the *Liber* was published in two volumes in 1886 and 1892. Six years later the first and only volume (covering the text to 715) of MOMMSEN's edition was published by the MGH. As it happened both scholars produced a superb text but developed divergent views on the composition of the work. DUCHESNE's argument, which has in fact prevailed, was that the first edition was completed under Pope Hormisdas (514–523), then continued by contemporaries, while a second redaction was completed under Pope Vigilius (537–55). MOMMSEN, on the other hand, thought he detected anachronisms and other obstacles pointing to an original date of composition not earlier than 604 (Gregory I). In fact he postulated two editions in the seventh century.¹¹³

¹¹² The six letters in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, cover the period 1875–1894, to which should be added the letter in the archives of the École française de Rome: *L'école de Rome 1875–1975*, Archives de France (Paris 1975), 95. There are sixteen extant letters and cards from DUCHESNE to MOMMSEN (from 1875–1894) in the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek/DDR.

¹¹³ C. VOGEL, *Le Liber Pontificalis dans l'édition de Louis Duchesne: État de la question*, in: *Monseigneur Duchesne et son temps* (Rome 1975), 99–127; cf. letter DUCHESNE to MOMMSEN, 11 November 1898: «Sur quelques points relatifs aux sources et à la date des rescensions, je ne parviens pas à me ranger à votre avis. Mais ce sont choses de peu d'importance».

In reviewing MOMMSEN's volume DUCHESNE took issue with MOMMSEN's dating of the *Liber Pontificalis* and some associated aspects but generally be concurred with MOMMSEN's claim that «haec mea editio Duchesniana non reformat, sed comprobatur et confirmatur». ¹¹⁴ He would certainly not have agreed with WILAMOWITZ that MOMMSEN's edition counted for nothing. ¹¹⁵

MOMMSEN's friendship with DUCHESNE as well as with GIOVANNI BATTISTA DE ROSSI (1822–1894) and WILLIAM RAMSAY helped impress upon him that the understanding of Christianity's role in the Roman state required the same refined tools as for strict secular history: archaeology, epigraphy and modern textual criticism. Although the Christian world had always attracted the textual interest of able critics (note for example LACHMANN's *New Testament*), it had really taken until the 1880s for the implications of that fact to be appreciated by philologists. A full understanding of late antiquity therefore necessitated a grasp of theology and a familiarity with the polemical and doctrinal works of Christian authors. As MOMMSEN put it to DUCHESNE the ideal late Roman historian needed to be «un poco monsignore» which he could never become himself. ¹¹⁶ Even so his editions of Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History*, the *Life of St. Severinus* and the *Liber Pontificalis* were a valuable contribution to Christian scholarship. DUCHESNE, who shared MOMMSEN's keen wit, suggested that the church should canonise the Berlin professor for his contribution so that the faithful could pray «Sancte Mommseni, ora pro nobis», and he recommended that DE ROSSI be conscripted to turn the hagiographic legend into Vaticanese. ¹¹⁷

Involvement with the CSEL and particularly the GCS also demonstrated how MOMMSEN became caught up in the wider scholarly movement which from the 1870s was transforming the study of Graeco-Roman religion and early Christianity through philological methods. This «new path of classicism» (described so lucidly by MOMIGLIANO) was sparked off by USENER at Bonn and carried forward by his pupils DIELS, WILAMOWITZ, and SCHWARTZ, together with JULIUS WELLHAUSEN (1844–1918). ¹¹⁸ MOMMSEN's close working relationship with all four scholars coincided with his work on the MGH and the developing friendship with DUCHESNE and RAMSAY and so facilitated his accommodation to the incorporation of Christianity and Christian documents within the traditional domain of the classical philologist. The arrival of the more theological HARNACK in the philological capital of the empire, Berlin, in 1889 served to consolidate

¹¹⁴ La nouvelle édition du *Liber Pontificalis*, MEF 18, 1898, 381–417.

¹¹⁵ Letter WILAMOWITZ to JAEGER, 15 December 1928: Calder (n. 75), 1983, 210. The same letter includes a short-sighted condemnation of MOMMSEN's contribution of Rufinus to the edition of Eusebius (*ibid.* 290–291).

¹¹⁶ WÜHR (n. 2), 385.

¹¹⁷ Letter DUCHESNE to MOMMSEN, 28 October 1889 (Deutsche Staatsbibliothek/DDR).

¹¹⁸ MOMIGLIANO (n. 38), 33–64; W. JAEGER, *Classical Philology at the University of Berlin 1870 to 1945*, in: *Five Essays*, ed. A. FISKE (Montreal 1966), 52–71.

MOMMSEN's realisation of the significance of Christianity in the Roman empire and the importance of producing editions of Christian texts by the same criteria and standards applied to classical texts. The service he rendered to the GCS in conjunction with HARNACK, WILAMOWITZ and DIELS, plus the collaboration with SCHWARTZ on the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, placed him in a central position in the emerging philological approach to Christian history, and it broadened his view of the late Roman world. Indeed it made him realise that despite all his efforts he had only laid the foundations and to make real headway in the study of later Roman history he would need the whole of another lifetime.

IV. Mommsen's Late Roman Legacy

Of all his many pupils MOMMSEN regarded MAX WEBER (1864–1920) as his chosen successor. WEBER grew up in MOMMSEN's neighbourhood in suburban Charlottenburg and the families had much in common. MOMMSEN was frequently attracted to the WEBER household because MAX WEBER senior was a liberal deputy in the Imperial parliament, while MOMMSEN's son KARL was a close school friend of the young MAX. The two families were finally united in 1896 when another of MOMMSEN's sons, ERNST, married CLARA WEBER, sister of the younger MAX. Perhaps the family friendship inspired MAX's early predilection for Roman history and his essay as a thirteen-year old «About the Roman imperial period from Constantine to the Migration of Nations». After a year at the university of Heidelberg WEBER spent a year in the army at Strasbourg before recommencing studies at Berlin, taking in MOMMSEN's lectures on the late Roman empire in 1884/5.¹¹⁹ WEBER subsequently proceeded to write a doctoral thesis on medieval trading companies (1889). Towards the end of the public defence of his three basic theses, so it was reported, a scrawny white-haired old man with a striking profile arose to speak. It was MOMMSEN. He interrogated WEBER on his concepts of *colonia* and *municipium* and after discussion MOMMSEN remained unconvinced. Nonetheless he explained that he did not wish to impede the young scholar's progress and confessed that this was probably another case of the younger generation having ideas the previous generation was unable to countenance. «But when I have to go to my grave someday», MOMMSEN concluded, «there is no one to whom I would rather say [quoting an eighteenth century German Lyric] «Son, here is my spear; it is getting too heavy for my arm», than the highly esteemed Max Weber».¹²⁰ WEBER went on to write his habilitation thesis (1891) on

¹¹⁹ M. WEBER, *Max Weber: A Biography*, trs. H. ZOHN (New York 1975), 46–9, 54, 96.

¹²⁰ WEBER (n. 119), 114, with CHRIST (n. 7), 107–112, and bibliography there cited and G. H. MUELLER, *Weber and Mommsen: non-Marxist materialism*, *British Journal of Sociology* 37, 1986, 1–20.

Roman land tenure and distribution, during which he had many vigorous exchanges with his teacher and old family friend.¹²¹ In WEBER's view the economy of the Roman empire was built on an urbanised monetary base in which the essentially coastal cities contributed to an international sea-borne trade and in which the large estates were worked by the plentiful supply of slaves. The transformation of economic and social life in late antiquity led to the virtual disappearance of commerce and the reversion to a rural economy where large estates supplied only their own needs and were worked increasingly by free peasants (*coloni*) tied to the land. In short «when the political centre of the Empire shifted from the coastal areas to the interior, and slave supplies dried up, then the natural economy imposed its pressure towards feudalism on the once commercialised superstructure of the ancient world».¹²²

How much of this interpretation was owed to and shared by MOMMSEN will never be known simply because MOMMSEN never committed his views to writing. Nonetheless what is clear is that MOMMSEN did indeed have some well developed views on the agrarian dimension of Rome's transformation into its feudal successor states. These views he shared with others, as indicated by the testimony of a casual luncheon guest at the MOMMSEN house.¹²³ Obviously too he will have engaged his students in the process of formulating and explaining his views. While WEBER was a student at Berlin, so too was LUDO HARTMANN who also became interested in the problems of land and labour in the late Roman empire and who became a life-long friend of WEBER. Setting aside the agrarian issue, by and large MOMMSEN's expanded view of the scope and sources of late Roman history was not taken up by his students and intellectual heirs. It was under the influence of MOMMSEN and HARNACK especially that K. J. NEUMANN (1857–1917) produced his history of Christianity in the Roman empire but it was not taken further.¹²⁴ SEECK found it difficult to give Christianity the serious attention it required, but HARTMANN learnt a great deal by accepting MOMMSEN's offer to take over EWALD's edition of the letters of Pope Gregory the Great.¹²⁵ Even so HARTMANN preferred to develop the lines of enquiry opened up by MOMMSEN prior to his encounter with HARNACK, namely the organization and administration of the late Roman state.

¹²¹ MOMMSEN replied to WEBER in: *Zum römisches Bodenrecht*, *Hermes* 27, 1892, 79–117 = *Ges. Schr.* 5, 85–122, while it was reviewed by HARTMANN in: *Archiv für soziale Gesetzgebung und Statistik* 5, 1892, 215–218.

¹²² M. WEBER, *Die sozialen Gründe des Untergangs der antiken Kultur* (1896), trs. R. I. FRANK, in: *The Agrarian Sociology of Ancient Civilizations* (London 1976), 410, with MOMIGLIANO (n. 38), 30–31.

¹²³ S. WITHMANN, *About Theodor Mommsen*, *Contemporary Review* 84, 1903, 870.

¹²⁴ K. J. NEUMANN, *Der Römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diocletian*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1890). On NEUMANN: W. SCHÜR, *Jb. f. Altertumskunde* 214, 1927, 94–110.

¹²⁵ *Gregorii I papae registrum epistularum*, MGH, Epp. I, II, 1891–1899.

Following his 1887 dissertation on exile in Roman history HARTMANN left Berlin for Vienna where he pursued his preference for constitutional, financial and economic history in a series of studies on early medieval Italy, while volume I of his *History of Italy* was dedicated to MOMMSEN.¹²⁶ Perhaps HARTMANN's most famous pupil was ERNST STEIN (1891–1945) who insisted on describing himself as 'the last successor of MOMMSEN'.¹²⁷ STEIN had completed his doctorate under HARTMANN's supervision in 1914 and taught at Vienna before being called to Berlin in 1927. He showed great foresight in moving on when HITLER came to power. First he found Brussels, then the Catholic University of America in Washington (1934–36), next the Chair of Byzantine History at Louvain (1937–40), followed by an adventurous interlude in France and final settlement in Swiss Fribourg. While at Vienna and Berlin he completed vol. I of his *Geschichte des spätromischen Reichs* (Vienna 1928) but the unsettled years afterwards made it very difficult for him to complete the second volume. Nonetheless, it was all but ready when he died (1945) and was published in 1949 after being nursed into existence by J. R. PALANQUE (b. 1898). It was written in French because after leaving Berlin in 1933 STEIN refused ever to write German again. An annotated French translation of the first volume appeared a decade later (1959) thus completing what we have come to know as STEIN's *Histoire du Bas-Empire*. The projected third volume, from Justin II to Heraclius was never written.

As MOMMSEN's 'last successor' STEIN's work was built on a direct and deep knowledge of all the available sources – archaeological, literary, numismatic and epigraphic. He always stuck scrupulously to the sources in producing a rigorous and exact account of events with careful attention to chronology. That was in the best tradition of the MOMMSEN school. Like MOMMSEN, STEIN preferred colourful character portraits to psychological analysis of the main figures with the result that Justinian's personality simply evaporates; and he generally ignored artistic culture, philosophical and religious developments including Christianity. STEIN's strength, as was that of both his mentors HARTMANN and MOMMSEN, was in describing with care and detail the transformation of institutions and the role of individuals in their development. According to his own judgement therefore

¹²⁶ On HARTMANN: E. STEIN et al., L. M. Hartmann, *Vierteljahresschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 18, 1925, 312–322; W. LENEL, Ludo Hartmann, *HZ* 131, 1925, 571–574; S. BAUER, *Neue österreichische Biographie* (Vienna 1926) 197–209; A. F. PRIBRAM, Ludo Hartmann, *Enc. Soc. Science* 7, 1932, 277–278; CHRIST (n. 7), 70.

¹²⁷ On STEIN: L. VAN DER ESSEN, Ernest Stein. *Historien du Bas-Empire et de Byzance* (1891–1945), *RHE* 41, 1946, 422–435; A. PIGANOL, *La méthode historique d' Ernest Stein*, *Journal des Savants*, 1964, 34–58; CHRIST (n. 7), 186–191; plus the introduction to vol. 2 of the *Histoire du Bas-Empire* by J.-R. PALANQUE (VII–XVII) and the note by Mme STEIN (XXIII–XXXII).

his best work was a study of the praetorian prefecture.¹²⁸ The *Histoire* of ERNST STEIN is a reminder of the sort of history of the later Roman empire MOMMSEN himself might have produced except that we could expect more attention to Christianity and Christian culture. In other words STEIN's MOMMSEN like HARTMANN's MOMMSEN remained essentially the MOMMSEN of the 1870s and 1880s – the author of the *Staatsrecht* and the editor of the *CIL*. There was no room for the friend of HARNACK, DUCHESNE, and RAMSAY, not to mention the collaborator of SCHWARTZ.

Generally speaking, the opportunities MOMMSEN envisaged for his second lifetime were left in abeyance for a long while. After his death, the momentum built up for late Roman studies was confined to SEECK and HARTMANN but for the most part scholarship failed to capitalise on the foundations laid by MOMMSEN, at least until the efflorescence of interest in late antiquity in the post-war period. Moreover, that so much research in the past quarter-century or so has been concentrated on the apparatus of late Roman government, as well as on the political, social and cultural role of the late Roman aristocracy and its relationship with the imperial and Ostrogothic courts, is arguably due to MOMMSEN's efforts in editing or sponsoring the essential documents such as the Codes, Symmachus, Claudian, Jordanes and Cassiodorus' *Variae*, in addition to the *CIL*. In anticipation of the publication of MOMMSEN's lectures on the later Roman empire which will illuminate his views on the transformation of the Roman world during the fourth century, it is well to be reminded of his contribution to late Roman studies and his influence on the ways that subsequent scholars have approached the subject to the present day. Not just in old age but all his scholarly life MOMMSEN was concerned with mastering and interpreting the sources for the later empire as an integral part of Roman history. No survey of MOMMSEN's achievement and impact is complete, therefore, unless it acknowledges his manifold contribution to the study of the later Roman empire, the period to which he would have liked to dedicate a whole scholarly lifetime.

30 Johnson St.
Lindfield 2070
Australia

¹²⁸ Untersuchungen über das Officium der Prätorianerpräfektur seit Diocletian (Vienna 1922).

