Brian Croke

Chronicles, Annals and 'Consular Annals' in Late Antiquity

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **31 • 2001**
Seite / Page **291–332**
https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/928/5312 • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-2001-31-p291-332-v5312.9

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**

BRIAN CROKE

Chronicles, Annals and ‹Consular Annals› in Late Antiquity

‹History› and ‹chronicle› are firmly differentiated in modern historiography, both in theory and in practice. ‹History› is usually defined as an expansive and analytical account of important events or people – an elite genre for the elite; ‹chronicle› is defined as a brief and simplified account of events – a popular genre for the general populace.[1] This traditional distinction is part of the complex heritage of classicism in historiography, reinforced by the concept of ‹living› documents (history) and ‹dead› documents (chronicle).[2] The study of historiography in late antiquity has not been able to escape the hegemony of this model, at least not until quite recently. With a blurring of the former entrenched distinction between elite and popular culture in late antiquity, emphasis is now given to the commonality of ideas, aspirations and attitudes shared by all, irrespective of so-

[1] Most recently, but typically, D. R. KELLEY, Faces of History. Historical Inquiry from Herodotus to Herder, New Haven – London 1998, 71 (applied to Byzantine historiography in this instance).

[2] The oft-repeated terminology of ‹living› and ‹dead› documents derives from B. CROCE, History, Chronicles and Pseudo-History, in: Philosophy, Poetry and History, London 1966, 503–504 and R. G. COLLINGWOOD, The Idea of History, London 1946, rev. ed. J. VAN DER DUSSEN, Oxford 1994, 202–203, and has come to represent a defining distinction for analytical philosophy of history (e.g. M. WHITE, Foundations of Historical Knowledge, New York 1965, 222ff; W. H. WALSH, Introduction to the Philosophy of History, London 1967, 33–34, and A. MARWICK, The Nature of History, London ^{3}1989, 235), but subject to the critique of A. DANTO, Analytical Philosophy of History, Cambridge 1966, 112–142. This chronicle/history dichotomy continues to permeate all serious discussions on the writing of history, especially the influential contributions of HAYDEN WHITE (e.g. Metahistory, Baltimore 1973, 5–7; Tropics of Discourse, Baltimore 1978, 56, 83; The Content of the Form, Baltimore 1987, 17–21, and Figural Realism, Baltimore 1999, 8–9) and is taken for granted in more recent analysis of his work (e.g. K. JENKINS, On What is History?, London 1995, 20–24, 150–154, and id., Why History? Ethics and Postmodernity, London 1999, 199; cf. A. CALLINICOS, Theories and Narratives, London 1995, 73–75), as well as other relevant discussions (e.g. J. TOPOLSKI, Historical Narrative: Towards a Coherent Structure, H&T, Beiheft 26, 1987, 75–86, and id., A Non-Postmodernist Analysis of Historical Narratives, Poznan Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and Humanities 41, 1994, 24ff; R. J. EVANS, In Defence of History, London 1997, 153; W. STANFORD, An Introduction to the Philosophy of History, Oxford 1998, 218; C. B. MCCULLAGH, The Truth of History, London 1998, 300).

cial or intellectual status.[3] The study of late antique historiography, in particular, now involves more careful attention to the intellectual and cultural presuppositions underlying the changing understanding of the past in late antiquity, and the way this understanding was presented.[4] It means that studies of individual historians now pay due attention to the worlds in, behind, and in front of, the text,[5] while much serious scholarship is finally being devoted to the chronicles.[6]

---

[3] The changing interpretation of late antiquity is well summarised in P. HEATHER, Late Antiquity and the Early Medieval West, in: M. BENTLEY (ed.), Companion to Historiography, London 1997, 69–87, and AVERIL CAMERON, The Perception of Crisis, in: Morphologie sociali e culturali in Europa fra tarda antichità e alto medievo, Settimane di Studio del Centro italiano di studi sull' alto Medioevo 45, Spoleto 1998, 9–31. Also germane are the various contributions to The World of Late Antiquity Revisited, SO 72, 1997, 5–89, especially the Report of P. BROWN (ibid. 5–30), and those to G. W. BOWERSOCK – P. BROWN – O. GRABAR (eds.), Late Antiquity. A Guide to the Postclassical World, Cambridge, Mass. – London 1999.

[4] Typified by the programmatic introduction of H. INGLEBERT, Les romains chrétiens face à l'histoire de Rome: histoire, christianisme et romanités en Occident dans l'antiquité tardive, Paris 1996, 3–19, and the various contributions to G. MARASCO (ed.), Later Greek and Roman Historiography, Fourth to Sixth Century A. D., Leiden 2002. Fundamental is the reconceptualisation of A. MOMIGLIANO, Introduction. Christianity and the Decline of the Roman Empire, in: A. MOMIGLIANO (ed.), The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century, Oxford 1963, 1–16; id., L'età del trapasso fra storiografia antica e storiografia medievale (320–550 d.C.), RSI 81, 1969, 286–303 = Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico, Rome 1975, 49–70 and, especially, id., Popular Religious Beliefs and the Late Roman Historians (1971), in: Essays in Historiography, London 1977, 156.

[5] E.g. AVERIL CAMERON, Procopius, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1985, and J. MATTHEWS, The Roman Empire of Ammianus, London 1989. On the other hand, some studies such as that of T. D. BARNES, Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality, Ithaca 1998, remain determinedly focussed on the historian's words as objectively representing a past reality. For the wider context: AVERIL CAMERON (ed.), History as Text. The Writing of Ancient History, London 1989, 1–10, 206–208, and id., Remaking the Past, in: BOWERSOCK – BROWN – GRABAR (n. 3) 1–20.

[6] On the Latin side: S. MUHLBERGER, The Fifth Century Chroniclers, Leeds 1990; M. SALZMAN, On Roman Time: the Codex Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1990; K. WOLF, Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain, Liverpool 1990; J. FAVROD, La Chronique de Marius d'Avenches (455–581), Lausanne 1993; R. BURGESS, The Chronicle of Hydatius and the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, Oxford 1993; C. CARDELLE DE HARTMANN, Philologische Studien zur Chronik des Hydatius von Chaves, Stuttgart 1994; B. CROKE, The Chronicle of Marcellinus, Sydney 1995; M. DONALSON, A Translation of Jerome's Chronicle and Historical Commentary, Lewiston 1996; A. PLACANICA, Vittore da Tunnuna, Chronica. Chiesa e impero nell' età di Giustiniano, Florence 1997; G. DE SENNEVILLE-GRAVE, Sulpice Sévère. Chronique, Paris 1999; B. CROKE, Count Marcellinus and his Chronicle, Oxford 2001; and on the Greek and Syriac side: A. A. MOSSHAMMER, The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition, Lewisburg – London 1979; W. WITAKOWSKI, The Syriac Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, Uppsala 1987;

What is emerging, among other things, is a less rigid and deterministic categorisation of historiographical genres.[7]

Yet it is a curious fact that, at the same time as the traditional historiographical paradigm of late antiquity is being displaced in general, in one particular area it is actually being reinforced and extended; that is to say, it is now argued that for late antiquity two distinct genres of chronicles can be identified: (1) those actually labelled ‹chronicles› (*chronica*) which were written by historiographically competent individuals with a serious purpose and which survive in manuscripts bearing the author's name, such as those of Jerome, Prosper, Hydatius, and Victor; and (2) those known as ‹consular annals› (*consularia*), not written by anyone with historiographical interest or acumen, surviving only in acephalous papyrus or manuscript fragments, and which were merely sources for chronicles proper. This distinction between a chronicle and its source roughly corresponds to that traditionally drawn between ‹history› and ‹chronicle›, since it is between a ‹high› or sophisticated form (*chronica*) and a ‹low› or rudimentary form (*consularia*). It is argued that these *consularia* were not so much chronicles in their own right. Rather they were just the sources for chronicles, providing ‹local and imperial information for the next generation of chroniclers› (BURGESS 1999 [n. 6], 145).

Consularia were different from chronicles, so the argument goes, in that they were deliberately anonymous and contained only scattered entries, rather than an entry under each year; they possessed a distinctively secular viewpoint (concentrating on the imperial court and its activities), rather than the religious viewpoint and content (councils, heretics etc.) of the chronicles; they were characterised by formulaic entries with precise dating, rather than the more varied dating and narrative form of the chronicles; they generally expressed entries in the passive voice, rather than the more regular active voice of the chronicles.[8]

---

id., Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre: Chronicle, Part III, Liverpool 1996; M. and M. WHITBY, Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD, Liverpool 1989; E. JEFFREYS – M. JEFFREYS – R. SCOTT, John Malalas: A Translation, Melbourne 1986, and E. JEFFREYS (ed.) with B. CROKE – R. SCOTT, Studies in John Malalas, Sydney 1990; A. PALMER with S. BROCK – R. HOYLAND, The Seventh Century in the West Syrian Chronicles, Liverpool 1993; G. BRUGNOLI, Curiosissimus Excerptor. Gli ‹Additamenta› di Girolamo ai ‹Chronica› di Eusebio, Pisa 1995 (in conjunction with R. BURGESS, CR 48, 1998, 68–70 and F. PASCHOUD, Gnomon 71, 1999, 599–603); C. MANGO – R. SCOTT, The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor, Oxford 1997; R. BURGESS, Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography, Stuttgart 1999.

[7] As noted in A. H. B. BREUKELAAR, Historiography and Episcopal Authority in sixth-century Gaul: the Histories of Gregory of Tours interpreted in their Historical Context, Göttingen 1994, 71 ff, and W. GOFFART, The Narrators of Barbarian History, Princeton 1988, 3 ff.

[8] The most comprehensive statements of the ‹consular annals› hypothesis are: O. HOLDER-EGGER, Untersuchungen über einige annalistische Quellen zur Geschichte des

Moreover, ‹those who compiled *consularia* were fundamentally different from those who compiled chronicles› (BURGESS 1993 [n. 6], 181). These *consularia* which (it is proposed) first appeared at Constantinople in the later fourth century and from there took root in Alexandria and Italy, are represented mainly by the contents of fragmentary texts which go by the modern names of Fasti Hydatiani, Auctarium Havniense Prosperi, Excerpta Barbari, Excerpta Sangallensia, Fasti Vindobonenses, Papyrus Goleniscev and Papyrus Berolinensis 13296. This distinction of genres was first promoted in the 1880s by HOLDER-EGGER who considered it ‹quite unthinkable› that an author of such a work as one finds in the late Roman chronicle fragments could imagine he was writing anything of any historiographical purpose or value.[9]

This study aims to critically evaluate the ‹consular annals› (*consularia*) genre by examining (1) the way contemporaries in late antiquity defined texts which modern scholars call ‹chronicles› and ‹annals›, particularly those texts being labelled *consularia*; and (2) how the pattern of textual transmission, and the working habits of copyists, have shaped the extant chronicle manuscripts and fragments of manuscripts, especially those documents claimed to be *consularia*.

1. *Defining chronicles and annals*

In the modern historiographical tradition there has been a tendency to differentiate between ‹chronicles› and ‹annals› in terms of scope and content. ‹Annals› are defined as local, ‹chronicles› universal; ‹annals› are anonymous and compiled progressively year by year, ‹chronicles› are the conscious creations of identifiable authors.[10] Yet this distinction is really a medieval one.[11] For late antiquity

fünften und sechsten Jahrhunderts: III. Die Ravennater Annalen, Neues Archiv 1, 1876, 214–368; MUHLBERGER (n. 6) 23–46 and BURGESS 1993 (n. 6), 178–181; cf. R. BAGNALL – A. CAMERON – S. SCHWARTZ – K. WORP, Consuls of the Later Roman Empire, Atlanta 1987, 48, 55; SALZMAN (n. 6) 37–38; M. HUMPHRIES, Chronicle and Chronology: Prosper of Aquitaine, his Methods and the Development of Early Medieval Chronography, Early Medieval Europe 5, 1996, 155–175; J. RÜPKE, Geschichtsschreibung in Listenform: Beamtenlisten unter römischen Kalendern, Philologus 141, 1997, 65–85.

[9] HOLDER-EGGER (n. 8) 238–247. His judgment in full was «Dass diese Annalen von einem Verfasser herrühren, der mit ihnen ein historiographisches Produkt hat geben wollen, ist vollkommen undenkbar» (240).

[10] E.g. D. HAY, Annalists and Historians. Western Historiography from the VIIIth to the XVIIIth Century, London 1977, 38ff.

[11] B. GUENÉE, Histoire, annales, chroniques, Annales (ESC) 28, 1973, 1001ff; M. MCCORMICK, Les annales du haut moyen âge, Turnhout 1975, 11–21; B. GUENÉE, Histoire et culture historique dans l'occident médiéval, Paris 1980, 203–206; A. GRANSDEN, The Chronicles of Medieval England and Scotland: Part I, Journal of Medieval History 16, 1990, 129–130; E. M. C. VAN HOUTS, Local and Regional Chronicles, Turnhout 1995, 13–16; J. O. WARD, ‹Chronicle› and ‹History›: The Medieval Origins of Postmodern Historiographical Practice?, Parergon 14, 1997, 101–128.

(fourth, fifth and sixth centuries) it cannot be justified at all. Although the terms *annales* and *chronica* are used at this time there does not appear to be a significant and consistent difference in their meaning,[12] just as in Latin there was never any real distinction of literary genre between *annales* and *historia*.[13] Indeed, it must be said that there were no rigidly self-contained historiographical categories in late antiquity. At least there were no tightly defined and consistent terminological boundaries. Cassiodorus, for instance, calls the works of Eusebius/Jerome *chronica* and the writers of the continuations of Jerome's chronicle *scriptores temporum* (Inst. 1.17.2). In late antiquity *chronica* is used not only to refer to individual works but also to describe chronicles generally, without reference to any particular one (Aug. Civ. Dei 18.27.37, 47; Sulp. Sev. Chron. 1.35.2, 1.41.1, 1.45.2, 2.5.4, 2.6.1; Greg. Tur. Hist. praef.). This pervasive terminological imprecision in the historiographical vocabulary of late antiquity is the case not only in Latin, but also in Greek and in Syriac.[14] So too, the subsequent traditions of history writing in the Latin west continued the inconsistent use of ‹history› and ‹chronicle› to such an extent that neither label ever denotes a distinct and coherent genre (BREUKELAAR [n. 7] 83–87), and much the same applies in the Byzantine tradition.[15]

For Cassiodorus, in his handbook for monks known as the Institutiones written in sixth-century Italy, chronicles come under the heading of ‹historians›, a general category of ‹narrators of times›. This category includes Josephus' Jewish Antiquities and Jewish War, the Church histories of Eusebius and his continuators as well as the History against the Pagans of Orosius. Cassiodorus does not present a rigid distinction between ‹historians› and ‹chroniclers›, nor between ‹histories› and ‹chronicles›, let alone between ‹chronicles› and ‹annals›. He never uses the term *annales* at all in his Institutiones, while chronicles are described as ‹briefest records of times›, and they are written by ‹historians› (*historici*). The Cassiodoran distinction between chronicle and other temporal works is not one of quality of content, author or audience.

---

[12] B. LACROIX, L'historien au moyen-âge, Montreal – Paris 1971, 38; C. MOLÈ, Prospettive universale e prospettive locali nella storiografia latina del V secolo, in: La Storiografia Ecclesiastica nella Tarda Antichità, Messina 1980, 200–202; cf. K. SCHNITH, Chronik, Lexikon des Mittelalters 2, 1983, 1956–1957.

[13] G. P. VERBRUGGHE, On the Meaning of Annales, on the Meaning of Annalist, Philologus 133, 1989, 217–219, and U. W. SCHOLZ, Annales und Historiae, Hermes 122, 1994, 64–79, especially 70–71.

[14] Greek: B. CROKE, Byzantine Chronicle Writing 1: The Early Development of Byzantine Chronicles, in: JEFFREYS (n. 6) 27–38; Syriac: WITAKOWSKI 1987 (n. 6) 147ff esp. 165.

[15] H.-G. BECK, Zur byzantinischen «Mönchschronik», in: Speculum Historiale, ed. C. BAUER et al., Freiburg 1965, 188–197; A. AFINOGENOV, Some Observations on Genres of Byzantine Historiography, Byzantion 62, 1992, 13–33; J. LUBARSKIJ, Narrative Structure in Byzantine Historical Writing, SO 73, 1998, 11–12.

What modern scholars have come to understand as ‹history› was not what late Roman scholars meant by *historia*.[16] As Junillus put it in the 540s, *historia* was simply a narrative account of past or present events (*praeteritarum rerum praesentiumue narratio*: Instituta Regularia Divini Legis 3). The writer of *historia* (including Moses and Luke) was normally an *historicus*, a term which included writers on geography and topography for in antiquity, and throughout the middle ages, geography remained an integral part of an historian's work (ThLL 6. 3, 2842 s.v. *historicus*). As for *historiographus*, it was a word which also came late into Latin from Greek and refers to writers of *historia* not just those we call ‹historians›. It is virtually synonymous with *historicus* (ThLL 6. 3, 2843 s.v *historiographus*). Time and chronology were not necessarily related to history;[17] they were, however, a special consideration of Christians who created ways of recording and describing vast tracts of time as part of the process of interpreting their scriptures.[18] So, before being certain that there was a particular and distinct genre which modern scholars call *consularia* there is a need to clarify the terminology used in late antiquity to describe the various chronographical works produced at that time.

(a) Chronicles and chroniclers

‹Chronicle› (*chronicon/chronica*) is a Greek term, late into Latin. It is first used by Cornelius Nepos to refer to Greek chronographical works such as that of Apollodorus.[19] Thereafter, the Romans seem never to have concerned themselves with *chronica*. In fact, except for Aulus Gellius' reference to Nepos' work (Noct. Att. 17.21.3), the word never appears again in Latin until the later fourth century when chronicles on the model of that of Eusebius (first produced in the early fourth century) had become well-known in Latin (ThLL 3. 1030 s.v. *chronicon*). The same pattern of usage is evident in Greek writers where the word χρονογραφία is used almost exclusively to refer to the works of the Hellenistic scholars Apollodorus and Eratosthenes, then centuries later to refer to particular Christian writings. Before the third century A.D. χρονογραφία can be found

[16] They understood *historia* as not necessarily having a temporal aspect but as an informational account to be treated as a literary (rather than a theological or philosophical) problem while it could also mean a personal life and a fictitious account of the gods; more specifically *historia* referred to the events contained in the Old and New Testaments: ThLL 6. 3, 2834–2840 s.v. *historia*; G. Press, The Development of the Idea of History in Antiquity, Kingston – Montreal 1982, 104ff.

[17] C. W. Fornara, The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1983, 91.

[18] R. Ray, Medieval Historiography through the Twelfth Century: Problems and Progress of Research, Viator 1, 1974, 38–39.

[19] Cf. N. Horsfall, Cornelius Nepos. A Selection Including the Lives of Cato and Atticus, Oxford 1989, 31–32, 99–100.

in only three authors (Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Strabo);[20] otherwise it is employed by Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius and Athanasius in the Christian context of chronographical discussions on the dates of persons and events in the Old and New Testaments.[21] By then the Latin *chronicon/chronica* is a term used almost exclusively to describe the Christian chronicle of Eusebius/Jerome.[22]

A similar situation applies to terms used to denote the writers of chronicles. Like χρονογραφία, the word χρονογράφος is not very common in Greek, being used originally to label Apollodorus and Eratosthenes but otherwise only to refer to Christian writers (Africanus and Eusebius).[23] Although uncommon enough in Greek, there appears to be but a single instance of the Latin word *chronographus*.[24] In the sixth century Cassiodorus identifies works called ‹chronicles› but groups them under the category of writers called ‹historians› (*historici*). Despite having written a chronicle himself (ed. MOMMSEN, MGH. AA. XI 120–161), he never uses the word ‹chronographer› for any writer of a *chronica*. Hence the chronicle was a Greek concept taken into Latin mainly through Jerome's translation of the chronicle of Eusebius. The question, then, is what was its subsequent relationship to ‹annals› which had a longer and firmer tradition in Latin literary culture?

(b) Annals and annalists

At Rome the composition of what were called ‹annals› began with the chief priest (*pontifex maximus*) keeping an annual record (known as the *tabulae pontificum*) of religious events in the public life of the city. It seems that this record began with the names of consuls and other magistrates and was compiled on a daily basis. The complete record for each year was then carved onto bronze plates and displayed in the Regia where they could be consulted and copied.[25] The early annalists (a modern term never used in Latin where the writers of

---

[20] Polyb. Hist. 5.33.5; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.7.3, 1.74.2, 11.62.3; Strab. Geog. 1.2.9. (I am grateful to ELIZABETH JEFFREYS for retrieving these and other references from the ThLG database on my behalf).

[21] Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.21.112.4, 114.4, 116.3, 121.4, 136.3, 146.5; Eus. Praep. Evang. 2.1.56, 10.10.1 (title), 10.10.7, 10.10.10, 10.12.19; HE 6.7.1, 6.13.7, 6.31.2; Dem. Evang. 8.2.46; Ecl. Proph. 155; Ath. de syn. 3.3.

[22] Hier. In Dan. 9.24; Aug. Civ. Dei 18.31; Greg. Tur. Hist. praef. Other examples in ThLL 3.1030 s.v. *chronicus*.

[23] Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.21.105.3 (Apollodorus); Eus. Praep. Evang. 10.12.19 (Apollodorus); Harpocrat. Lex. in. dec. or. Att. 139.17 (Eratosthenes); Epiph. Pan. 47.11 [GCS 37: 501.5]; Jo. Chrys. in nat. dom. [PG 61.765].

[24] Sid. Apoll. Ep. 8.6.18, that is, excluding the transliteration from the Greek in the Barbarus Scaligeri (24b.4 [SCHOENE, 200]).

[25] G. S. BUCHER; The Annales Maximi in the Light of Roman Methods of Keeping Records, AJAH 12, 1987, 2–61.

annals are usually called *historici*) relied on the data originating in the *tabulae pontificum*, and these documents helped dictate the annalistic shape of Roman writing about the past.[26] Such writers set out to provide a successive and connected account of Roman history, while others writing in the tradition of Herodotus and Thucydides were concerned to describe in a more elaborate and stylish way the great events of their time frequently from the viewpoint of a participant.[27] Some Romans sought to establish a formal contrast between these two types of works, a contrast defined by Sempronius Asellio in terms of content: that is to say, annals were concerned with recording briefly and dryly all sorts of information about the past, while histories were more concerned with great events of the present and recent past.[28] For Cicero ‹histories› had to be written in the grandest manner whereas the earliest Roman historians had done nothing more than assemble a compilation about the past (*annales*).[29]

Generally speaking, the Roman use of the term *annales* is almost exclusively republican and early imperial. In late antiquity the term is quite rare, and it is used in the general sense of historical records or representation (e.g. Prud. c. Symm. 1.596; Rut. Nam. de red. suo 1.311; Oros. Hist. Prol. 10). Cassiodorus, for example, in the extant fragment of a lost speech, claims that he only discovered that Gaul was once Roman by reading about it in his history books.[30] In the history of Ammianus Marcellinus *annales* are cited for information on ancient Egypt (22.16.24) as well as the whole of the Roman past (25.9.9), and for specific episodes such as the Gothic destruction of Philippopolis in the mid-third century (31.5.17). Ammianus himself wrote history (*res gestae*) in the Greek

[26] M. CHASSIGNET, L'annalistique romaine: les Annales des Pontifes et l'annalistique, Paris 1996, XXIII-XLV. Most of the relevant issues remain contested. For orientation: J. A. NORTH, The Books of the *Pontifices*, in: C. MOATTI (ed.), La mémoire perdue. 2. Recherches sur l'administration romaine, Rome 1998, 45–63; S. P. OAKLEY, A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X, vol. 1, Oxford 1997, 24ff; J. SCHEID, Les annales des pontifes. Une hypothèse de plus, in: Convegno Santo Mazzarino, Rome 1998, 199–220; FRIER (n. 39) XIV–XVIII. No less important an influence in this respect was the tradition of the Greek city records or '*horographiai*: FORNARA (n. 17) 16–17; A. CHANIOTIS, Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften, Stuttgart 1988, 181–182.

[27] T. P. WISEMAN, Clio's Cosmetics, Leicester 1979, 3–26, and id., Practice and Theory in Roman Historiography, History 66, 1981, 375–393 = Roman Studies, Liverpool 1987, 244–262. Also important in this regard is A. J. WOODMAN, Rhetoric in Classical Historiography, London – Sydney 1988, 70–116; T. P. WISEMAN, The Origins of Roman Historiography, in: Historiography and Imagination, Exeter 1994, 1–22.

[28] FRIER (n. 39) 219–220 (on Asellio) with SCHOLZ (n. 13) 72–79; VERBRUGGHE (n. 13) 192–230; E. BADIAN, The Early Historians, in: T. A. DOREY (ed.), Latin Historians, London 1966, 1–38.

[29] De orat. 2.52, as interpreted by VERBRUGGHE (n. 13) 209–210.

[30] Orationum Reliquiae (ed. L. TRAUBE, Cassiodorus. Variae [MGH. AA. XII 466. 17–21]): *Galliam quondam fuisse Romanam solis tantum legebamus annalibus.*

tradition in which he grew up (MATTHEWS [n. 5] 462ff). The works of Livy and Tacitus came to be called ‹annals› although that was not their original title in either case; likewise, in the late fourth century an honorific inscription (CIL VI 1783 = ILS 2948) attributes *annales* to Nicomachus Flavianus and another inscription (CIL VI 1782 = ILS 2947) calls him *historicus*. While there has been much speculation about the nature and scope of Flavianus' *annales* its very title cannot be cited to propose that it was necessarily a work on the Roman republic.[31] It is difficult to draw a tight definitional line between the writings of Livy, Tacitus and Ammianus not least because the works of each of them was essentially annalistic (VERBRUGGHE [n. 13] 198–199, 227–229), while chronographical writing on the Greek model largely remained outside the mainstream (at least of Latin historiography).

(c) Chronicles, annals and fasti

While chronicles were not so familiar at Rome, eventually annual lists of consuls (known as consular *fasti*) were available and could be used in the way lists (*pinakes/tabulae*) of Athenian archons and the officials of other Greek city-states had once been. Throughout Roman history consular lists continued to be produced because they were always necessary. Some late antique lists still survive, notably the fifth-century Fasti Veronenses (ed. MOMMSEN, MGH. AA. XIII 382–383) covering the period 439–486 then continued in a later hand to 494 and the Fasti Heracliani (ed. H. USENER, MGH. AA. XIII 392–410) from 222–630 which also include a reckoning by the years of Diocletian. By the Augustan age, there had also emerged the *acta urbis*, a record of public events in the city of Rome. It was material from the *acta* which formed the basis for the numer-

[31] J. SCHLUMBERGER, Die verlorenen Annalen des Nicomachus Flavianus: ein Werk über Geschichte der römischen Republik oder Kaiserzeit?, Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1982/83, Bonn 1985, 305–329; cf. B. BLECKMANN, Bemerkungen zu den Annales des Nicomachus Flavianus, Historia 44, 1995, 83, arguing that the Annales was a work of recent history. A consideration of the late antique meaning of *annales* only strengthens his case; G. ZECCHINI, Da Nicomaco Flaviano a Memmio Simmaco. La fine della storiografia classica in occidente, in: Ricerche di storiografia latina tardoantica, Rome 1993, 51–64; M. FESTY, Le début et la fin des Annales de Nicomaque Flavien, Historia 46, 1997, 465–478; S. RATTI, Jérôme et Nicomaque Flavien: sur les sources de la Chronique pour les années 357–364, Historia 46, 1997, 479–508. These recent reconstructions of the Annales of Nicomachus are taken to be a triumph of Quellenforschung by F. PASCHOUD, Quelques problèmes actuels relatifs à l'historiographie de l'antiquité tardive, SO 73, 1998, 82–85; cf. id., Nicomaque Flavien et la connexion byzantine (Pierre le Patrice et Zonaras): à propos du livre récent de Bruno Bleckmann, AntTard 2, 1994, 71–82. One suspects this will not be the final word on the matter, cf. AVERIL CAMERON, The Later Roman Empire, London 1993, 22; ALAN CAMERON, The Last Pagans of Rome, in: W. V. HARRIS (ed.), The Transformation of Urbs Roma in Late Aniquity, Portsmouth R.I. 1999, 115; BURGESS 1999 (n. 6) 115 n. 8.

ous annalistic chronicle records (not unlike those on the Parian marble) such as the Fasti Ostienses which also appeared at this time.[32]

The normal use of *fasti* is to denote an annual calendar which sets out the *dies fasti* and *dies nefasti* for the whole year. Sometimes in setting out the calendar for the current and forthcoming year the consuls' names and those of other annual officials were placed at the beginning, which remained the case throughout the later Roman Empire. From an accumulation of these annual calendars could be compiled de novo a list of consuls, with or without noting events of a specific consulship. *Fasti* was, however, also used metonymically for the list of successive consular years and therefore for the actual tabular lists of consuls. In other words, *fasti* had come to be something quite distinct from ‹annals› and remained nothing more than a consular list however elaborate.[33] Claudian, for example, notwithstanding the possibilities of poetic licence, makes frequent use of *fasti* as the list or record of consuls (In cons. Olybr. et. Prob. 279; In Eutrop. 1.151, 319; 2.13, 58, 131; De IV Cons. Hon. 155; Cons. Man. 267, 335; De Cons. Stil. 2.4, 244, 306–307; 3.88). By contrast, he uses *annales* to mean the historical record of past events (In Eutrop. 2.58; De Cons. Stil. 3.183). To have one's name added to the consular list was a mark of the greatest distinction. Ausonius' *fasti*, for instance was evidently nothing more than a list of consular names culminating in his own in 379, then continued to 382 and with the expectation that others would add future ones.[34] At the same time, he evidently produced a lost work described in a fourteenth century catalogue as a *cronicam ab initio mundi usque ad tempus suum* which sounds like a version or rival of the chronicle of Jerome.[35] Ausonius' *cronica* is not to be confused with his *fasti* for he used the word *fasti* in the strict sense of a consular list (15 [de fastis].1.3; 3.1), as did

[32] This is another zone of uncertainty: B. Baldwin, The acta diurna, Chiron 9, 1979, 189–203; B. Croke, City Chronicles of Late Antiquity, in: G. Clarke – B. Croke – R. Mortley – A. Emmett Nobbs (eds.), Reading the Past in Late Antiquity, Sydney 1990, 170–176; M. Bats, Les débuts de l'information politique officielle à Rome au premier siècle avant J. C., in: C. Moatti, La mémoire perdue. 1. À la recherche des archives oubliées, publiques et privées, de la Rome antique, Paris 1994, 19–43; P. White, Julius Caesar and the Publication of Acta in Late Republican Rome, Chiron 27, 1997, 73–84; R. W. Burgess, «Non duo Antonini sed duo Augusti». The Consuls of 161 and the Origins and Traditions of the Latin Consular *Fasti* of the Roman Empire, ZPE 132, 2000, 279–284.

[33] Wiseman (n. 27) 13–14, and, for the *fasti* as an historiographical creation in their own right: J. Rüpke, Fasti, Quellen oder Produkte römischer Geschichtsschreibung?, Klio 77, 1995, 184–202.

[34] Aus. 15.1–4 with Burgess 1993 (n. 6), 7 with n. 11, and R. P. H. Green, Ausonius' *Fasti* and *Caesares* Revisited, CQ 49, 1999, 573–578.

[35] Details in R. P. H. Green, The Works of Ausonius, Oxford 1991, 720 (unnecessarily supposing Nepos as Ausonius' model) and R. W. Burgess, *Principes cum Tyrannis*: Two Studies on the Kaisergeschichte and its Tradition, CQ 43, 1993, 495 with n. 20; Burgess (n. 32) 285 n. 97.

Prudentius (c. Symm. 1.595, 2.427; Peristeph. 10.614) and Sidonius Apollinaris (carm. 2.4, 5.112, 13.33, 23.177).

Occasionally, in both earlier times (Horace, Seneca and Pliny) and later, *fasti* is also used in the broader sense of ‹historical record›. However, *fasti* never denotes a historical work of a particular kind or of a particular period (examples in ThLL 6, 1, 325–328 s.v. *fastus*), only one of extreme generality as Orosius did in explaining that nothing could be found out about Joseph's time in Egypt in the *historiis fastisque* (Hist. 1.8.9). *Fasti* is not the title of any extant late antique work. Well-known and significant documents such as the Fasti Hydatiani and the Fasti Vindobonenses are modern titles for acephalous sections of medieval manuscripts.

(d) The ‹consular annals› (consularia) genre

Of particular importance to the hypothesis of the ‹consular annals› genre is the use of *annales* by the sixth century historian Jordanes. In introducing his Getica he refers back to his recently completed summary history of the world and of Rome (Romana) as *adbreviatio chronicorum* (Get. 1). The *chronica* in question include the works of Jerome, Festus, Florus, Eutropius and Orosius (details in Mommsen, MGH. AA. V.1, XXIII–XXX). That is, like his contemporary Cassiodorus, Jordanes understands *chronica* in the comprehensive sense to include what nowadays we would define separately as chronicles (Jerome), histories (Florus, Orosius) and epitomes (Festus, Eutropius). As for *annales*, he employs that label to describe Josephus and his writings (Get. 29), as well as Dio Chrysostom's Gothic history in Greek (Get. 40); Dio is described as both ‹historian› (*storicus*: Get. 58, 65) and ‹annalist› (*scriptor annalium*: Get. 14). In drawing his history to a conclusion Jordanes refers his reader to the *annales consulumque series* (Rom. 388). Writing in the mid-sixth century Jordanes made considerable use of the chronicle of Marcellinus and a similar document from 534 (end of Marcellinus) up until his time of writing in 551. Although never cited, these sources (or those like them) are clearly what he meant by *annales consulumque series*.

What Jordanes says, in fact, is that if you want to find out what was happening in the rest of the empire at the time of the events he has just described in Italy, Africa, and Persia (i.e. 530s and 540s), then the reader should look over the same sources (*annales consulumque series*) – by implication documents such as Marcellinus and his continuation (or the source lying behind the continuation, cf. Mommsen, MGH. AA. V. 1, XXIX). Jordanes is not necessarily referring to a single specific document or even particular kind of document, much less something known technically as *consularia* (Muhlberger [n. 6] 24 n. 54). He is merely following customary usage in referring broadly to historical records of Roman history (cf. Verbrugghe [n. 13] 222, 230). At best there is no reason to insist that from this description he means to exclude the chronicle of Marcellinus, for example. Jordanes' usage, whereby *annales* can embrace equally the works of Josephus, Dio

Chrysostom and Marcellinus, and whereby *chronica* can encompass a similarly diverse range of works, certainly does not form the basis for making a formal distinction between (1) an annalistic chronicle with a consular chronology (such as that of Marcellinus) on the one hand, and (2) an anonymous impersonal source representing a genre called ‹consular annals› or *consularia* on the other.

To further support the notion of the *consularia* genre, however, particular attention is given to the word *consularibus* in the Histories of Gregory of Tours (Hist. 2.9),[36] writing at the end of the sixth century. This, it needs to be stressed, appears to be the only extant use of *consularia* (ThLL 4, 571 s.v. *consularius*). What Gregory says is that he has consulted the histories of Frigeridus and Sulpicius Alexander which cover the period to 425 but they never mention the name of any king of the Franks. Then he explains the tradition (*tradunt enim multi*) that the Franks crossed from Pannonia to the Rhine, before moving into Thuringia where they occupied different territories and came under the control of various long-haired kings from their most distinguished family. Gregory advises, parenthetically, that he will prove this point when he comes to explain how Clovis conquered and united the various Frankish territories, which he does (Hist. 2.42). Next follows his resort to the *consularia: Nam et in consolaribus legimus, Theudomerem regem Francorum, filium Richimeris quondam, et Ascylam, matrem eius, gladio interfectus. Ferunt etiam, tunc Chlogionem utilem ac nobilissimum in gente sua regem fuisse Francorum, qui apud Dispargum castrum habitabat, quod est in terminum Thoringorum.*[37] So Gregory finds in the *consularia* the fact that Theudomer and Chlogio are referred to as ‹kings› of the Franks. He begins his explanation by consciously linking it back (*nam et*) to the tradition of the long-haired kings settled in Thuringia. In referring to events over 150 years ago Gregory is not contrasting *consularia* with chronicles such as those of Prosper. They mean one and the same. Gregory's point is just that for this period the detailed histories such as those of Frigeridus and Sulpicius Alexander (whom Gregory calls both ‹historian› and ‹chronicler›) do not mention any Frankish kings, although Theudomer and Chlogio are given the royal title in the *consularia*. Something like Prosper was evidently what he had in mind by *consularia*, rather than something akin to the hypothetical ‹consular annals›.[38] Gregory's failure to name these sources more explicitly does not mean that they were necessarily anonymous, just as Jordanes refrains from naming any contemporary source such as Marcel-

[36] Originally noted by HOLDER-EGGER (n. 8) 275–276 and TH. MOMMSEN in Jordanis Romana et Getica, MGH. AA. V.1, XXIX, followed by W. WATTENBACH – W. LEVISON, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter. Vorzeit und Karolinger, Weimar 1951, 56–57, and most recently by MUHLBERGER (n. 6) 24 n. 54, and BURGESS 1993 (n. 6), 175 n. 1.

[37] Quoted, preserving the orthography (i.e. *consolaribus*), from the standard edition: Gregorii Episcopi Turonensis Libri historiarum X, eds. B. KRUSCH – W. LEVISON, MGH, Sciptores Rerum Merovingicarum 1.1, 57.15–58.3.

[38] Cf. MOMMSEN in his edition of the ‹Chronica Italica› (MGH. AA. IX 253 n. 1).

linus but prefers *annales consulumque series* and as Cassiodorus cites *annales* for his knowledge of Roman Gaul. Gregory is like Jordanes in another respect too, namely that he does not distinguish between history and chronicle and the writers of each (GUENÉE [n. 39] 5; BREUKELAAR [n. 7] 96–97). For Gregory, *historiographus* covers both Eusebius, as the author of the Chronicle (Hist. 1.36, 9.15), and Orosius (1.6, 2.9).

The practice of Jordanes and Gregory is reinforced by Isidore of Seville in his attempt to define the genres of late Roman historiography. Although writing in the early seventh century, Isidore's distinction between genres is based on a literary model, rather than contemporary usage.[39] In practice, however, Isidore employs *historia* and *chronica* indiscriminately, but at the same time he never refers to any late antique work as *annales*. He refers to the sixth-century chronicle of Victor of Tunnuna as *historia* (de vir. ill. 25), that of Maximus as *historiola* (de vir. ill. 33) and that of John of Biclaro as the provision of an *historia* through a *liber chronicorum* (de vir. ill. 31), while in the preface to his own chronicle Isidore refers to the chronicle of Eusebius (translated and continued by Jerome) as *multiplex historia*.[40] For Isidore, chronicles are something quite separate; they are a *series temporum* or ‹succession of times›, that is, a record with a purpose and pattern (Etym. 5.28). Isidore never refers to anything called *consularia* or otherwise indicates any such separate literary form.

There is no suggestion that in late antiquity *annales* meant anything more than ‹historical record› or that *fasti* meant anything more precise than a bare list of consuls; in other words, there is no evidence for construing either *annales* or *fasti* as a distinctive form of history writing having the characteristics attributed by modern scholars to the *consularia* or ‹consular annals›. There is *fasti consulares* which means nothing more than a consular list (perhaps annotated, perhaps not) and there is *consularia* but that cannot be translated as ‹consular annals› either. Certainly there does not appear to be a single instance of *consularia* coupled with *annales*. In Greek there is *hypataria* but that means no more than an unadorned list of consuls (Epiphanius, adv.haer. 2.51 [GCS 37]; Chron.Pasch. s.a. 609 [DINDORF 698]). For late antiquity we may legitimately speak of ‹annals› but not ‹consular annals›.

---

[39] That Isidore's lacunose description was copied from Verrius Flaccus' de significatu verborum has been demonstrated by B. FRIER, Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum. The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition, Ann Arbor ²1999, XIII, 30–35; cf. LACROIX (n. 12) 34 and B. GUENÉE, Histoire et chronique. Nouvelles réflexions sur les genres historiques au moyen-âge, in: D. POIRION (ed.), La chronique et l'histoire au moyen-âge, Paris 1984, 4. Isidore was evidently following the use of *historia* of the Virgilian commentator Servius, cf. D. DIETZ, Historia in the Commentary of Servius, TAPhA 125, 1995, 61–97.

[40] Examples in M. REYDELLET, Les intentions idéologiques et politiques dans la Chronique d'Isidore de Seville, MEFRA 82, 1970, 371–372.

The terms *chronica*, *consularia* and *annales* (and to a lesser extent *historia* and *fasti*) were used inconsistently and indiscriminately in late antiquity.[41] A clear indication of this situation is evident in Orosius who notes that all his diverse historical information on wars, plagues, floods, earthquakes, and an assortment of other disasters, will come *ex omnibus ... historiarum atque annalium fastis* (Hist. Prol. 10). Another indication is to be found in the preface of Victor of Aquitaine's Easter table produced in 457 where he construes the chronicle of Eusebius/Jerome/Prosper as a single unified work from creation to the present. The works of all three are called both ‹histories› (*historiae*), and ‹chronicles› (*chronica*), while Eusebius' format gives rise to the label *annales* (MGH. AA. IX 681). History is both the past and a way of describing the past; it is what one finds in chronicles, so there is no problem in calling a chronicle a history, hence the occasional title ‹chronicle history›.[42] Nor is there any problem in calling a history a chronicle, or even annals: Sulpicius Severus described his own work as a *historia* (praef.) while for Hydatius (chron. 30 [BURGESS, 80] = 37a [MGH. AA. XI 16]), Gennadius (de vir. ill. 19) and Gregory of Tours (HF 1.7) it was a *chronica*, but for Paulinus of Nola (Ep. 28.5) the same work was *annales*. In other words, late antique writers and audiences made no meaningful distinction between ‹chronicles› and ‹annals›. They definitely had no particular way of unequivocally designating works which modern scholars ascribe to ‹consular annals› (*consularia*) as ‹a Latin historical genre that came to prominence in the late fourth century›.[43] Consequently, on what grounds have scholars come to distinguish so firmly between *chronica* and *consularia* as historiographical genres manifesting different fundamental characteristics and produced by different kinds of authors?

2. *Characterising the chronicle fragments*

Eusebius of Caesarea, so Cassiodorus states, wrote *chronica* in Greek which Jerome translated into Latin and continued to 378. This work was then continued by Prosper of Aquitaine whose chronicle was first written in the 430s, and by Marcellinus whose chronicle reached to the early years of the reign of Justinian

[41] While this situation is duly acknowledged in BURGESS 1993 (n. 6), 178 (cf. id. [n. 32] 260 n. 8), his argument then proceeds to explaining the distinguishing features of two separate genres.

[42] This occurs in both Greek, for instance for the works of Hesychius and John Malalas, cf. CROKE, apud JEFFREYS (n. 6) 27–38, and in Latin as noted by Hydatius' description of Eusebius' chronicle as *chronographia historia* (Chron. 2, ed. BURGESS 72, cf. 125), which in BURGESS' English translation is curiously rendered into German (‹chronologische Geschichte›). Likewise, Hydatius' *singraphus* (‹historian›) is rendered ‹Schriftsteller› (Chron. 3, ed. BURGESS 72).

[43] BURGESS 1999 (n. 6), 113. Elsewhere, although using *consularia* frequently to refer to ‹a list of consuls that has been annotated with short historical notices of various kinds› BURGESS (n. 32) 260 n. 8 notes that *consularia* was not a contemporary term.

(534 in fact).[44] Cassiodorus is aware that there have been other chroniclers (*alios subsequentes*) later than Prosper and Marcellinus because there is no shortage of such writers, although he does not actually name any. For the next thousand years Cassiodorus' recommended works constituted the historiographical culture of the Latin West,[45] while his endorsement of the chronicles of Jerome, Prosper and Marcellinus ensured that they have been exceptionally well-preserved in the textual tradition. There are over one-hundred more or less complete manuscripts of Jerome, over eighty of Prosper and fourteen of Marcellinus.[46] These are all very high figures by medieval standards (to judge by the ladder in GUENÉE 1980 [n. 11], 250–252).

In addition to those particular chronicles which survive from late antiquity there were many others which have not survived.[47] Instead, what we do have is a range of excerpts from manuscripts and papyri of varying date, but which appear to be copies or versions of chronicles originally written in the fifth and sixth centuries, or at least they used chronicle material covering these centuries in compiling the later chronicle. It is primarily on these fragments that the hypothesis of the ‹consular annals› genre rests. In fact, notwithstanding the date of the various manuscripts (4th/5th to 15th century) and the vagaries of transmission, they are taken to be ‹the only consularia to have survived in something approaching their original state› (BURGESS 1993 [n. 6], 179). They may be listed as follows (including usual modern titles), in chronological order:

(1)	c. 4/5	Pap. Berol 13296
(2)	c. 7/8	Pap. Golen. (Alexandrian World Chronicle)
(3)	c. 7	Cod. Vat. Reg. 2077 (Paschale Campanum)
(4)	c. 8	Cod. Par. Lat. 4884 (Barbarus Scaligeri or Excerpta Barbari)
(5)	c. 8/9	Cod. Berol. Phillipps 1829 (Fasti Hydatiani or Consularia Constantinopolitana or Descriptio Consulum)
(6)	c. 9	Cod. Sangall. 878 (Excerpta Sangallensia)
(7)	c. 11	Cod. Mers. Dom. 202 (Fasti Ravennates/Annals of Ravenna)
(8)	c. 12/13	Cod. Hav. 454 (Continuatio Havniensis Prosperi)
(9)	c. 15	Cod. Vindob. 3416 (Fasti Vindobonenses)

[44] B. CROKE, The Misunderstanding of Cassiodorus Institutiones I. 17.2, CQ 32, 1982, 225–226.

[45] B. GUENÉE, Histoire et culture historique dans l'occident médiéval, Paris 1980, 302–305.

[46] Jerome: MOSSHAMMER (n. 6) 38; Prosper: MOMMSEN, MGH. AA. IX 353–371; Marcellinus: MOMMSEN, MGH. AA. XI 47–52.

[47] Lost late antique chronicles include those of Nummius Aemilianus Dexter (Jerome, de vir. ill. 132); Maximus of Caesareaaugusta (Isidore, de vir. ill. 33); Maximian of Ravenna (cited by Agnellus 78, 82 [MGH. AA. IX 257]). Nestorianus (Jo. Mal. Chron. XIII § 14 Bonn 324, XIV § 47 Bonn 376), Domninus (Jo. Mal. Chron. IV § 24 Bonn 88 et al.) and Helikonius (Suda, vol. 1, 247 [ADLER]).

All of these fragmentary manuscripts, except for those not known in the 1890s (Pap. Berol. 13296, Pap. Golen., Cod. Mers. Dom. 202),[48] were printed by MOMMSEN in the volumes of Chronica Minora, under a generic heading for Italian (Paschale Campanum, Barbarus Scaligeri, Excerpta Sangallensia, Fasti Vindobonenses) or Constantinopolitan (Fasti Hydatiani) chronicles. These headings were purely for the sake of convenience and MOMMSEN was generally faithful to the integrity of the individual manuscripts by printing them side-by-side, although sometimes the continuity of a particular manuscript was necessarily violated by different parts of a work having to be included under different generic headings. Despite these considerations, the problem remains of determining the nature and sources of these various fragments, their pattern of transmission and the relationships between them; but before proceeding to that there are some contextual issues to consider.

Firstly, all these fragments are fragments from a larger manuscript or papyrus now otherwise lost. So it is not known what works they originally formed part of, and whose name (if any) appeared at the head of the work. In view of the inherent problem of dealing with literary works preserved only in fragments, judgments made about genre on the basis of format and type in the fragments are especially insecure.[49] What can be reasonably supposed, given the surviving works of the main chroniclers, is that in the broad sense most of the fragments (i.e. those in Latin) may have formed part of a manuscript which at some point was a version, or adaptation, and/or continuation of the chronicle of Jerome. In the same way, we cannot be certain that the Greek fragments (Pap. Berol. 13296, Pap. Golen.) did not form part of a work (or section of a work) based on the chronicle of Eusebius (or a version thereof). Although now acephalous, these excerpts should not necessarily be thought of as having been part of a work that was originally produced and circulated anonymously; nor, where the chronicle manuscripts are mere fragments, should they be considered as having been necessarily anonymous even in the manuscripts in which they currently stand. Like the chronicles of Prosper and Hydatius, the chronicle fragments

[48] Pap. Berol: H. LIETZMANN, Ein Blatt aus einer antiken Weltchronik, Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake, ed. R. CASEY – S. LAKE – A. LAKE, London 1937, 339–348 (rp. in: Texte und Untersuchungen 67, 1958, 419–429); Pap. Golen.: A. BAUER – J. STRZYGOWSKI, Eine Alexandrinische Weltchronik, Denkschrift der Kaiserlichen Akad. der Wiss. zu Wien, Phil-Hist. Kl. 51, 1906; Cod. Mers. Dom.: B. BISCHOFF – W. KOEHLER, Medieval Studies in Memory of A. Kingsley Porter, ed. W. KOEHLER, vol. I, Cambridge 1939, 125–138 [cited here] = Un'edizione illustrata degli Annali Ravennati del basso impero, StudRomagn 3, 1952, 1–17.

[49] D. S. POTTER, Literary Texts and the Roman Historian, London – New York 1999, 62–78; cf. P. A. BRUNT, On Historical Fragments and Epitomes, CQ 30, 1980, 477–494; S. C. HUMPHREYS, Fragments, Fetishes and Philosophies: Towards a History of Greek Historiography after Thucydides, in: G. MOST (ed.), Collecting Fragments/Fragmente sammeln, Göttingen 1997, 207–224.

represent the work of an individual author even though that author may be writing much later than the events described. Further, if they are illustrated presentation copies (as supposed for Pap. Golen. and the original of Cod. Mers. Dom. 202), then it is all the more likely that the chronicle manuscript advertised its author, rather like the Chronographer of 354 (cf. SALZMAN [n. 6] 26).

A second significant contextual point is that in terms of structure and content the chronicle fragments are not essentially different from the extant chronicles. This can be illustrated on the one hand by recognising that many similar fragments exist of other chronicles which are preserved more fully in other manuscripts under their author's name (e.g. Jerome, Prosper); that is, these particular fragments are torn leaves from a previously complete manuscript of (say) Jerome or Prosper but now there is not any indication of authorship or context in the fragment itself. For instance, there are various scraps of Jerome's chronicle dating from late antiquity: two folios of a fifth-century Breslau manuscript, one folio of an eighth-century Karlsruhe manuscript and scattered folios of another fifth-century manuscript now in the British Museum.[50] These fragments are not evidently different in any respect from the other chronicle fragments listed above, except that their authorship can be identified. This situation is also neatly illustrated by the palimpsest Grottaferrata manuscript which contains just a few detached leaves from a sixth-century Greek chronicle. This was just another anonymous chronicle fragment, and would therefore probably still be listed with the fragments above, were it not for the fact that in 1891 it was realised that its entries formed part of the chronicle of John Malalas.[51]

In terms of structure and content there is no manifest or generic difference between the extant chronicles and, for example, parts of the Fasti Hydatiani and the Fasti Vindobonenses Priores covering the same years. Although it is claimed that ‹consular annals› are distinct from chronicles because they contain only scattered entries amid the list of successive years, many chronicles display a similar shape. Indeed, given that the historiographical purpose of the chronicle was to show the duration and direction of history over vast tracts of time, rather than to provide a full yearly historical record, years with merely a date and no other historical information were not seen as historiographically deficient. Prosper, for example, has long stretches of the third and fourth centuries without an entry (MGH. AA. IX 435–451), just like Pap. Berol. 13296; while

[50] E. A. LOWE, Codices Latini Antiquiores, London ²1972, 1075 (VIII, 17) – Breslau; 1120 (VIII, 28) – Karlsruhe, and 1704 (Supplement, 12) – British Museum, with A. A. MOSSHAMMER, Two Fragments of Jerome's Chronicle, RhM 124, 1981, 66–80.

[51] E. PATZIG, Unerkannt und unbekannt gebliebene Malalas-Fragmente, Jahresbericht der Thomasschule für das Schuljahr von Ostern 1890 bis Ostern 1891, Leipzig, with B. CROKE, Modern Study of Malalas, in: JEFFREYS (n. 6) 330–331.

Cassiodorus follows a similar pattern throughout his chronicle (MGH. AA. IX 121–161), as does Marius of Avenches (MGH. AA. XI 232–239). Similarly, stretches of the Chronicon Paschale resemble Pap. Golen. and Pap. Berol. 13296, in that they contain only scattered entries. Had all that survived of the Chronicon Paschale been a page or two covering the 460s, the 500s or 560s[52] then it too might qualify for inclusion in the list of fragments upon which the hypothesis of the ‹consular annals› genre is founded. The relative distribution of entries cannot, therefore, be maintained as a criterion for distinguishing different types of late antique chronicle texts and for categorising them into separate genres. Concern at the absence of detailed historical information under every year, coupled with an impulse to fill in these ‹gaps›, reflects more a modern predilection for historiographical detail and amplitude than a peculiarly late antique ‹phenomenon of sporadic compilation›.[53]

Still, it has been argued that chronicles such as those of Prosper or Marcellinus are further different from the fragmentary chronicles in that they possess a religious viewpoint, to be contrasted with the distinctively lay or secular viewpoint of the extant chronicle fragments (MUHLBERGER [n .6] 24; BURGESS 1993 [n. 6], 181). Again this claim is based on a misconception. The chronicles such as those of Prosper, Hydatius and Marcellinus are indeed religious documents in the broad sense of the word, that is, they represent the pattern of divine chronology based on a Christian interpretation of history and they include many events of an explicitly religious nature; but so are the fragments listed above. Those events contained in the fragments such as earthquakes, victories and so on which have been labelled ‹secular›, at least on the *consularia* hypothesis, were just as much ‹religious› events as the consecration of bishops and the discovery of relics. All these occasions conform to the broad pattern of late Roman religious and ceremonial life; they all reflect the essentially religious interpretation of these events and the liturgified ceremonial that surrounded each of them.[54]

The meticulous recording of natural prodigies was important in a document such as a chronicle, which represented man's relationship to God and the role of God's providence in human history.[55] Here too the chronicles merely extend the pattern of earlier historical records of the Romans and Greeks where prodi-

---

[52] E.g. the years 457–463 (592–593 [ed. DINDORF], translation in WHITBY-WHITBY [n. 6] 84–85); 499–507 ([609 DINDORF], WHITBY-WHITBY, 101); 564–601 ([687–693 DINDORF], WHITBY-WHITBY, 137–142).

[53] BURGESS 1993 (n. 6), 182; cf. id. 1999 (n. 6), 74: ‹Another surprising aspect of the reconstructed text of the *Canones* [of Eusebius] is the sparseness of its final years›.

[54] CROKE (n. 32) 192–197; J. F. BALDOVIN, The Urban Character of Christian Worship, Rome 1987, 205ff; M. MCCORMICK, Eternal Victory, Cambridge 1986, 100ff.

[55] LACROIX (n. 12) 104; W. J. BRANDT, The Shape of Medieval History. Studies in Modes of Perception, New York 1966, 52–53, 79.

gies occupied a place because of their religious significance.[56] Even allowing for this, in terms of content there is still no firm division between the fragments and the extant chronicles. For example, the Pap. Berol. 13296 contains as many overtly religious entries (s.a. 251, 258, 306, 336) as does any chronicle; the same may be said of Pap. Golen. and the Cod. Mers. Dom. 202 (s.a. 429, 443, 452), as well as the Fasti Vindobonenses and the Barbarus Scaligeri. By contrast, the chronicle of Cassiodorus (especially in the independent Cassiodoran section from 457 to 519 [MGH. AA. IX 157–161]) contains no definably religious entries at all. The great ecclesiastical controversies of the day find no place in Cassiodorus' chronicle. Nor does one find many ‹religious› entries in the chronicle of Marius, bishop of Avenches no less. The fact is that some chronicles include more ‹secular› and less ‹religious› events than others, just as the fragments themselves do. Further, some sections within a chronicle are more ‹secular› or more ‹religious› than other sections. As a distinguishing feature of literary genres, however, a consistent dichotomy between what we consider ‹religious› (= *chronica*) and what we consider ‹secular› (= *consularia*) is not sustainable.

In addition, there is no need to consider that the consular chronology and detailed dating method of the fragments were somehow markedly different from other chronicles. If most of the extracts employ a consular chronology that should occasion no surprise, since it was the most usual system in late antiquity and the natural one to follow for an annalistic chronicle. It is simply the system used by most chroniclers. One has only to juxtapose part of the Fasti Vindobonenses Priores with Cassiodorus, Prosper or Marcellinus to see that. As for detailed day and month dating, at first glance it might appear that there is a real distinction in dating technique between the fragments (especially Fasti Vindobonenses and Fasti Hydatiani) which normally employ month/day dating for the events they describe and the chroniclers such as Prosper, Hydatius and Marcellinus who do so less frequently. However, this pattern is neither exclusive nor consistent. The extant chroniclers also use detailed dating.[57] At the same time the chronicle fragments (e.g. Fasti Vindobonenses Posteriores) frequently demonstrate an absence of (or limited) dating, just like the extant chroniclers. So too, both employ the same formulas of *his cons.*, *eodem anno*, *per idem tempus* and so on. For any chronicler who insisted on using detailed dating, the author of the Chronicon Paschale for instance, the relevant details could be located. Marcellinus was able to add precise dates to entries he simply copied

[56] E.g. E. Rawson, Prodigy Lists and the Use of the Annales Maximi, CQ 21, 1971, 158–169 = Roman Culture and Society, London 1991, 1–15; J. A. North, Religion and Politics, from Republic to Principate, JRS 76, 1986, 256–257; D. S. Levene, Religion in Livy, Leiden 1993, passim.

[57] For example: Hydatius, Chron. 15, s.a. 439 (ed. Burgess, 95); Marcellinus, Chron. s.a. 383.3, 384.2, 389.1 (MGH. AA. XI 61–62); Marius, Chron. s.a. 580, 581.1 (MGH. AA. XI 239).

verbatim or paraphrased from Orosius (s.a. 379.2; 381.2; 398; 408.2; 410). This similarity between the *chronica* and the so-called *consularia*, especially evident in the chronicles of Cassiodorus and Marius of Avenches, is recognised by the advocates of *consularia* but is explained as the influence of the latter on the former.[58] A sounder explanation would be that the similarities are a reflection of the chronicler's essential techniques of selection, summary and condensation. This process was continued by the medival copyists and redactors who have transmitted the chroniclers to our day but who combined, interpolated and reworked them for their own purposes. These processes may be illustrated by Cassiodorus' use of the chronicle of Prosper whereby he systematically edited out most of the demonstrably ‹religious› entries in his source.

Finally, it has been proposed that many of the chronicle fragments attributed to the *consularia* genre represent the exclusive product of booksellers who kept consular lists up to date and could therefore engage in the business of providing a customised consular *fasti* or even a *consularia* for any buyer. Such a chronicle would culminate in the present and highlight the buyer's particular honour or achievement. This particular hypothesis was first advanced (so far as I know) by MOMMSEN in 1882 and was subsequently adopted by SEECK in 1889 but without a solidly reasoned case.[59] Rather, he speculated on the basis of the Fasti Hydatiani's indication of a chronicle customised for Achantia, the wife of Cynegius, that such works were easily compiled, and could only be produced by booksellers. In brief, SEECK's case was asserted, instead of argued, and advanced with some reservation. A decade later, on no firmer evidence, it was simply reasserted.[60] MUHLBERGER acknowledges that ‹Seeck propounded his theory on slight evidence› before going on to argue that subsequent manuscript discoveries have vindicated SEECK's hypothesis.[61] A conjecture which MOMMSEN considered ‹not improbable›, repeated with no greater elaboration by SEECK, has become the cornerstone for a whole historiographical genre, albeit a ‹subliterary genre›.[62] It is not a very substantial cornerstone, however. At least the texts adduced in its favour are open to other interpretations. Nor is there any evident method for formulating a distinction between ‹literary› and ‹sub-literary› genres at this period.

---

[58] MUHLBERGER (n. 6) 24 n. 54; BURGESS 1993 (n. 6), 178–181.

[59] MOMMSEN, MGH. AA. V, XXIX: neque improbabile est eiusmodi libellos ita venales prostitisse, ut, qui exemplar emeret, haberet res gestas ad ipsum qui currebat annum continuatas; O. SEECK, Studien zur Geschichte Diocletians und Constantins II. Idacius und die Chronik von Constantinopel, Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik 35, 1889, 601–635, esp. 619–620.

[60] O. SEECK, RE 3,2, 1899, 2454–2460, s.v. Chronica Constantinopolitana.

[61] MUHLBERGER (n. 6) 38; cf. BURGESS 1993 (n. 6), 179–180.

[62] BAGNALL – CAMERON – SCHWARTZ – WORP (n. 8) 48; BURGESS 1993 (n. 6), 180; id. (n. 32) 283–284.

Leaving aside for a moment the alleged nature of the ‹consular annals›, the hypothesis that there was a constant demand for updated or personalised lists of consuls alone (*fasti*) which could only be met by the mass production capability of booksellers is a doubtful conjecture for various reasons. Firstly, there had been a need and demand for consular lists, for reference and administrative purposes, for hundreds of years without any indication of an exclusive role for booksellers in their production and distribution. That is not to say that booksellers never dealt with a consular list at all; it's just that it is not apparent why suddenly, in the later fourth century, they would need to take a special interest in them at last. Secondly, there is the question of commercial demand. At Rome, Ravenna or Constantinople there was obviously a very limited demand from current consuls for customised *fasti* which culminated in their year – that is, one or two only. Family and friends may have swelled demand a little. They were not conventional gifts like consular diptychs. Thirdly, it is not necessary to expect that there was constant demand for mass-produced lists of consuls which could only be filled by booksellers. Late Roman law and administration required for reference purposes a list of indictions and/or consuls but they were easily compiled and kept up to date. In any event, apart from the occasional presentation copies, it is not clear why people in a society with such an undeveloped sense of historical time compared to ours should need a reference table covering each previous year for up to 900 years ago (cf. BURGESS [n. 32], 261 n. 12).

In principle, consular lists were no different from those Easter tables where one can see the table being progressively completed with the addition of annual consuls (e.g. in the so-called ‹Paschale Campanum› [MGH. AA. IX 748–750]). The acquisition of a new list did not require the services of a bookseller. Nor is there any need to propose that multiple copies could be produced by the ‹one reliable or trustworthy βιβλιοπώλης in Constantinople that catered to everyone's *fasti* needs› thereby ensuring that they remained ‹relatively faithful to the original since all copies would be made from the master copy kept in the shop› (BURGESS [n. 32] 283). Instead, copies could easily be made by borrowing someone else's original. Or a library version could be consulted and copied. At Rome and Constantinople, at least, there were large libraries in late antiquity. Further, the aristocratic households of the late antique capitals were busy locations for acquiring, sharing and copying manuscripts. By now too monasteries were beginning to become centres of manuscript production through their *scriptoria*.[63] Booksellers were not the only, nor the obvious, option for anyone wanting a fresh consular *fasti*.

[63] L. D. REYNOLDS – N. G. WILSON, Scribes and Scholars, Oxford ²1974, 33–37, 45–46, 70–76.

Returning to the production of *consularia*, it is argued that the booksellers and their employees were responsible not only for their normal tasks of copying and selling. In the case of the ‹consular annals› they have been assigned the additional roles of research and production, that is, ‹gathering the names of the consuls and any other important news for the historical entries in the *consularia* at this time› (BURGESS [n. 32] 283–284 with n. 92). This at least begs the questions of where the bookseller acquired the information for his ‹master copy›, and the process of selecting what to record in the customer's work (cf. CROKE 2001 [n. 6], 183–185, cf. id. 1990 [n. 32], 189). Further, this hypothesis presupposes that documents assigned to the distinct genre of *consularia* constitute authentic copies of fourth, fifth and sixth century originals, whereas what we have are merely excerpts from manuscripts ranging from the fifth to the fifteenth century. They necessarily reflect their own contemporary reality at the time they were copied and most of these documents will have been copied in monastic *scriptoria*. Even so, for those documents which are closest to the years they cover (Pap. Berol. 13296, Pap. Golen.) it cannot be shown that they did not form part of some larger chronicle (*chronica*) such as the Chronicon Paschale and it is more than likely that they did. So, to claim that the manuscript fragments not known to MOMMSEN and SEECK, namely Pap. Berol. 13296 Pap. Golen. and Cod. Mers. Dom. 202, confirm their bookseller hypothesis is essentially a circular argument. In any event, the editors of these fragments did not argue that such works were necessarily produced by urban booksellers.

In the final analysis, on the basis of the extant fragments, the most that can be said is that presentation copies of consular *fasti* or chronicles were sometimes produced to honour the recipient – examples being Ausonius, Cynegius (incorporated into Fasti Hydatiani) and Eutharic (the dedicatee of Cassiodorus' Chronicle). Likewise, illustrated chronicles with a consular framework were also produced occasionally but they were no different from other contemporary illustrated histories and chronicles.[64] Certainly some of these may have been copied or produced in a bookseller's workshop. Yet they need not have been. Nor is there any clear criterion for distinguishing between something mass-produced in bookseller's workshop and something produced privately, whether for functional or decorative purposes. In short, there is no concrete evidence for the MOMMSEN/SEECK hypothesis that certain extant texts dating from the fifth to the fifteenth century necessarily reflect a mass-production workshop of Rome, Ravenna or Constantinople which found a special market for such works only in the fourth century. However, to what extent the relationships between these texts support the notion of the ‹consular annals› genre is a more complex matter.

[64] K. WEITZMANN, Illustrations for the Chronicles of Sozomenos, Theodoret and Malalas, Byzantion 16, 1942/43, 87–134.

3. Relationship between chronicle fragments

A century and more ago a great deal of scholarly labour was invested in establishing a relationship between many of these fragments, especially in trying to link the Italian chronicles to a common Ravennan original as their ultimate source. Turning first to what are called the ‹Italian chronicles› (Paschale Campanum, Barbarus Scaligeri, Fasti Vindobonenses) the earliest relevant manuscript is the so-called Paschale Campanum. It formed part of a sixth century manuscript (Cod. Vat. Reg. 2077) in which it followed a summary version of Prosper's chronicle (MGH. AA. IX 371–372). This work which has the manuscript title *epitoma temporum et indiculum pascae* drew on the popular Easter Table composed by Victor of Aquitaine in 457 and which continued prospectively to the year 559. Victor's table ran from the year 28 (the so-called ‹Year of the Passion›) and included for each year its number in the Easter cycle together with the consulship (copied from Prosper) and the calculated date for Easter (MGH. AA. IX 686–735). Although set out in an annalistic form which invited interpolation there are no such interpolations in the Table. The anonymous Paschale Campanum is likewise an Easter table which was written in two separate stages by the same scribe: the first stage was from 464–512, the second from 513–585; with both the historical notices (for the period 464–512 only) and the consular dates being added by a later scribe or scribes; yet another hand added the years 586–599 and the remainder of the years to 613 by anticipation (MGH. AA. IX 744).

The historical notices in the Paschale Campanum covering the period 464 to 512 were not part of the original work but were added subsequently, either at one time or over several years. In terms of content they are very straightforward: mainly imperial deaths and accessions (465, 467, 472, 473, 475, 476, 491) and the death of a general (468), the outbreak of persecution by the Vandals (484) and the Roman synod summoned on account of the disputed papal election of Symmachus (502). In addition, however, there are three sets of items of interest: (1) the notice of the entry of Theodoric into Dyrrachium in 478 which has been taken to suggest a local Illyrian source for this entry; (2) two entries (493 and 496) which are tied to the millennial foreboding of the reign of Anastasius each referring to years where by different calculations the fateful year 6000 was reached; (3) three events recorded close together, namely eruptions of Mt. Vesuvius in 505 and 512[65] and an eclipse visible at Naples on 29 (read ‹iii› for ‹in›) June 512,[66] indicate some local affiliation so that it has

[65] R. B. Stothers – M. R. Rampino, Volcanic Eruptions in the Mediterranean Before A.D. 630 From Written and Archaeological Sources, Journal of Geophysical Research 88, 1983, 63–67.

[66] R. R. Newton, Medieval Chronicles and the Rotation of the Earth, Baltimore 1972, 452.

been thought that the compiler/interpolator of this particular manuscript was of Campanian origin which is more than likely, although the eclipse could be seen elsewhere, including Constantinople where it was recorded by contemporaries Marcellinus and John the Lydian.[67]

Where did these historical entries come from and when were they added? Obviously one cannot be certain but it is probable that they were added at one and the same time by the same scribe, perhaps in the late sixth century. He may have found the information in some local document in the case of the three Campanian events (505, 512) but it need not have been a chronicle as such, just a document which gave sufficient indication of date to enable the scribe to locate it under the correct year. Chroniclers always used other sources where they had a date into which to link. Maybe the imperial entries came from some chronicle or list of imperial accession and death dates. Some of the entries (e.g. 472, 473, 476, 505, 512) display characteristics attributed to the ‹consular annals› genre, that is, they are dated by exact day, but most do not. There is no need to think that they must have come from some major Italian chronicle, or something as precise as a local Ravenna chronicle. They are random dates, it would appear, rather than the product of systematic research. So, here we have a typical chronicle manuscript in which different works or phases are combined together to create a continuous whole.

The next oldest manuscript is Cod. Par. Lat. 4884 (Barbarus Scaligeri), an eighth century Gallic manuscript representing the Latin translation of an earlier Greek work which, as indicated by the spaces (of varying size) in the Paris manuscript, must have been illustrated.[68] It consists of three separate sections: a world chronicle from Adam to the death of Cleopatra when Egypt became part of the Roman empire, based on the chronology of the Old Testament and the division of the earth among the sons of Noah (fols. 1a–36b); a supplementary chronology of kingdoms lying outside the Old Testament culminating in a list of Roman emperors and their reign-lengths from Augustus to Anastasius (fols. 37a–48b); and a list of Roman consuls (some with annotations) from Julius Caesar to A.D. 387 where the manuscript breaks off (fols. 49a–63a). Whether this list also continued to Anastasius is not known. As it stands it is rather inaccurate and corrupt (cf. BURGESS [n. 32] 260 n. 9); for example, it confuses Honorius' birthdate with that of Arcadius' accession. There is no direct indication of authorship or audience except for the writer's attention to the organisation of his material, as well as his direct address to the dedicatee of the work on two occasions (11b [SCHOENE 188], 13b

[67] Ibid. 592, and, for more detailed discussion, D. SCHOVE, Chronology of Eclipses and Comets AD 1–1000, Woodbridge 1984, 92–94.

[68] The most useful edition remains that of A. SCHOENE, Eusebi Chronicorum vol. I, Zurich 1875, 177–239.

[SCHOENE] 190]), a clear sign of personal authorship rather than the deliberate anonymity claimed for the *consularia*. The Greek original is now lost, so it is not possible to tell how complete the translation is and how much (if any) extra material was added by the original Latin translator, or by subsequent scribes before the time of the Barbarus Scaligeri.[69] Nonetheless, it is evident that the original work was Alexandrian for it revolves around the transition of Egypt to Roman rule, includes Egyptian dating and in the latter part provides a consistent account of events in the province of Egypt including the inauguration in the late fourth century of successive *augustalioi*, or imperial governors. This original was based on the third-century chronicle of Hippolytus but was considerably augmented by the chronography of Julius Africanus and others (JACOBY, RE 6, 2, 1909, 1570–1575 s.v. Excerpta Barbari). It may also be the Alexandrian chronicle source later utilised, directly or indirectly, by Theophanes (MANGO – SCOTT [n. 6] LXXVIII–LXXIX).

It has been further suggested that the Pap. Berol. 13296 which dates from around 400, and which was also illustrated, was close to the Alexandrian original of Barb. Scal. (as implied in LIETZMANN [n. 48] 421–422). This may explain, for instance, why both chronicles place in 336 the arrival in Constantinople of the relics of Luke and Andrew which definitely occurred in 357.[70] The chronicle in Pap. Berol. 13296 which includes consuls (with some breaks) from 251 to 338 was not detailed. In fact most consulships listed are empty, many mistakes and serious misspellings are evident in the list,[71] and there is no specifically Alexandrian information preserved in it. For the decade from 326 to 336 it runs as follows (LIETZMANN [n. 48] 425):

---

[69] Cf. BAGNALL – CAMERON – SCHWARTZ – WORP (n. 8) 53 noting that scribal errors in the Barb. Scal. indicate some distance between it and the original translation.

[70] The dating to 357 is dependent on the near-contemporary witness of Jerome (Chron. s.a. 357 [HELM 240i]; de vir. ill. 7; contra Vigilantium 5) and Paulinus of Nola (carm. 19.329, 336, cf. Ep. 32.17); cf. John Malalas, Chron. 18. 109 (Bonn 484. 17–21), Theophanes AM 6042 (DE BOOR 227. 10–15), and Cons. Const. s.a. 357 (BURGESS 238). Incidentally, the attempt by D. WOODS, The Date of the Translation of the Relics of SS Luke and Andrew to Constantinople, VChr 45, 1991, 286–292 to date the translation to 360 is based on a misconstrual of Jerome, de vir. ill. 7. When Jerome says the translation took place in Constantius' ‹20th year› (de vir. ill. 7) he means 20th year from his accession (337), not from his recognition in Constantinople (340) as proposed by WOODS. This is the plain meaning of Jerome who frequently dates events in the de viris illustribus to an imperial year from accession (e.g. de vir. ill. 1, 2, 5, 8, 15, 16, 41, 42, 69, 135). It is also possible that the chronicle tradition separately embodies two correct dates, one (336 as in Pap. Berol. and Barb. Scal.) for their arrival, and the other (357) for their deposition in the newly completed Church of the Holy Apostles (cf. C. MANGO, Constantine's Mausoleum: Addendum, ByzZ 83, 1990, 434).

[71] BAGNALL – CAMERON – SCHWARTZ – WORP (n. 8) 53; BURGESS (n. 32) 272 labelling it an ‹odd› and a ‹hybrid› document.

Κωσταντίνου καὶ Κωσταντ. (326)
ταύτῃ τῇ ὑπ. ἐσφάγη Κρίσπος
Κωσταντ. δ̄ καὶ Μαξίμου (327)
Ἰανουαρίου καὶ Ἰούστου (328)
Κωσταντίνου καὶ Κωσταντίνου (329)
Γαλλικανοῦ καὶ Οὐαλερίου (330)
ταύτῃ τῇ ὑπ. ἀφιερώθη Κωστ. πο.
πρὸ ε̄ ἰδῶν Μαΐων
Βάσσου καὶ Ἀβλαβίου (331)
Πακατιανοῦ καὶ Ἱλαριανοῦ (332)
Δαλματίου καὶ Ζενοφίλου (333)
Ὀπτάτου καὶ Παυλίνου (334)
ταύτῃ τῇ ὑπ. ἐγέρθη Κώστανς
βασ. πρὸ η̄ καλ. Ἰανουαρ.
Κωσταντίου καὶ Ἀλβίνου (335)
Πομπεϊανοῦ καὶ Φακούνδου (336)
ταύτῃ τῇ ὑπ. εἰσῆλθεν ἐν Κωστ. πο.
τὰ λίμψανα τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων
Ἀνδρέα καὶ Λουκᾶ πρὸ ιᾱ καλ Ἰουλ.

Pap. Berol. 13296 could just as easily be based on a Constantinopolitan chronicle for the few events recorded (and quoted above) include the foundation of Constantinople (330) and the arrival there of the relics of Andrew and Luke (336). On the other hand, the evident affinities between the meagre scraps of a chronicle in Pap. Golen. and the fragments of the Barbarus Scaligeri suggest that Pap. Golen. was close to the original Alexandrian chronicle translated in the Barb. Scal., or else a version of the original Greek chronicle lying behind both Pap. Golen. and Barb. Scal. Even so, the latter part of the Pap. Golen. chronicle is rather flawed in its chronology. It places Honorius' birth in 383 (not 384), has the emperor Maximus killed in 387 (not 388), dates the usurpation of Eugenius and the death of Valentinian II to 391 (not 392) and then has Eugenius killed in 392 (not 394). It is equally unreliable for local Alexandrian information, particularly the Augustal prefects, by placing Eusebius in 385 (not 387), Erythrius in 387 (not 388) and Evagrius (391) as early as 389.[72] If Pap. Golen. were merely intended to be the source for a chronicle, rather than a chronicle in its own right, then it does not constitute a very reliable source, nor is it likely that such widespread unreliability could be contemporary. Some of its errors appear later in the Barbarus Scaligeri (s.a. 383), other errors over a millennium later in the Fasti Vindobonenses Priores (s.a. 383, 391, 392), having been copied many

[72] C. VANDERSLEYEN, Chronologie de préfets d'Égypte de 284 à 395, Brussels 1962, 169–181.

times over in the course of a transmission which at some stage may also have involved the addition of entries copied from the tradition of the Barbarus Scaligeri.

As recognised by its editors, the seventh/eight century chronicle in Pap. Golen. can be explained as deriving from an Alexandrian monastery. It may have been based closely on the chronicle of Annianos produced in the early fifth century (BAUER – STRZYGOWSKI [n. 48] 82ff). Its author may be unknown but there is no case for assuming that in Pap. Golen. the authorship of the chronicle was not inscribed. Indeed, Pap. Golen., along with Pap. Berol. 13296, and Barb. Scal., should be considered itself as part of a chronicle, not just raw material for some later chronicle and thereby a different genre called ‹consular annals›. Even so, whatever the actual relationship between all these chronicles (Pap. Berol. 13296, Pap. Golen., Barb. Scal.), the question of the sources of the original Greek chronicle, or chronicles, lying behind them remains. Hippolytus was used extensively, while the civic Alexandrian character of so many events points to a local record of Alexandria as one likely source for the latter part, at least for Pap. Golen. and Barb. Scal. (JACOBY, RE 6, 2, 1909, 1569, 1576 s.v. Excerpta Barbari). There is no need at all to see any Italian, much less Ravennan, origin for the chronicle in Cod. Par. Lat. 4884 (Barb. Scal.) despite its inclusion in the Chronica Italica section of MOMMSEN's edition.

So far we have reached the ninth century and have not seen much indication for the assumption of a surviving set of anonymous contemporary annalistic records which could provide the key source of information for the fourth, fifth and sixth century for later chronicles. Rather we have a collection of different excerpts resulting from the copying and combination of chronicles over the centuries with later additions made from both annalistic and other sources as required. In both content and style these excerpts are not demonstrably different from the extant chroniclers – contrary to the hypothesis of the ‹consular annals› genre.[73]

In the eighth/ninth century Berlin manuscript of the chronicle of Hydatius, in fact following directly upon Hydatius after a blank page, is the chronicle known as the Fasti Hydatiani (or Chronica Constantinopolitana, as MOMMSEN called it, or Descriptio Consulum in the heading of the manuscript itself, followed by BURGESS). This work is actually a medley of documents: (1) a consular list compiled at Rome and running from 509 BC to 356 AD (with various interpolations); (2) a Constantinopolitan chronicle continuing to 389; and (3) a ‹hodgepodge› continuation to 468 which utilises Hydatius.[74] The background of the work is well-understood. The original was a chronicle, perhaps illustrated,

[73] HOLDER-EGGER (n. 8) 239; MUHLBERGER (n. 6) 25.

[74] This is a simplified description; for the more complex analysis of its composition: BURGESS 1993 (n. 6), 175ff.

executed for Achantia the wife of Maternus Cynegius and which she probably took with his corpse to his Spanish homeland. At some stage, like other chronicles, it was continued by an anonymous author to the year 468. Although there is no trace of authorship, it is likely that the original work commissioned for Achantia was the work of a known chronicler, just as Cassiodorus was commissioned to produce a chronicle to commemorate the consulship of Eutharic (519). Notwithstanding this, allowance must be made for the fact that the author of the manuscript or its exemplar standardised the content and format to a certain extent. Indeed, that probably explains the fact that within such a single multi-authored chronicle manuscript there is no discernible distinction in style between the various sections (as observed by BURGESS 1993 [n. 6], 204). The Fasti Hydatiani share some entries in common with Pap. Berol. 13296 (s.a. 258, 306, 316, 325, 326, 330, 334 [correctly 333 in Fasti], 336, 338 [correctly 337 in Fasti]), and one entry in common with Pap. Golen. (389). Just as the Barb. Scal. may be related to the Greek chronicle in Pap. Golen., so the Fasti Hydatiani is obviously related to the Chronicon Paschale and the chronicle of Marcellinus. The relationship is probably to be explained by the ultimate common dependence of all three on a chronicle produced locally at Constantinople.[75]

The next fragmentary chronicle manuscript is the so-called Excerpta Sangallensia. This ninth century manuscript from St. Gall contains a few broken pages with brief and scattered entries from the period 390 to 573 without any indication of the origin of the entries (MGH. AA. IX 32, 299ff). These historical notices are almost exclusively concentrated on prodigies such as earthquakes, eclipses and outbreaks of disease but with occasional reference to the accession or passing of an emperor or Gothic king. As we know, recording man's relationship with the cosmos was an important dimension of medieval chronicles which explains the presence of so many prodigies in a list such as this. It looks as if the author of the St. Gall manuscript (or some prior scribe) has culled these entries from some larger work, perhaps a single chronicle, and since so many of these events are Italian in location an Italian chronicle is a reasonable assumption. Again, however, the source need not be some single amorphous Ravenna chronicle (as argued by HOLDER-EGGER [n. 8] 234–237) but could easily have been an otherwise lost chronicle such as that of Maximian of Ravenna, especially since Maximian's work extended at least into the late sixth century (Agnellus 78 and 82 [MGH. AA. IX 257]). In any case, the source of the ninth century St. Gall excerpt could not be described more narrowly than an Italian chronicle. This document is not so much the source of a chronicle as its residue.

[75] CROKE (n. 32) 182ff and 2001 (n. 6), 181–186 with the critique of BURGESS 1993 (n. 6), 183–185, and id. (n. 32) 281–284; cf. A. KARPOZILOS, Βυζαντίνοι Ἱστορίκοι καὶ Χρονογράφοι, Athens 1997, vol. 1, 511–527.

It certainly cannot be considered necessarily a direct copy of an anonymous fifth century document. Much the same problem is involved in determining the origin of the chronicle extracts preserved in the ninth century manuscript Cod. Berol. Phillipps 1885 under the heading *item ex libris chronicorum inter cetera*, which goes under the modern label Excerpta Valesiana. Pars Posterior.[76]

From the eleventh century comes a single torn half-page of a manuscript now in the cathedral collection at Merseburg (Cod. Mers. Dom. 202). What is interesting about this solitary leaf is that (like Pap. Golen.) it is illustrated and it preserves some otherwise unknown information for the period it covers (411–454), albeit partially. There is no way of telling how long the chronicle was and who wrote it, nor whether the Merseburg manuscript represents a faithful copy of a genuine fifth or sixth century work, or merely an abbreviated copy of a much later chronicle. The entries in the first column (front and back) are as follows (BISCHOFF – KOEHLER [n. 48] 127–128):

Theodosio augusto IIII [411]
His consulibus [412] *occisi sunt in Galliis Iovinus*
et Sebastianus et venerunt capita
eorum Ravennam III kal. Sep. et occisus est frater
eorum Sallus.
Lucio v.c. consule [413]
His consulibus occisus est Heraclianus Kar-
tagine non. Mart.
Aspare et Ariovino [434]
Theodosio XVI et Valentiniano IIII [435]
His consulibus Aetius magister mili-
tum patricius factus est non.
Sept. Ravennae
Isydore Senatore [436]
Aetio II et Segisvul. [437]
His consulibus Valentinianus na-
vigavit ad orientem Id. Iul.
die Iovis hora III et acce-
pit uxorem V kal. Novemb.

The omission of some consulships (e.g. 412, noted above) and the high degree of corruption in the consular names (e.g. 436, noted above) suggest a copy several generations removed from the original, rather than ‹at one remove› (MUHLBERGER [n. 6] 40); that is to say it had probably been copied and recopied (and possibly interpolated) many times before the eleventh century. In any

[76] Ed. I. KÖNIG, Aus der Zeit Theoderichs des Großen: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar einer anonymen Quelle, Darmstadt 1997.

event the few entries preserved (only 10 consulships of the extant 20 contain entries) show some possible connection with the St. Gall excerpts (s.a. 429, for instance). Both may ultimately derive from the same chronicle (say, Maximian) so that over the centuries of copying and recopying, with its attendant processes of interpolation and omission, the differences between them were multiplied. Other entries correspond to entries in the Chronicle of Marcellinus (s.a. 412, 413, 422, 423, 437) written five hundred years earlier which probably indicates the earlier recording of all this information by other chroniclers. In the final analysis, however, some or many of the entries in the Merseburg chronicle, as in that of St. Gall, could derive directly or indirectly from some local urban record of Ravenna (as insisted by BISCHOFF – KOEHLER [n. 48] 136). Yet the fact that this Merseburg fragment records dates by day and month does not automatically mean that it is contemporary and local to Ravenna (ibid. 126); nor does it mean that it formed part of an annalistic tradition separate from the other chronicles as supposed by HOLDER-EGGER (n. 8) 240–241 and MUHLBERGER (n. 6) 39–40, 44.

Next, in the thirteenth century, is a Copenhagen manuscript (Cod. Hav. 454) constituting essentially a seventh century continuation of the chronicle of Prosper, which is itself confined to that part which formed a continuation of Jerome, that is, from 378. There are other versions of some parts clearly deriving from marginal additions. Again, it is evident that the original seventh-century document had gone through a deal of copying and re-copying to reach its present form. Finally, in the late fifteenth century, more than a full millennium after the latest events they describe, are found two separate chronicle excerpts contained in a single Viennese manuscript (Cod. Vindob. 3416). They usually go by the name of Fasti Vindobonenses Priores and Fasti Vindobonenses Posteriores. The Fasti Vindobonenses Priores (fols. 47–53) commence with Romulus and continue to 493, except for three lost folios concerning the years 404–454; the Fasti Vindobonenses Posteriores (fols. 15–24) lack the period before 44 BC as well as 388–438 and 456–494. In general the Priores are fuller, and although both versions appear to depend on a common archetype it is plain, as MOMMSEN observed, that many entries were added by recent scribes (MGH. AA. IX 264). There are also affinities with the Excerpta Sangallensia for some entries (e.g. 390, 393, 443, 455, 501, 502). In both versions the consular lists are incomplete and disordered and there are numerous fundamental inaccuracies which is only to be expected given the late date of the manuscript. In other words, they represent the most recent in a long stage of copying in which from the earliest there was addition and interpolation.[77]

Given this situation, it is impractical to think that this Vienna manuscript represents an authentic and unadulterated copy of an original fifth century

[77] BURGESS (n. 32) 264 n. 19, 274.

document, or that it contains two versions of a single common chronicle. Instead, the reality is more likely that this manuscript is simply a concatenation of different previous chronicles with entries derived from here and there and which was put together for a particular contemporary purpose as late as the fifteenth century. The significant increase in entries from 379 in the Priores suggests that ultimately a continuation of Jerome's chronicle lies here, although its dating to 336 (MGH. AA. IX 293) of the translation of the relics of Andrew and Luke to Constantinople would appear to derive from the Barb. Scal. rather than Jerome who correctly records the event in 357.[78] Perhaps the base of the Priores had been the chronicle of Maximian which may explain its preponderance of Ravennan events in the fifth century. What has been lost in the lengthy process of transmission of the Viennese manuscript is the author's name and the precise title and historiographical context of the original chronicle. Renaissance manuscripts of Prosper and Jerome are similarly imperfect too. This situation may be contrasted with the Fasti Augustani, a relatively accurate consular list (covering the years 378–498) which was copied in the fifteenth century, but probably directly from a sixth-century original thereby indicating that early copies were still accessible then (ed. MOMMSEN, MGH. AA. XIII 384–385).

In the same year (1892) in which MOMMSEN published his edition of the chronicle fragments in Cod. Vindob. 3416 they were also published in a new edition by C. FRICK in which he gave them the misleading title of ‹Consularia Ravennatia A› and ‹Consularia Ravennatia B›. The connection with Ravenna had been postulated in the mid-nineteenth century and by the 1890s had been raised to canonical status. The origin of this attribution to Ravenna seems to have been the attempt to apply to the chronicles the same stemmatic method of recension as was being applied to other ancient texts, that is, combined with the prevailing mechanical method of source criticism. The attempt to trace all the extant chronicle fragments to a single lost source, and a Ravenna Ur-chronik at that, was misguided.[79] Even so, the view persisted that the fragments of Italian chronicles, dating from the fifth to the fifteenth centuries, represented not so much the remnants of the works of individual chroniclers like Jerome or Prosper, but rather versions of a single source for such chronicles; or at least a variety of chronicles with a single common pedigree.

---

[78] The garbled entry in the Fasti Vind. Posteriores (MGH. AA. IX 293) is also ultimately dependent on the 336 tradition, although it does not record the translation of the relics of Luke and Andrew but conflates their separate passions, then dates both to a single day, namely the annual feast of Andrew (30 November, but ‹29 November› in F. Vind. Post.) which commemorated the anniversary of his birth not his death (cf. MANGO [n. 70] 434).

[79] As pointed out by MOMMSEN and KAUFMANN in particular (references in CROKE [n. 32] 187–189).

It is tempting to assume that the chronicles which do survive represent the polished works of serious chroniclers, while what remains only in fragments was merely their raw material. Such an assumption is fallacious, however. There is, in fact, no sustainable distinction between the two in terms of structure, chronology and content. First of all there were many chronicles written in late antiquity whose authors we know about but whose works are lost (e.g. Annianos, Nestorian, Helikonius, Maximian). We cannot be certain, therefore, that some of the chronicle fragments listed above do not belong originally to one of these chronicles – especially to Maximian in the case of the Fasti Vindob. and the Exc. Sangall. and Annianos in the case of the Pap. Golen. In addition, many of the known chronicles such as Prosper and Marcellinus were also anonymously continued in particular manuscripts. The Oxford manuscript of Marcellinus (Bodl. Auct. T. 2.26), for example, contains an anonymous continuation to 548; several manuscripts of Prosper contain anonymous continuations extending to various points, while the eighth-century Reichenau continuation from 450, for example, with its scattered and precisely dated events covering imperial history only, might otherwise qualify for the list of ‹consular annals› (MGH. AA. IX 490):

et levatus est imperator Marcianus XLVII
Placidia defuncta est V kl. Decembris.
ordinatur imperator anno VIII.
Marciano et Adelfio [451]
Pugna facta in Galliis inter Aetium et Attilanum regem
Hunorum cum utriusque populi caede. Attila fugatur in Gallias superiores
Honorio et Aspere [452]
Iconica Marciani imperatoris Romam ingressa III kal. Aprilis
Opilione et Vincomalo [453]
Aetio et Studio [454]
Eo anno occisi sunt Aetius et Boetius patricii.
Carthagine ordinatur episcopus Deogratias in basilica Fausti die dominico VIII kal. Novemb.
Valentiniano VIII et Antemio [455]
Valentianus ipse occisus ad duos lauros XVII kal. Aprilis, et levatus Petronius Maximus imperator.
qui LXXII die occisus per urbem tractus.
Geisericus Romam ingressus praeda facta Carthaginem revertitur.
et post aliquos dies levatur in imperium Avitus.
Varane et Iohanne [456]
Constantino et Rufo [457]
Ardabure et Maximiano [inexplicable error]

The similarities between this extract and those of Pap. Berol. 13296 and Cod. Mers. Dom. 202 quoted above are clearly evident. That this excerpt has not traditionally been listed among the samples of so-called *consularia* is explained by the fact that it is so firmly linked to the chronicle of Prosper. That is, it represents an original attempt three hundred years later to continue Prosper, or else it simply copies an earlier continuation of the chronicle. In any event, this Reichenau text illustrates the very difficulty of developing a distinction of genres on the basis of style and format, and irrespective of the date of the manuscript.

Chronicles invited continuation either explicitly or by implication and habit, so that by the mid-sixth century Cassiodorus implies that there were many continuations of Prosper and Marcellinus (Inst. 1.17). Continuation, anonymous or not, was only natural because it helped prolong essentially the same story. It also meant that an individual manuscript contained a medley of chronicles amounting to a continuous story down to the present. So it is possible that some, or many, of these fragments represent late copies of what originally were anonymous continuations of known chronicles, rather like the Reichenau continuation of Prosper. We find the same situation with the Byzantine Greek chronicles and Syriac chronicles. So too, that a continuation of a chronicle is now anonymous does not mean that the continuator and the continuation were materially different in education, outlook and style from the chronicle and the chronicler being continued.

Instead of appreciating the reality of this situation, reflected in the manuscript tradition of the late antique chronicles, it has been suggested that the chronicle fragments discussed here not only represent a genre distinct from other chronicles (*chronica*) and called ‹consular annals› (*consularia*), but also that they can be made to yield an internally coherent path of development. This involves their establishment at Constantinople in the mid-fourth century (Fasti Hydatiani), then their subsequent dispersal to Alexandria (Pap. Berol. 13296, Pap. Golen., Barb. Scal.) and Spain (Fasti Hydatiani), then Italy (Cod. Mers. Dom. 202) and their continuation there (Exc. Sangall., Fasti Vind.). Further, these ‹consular annals› are taken to be necessarily illustrated, thereby forming part of the late Roman book-trade in luxury volumes.[80] There are several problems with this interpretation, however. Firstly, the annalistic fragments are not unrelated to the other extant chronicles. At least they cannot be shown not to be continuations or simplified adaptations of Eusebius (Barb. Scal., Pap. Berol. 13296, Pap. Golen.) or of Jerome (Cod. Mers. Dom. 202). All the Latin excerpts date from a time after Jerome and would have been influenced by his chronicle. Secondly, in the case of the papyrus fragments (Pap. Berol. 13296, Pap. Golen.) they are not essentially different from the fragmentary papyri of earlier Greek chronicles

[80] MUHLBERGER (n. 6) 37ff; BAGNALL – CAMERON – SCHWARTZ – WORP (n. 8) 54–55; BURGESS (n. 32) 287.

which are quite obviously unrelated to the hypothesis of the ‹consular annals› genre.[81] The earlier Greek chronicles too may now be anonymous but there is no reason to think that in their complete original version they were not attributed to a particular author. One certainly cannot say they were fundamentally different from Eratosthenes, for example; just as it seems impossible to construct a categorical distinction between the corresponding sections of the Chronicon Paschale and Pap. Golen. Thirdly, there is the issue of their being illustrated which is nothing special since it is evident that other chronicles and histories were illustrated too (WEITZMANN [n. 64] 87–134). In any event, by the standards of late antique illustration the fragments in question here (Pap. Berol. 13296, Pap. Golen., Cod. Mers. Dom. 202) are hardly luxurious (WEITZMANN [n. 64] 132).

Each of the papyri and manuscripts cited as constituting the ‹consular annals› genre, even the most fragmentary such as Pap. Berol. 13296, Pap. Golen., and Cod. Mers. Dom. 202, were written for a contemporary purpose and a contemporary audience, not as a source of historical detail for posterity. For the writer of the Fasti Vindobonenses the fourth and fifth centuries were over a thousand years ago, for the writer of the Continuatio Havniensis Prosperi seven to eight hundred years ago, for the writer of the Cod. Mers. Dom. 202 six to seven hundred years ago and for the author of the Fasti Hydatiani four to five hundred years ago. Their preoccupation and understanding was not focussed on late antiquity. They were not seeking out the still extant sources of the most popular and most frequently copied late antique chroniclers. Instead, their efforts were directed at utilising the considerable number and variety of chronicle manuscripts which existed at the time so as to tell or retell the story of world history as understood in their day. For the most part, this meant splicing together or selectively combining sections of previous chronicle manuscripts, irrespective of their original authorship, which was the normal habit of western medieval chroniclers.[82] That explains why the later manuscripts of chronicles such as those of Prosper and Bede, for example, are so variegated and so frequently interpolated with material from other chronicles. The Byzantine chronicle tradition followed much the same path, except that later chronicles were frequently rewritten to accommodate changing ideas of world chronology and theological understanding.[83] There is a certain circularity involved in claiming that pages of a chronicle copied in a ninth, twelfth or fifteenth century manuscript represent

[81] F. JACOBY, FGrHist 255 (P. Oxy. 12); 257 (P. Oxy. 2082) with POTTER (n. 49) 138–142 and BURGESS 1999 (n. 6), 82–83.

[82] Details in A.D. VON DEN BRINCKEN, Studien zur lateinischen Weltchronistik bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising, Düsseldorf 1957.

[83] Details in C. MANGO, The Tradition of Byzantine Chronography, Harvard Ukrainian Studies 22/23, 1988/89, 360–372 and J. N. LUBARSKIJ, New Trends in the Study of Byzantine Historiography, DOP 47, 1993, 131–138.

the unmodified source of a fifth or sixth century chronicle, rather than the remnant of a chronicle which was itself copied and recopied, written and rewritten, over the succeeding centuries. Likewise it is difficult to sustain the claim, based mainly on these same fragmentary documents, that their textual corruption occurred immediately (rather than progressively over the subsequent centuries of transmission) because of ‹the high velocity of circulation and sloppy copying practices of the Roman scribes› (BURGESS [n. 32] 286).

The hypothesis of a distinct ‹consular annals› genre is therefore not required to explain the present anonymity of the chronicle fragments; nor is it required to explain the mobility of annalistic chronicle texts. As with consular lists and Easter tables, late Roman chronicles were very mobile and circulated quickly: Eusebius was adapted and continued in Syria and Armenia, while Jerome's translation of Eusebius circulated and was continued in Ireland and Constantinople, as well as in Italy and Gaul. Paulinus of Nola, for example, found a copy at Rome which he then had copied and despatched to Alypius in North Africa (Paul. Nol. Ep. 4.3). Prosper's chronicle, written in Gaul, was known in Italy as well as the East where it was continued by Victor of Tunnuna, while Victor's work was continued in Spain by John of Biclaro. Isidore's chronicle was used in Ireland and Britain while Bede's turned out to be one of the most popular books in medieval Europe. On the eastern side the chronicle of John Malalas, written in Antioch, was available in Constantinople and Rome; that of Marcellinus was written in Constantinople but was soon available in Italy and then Ireland. It is easy to see therefore how the annals recorded in Pap. Berol. 13296 and Pap. Golen. may have been written in Alexandria but included material from Constantinople, how an Alexandrian chronicle (Barb. Scal.) could come to be found in Gaul and how a Constantinopolitan chronicle document (Fasti Hydatiani) could be continued in Spain. Nor is it surprising that such documents should only begin to appear from the mid-fourth century because it is only from then that chronicle writing on the lines laid down by Eusebius became widespread and popular as the elementary presentation of the sophisticated Christian view of human history.

What we have extant are not the fragments of luxury documents providing the sources of subsequent chronicles. but the fragments of chronicles themselves, written by a particular author and perhaps commissioned from a particular copyist. The production of a chronicle involved copying. Creation of a new chronicle required access to sources and decisions about what to include and what to omit. Obviously it was possible to produce customised chronicles. Cassiodorus did just that in 519, Ausonius too (at least for a consular *fasti* in 379 and 382, perhaps for his chronicle too). So a customised chronicle for the wife of Maternus Cynegius (Fasti Hydatiani) in the late 380s is no surprise. It is not necessary, however, least of all on the basis of the few extant fragments, to insist that such a customised chronicle was essentially different from the works

of the extant chroniclers. As noted above, it is possible that Pap. Golen. and Barb. Scal. derive ultimately from the same fifth-century Alexandrian chronicle (perhaps even that of Annianos), while Fasti Vind., Exc. Sangall. and Cod. Mers. Dom. 202 represent, directly or indirectly, the remains of some Italian chronicle such as that of Maximian of Ravenna. In the last resort what survives are individual manuscripts in which chronicles, sometimes exhibiting a range of styles, are connected together to form a continuous story. In a real sense each manuscript constitutes a unique chronicle. Identifying the actual sources of information used in individual chronicles is another problem altogether.

4. *Sample chronicle manuscripts*

In order to illustrate the significance of dealing with manuscripts individually as a means of establishing the shape and scope of a late antique chronicle and the chronicle tradition two examples may suffice. Each is an important chronicle manuscript and has the added advantage of having been recently studied afresh.

(1) British Library Additional Manuscript 16974, London, 9th or 10th century, begins with the chronicle of Jerome to 378 but in a simplified format, so that there is only a single column of dates and events throughout, and with some extra items added from various sources. This is followed by an anonymous chronicle to the year 452; then comes a brief extract from Prosper for the years 452–456 followed by the chronicle of Marius of Avenches to 582, a list of the years from 582–586, then an extract from Isidore covering the period 586–624. Together these various chronicle documents, so different in their style and emphasis, provide a continuous record of world history from Abraham to AD 624. In the course of establishing this continuity a later scribe extended the Olympiad and Year from Abraham dating sytems of Jerome into the continuation to 452. In addition, a prefatory note in the same later hand was inserted between Jerome and his continuation attributing the continuation to Prosper. Further, in order to bridge the gaps between the continuation and Marius, and between Marius and Isidore, the scribe was forced to splice in short joining sections: from Prosper (452–456) at one end and a simple list of years (582–586) at the other.[84] In other manuscripts containing this particular continuation of Jerome we find that subsequent scribes and chroniclers have added the reign lengths of Roman emperors and Frankish kings. There are even some AD dates which are later still (MUHLBERGER [n. 6] 140). Of special interest is

[84] S. MUHLBERGER, The Gallic Chronicle of 452 and its Authority for British Events, Britannia 14, 1983, 24–27; M. E. JONES – P. CASEY, The Gallic Chronicle Restored: A Chronology for the Anglo-Saxon Invasions and the End of Roman Britain, Britannia 19, 1988, 368–375; MUHLBERGER (n. 6), 137–141; R. W. BURGESS, The Dark Ages Return to Fifth-Century Britain: The «Restored» Gallic Chronicle Exploded, Britannia 21, 1990, 185–195.

that section containing Marius. It is a very imperfect reflection of the original with names corrupted and consulships omitted, thereby producing uncertainty in chronology.[85]

(2) Codex Havniensis 454 in the Kongelige Bibliotek, Copenhagen, 12th or 13th cent., consists firstly of Jerome's chronicle to 378 (incorporating extra information taken by the scribe – or previously in the tradition – from Jerome's de viris illustribus, Prosper and Isidore), then that part of Prosper which continued Jerome from 379 to 455 (incorporating extra material from Isidore and other unidentifiable sources) and finally a continuation of Prosper from 455 to 625 (based on a range of unidentifiable sources). The original compiler of this collection was probably the continuator of Prosper who can be shown to have been a seventh-century Italian.[86] This continuation part of the manuscript is more complicated in that it contains some duplication and it is made more complicated still by being broken up and spread out in MOMMSEN's section on ‹Chronica Italica› (MGH. AA. IX 304–339). Indeed, the continuity of the manuscript is completely obscured in the MGH because Prosper is edited separately (MGH. AA. IX 385–485). From 475 the manuscript reverts to 457 and continues then to 489, then reverts to 474 and continues again to 489 before continuing on to 625. For the period 475–480 there is a third version in the margin following the conclusion of the second one. Although following each other in the manuscript, MOMMSEN printed them side-by-side in the section ‹Chronica Italica›. How these three versions of the same years came to be in the same manuscript is now explained by the fact that the lost archetype of the Copenhagen manuscript contained many marginal corrections and comments, perhaps by the original author. So when the scribe of Cod. Havn. 454 came to the years 475–489 he first copied the more complete marginal version (MOMMSEN's ‹ordo prior›) followed by the original (‹ordo posterior›) but, having done the copying carelessly, a second scribe then produced a more accurate version (‹ordo posterioris margo›) of the same years (details in MUHLBERGER 1984 [n. 86], 68–70). This apparently untidy process of compilation was common in the Middle Ages,[87] and is also evident in the content of the Fasti Vindobonenses, as we have seen.

Each of these manuscripts underscores the fact that in analysing the chronicles of late antiquity it is essential to begin with the way they are preserved in the manuscript tradition. When these chronicles were originally edited in the

[85] C. MORTON, Marius of Avenches, the «Excerpta Valesiana» and the Death of Boethius, Traditio 38, 1982, 110–115.

[86] S. MUHLBERGER, Heroic Kings and Unruly Generals: The Copenhagen Continuation of Prosper Reconsidered, Florilegium 6, 1984, 53–63, and id., War, Warlords and Christian Historians, in: A. C. MURRAY, After Rome's Fall. Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History, Toronto 1998, 96–97.

[87] Cf. N. F. PARTNER, Serious Entertainments, Chicago – London 1977, 208.

nineteenth century what was important was the extent to which they were reliable factual evidence for the years they cover. While MOMMSEN understood probably better than anyone the significance of their tradition, he only obscured the situation by breaking up many of these manuscripts and printing their constituent parts under different generic headings. He was basically concerned with providing a critical edition for the use of historians in search of factual testimony. In our less positivistic era we have come to place more fundamental importance on the shape of the chronicle manuscripts as texts and as cultural artifacts of the time in which they were assembled and copied which leads to some frustration with MOMMSEN's format.[88] This current perspective highlights the context of fragments and cautions against using them to create false distinctions of genre.

5. *Variety within the chronicle genre*

The late Roman chronicles were not seen by contemporaries as discrete and self-contained works. From the time of Eusebius they fitted together in each manuscript, one continuing the other in order to tell an ongoing story. Furthermore, their format meant that material was easily added, written and omitted; not just entries but also systems of chronology. In these circumstances it becomes very difficult to determine what a fifth century chronicle originally looked like, and this explains why the most important recent discussions of aspects of these chronicles have hinged on establishing the correct interpretation of the manuscripts and their process of compilation. It also explains the many failed attempts at producing an authentic edition of the chronicle of Jerome, for instance, despite the relatively large number of extant manuscripts.

The Latin chronicle fragments discussed above are perhaps the remnants of chronicle manuscripts such as Cod. Havn. 454 and BM Add. Ms. 16974. That is, they are not necessarily direct copies of uncontaminated original fourth/fifth/sixth century works but later redactions with modifications and interpolations. If so, they were not so much sources for late Roman chronicles but chronicles in their own right, even though they are (by virtue of being fragmentary) preserved anonymously which makes them no different from (say) the ‹Chronicler of 511› in Cod. Matrit. 134 (MOMMSEN, MGH. AA. IX 626–628). Indeed, if only part of the Bodleian manuscript of Marcellinus had survived, two leaves of the anonymous continuation for example, we would have no way of piecing together the original manuscript context of those leaves. As it is, there is no indication of authorship for the continuation of Marcellinus from 535 to 548;

[88] Summed up fairly directly by I. N. WOOD, Continuity or Calamity? The Construction of Literary Models, in: J. DRINKWATER – H. ELTON (eds.), Fifth Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?, Cambridge 1992, 15.

yet a coherent picture of the author and his background can be reconstructed to some extent (CROKE 2001 [n. 6], 216–236), just as it has been reconstructed for the ‹Chronicle of 452› (MUHLBERGER [n. 6] 136–192) and in a completely different cultural context for pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre (WITAKOWSKI [n. 6] 90–146).

When Eusebius set about producing his annalistic chronicle canons in the early fourth century there were similar kinds of works already in existence – on papyrus, on stone and on parchment: Hellenistic chronographies such as that of Eratosthenes; local chronicles of various Greek cities (*horographiai*), such as the Parian Marble, followed by comparable Roman city records such as the Fasti Ostienses; lists of rulers and religious officials such as the Priestesses of Hera at Argos; lists of Roman consuls; Easter tables which included various other chronological indicators. In addition, there were two significant works of Christian chronography – by Hippolytus and Julius Africanus – in which many of these ancient records were assembled, critically compared and correlated in order to construct a chronology of human history which was reconcilable with that contained in the Old and New Testaments. The significance of Eusebius' two-part chronicle was that it provided a comprehensive and complete tabular framework containing each year from the birth of Abraham. Subsequently, others sought to extend and refine the canons of Eusebius – on parchment and on papyrus.

Over several centuries this process was undertaken in different ways and gave rise to a variety of forms and versions, but they were all generically ‹chronicles› and labelled as such: (1) production of a more complete version by filling in the period between Adam and Abraham (Panodorus); (2) revised and restructured versions of Eusebius' chronology (Diodorus of Tarsus, Annianus, Jacob of Edessa); (3) amplification of Eusebius' account with material from other documents (Malalas, Chronicon Paschale, Syncellus); (4) translation into other languages and incorporation of events specific to the history of that culture (Armenian, Syriac, Coptic, Latin, Irish); (5) simplification of the presentation of Eusebius (Ekloge Historion, Prosper); (6) updating of the canons of Eusebius at later periods to provide a continuous record (Continuatio Antiochiensis [BURGESS 1999 (n. 6), 164–173], Andronicus, Jerome and continuators). The variety of ways in which Eusebius' work came to be used gave rise to a variety of subsequent works but generically they all fall within the same understanding of what constitutes a chronicle.[89]

---

[89] MOSSHAMMER (n. 6) passim; W. ADLER, Eusebius' Chronicle and its Legacy, in: W. ATTRIDGE – G. HATA (eds.), Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism, Leiden 1992, 467–491; BURGESS 1999 (n. 6), 79–84, and on the date and context of Eusebius' Chronicle: id., The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' *Chronici Canones* and *Historia Ecclesiastica*, JThS 48, 1997, 471–504.

As a text, the chronicle was a practical document which demonstrated in an immediately observable fashion the chronology of the whole of human history to the chronicler's present day. For this reason, chronicles were frequently copied and in the process of copying were adapted and updated to suit the immediate purpose of the author and audience. When chronicles came into fashion, however, from the fourth century, they did not displace previous kinds of chronographic works such as consular lists. These continued to exist and continued to be needed for they continued to fulfil a different purpose from the Eusebian chronicle. Although consular lists and Easter tables had an immediate practical use they were essentially ephemeral, just as modern calendars and almanacs are, and after a while were unusable for everyday purposes, except where they were conscientiously maintained on a yearly basis. Yet, there was now a permanent use for them because their traditional annalistic format lent them ideally to the technique of the chronicler. When Prosper came to write his chronicle he needed a consular list (or series of lists) to provide the framework, just as did Marcellinus when he came to continue Jerome from 379 to 518. A consular list could also be useful in the compilation of an Easter table as Victor of Aquitaine found in the 450s. The main sources of most late antique chronicles were previous chronicles.

Clearly, there were produced in late antiquity a variety of different forms and versions of chronographical works – by a variety of authors in a variety of contexts. One may juxtapose the consular list contained in the Codex-Calendar of 354 (MGH. AA. IX 354, 89–140) with, say, the chronicle of Prosper a century later and the Chronicon Paschale nearly two centuries after that, but still see a basic commonality of form. Further, one may juxtapose the Liber Generationis preserved in one of the manuscript traditions of the Codex-Calendar of 354 with the fragmentary Barbarus Scaligeri, as well as with the chronicle of John Malalas, in order to illustrate once more the basic unity of the chronicle tradition manifest in a plethora of outward textual forms. There is a considerable flexibility, fluidity and elasticity of form within the genre of the late antique chronicles, just as there is within the apparently stricter structures of Greek and Roman historiography.[90] The problem for the modern student of late antique historiography, however, is that the nature of the genre ensured that chronicles were adapted, truncated, combined and superseded over time. What remains is not the original chronicles of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries but mainly

[90] More generally, recent research on Greek and Roman historiography has also resulted in an appreciation of the fluidity and elasticity of genres among the ancient historians: J. Marincola, Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography, Cambridge 1997, and id., Genre, Convention and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography, in: C. S. Kraus (ed.), The Limits of Historiography. Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts, Leiden 1999, 281–324.

mutated and mutilated versions of them dating from the fifth to the fifteenth centuries. They are mainly the product of medieval scribes and scholars.

When set against the hundreds of medieval manuscript pages of late Roman chronicles (Jerome, Prosper, Isidore, Bede etc.) the documents adduced in support of the *consularia* genre provide a very meagre dossier: a single damaged page of a fifth century papyrus (Pap. Berol. 13296) and one very torn page of a seventh/eighth century papyrus covering just ten years (Pap. Golen.) – both containing many dating errors; one torn half-page from an eleventh century manuscript covering twenty-three years (Cod. Mers. Dom. 202), again with dating errors resulting from the process of copying over the centuries; two pages of an eighth century Latin translation of an earlier Alexandrian chronicle (Cod. Par. Lat. 4884, fols 61b, 62ab, 63a); two ninth century manuscripts, one a fragment including a few select entries on prodigies and eclipes (Excerpta Sangallensia), the other including a section covering the period to 468 (Fasti Hydatiani) and, finally, part of a late fifteenth century chronicle covering the period 379–403 (Fasti Vind. Priores) but which includes many years without an entry. These few texts which have been aggregated under the modern label of ‹consular annals› are not so distinct in terms of authorship, style, purpose and presentation from the other known chronicles of the period as to constitute a separate literary genre.

It would appear, then, that the hypothesis of the ‹consular annals› genre, however ‹sub-literary›, is untenable because (1) it fails to take proper account of contemporary nomenclature for chronographical works which make no distinction between *chronica* and a genre called *consularia*, and (2) it tends to over-simplify the patterns of the textual transmission of late Roman chronicles. Throughout the late antique world, east and west, contemporaries did not make firm distinctions of genre among the variety of chronographical productions with which they were familiar. We should not attempt, at this stage, to impose our own artificial categories on their chronographical works. Instead, we should simply acknowledge the variety and adaptability of structures and forms which developed in late antiquity under the single rubric of ‹chronicle›.[91]

2 Newark Crescent
Lindfield 2070
Australia

[91] I would like to thank RICHARD BURGESS and STEVEN MUHLBERGER for their comments on an earlier version of this paper, several years ago. Although neither has been attracted by the line of argument presented here, their important research remains fruitful for all studies of the late antique chronicles.