

Richard W. Burgess

Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography

HISTORIA
Einzel-
schriften

135



Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart

RICHARD W. BURGESS

STUDIES IN EUSEBIAN AND
POST-EUSEBIAN CHRONOGRAPHY

HISTORIA

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ALTE GESCHICHTE · REVUE D'HISTOIRE
ANCIENNE · JOURNAL OF ANCIENT HISTORY · RIVISTA
DI STORIA ANTICA

EINZELSCHRIFTEN

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON
MORTIMER CHAMBERS / LOS ANGELES · HEINZ HEINEN / TRIER
FRANÇOIS PASCHOD / GENEVE · HILDEGARD TEMPORINI / TÜBINGEN
GEROLD WALSER / BASEL

HEFT 135



FRANZ STEINER VERLAG STUTTGART
1999

RICHARD W. BURGESS

with the assistance of Witold Witakowski

STUDIES IN EUSEBIAN AND POST-EUSEBIAN CHRONOGRAPHY

1. The *Chronici canones* of Eusebius of Caesarea:
Structure, Content, and Chronology,
AD 282–325

AND

2. The *Continuatio Antiochiensis Eusebii*:
A Chronicle of Antioch and the Roman Near East during
the Reigns of Constantine and Constantius II,
AD 325–350



FRANZ STEINER VERLAG STUTTGART
1999

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Historia / Einzelschriften]

Historia : Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte. Einzelschriften. – Stuttgart :
Steiner

Früher Schriftenreihe

Reihe Einzelschriften zu: Historia

H. 135. Burgess, Richard W.: Studies in Eusebian and post-Eusebian
chronography. - 1999

Burgess, Richard W.:

Studies in Eusebian and post-Eusebian chronography / Richard W.

Burgess. With the assistance of Witold Witakowski. - Stuttgart :

Steiner, 1999

(Historia : Einzelschriften ; H. 135)

Enth.: 1. The "Chronici canones" of Eusebius of Caesarea. - 2. The
"Continuatio antiochiensis Eusebii"

ISBN 3-515-07530-5



ISO 9706

Jede Verwertung des Werkes außerhalb der Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist unzulässig und strafbar. Dies gilt insbesondere für Übersetzung, Nachdruck, Mikroverfilmung oder vergleichbare Verfahren sowie für die Speicherung in Datenverarbeitungsanlagen. © 1999 by Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, Sitz Stuttgart. Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier. Druck: Druckerei Peter Proff, Eurasburg.
Printed in Germany

Hunc librum dedico
magistris praeclarissimis
William S. Elliott,
Ian Hundy,
Timothy D. Barnes,
sine quibus
nihil essem

Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements	9
Abbreviations	15
A Note on Citations	17

STUDY 1

The *Chronici canones* of Eusebius of Caesarea: Structure, Content, and Chronology, AD 282–325

1. Introduction: Overview and Witnesses	21
1.1. The Witnesses	23
2. Regnal Years and Other Chronological Systems	28
3. Errors and Corrections	36
4. The Episcopal Lists	44
5. Text and Chronology, 282–325	46
5.1. Methodology	46
5.2. Establishing the Text	47
5.3. Reconstruction and Translation	59
6. Commentary	66
6.1. Eusebius	66
6.2. Jerome	90
Appendix 1: The Witnesses	99
Appendix 2: The Calendars of Josephus	104
Appendix 3: Imperial Reigns in Eusebius, Theophilus, Clement, Hippolytus, Tertullian, and the <i>Chronica urbis Romae</i>	107

STUDY 2

The *Continuatio Antiochiensis Eusebii*: A Chronicle of Antioch and the Roman Near East during the Reigns of Constantine and Constantius II, AD 325–350

1. Introduction	113
1.1. Introduction	113
1.2. <i>Quellenforschung</i> and the Recovery of the Text	114
1.3. The Entries and the Witnesses	119
1.4. The Nature of the Work, its Extent, the Theology of its Author, and the Place of Composition	122

1.5. The Relationship of the Witnesses to the Original	129
1.6. Style and Structure	132
1.7. Chronology	134
1.8. Preliminary Analysis	143
1.9. Preface to the Following Chapters	147
2. The Reconstruction	148
Introduction	148
Part 1. The Witnesses	150
Part 2. Hypothetical Reconstruction and Translation	164
Appendix: Hypothetical Reconstruction of Unical Page Layout	174
3. Commentary	178
Appendix 1: A Guide to the Syriac and Arabic Transliterations Used in this Work	284
Appendix 2: The Bishops of Antioch, 313–350, and Consolidated Bishop Lists for Studies 1 and 2	285
Appendix 3: The Dates in Syriac Martyr Acts by Raymond Mercier	287
Appendix 4: Table of Chronological Data for Entry 34	302
Appendix 5: Chronology, 311–350	304
Appendix 6: Earthquakes, Comets, and Eclipses, 325–350	305
Bibliography	307
1. Ancient Sources	307
2. Modern Works and Collections of Ancient Sources	314
Indices	327
1. Ancient Authors and Works	327
2. Modern Scholars	334
3. Names of People, Places, and Things	338

Preface and Acknowledgements

The secret dream of most ancient historians is to discover the text of a long-lost Greek or Roman historian that will shed light on a hitherto dark area of history, a text that will confirm old hypotheses or put a completely new perspective on important events or persons. As the twentieth century draws to a close, most of us realize that barring a papyrological discovery in Egypt or the Near East this dream is unlikely to come true. Documentary texts of all sorts continue to stream out of these areas on papyrus, but a new work of ancient history is rare indeed. Often our only recourse is *Quellenforschung*, by which we try to identify lost sources from surviving histories. The results of this method can be important – the discovery of the *Kaisergeschichte* at the end of the last century is an excellent example – but they are often not as earthshaking as a completely new text would be, and one can rarely completely reconstruct the lost work from surviving histories. Often great effort is spent just trying to convince the scholarly community that such a lost common source did actually exist (it has taken almost 100 years in the case of the *KG*!). Sometimes the postulated work turns out not to have existed at all.

The texts that I present in these studies fall somewhere between these two extremes: they are not complete, newly-discovered works, nor are they hazy postulated works hinted at by *Quellenforschung*. They have been revealed through *Quellenforschung*, but almost all their content can be restored – perhaps more than would even have been the case had they been discovered on papyrus – and their existence cannot be doubted. The first study treats a work familiar to all who study the fourth century, the *Chronici canones* or *Chronicle* of Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea. Although it is certainly one of the most important and influential historical works of western literature and thought, not a single folio of its text survives in its original state. It exists only in two generally complete ancient translations, two translated epitomes, and many fragments of the original recovered from other ancient histories that excerpted the original Greek document before it was lost. The last part of the *Canones* is particularly badly transmitted and it is that section that I have undertaken to reconstruct. Only one person ever has undertaken to reconstruct Eusebius' *Canones* and that was in 1606; it has always been assumed that either Jerome or the Armenian translation is sufficiently accurate to be considered as the work of Eusebius himself. As we shall see, that does not turn out to be the case. Before beginning the process of reconstruction, however, a number of matters involving Eusebius' chronology must be established. The reconstructed text of the *Canones* allows us for the first time to compare Jerome's translation with the original (or at least a close approximation) and to analyse how he translated and augmented Eusebius' Greek original. The results of both the reconstruction and the analysis are quite surprising. As well they may be; it is the first time in over one thousand years that anything approximating the original Greek text has been available for study.

The second study is rather more complicated and deserves a rather longer introduction. This is a chronicle whose existence has been suspected in the past, but that

was never properly reconstructed. Even though this chronicle has been reconstructed from existing sources, many of these sources are obscure or rarely used by modern historians of the fourth century, and the reconstruction has its own chronological framework, thus providing a context that did not exist in many of the source documents. As a result much of what this reconstructed work has to say has the appearance of novelty. In essence, then, we have a newly discovered lost history, whose existence has been postulated by modern scholars, but which has never been properly reconstructed or subjected to a serious, detailed analysis. So even though certain aspects of this chronicle are known and understood, this new reconstruction puts what we do know on a much more solid footing.

As I explain in Chapter 1 of Study 2, most of the entries that I include in this new chronicle were collected by Joseph Bidez in an appendix to his edition of Philostorgius for GCS (Anhang VII); this is the work of the so-called 'Arian Historiographer'. Unfortunately Bidez did nothing to establish a chronology for the fragments and included a vast amount of material that demonstrably does not belong to this work: most of his pages 204 to 214 do belong, but pages 203 and 215 to 241 do not. Recent studies have even suggested that this work was a continuation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, rather than his *Chronici canones*, as Bidez suggested. In spite of Bidez's collection, however, I deduced the existence of this chronicle quite independently through a comparison of Jerome and Theophanes, and I therefore introduce it here through this avenue of *Quellenforschung*, starting with the study of Jerome, not through the collection of Bidez. I hope that this will not confuse readers into thinking that I am claiming for my own something that has been undertaken by others. It is better in the case of such a reconstruction as this to start from first principles and not to skip any step in the process of analysis and deduction by simply assuming the validity of Bidez's identification, especially since I do not agree with it in its entirety. This will allow critics to judge the method as well as the results. That both Bidez and I independently came to virtually the same conclusions regarding the content of this work (between 325 and 350 at least) is a strong testament to the reality and content of the original document.

The commentary is primarily an attempt to evaluate the historical and chronological value of this source. If its chronology is unsound or it retails inaccurate or misleading information, it will corrupt the reconstructions of those who use it blindly. Only after a detailed analysis could I evaluate the reconstructed chronicle as a historical source, like any other. Such an analysis seemed like a simple task, given that we are dealing with a chronicle that covers only twenty-six years, but I soon found that I was faced with a vast array of differing scholarly opinion. I came to the study of fourth-century historiography via the chronicles of the fifth century, where one has to extract every drop of meaning from every one of the meagre sources at one's disposal. Yet I found that in many cases the evidence of this chronicle (or rather of the witnesses to it) had not been given the weight it deserved or had not even been considered. Such fundamental facts as the dates of the bishops of Antioch, of the first siege of Nisibis, of the Persian persecution of the Christians, and of the refoundation of Amida were found to be matters either of long-standing scholarly dispute or of almost complete indifference, with some scholars making sweeping pronouncements on the basis of a tiny fraction of the available evidence. This forced

me into the position of having to evaluate all the relevant evidence for myself, going back to the original sources in each instance to determine what could plausibly and reliably be derived from them. As Marie-Joseph Pierre says, 'Il faut beaucoup d'audace ou beaucoup de naïveté pour s'engager dans une telle recherche, où les savants les plus reconnus ne se sont pas accordés' (Pierre 1995: 266 n. 59). In my case I am sure it is a bit of both.

In my analysis I have sought to examine all the pertinent evidence that I could find; I am sure I have missed some, nevertheless. In most, if not all, of the instances that I analyse, it is my hope that this commentary offers the most detailed examination of the individual events and sources available. Such a commentary, I believe, should provide a new basis for future scholarly consensus concerning the events that are discussed, whether such consensus forms around my conclusions or not. If not, I should hope that the commentary would at least serve to spur others to undertake the sort of detailed analysis that has been lacking in some of the recent scholarship on these events. Sweeping historical narratives and structuralist interpretations may turn out to have been built on sand if the details are not correct. Thus, whether my conclusions and hypotheses are accepted or not (that is not really important), I hope that they will serve the greater interests of the history and historiography of the period.

I also hope that my detailed presentations will help scholars to become more aware of the historiographical currents and eddies that underlie many of the surviving accounts of the period. This is an aspect of historical reconstruction that I find that most historians avoid in their attempts to reconstruct the 'truth' of the past. An understanding of how the events of the past were perceived, modified, and recorded, however, is fundamental for our attempts to explain and understand those events (see Burgess 1993/4 and Fowden 1994 for two examples of the sorts of studies I am talking about here). I have refrained from seeking out all the ramifications of my conclusions and incorporating them into a larger historical narrative, though I have hinted at some, chiefly with regard to ecclesiastical politics and Romano-Persian relations between 337 and 350. In almost all cases the *Continuatio* has proven to be accurate and valuable, and I would venture to assert that it is one of the most valuable sources for the history of Syria and the eastern frontier for the period that it covers (325–350).

The commentary is very unusual in its form. Most sections are very short, but some are quite long, and one is very long indeed, being greatly out of proportion to the rest of the work (no. 34). This was to a great extent deliberate. Anywhere I believed that I had something interesting or useful to contribute with regard to the history or historiography of a particular sequence of events, an episode, or a date, I took whatever space was required to set forth my exposition. In most cases I have provided only the minimum of 'background' information that one finds in a standard historical commentary; each entry of the text is more of a starting point for an examination of the event narrated or the narrations of the event. Some of these sections I have published separately in different journals so that scholars who may find my analyses of interest but who may not be aware of this volume will have access to my arguments and conclusions. In all cases the final version appears here.

In this post-modern age my attempts to determine the details of past events must seem naïve at best. I must admit that my own approach to history is very much in sympathy with post-modernists, though I have always favoured the more classical epithet of 'Pyrrhonist' for my views on the unrecoverability of the past. How far can we truly know what happened in the past? For the most part, generalities only, it must be admitted. My method has been to uncover the version or versions that make the most sense within the twin prerequisites of the context within which the event supposedly occurred and the context of the recording of the various perceptions of that event, i.e. the historical and historiographical contexts. The result is a general likelihood or probability that things happened in one way rather than in another. For instance, that Constantine was a real man who died on 22 May of the year we call 337, cannot be doubted; post-modernists go too far in denying the security of such knowledge. But the circumstances of his final days are very foggy; my reconstruction is based on probabilities and assumptions about the events and the sources that make the reconstruction different from what any other scholar has presented. But a different approach – an acceptance of the truthfulness of the earliest account, by Eusebius, for instance – would render a different set of probabilities and a different description of the past. Each would be just as 'true' within its own parameters. The past, of course, never changes; however it was that Constantine died remains the same no matter what we say. It happened the way it happened and we are left trying to catch distant echoes and glimpse vague reflections in distorting mirrors. The important thing to realize is the precariousness of any reconstruction. I have no illusions about discovering any truth; I have only the hope of offering a more complete account of the historical and historiographical contexts than before and that such approaches will seem more likely or plausible or acceptable than earlier such attempts because of this. As such, mine are simply attempts to come closer to ancient reality as it has been described to us.

Another unusual aspect of this commentary, since I am treating a lost text, is its attention to certain philological aspects of the reconstructed text. The necessarily small scale of this analysis nevertheless brings to light many fascinating aspects of the style and vocabulary of the chronicle, most especially its detailed reliance on the *Chronici canones* as a stylistic model. In many cases these verbal and phraseological parallels also help to confirm the accuracy of our witnesses. Having noticed certain problems that some have had with non-Attic Greek in relation to some of the witnesses to this text (e.g. ἐν + dative = εἰς + accusative) I have also commented upon certain obvious aspects of late Greek grammar and vocabulary that could cause problems.

Readers will note that there is some duplication in the text and notes of these two studies. I wanted each to be able to be read on its own and did not want readers of the second study having to constantly flip back to related matters in the first. The overlap is minor and I think that the extra space taken is more than made up for by the convenience for the reader.

Finally, I should point out that in these studies I use the term 'Arian' as nothing more than a convenient short-hand to describe those who held that Christ was of a similar substance and nature to God and was not co-eternal with him. The 'orthodox' and probably majority view at the time was that the Son was of the same nature

and substance as and was co-eternal with the Father. The theology of the various parties is for the most part of no concern of this work, just the 'us' and 'them' opposition preserved in most of our sources, the 'Arians' usually being 'them'. The name was, of course, a pejorative term and used as a very wide brush to tar non-orthodox bishops and clergy of many differing shades of belief with regard to the Trinitarian question. The reader should treat the term 'Arian' as the convenient, if inaccurate, shorthand that it is intended to be. The same should also be said of my use of the word 'pagan'.

I should first like to thank Eleanor Dickey for reading early drafts of parts of this work and for making comments upon it. Timothy Barnes read over two drafts of the second study and the final draft of the first study, and offered many valuable suggestions and saved me from numerous errors. He has been extremely encouraging during the writing of this book and without that encouragement it might never have been completed. His willingness generously to accept correction (more often just clarification) from a former student is a model for us all and I thank him for it. Whatever is meritorious in the methodology and approach of this work is due to what he has taught me, both in the classroom and in print. Tom Elliott drew my attention to the continuing, if minor, controversy of the date of the council of Serdica and read over and commented upon the developing versions of that section of the commentary. Geoffrey Greatrex, my colleague for a too-short year here in Ottawa in 1995–6, provided an excellent sounding board for various ideas while he was here, and after his return to Britain took the time to read over and comment upon the penultimate draft of the second study and provided much-needed bibliographical assistance. Raymond Mercier, an expert on ancient calendars whose questioning on the theory of M. J. Higgins first lead me to suspect that the Jewish calendar was the unknown calendar used in the Persian martyr acts, has composed an appendix that both sets forth the argument for the use of the Jewish calendar in the martyr acts and explains the errors of Higgins' theory. I should also like to thank Kevin Coyle for his preliminary help with certain Syriac texts, and Sebastian Brock, Aho Yamac, and Marina Greatrex for last minute help with other Syriac problems. I owe a further debt of gratitude to Marina Greatrex for supplying camera-ready copy of the Syriac text for Study 2 at the proof stage when other means had failed. I also wish to thank an anonymous referee who encouraged me to undertake a number of changes that have made this a substantially better work than it was when s/he read it. Wolfson College elected me a Visiting Scholar for the spring and summer of 1998, which allowed me to finish this book and launch myself into new projects in the incomparable atmosphere of the Bodleian, Ashmolean, and Oriental Institute libraries. For this overdue return to Oxford I am grateful. Finally, I must express my gratitude to Witold Witakowski, who entered this project originally simply as an expert in Syriac who could check a few of my conclusions against the original texts. His assistance was so thorough and comprehensive that I asked him to assume a larger role in the production of the work. He agreed and he has been responsible for providing me with citations to and transcriptions and translations of the Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic texts, as well as providing me with the Syriac texts themselves for chapter two of the second study. All this in spite of a heavy workload of his own. In addition, he

and his work have provided me with many invaluable insights into Syriac and Syriac historiography. However, he should not be held responsible for any errors, inferences, or conclusions with respect to the texts that he has analysed for me. It is always the author's right to claim for himself all errors, and I am sure many remain. Whatever is good in this *tumultuarium opus* is the result of the scholars who have gone before me (they are named in the bibliography), those who have taught me (they are named in my dedication), and those who have helped directly with the writing of this book (they are named above and below).

I finally wish to thank my wife Louise for her constant support and encouragement, especially over the last three years as I attempted to finish this book amidst seemingly unending academic crises brought on by government funding cuts, the closure of our sister Classics department at Carleton University across town, and further (and continuing) budget cuts to the department and Faculty by the administration of my own university, during which time I have seen my colleagues dwindle from twelve to four as a result of early retirement, regular retirement, death, illness, and disgust.

RWB
Kal. Iun. MCMXCVIII
ciuitate Oxoniensi

Abbreviations

Journal abbreviations are those used by *L'Année Philologique*.

AASS	Acta Sanctorum. Paris and Brussels, 1643–.
ACOec	<i>Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum</i> . Leipzig and Berlin, 1914–.
BHO	Paul Peeters. <i>Bibliotheca hagiographica orientalis</i> . Subsidia hagiographica 10. Brussels, 1910.
CLRE	Roger S. Bagnall, Alan Cameron, Seth R. Schwartz, and Klaas A. Worp. <i>Consuls of the Later Roman Empire</i> . Atlanta, 1987.
Chron. min.	<i>Chronica minora</i>
CIL	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum</i> . Berlin, 1863–.
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum series Latina. Turnholt, 1953–.
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium. Paris and Louvain, 1903–.
	SA Scriptores Arabici
	SS Scriptores Syri
CSEL	Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vienna, 1866–.
CSHB	Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae. Bonn, 1828–1897.
DAC	Fernand Cabrol and Henri Leclercq (eds.). <i>Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie</i> . Paris, 1907–53.
DCB	William Smith and Henry Wace (eds.). <i>A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literatures, Sects and Doctrines</i> . London, 1877–87.
DHGE	A. Baudrillart, A. Vogt, U. Rouziès, et al. (eds.). <i>Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques</i> . Paris, 1912–.
EEC	Angelo di Berardino (ed.). <i>Encyclopedia of the Early Church</i> . New York, 1992.
EOMIA	Cuthbert Hamilton Turner (ed.). <i>Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima</i> . Oxford, 1899–1939.
FGrHist	Felix Jacoby (ed.). <i>Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker</i> , 2B. Berlin, 1929.
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Leipzig and Berlin, 1897–.
	NF Neue Folge
HE	<i>Historia ecclesiastica</i>
LSJ ⁹	Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones (eds.). <i>A Greek English Lexicon</i> . ⁹ Oxford, 1940.
LTK	Josef Höfer, Karl Rahner, et al. (eds.). <i>Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche</i> . ² Freiburg, 1957–65.
MGH: AA	Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Auctores Antiquissimi. Berlin, 1877–1919.
NIDCC	J. D. Douglas (ed.). <i>The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church</i> . Exeter, 1974.
ODB	Alexander P. Kazhdan (ed.). <i>The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium</i> . Oxford, 1991.

ODCC	F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (eds.). <i>The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church</i> . ² Oxford, 1983.
PG	Patrologia graeca. Paris, 1857–66.
PL	Patrologia latina. Paris, 1844–65.
PLond.	F. G. Kenyon et al. (eds.). <i>Greek Papyri in the British Museum</i> . London, 1893–1974.
PLRE I	A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris (eds.). <i>The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</i> 1. Cambridge, 1971.
PO	Patrologia orientalis. Paris, 1905–.
POxy	Bernard P. Grenfell, Arthur S. Hunt, et al. (eds.). <i>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i> . London, 1898–.
PSyr	Ignatius Ortiz de Urbina. <i>Patrologia Syriaca</i> . Rome, 1958.
QGB	Johannes Karayannopoulos and Günter Weiß. <i>Quellenkunde zur Geschichte von Byzanz (324–1453)</i> 2. Wiesbaden, 1982.
RE	Georg Wissowa et al. (eds.). <i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> . Stuttgart, 1894–1963.
SB	F. Preisigke et al. (eds.). <i>Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten</i> . Wiesbaden et alibi, 1915–.
SPP	C. Wessely et al. (eds.). <i>Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde</i> . Leipzig, 1901–24.
TAVO	<i>Tübinger Atlas des vorderen Orients</i> . Wiesbaden, 1977–.
TIR L 34	<i>Tabula Imperii Romani. Aquincum-Sarmizegetusa-Sirmium. L 34</i> Budapest. Budapest, 1968.
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Leipzig and Berlin, 1883–.

A Note on Citations

Page or column numbers usually follow the colon in a name-date citation, e.g. Smith 1991: 34–78. The volume number of separately paginated volumes of the same work follow the date and a comma, e.g. Ginzel 1885, 2: 34. There is no comma where there is no date, e.g. *DCB* 2: 34.

When a text does not have the usual book or chapter divisions, page or column numbers are cited. Line numbers appear after the page number and a period. In a reference to an ancient author in a sentence these numbers are placed in brackets without a 'p.' or 'col.', e.g. in a reference to a passage in *Chron. Pasch.* (324.4–7). When the name or title of an ancient author is used as a simple citation, the page or column numbers immediately follow the name or title, e.g. Sync. 343.1–3. If page numbers are included with a book or chapter reference, usually when the chapters are very long, the page numbers will follow a 'p.' or 'pp.', e.g. in a reference to a passage of Zonaras (12.34, p. 625.2–3).

In cases where I believe that a reference to the original Syriac or Arabic text is useful or of value, the page or column number appears in italics following the page reference to the translation and a slash, following the same rules as above, e.g. Ps-Dionysius, *Chron.* 126.25–7/169.24–6. Often in such cases the Syriac or Arabic reference will contain line references that do not appear in the translation. This is because the translation has no line numbers and it will always be easy for a reader to find the relevant passage in the translation. The line references make the Syriac or Arabic passage easier to find, especially for non-specialists. For texts whose pages do not have line numbers '*fb*' means 'from the bottom'; otherwise the counts are from the top.

8 Constantine or 8 Const.: this refers to the regnal years of the emperors as expressed by the marginal regnal year figures used in chronicles; in this case, the eighth year of Constantine.

Other Notes

All translations are mine unless otherwise stated, with the exception of Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic texts, which have been translated by Witold Witakowski.

A pronunciation guide for the Syriac and Arabic transcriptions has been provided in Appendix 1 at the end of Study 2.

STUDY 1

The *Chronici canones* of Eusebius of Caesarea:
Structure, Content, and Chronology,
AD 282–325

1. Introduction: Overview and Witnesses

Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 260–30 May 339) was without doubt one of the most important Greek scholars of the early church. His most influential and lasting contributions, to the eastern and the western parts of the empire, were in the field of history, for he both merged Hellenistic and Christian chronography to create the first Christian world chronicle and almost single-handedly invented the genre of ecclesiastical history. His *Χρονικοί κανόνες* (*Chronici canones* or *Chronological Tables*) was probably first composed around 308–311, during the lull in the middle of the Great Persecution, as a work of apologetic and scholarship, aimed at Christians and non-Christians alike. The first edition of his *Historia ecclesiastica* (*Church History*) followed two years later, after the end of the persecutions. Both works reached their culmination in 325 with the advent of the sole reign of Constantine.

The *Canones* was actually the second of two linked works, the first being the *Chronographia*, a compendium of regnal lists, commentaries, and source lists setting out nation by nation, as Eusebius himself said, the raw material for a complete chronology of world history from the time of Abraham, all derived from existing histories and chronological works (Chapter 2, n. 11, below). The second volume, the *Canones* itself, is the synthesis of the *Chronographia*. It sets forth all known world history from the birth of Abraham, in what we would call 2016 BC, to Constantine's *uicennalia*, celebrated in Nicomedia on 25 July 325, noting each regnal year of the kings of the nineteen important world kingdoms in synchronized vertical columns: in order, the Assyrians, Hebrews, Sicyonians, Egyptians, Argives, Athenians, Mycenaean, Latins, Lacedaemonians, Corinthians, Medes, Macedonians, Lydians, Romans (kings), Persians, Alexandrians (Ptolemies), Asia (Antigonids), Syria (Seleucids), and Romans (emperors). These columns appeared first on double-page spreads, to a maximum of nine at a time, i.e. the Medes, Juda and Israel of the Hebrews, Athenians, Latins, Spartans, Macedonians, Corinthians/Lydians, and Egyptians (see Helm's edition of Jerome's Latin translation, pp. 83–86), and then on single pages (after p. 105 in Jerome). On each page the regnal year columns are crowded to the left and right sides of the page. Important events from secular and Biblical history were noted opposite their proper regnal years or Olympiads – as well as Eusebius could calculate them on the basis of the often conflicting evidence that he possessed – within the resulting large blank space down the middle of each page, the so-called *spatium historicum*, Biblical history on the left-hand page, secular on the right (though it often spilled over onto the left). The regnal years of a single kingdom could be read from top to bottom; the kingdoms existing within a single year could be read across the page from left to right. Eventually all the columns resolved themselves into a single column of text representing the year by year chronology of the Roman Empire. Although Eusebius was writing within a definite chronographic tradition, as we shall see in chapter 6, no such universal synchronism for world history had ever been written before.¹

1 For the date of the first edition of the *Canones* and the *HE*, see Burgess 1997. For the *Canones*

Unfortunately, the *Canones* no longer exists in the original Greek – indeed it would seem that an intact, uncontaminated version of the chronicle failed to survive even the fourth century² – and in order to study it one must reconstruct it from other histories that can be shown to have used it or that reproduce material at second hand that can be traced back to Eusebius. Surprising as it may seem, in spite of the importance of Eusebius' *Canones* for so many aspects of both history and historiography, no attempt reconstruct the chronicle to find out exactly what it was that Eusebius wrote has been undertaken since the early seventeenth century (see below). The *Canones* is usually cited from Jerome's Latin translation and sometimes from the Armenian translation – itself always cited from a Latin or German translation – as if they were both accurate representations of Eusebius' original (these translations are discussed below). Neither translation, however, is a certain guide to Eusebius' original, since Jerome and the Armenian translation often differ greatly in their content, translation, and chronology, making it difficult if not impossible to recover the original from a simple comparison of the two. Furthermore, the loss of the Armenian translation after AD 301 complicates any true understanding of the last part of the chronicle separate from Jerome's version, which, as we shall see, has been heavily augmented from other sources, thus making the recovery of Eusebius' original even more difficult.

In 1606 one of Jerome's first editors, Joseph Justus Scaliger, attempted to reconstruct both the *Chronographia* and the *Canones* in Greek (Scaliger 1606; Scaliger 1658). His knowledge of the Greek and Latin witnesses was very good for his time, but incomplete by today's standards, since he knew nothing of the Armenian version or the Syriac epitomes. The result, though impressive for the state of knowledge in 1606, is today unfortunately completely useless, even as a scholarly aid.³ It is long since past time for someone to attempt a reconstruction of at least this last, confused portion of the *Canones*, since, as will be seen, neither Jerome nor the Armenian translation is an accurate witness to Eusebius' original.

and the historiographical background to it, see, for example, Mosshammer 1979: 29–112 (a fundamental work with a full bibliography); von Gutschmid 1868; Gelzer 1885, 1 and 1885, 2: 1–107; *DCB* 2: 348–55; *RE* 6: 1376–84; Milburn 1954: 57–73; Quasten 1960: 311–3; Wallace-Hadrill 1960: 155–89; Sirinelli 1961: esp. 31–134; Grant 1980: 3–9; Barnes 1981: 111–20; Croke 1983; Adler 1989: 15–71; Croke 1990b: 27–36; Adler 1992; Inglebert 1996: 55–73, 155–75; and Chapter 6.1.3, below. For a detailed description of the *Canones* in the translation of Jerome, see Burgess forthcoming. For the pioneering nature of the *Canones*, see Croke 1982.

2 On this, see Study 2.

3 The reconstructed Greek texts of the *Chronographia* and *Canones* form the third part of the first edition of the *Thesaurus temporum* (Scaliger 1606), pp. 3–72 and 73–212, with an addendum to the former on pp. 213–29. In the second edition (Scaliger 1658) they appear in the fourth part, pp. 3–86 and 87–226. Scaliger followed the format of later and inferior manuscripts of Jerome, crowding the regnal years along the left-hand side of the page and squeezing the actual historical entries along the right-hand edge and across the page in large blocks at various points on the page. Olympiads and years of Abraham were marked in the left-hand margins. Scaliger included few of Eusebius' historical entries since he believed that most of the historical material was in the *Chronographia*, and he also included a separate column for years AD. The most noticeable addition he made was the name of every consular pair from 509 BC to AD 325 in large capital letters that extend right across the page.

The question of a starting place for a new reconstruction is difficult. A Greek version of the entire *Canones* would be impractical, however desirable. To begin with, a small section of the particularly problematic final section would be sufficient as a starting point, as an experiment, to determine the value of any further reconstruction. Any point before the termination of the Armenian translation in 301 is valid for such a test, but it is only with the reigns of Carus and his sons that Jerome starts replacing Eusebius' text or interweaving his text with that of other sources with greater frequency than before (see n. 5, below, for Helm's difficulties in differentiating between Eusebius and Jerome from about this point). For that reason I have begun this reconstruction with the accession of Carus and his sons in 282, though this is not to deny that there are serious problems with ascertaining the content and chronology of earlier sections as well. Further reconstruction will have to await the outcome of this experiment.

Before such a reconstruction can be undertaken however, there are various prolegomena that must be dealt with. First of all, the witnesses to the *Canones*, i.e. the sources for the reconstruction, must be introduced and described (below). An examination of these witnesses reveals two extremely problematic aspects of chronology that hamper reconstruction: Jerome's chronology for the reign of Constantine is at variance with the other witnesses by one year and there is an instance of a single regnal year that seems to be divided into two calendar years (Chapter 3). In order to understand and explain these problems, it is first necessary to understand Eusebius' chronological systems and his methods of presenting his chronology (Chapter 2). Next, Eusebius' practice of naming and enumerating the bishops of the apostolic sees must be determined, since there is reason to believe that he terminated them at the beginning of the persecution, yet they continue in most witnesses past that point (Chapter 4). The evidence for each entry in the reconstructed *Canones* must be evaluated and the rationale for each reconstructed entry must be presented (Chapter 5). The reconstruction itself and translation then follow, in the same chapter. This study concludes with a commentary evaluating some of the results of the reconstruction for both Eusebius and Jerome. A large part of this concerns an analysis of Eusebius' accuracy as a historian and Jerome's methods of translating and augmenting Eusebius' Greek original. Citations for all the evidence used in the reconstruction are presented in an appendix at the end.

1.1. The Witnesses

Jerome's Latin translation and continuation of the *Chronici canones*, made in Constantinople in 380/1, is without doubt the most faithful witness to the *Canones* we possess,⁴ but as Jerome himself indicated, he augmented the work in many places from Latin histories:

4 For Jerome's translation, see Kelly 1975: 72–5 and Mosshammer 1979: 37–8, 67–73. For Jerome's version of the *Canones* in general, see Schöne 1900 (though in many important respects it has been superseded); Donalson 1996: 1–38; Inglebert 1996: 205–95; and Burgess forthcoming.

Sciendum etenim est me et interpretis et scriptoris ex parte officio usum, quia et Graeca fidelissime expressi et nonnulla, quae mihi intermissa uidebantur, adieci, in Romana maxime historia, quam Eusebius huius conditor libri non tam ignorasse ut eruditus, sed ut Graece scribens parum suis necessariam perstrinxisse mihi uidetur. Itaque a Nino et Abraham usque ad Troiae captiuitatem pura Graeca translatio est. A Troia usque ad uicesimum Constantini annum nunc addita, nunc admixta sunt plurima, quae de Tranquillo et ceteris inlustribus historicis curiosissime excerpti. A Constantini autem supra dicto anno usque ad consulatum Augustorum Valentis sexies et Valentiniani iterum totum meum est. (Helm, 6.8–7.3)

As a matter of fact, you should know that I have served as both translator and, to some extent, author, since I have translated the Greek very faithfully and I have added quite a number of items that I felt had been omitted, especially with regard to Roman history. It seems to me that Eusebius, the author of this book, was not so much unacquainted with Roman history, since he was a well-educated man, but that he treated it cursorily because it was less important for his readers, since he was writing in Greek. Therefore, from Ninus and Abraham down to the capture of Troy is straight translation from the Greek. From Troy down to the twentieth year of Constantine I have added many new entries and augmented many existing entries using material that I have most carefully excerpted from Tranquillus and other famous historians. And from the above-mentioned year of Constantine down to the sixth consulship of Valens Augustus and the second of Valentinian Augustus the material is all mine.

In his now-standard edition of Jerome, Rudolf Helm attempted to sort out what was Eusebian and what was Hieronymian by denoting Jerome's additional entries with asterisks and entries with supplements or changes made by Jerome with a bracketed asterisk. In the latter case, however, there is no sure or easy way to sort out which author is responsible for what text without a careful reading of the *testimonia* supplied by Helm in an appendix. Even so, Helm was often incorrect, especially towards the end of the *Canones*.⁵ However, Jerome also made a number of important changes to Eusebius' chronology. These changes are less well-known and were not signalled by Helm. For instance, Jerome changed the date of the battle of Actium (162^b) from the fifteenth year of Augustus (= 29 BC) to the eleventh year (= 33),⁶ which was his equivalent of the year 722 AUC (*ab Urbe condita*), which he found in an independent Latin source.⁷ Since Jerome dated the foundation of Rome

- 5 As we shall see below, the following entries should be followed by a '(*)': 229^a, c, d, k, 230^e, h, 231^b, e; and the following should be followed by a '*': 225^c, 227^m, 228^e, 229^e, g, i, 230^a, b, d, 231^d. These were either missed or incorrectly denoted by Helm. This is an extreme example, from the particularly problematic section of the text that will be discussed below. For a few earlier examples, see 201^e, 205^g, 206ⁱ, 213^a, 216^e, and 223^a, which should all be followed by a '(*)', and 221^k, which should be followed by a '*'. Barnes' description of the procedure for reconstructing the original Greek is too simplistic, as well as being incorrect in stating that 'the Syriac tradition can be ignored' (1981: 112–3). Brugnoli 1995 is a brave attempt to identify Jerome's additions, but it is wildly inaccurate, insensitive to Jerome's methods, and not interested in chronology or Eusebius' original text. On this, see my review, Burgess 1998, and Chapter 6.2, below, which shows the shortcomings of Brugnoli's methods. Inglebert 1996: 221–53 (see also 217–20 and 255–76) is an even less detailed and rigorous attempt to locate Jerome's additions. I am embarking on a more ambitious and accurate attempt to ascertain Jerome's additions and modifications with a view to determining Eusebius' original, of which Chapter 6.2 is a preview.
- 6 In spite of changing the date of Cleopatra's death, Jerome left her regnal years as they appeared in Eusebius. That is why she still has four regnal years after her death.
- 7 That is the now-lost *Kaisergeschichte*, as reported by two witnesses, Aurelius Victor: 'Anno

to 755 BC (88a^a), his date for Actium is two years early. Eusebius dated the foundation to 752. Jerome also moved the date of Christ's crucifixion from 19 Tiberius to 18 Tiberius (AD 32 to 31).⁸ Without careful comparison of the existing witnesses, such changes are difficult to identify. For the purposes of this study the most important chronological change that Jerome introduced involves the regnal years of the reign of Constantine and this will be discussed in chapter 3.

The Armenian translation survives in two manuscripts of the thirteenth or fourteenth century (and a later copy of one) that present a text that is a compilation of an earlier Armenian translation and a Syriac translation.⁹ It is the only intact, uninterpolated version of the *Canones* we possess, but its structure has been completely reworked, it is chronologically corrupt (for instance, the Olympiads have all been shifted back one year and Eusebius' sometimes peculiar treatment of regnal years has been regularized), a number of folios are missing from various places in the manuscript, and it is missing many entries throughout the text. Worse, it breaks off at 16 Diocletian (AD 301).¹⁰ We also possess a witness to a different tradition of the Armenian version, that of Samuel Aniensis (of Ani), who used a complete text of the Armenian translation when compiling his *Summarium temporum* in the late twelfth century.¹¹ In spite of his late date and distance from Eusebius' Greek original, his entries can sometimes be more accurate and useful than those of the surviv-

urbis septingentesimo fere uicesimoque duobus etiam mos Romae incessit uni prorsus parendi' (*de caesaribus*, 1.1) and the anonymous *Epitome de caesaribus*: 'Anno urbis conditae septingentesimo uicesimo secundo, ab exactis uero regibus quadringentesimo octogesimoque, mos Romae repetitus uni prorsus parendi, pro rege imperatori uel sanctiori nomine Augusto appellato' (1.1). For the *KG*, see Chapter 5, n. 1, below.

- 8 Cf. Jerome's date for 174^d and his translation of line three of the same entry, 'anno Tiberii XVIII', with Eusebius' own comment, translated by Jerome unchanged, that the crucifixion took place in the fourth year of Olympiad 202 (= 19 Tib.; p. 174.24–5) as well as with the Armenian translation, 'im neunzehnten Jahre der Regierung des Tiberios' (213); Syncellus' excerpt from Eusebius' Greek original, ἔτους ιθ' τῆς Τιβερίου βασιλείας (394.3); the Syriac chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, which contains a Syriac epitome of the *Canones*, '(in) the nineteenth year of the reign of Tiberius' (73.33/96.4–5); and the other sources cited by Helm in the *testimonia*, pp. 398–9.
- 9 For the Armenian translation, see Karst 1911: xi–liv and Mosshammer 1979: 41–4, 49–50, 58–60. Karst's German translation is superior to Petermann's Latin, in spite of being, strangely, a critical edition of the Armenian in German, and is the text cited here.
- 10 For an overview of Jerome and the Armenian translation, see Mosshammer 1979: 37–83. On the general inferiority of the Armenian version, see Turner 1899–1900: 184–7 and Mosshammer 1979: 81: 'As far as the *Chronological Canons* is concerned, the Armenian version is of considerably less value as a witness to the chronological traditions preserved by Eusebius than is the *Chronicle* of St. Jerome.' With regard to the differences between Jerome and the Armenian translation with respect to the bishop lists, for instance, see Sundermeier 1896: 4–17 and Schwartz 1909: ccxxxvi–ccxxxviii.
- 11 That Samuel was using the same Armenian translation is proven, for instance, by the fact that he reproduces the same chronological error with regard to the Olympiads as does the surviving Armenian translation. The last year in the Armenian translation, 16 Diocl., is assigned to Olympiad 270.4 (227), which is the same Olympiad preserved in Samuel (41/663). In Jerome and other witnesses it is Olympiad 270.1 (227^c). There are no Years of Abraham in Samuel. On the accuracy of Jerome's chronology at this point, see Chapter 3, n. 12.

ing text of the Armenian translation and it is our only witness to the original Armenian version after 301.

Luckily, we also possess two major Syriac epitomes, contained in the *Chronicon miscellaneum ad annum Domini 724 pertinens* (*Chron.* 724) and the *Chronicle* of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre (Ps-Dion.). There also survive a number of other Syriac witnesses to the chronicle, including the *Chronicon Maroniticum* (*Chron. Mar.*), the *Chronicon ad annum 846 pertinens* (*Chron.* 846), the *Opus Chronologicum* of Elias of Nisibis, the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian, and the *Chronicon ad annum 1234 pertinens* (*Chron.* 1234).¹² These chronicles are of varying value and quality as witnesses. For all these witnesses to Eusebius, the easy availability of other sources and narratives for the reign of Constantine led to the alteration of much of Eusebius' narrative and chronology, a cause of much difficulty for any modern scholar trying to reconstruct the *Canones*. Still useful, though of lesser value, are two later Arabic sources, the *Chronicle of Se'ert* (*Chron. Se'ert*) and the *Kitab al-Unvan* or *Universal History* of Agapius, the first Christian Arabic historiographer.¹³ For the period under discussion, both depend almost exclusively on Syriac sources.

In Greek, all we have of the *Canones* are fragments derived from later authors who used Eusebius to compile their own works. For the earlier portions of the *Canones* the chronicle of Syncellus is of great importance, but it ends in 284 and its continuator, Theophanes, though still of importance for content, is less reliable for chronology. The chronicler Cedrenus copied Theophanes but seems to have compared his text to that of Eusebius (or more likely a Eusebian witness) and sometimes his chronology or wording is of independent value. Like Syncellus, the *Chronicon Paschale* (*Chron. Pasch.*) is an important witness to the earlier Eusebian material, but like Theophanes its chronology becomes less reliable under Diocletian, since it starts to rely on a variety of different sources including the more accurate consular chronology supplied by an early recension of the *Descriptio consulum*.¹⁴ The *Anonymus Matritensis* (*Anon. Matr.*), one of many surviving short Byzantine chronologi-

12 *Chron.* 724, compiled c. 640 from a variety of earlier chronicles (*PSyr* no. 146.IV, *QGB* no. 173, Palmer 1992: 31–46, and Palmer 1993: xxix–xxx, 5–12); *Chron. Mar.*, written c. 664 (*PSyr* no. 146.III and Palmer 1993: xxx, 29); Ps-Dionysius, *Chron.*, written c. 775 (*PSyr* no. 149, *QGB* no. 172, Siegfried and Gelzer 1884, Witakowski 1987, and Palmer 1993: xxxi, 53); *Chron.* 846 (*PSyr* no. 146.V, *QGB* no. 209, and Palmer 1993: 80–1, 83–4); Elias, *Op. Chron.*, written c. 1018 (*PSyr* no. 157 and *QGB* no. 348); Michael the Syrian, *Chron.*, written c. 1195 (*PSyr* no. 162, *QGB* no. 402, and Palmer 1993: 103–4); and *Chron.* 1234 (*PSyr* no. 150, *QGB* no. 458, and Palmer 1993: xxxi–xxxii, 103). For the general background to most of these works, see Witakowski 1987: 76–146, and especially Wright 1894, Duval 1899, Baumstark 1922, Chabot 1934, Brock 1979/80, and Nagel 1990. For the relationship of the Syriac sources to Eusebius in particular, see von Gutschmid 1886 and Keseling 1927. The Syriac evidence is by far the most accurate witness we possess after Jerome.

13 Agapius Hierapolitanus, *Kitab al-Unvan* ('Book of the Title'), written c. 942 (*QGB* no. 278), and the *Chronicle of Se'ert*, an Arabic translation of c. 1036 of a lost Syriac history (*QGB* no. 351). For these two works, see Graf 1947: 39–40 and 195–6.

14 For the *Descriptio consulum* (the text Mommsen called the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*), see Whitby and Whitby 1989: xvii and Burgess 1993a: 187–98, esp. 195 and 197. It was essentially a consular list, noting the consuls of each year, with short historical entries added beneath the appropriate year.

cal compendia, is useful for content but provides no chronology, and is very abbreviated. There are a variety of other Greek sources that contain material that can be identified as Eusebian but they are usually useful only in certain instances.¹⁵ Unfortunately, therefore, the Greek witnesses to Eusebius' original text are extremely limited, especially with regard to chronology, and are often modified and rewritten. Finally, there is Eusebius' own *Ecclesiastical History* (*HE*) – though this source is only of limited value since it seems to represent Eusebius' revised chronological ideas after the composition of the *Canones* – and, to a much lesser extent, his *Martyrs of Palestine* (*MPal*) and *Life of Constantine* (*VConst*).¹⁶

It is therefore plain to see that anyone who wishes to know what exactly it was that Eusebius said – with respect to both content and chronology – must compare and sift through many different sources, piecing together the fragments and excerpts with great care and caution, as if reconstructing a smashed glass goblet that has been mixed with broken glass from other objects. As we shall see, the results are surprising, for scholars have been discussing Eusebius' chronicle for several hundred years and yet it turns out that we really have had no clear idea what Eusebius actually wrote.

15 These are Malalas; Socrates, *HE*; Leo Grammaticus (as the representative of the Logothete tradition; on which, see Study 2, Chapter 3, n. 126); Nicephorus Constantinopolitanus, *Chronographicon syntomon*; Anonymus, *Synagoge chronon*; and the *Excerpta Latina barbari* (a poor Latin translation of an originally Greek document that contains, among other things, excerpts from Eusebius' *Chronographia*; on which, see n. 11 in Chapter 2, below).

16 On the date of the *HE* and the relationship of the *MPal* to it and the *Canones*, see Barnes 1980 and Burgess 1997: 482–6, 487, 495–8, 502–3.

2. Regnal Years and Other Chronological Systems

In the *Chronici canones* Eusebius used three main chronological systems: years since the birth of Abraham, Olympiads, and the regnal years of kings, emperors, pharaohs, and other leaders. The Years of Abraham were merely notional units designed to give an overall chronological context for the work as a whole and simply counted each passing year from 2016 BC. Olympiads ran from c. July of the quadriennium that began with the celebration of the games themselves. Each Olympiad was broken down by historians into four year-long units for chronological purposes.¹ Ordinarily each king or emperor's regnal years began from the day he ascended the throne and changed to the next year on each anniversary of that day, though some kings, such as those of Persia and Egypt, synchronized the beginning of their second regnal year and every regnal year after that with the first day of the local calendar. Thus the regnal years and calendar years of those kingdoms were almost always in synchronization. The calendars of some kingdoms were solar, some were lunar, and some were lunisolar; consequently they were never in synchronization with one another from one year to the next.² Eusebius' own civic year, that of Caesarea, like most of those in the eastern Roman empire, was based upon the Seleucid or Syro-Macedonian calendar, a Babylonian calendar with Macedonian month names that in origin was lunisolar but had been correlated in a variety of different ways at different times with the solar Julian calendar during the first century AD.³ Analysis of Eusebius' correlations between his own calendar and the Roman calendar in the *Martyrs of Palestine* shows that his calendar was of the unusual type used in Tyre; his year therefore probably began on 3 October.⁴

1 For short accounts of Olympiads as a chronological system, see Bickerman 1980: 75–6 and Samuel 1972: 189–94.

2 On ancient calendars, see Bickerman 1980 and Samuel 1972. See also Meimaris 1992: 35–6.

3 For the Syro-Macedonian calendar, see Grumel 1958: 168–71, 172–5, and 300–1; Schürer, Vermes, and Millar 1973: 588–90; Bickerman 1980: 24–5; Samuel 1972: 139–45; and Meimaris 1992: 38–41. For the effect of the Julian calendar on local Eastern calendars, see Samuel 1972: 171–88.

4 Rey-Coquais 1978: esp. 62, which shows that 1 Hyperberetaios = 3 October. That Hyperberetaios was the first month of the Caesarean calendar is implied by the similarities between the calendars of Caesarea and Tyre. For the calendar of Tyre, known from manuscript hemerologia ultimately dating from the second half of the third century (for the date, see Samuel 1972: 171–3 and Meimaris 1992: 36), see Schwartz 1906: 346; Ginzel 1914: 29–30; Lietzmann and Aland 1956: 81 and 108–19; Bickerman 1980: 70–1 (where '18 October' is an error for '19 October'); and Meimaris 1992: 41, 60–2. Bickerman (1980: 48) and Samuel (1972: 176) have modified their calendars of Tyre to start in Dios (18 November) rather than Hyperberetaios (19 October) on the basis of an inscription that has been interpreted as showing that by AD 576 the calendar of Tyre had shifted its first month to Dios (see Ginzel 1914: 30 and Meimaris 1992: 61), but Schwartz (1906: 346) rightly discounts this evidence, which is irrelevant for this period anyway. Josephus indicates that the first month of the Macedonian calendar he was using was Hyperberetaios (*AJ* 1.80) and synchronisms prove that this calendar was Tyre's (see Appendix

All these differing calendar systems would have been impossible for Eusebius to calculate, synchronize, and represent if they were all treated as accurate representations of reality. In order to work they all had to be coordinated to a single system. Consequently all Years of Abraham, Olympiads, and regnal years were equated with the civic Syro-Macedonian year of Caesarea and began at the same time of the year. As a randomly selected example, the various regnal years that are relevant to the slaughter of the Gauls in 133^d in Jerome's translation, 20 Ptolemy (Alexandrino-rum), 20 Seleucus (Syriae et Asiae), and 7 Antigonus (Macedonum), as well as the year 1790 Abr. and Olympiad 138.2, were all exactly equated with 3 Oct. 228 BC to 2 Oct. 227 BC by Eusebius.⁵ For all his history from 776 BC to AD 217 Olympiads were Eusebius' primary chronology. That the 'real' Olympiad year in this example actually began in c. July of 227 BC, just a few months before the end of the stated 'Olympiad', is completely irrelevant. These are not 'real' Olympiads, they are 'chronological' Olympiads adjusted to correlate with the Syro-Macedonian calendar year of Caesarea: the system Eusebius followed simply equated the beginning of each Olympiad with the beginning of the Syro-Macedonian calendar year in which the 'real' Olympiad actually fell.⁶ This is the system Eusebius used for his regnal years as well: the year in which an emperor or king's accession fell was counted as his first year from the previous 3 October, no matter how late in the year before 3 October that accession took place (see below).

Throughout the early imperial period, starting with the sole rule of Julius Caesar in 48 BC, Eusebius' regnal chronology is almost perfectly accurate. Each regnal year is treated as the equivalent of a full calendar year, and no attempt is made to indicate partial regnal years. In the case of each emperor – let us use Trajan as an example – Eusebius noted the true length of the reign in calendar years and months in a notice of accession (originally in red), noting also that emperor's position in the succession of legitimate emperors (Helm, 193). Trajan was the eleventh legitimate emperor (Galba, Otho, and Vitellius are omitted) and he reigned for nineteen years and six months (this figure is correct). 1 Trajan (= the first regnal year of Trajan) is noted in the left margin immediately after his accession and a sequence of regnal years to nineteen follows from there. His death is noted as the last event in 19 Traj. (197^a) and there immediately follows the notice for Hadrian's accession (as twelfth emperor) and his first year is noted immediately after that rubric. 1 Trajan is the equivalent of the Year of Abraham and Olympiad that correspond to 98 (starting 3 October 97), the correct year of his accession, and 1 Hadrian corresponds to 117 (from 3 October 116), the correct year of his accession. Trajan's death and Hadrian's accession are actually noted in 19 Traj., which is 116, a year earlier than the

2). Furthermore, at this period the influential calendar of Antioch also began with Hyperborea-taios, as did those of Ascalon and Palmyra: see Bickerman 1980: 48; Samuel 1972: 174 n. 1, 177, and 178–9; Ginzler 1914: 32; Downey 1940–1; and Honigsmann 1944–5.

- 5 The accuracy of Jerome's date is confirmed by the Armenian and Ps-Dionysius, but the entry should be followed by a (*) because Jerome has modified the entry somewhat.
- 6 For the correlation of Olympiads with the Syro-Macedonian year, see Bickerman 1980: 76. This correlation leads to the epoch of 777 BC rather than 776 BC, as Bickerman notes; in this case, the autumn of 777 BC (for the exact date, see below).

events themselves. This is the pattern for each emperor from Julius Caesar, with the exception of the accession of Augustus:⁷ like the Olympiads the year of accession is equated with the calendar year within which it occurred.

The fundamental point to realize here is that the regnal year markers that Eusebius uses throughout the *Canones* do not count the actual regnal years of each emperor from the date of his accession to the date of his death, as is normally assumed, just as the Olympiads do not mark real Olympiads. They are simply chronological place-holders for calendar years. For his chronology of the Roman emperors (and for all earlier historical rulers) Eusebius was interested in only two things: that the first regnal year of a ruler should correspond to the year of his accession and that the overall accounting of regnal years for each kingdom should be accurate. He had no interest in matching the exact length of each ruler's reign with his regnal years, which was, of course, impossible, given that most rulers did not reign for an exact number of full years. The point was not to represent accurately the exact few years of each ruler's reign, but to have a system of representation that could keep track of multiple decades and centuries of reigns with a minimum of confusion, calculation, and error. A number of examples will demonstrate this principle.

As we have seen, Trajan is said to have reigned for nineteen years and six months, but is given only nineteen regnal years, not twenty as we might expect since he died within his twentieth regnal year. On the other hand, Pius is said to have reigned for twenty-two years and three months, and is given twenty-three regnal years (which is actually closer to the correct twenty-two years and eight months that he reigned; pp. 202–3⁸). Pertinax is said to have reigned for six months (it was just three, 31 Dec. 192–28 March 193) and so must be assigned a minimum of one regnal year since he is regarded as a legitimate emperor (number sixteen), but the overall chronology would not allow him a full regnal year and Severus his proper eighteen regnal years (emperor from 9 April 193 to 4 Feb. 211), since both Pertinax and Severus dated their accessions to the Syro-Macedonian equivalent of 193 (which started in the autumn of 192). Eusebius was thus forced to the unique expedient of counting 1 Pertinax as 1 Severus as well (p. 210). After the notice of Severus' accession his regnal years begin with the second year. Thus the first year of each emperor is correctly placed in 193. The result of this accuracy is that for the Roman emperors, for example, Eusebius assigns 373 regnal years to the period from 1 Caesar in 48 BC to 20 Constantine in AD 325, a total of 373 calendar years.

In order to create this imperial chronology Eusebius had to have accurate sources that told him not only how long each emperor had reigned but in what year each had become emperor. For the period from Caesar to M. Aurelius he had a source that provided him with the detailed lengths of the emperors' reigns in years and months, except for Tiberius, whose twenty-three years is rounded from twenty-two years and seven months, and for Hadrian, whose twenty-one years is rounded from

7 For Eusebius' treatment of the death of Julius Caesar and the accession of Augustus, see Chapter 3, n. 1. There are a few instances where the emperor's first regnal year does not immediately follow his accession or his death does not immediately precede an accession rubric but these are mostly a result of changes made by Jerome and are unimportant for my purposes here.

8 For a possible explanation for this, see Chapter 3, n. 2, below.

twenty years and eleven months.⁹ For Nero, Claudius, and Vespasian he also includes the number of days (Claudius is too long by nine days, Nero by one, and Vespasian is exact). From Commodus to Philip he knew only in rounded years how long each emperor had reigned and from Decius to Carus and his sons he again had the lengths of the reigns in years and months (see below for changes to the reigns of Carus and his sons¹⁰). In the first and last periods noted above the figures overall are very accurate: only seven months short over almost 227 years from August 48 BC to March AD 180, and only four months short over exactly thirty-three years from c. Sept. 249 to c. Sept. 282 (not including the reign of Carus and his sons since we do not know Eusebius' original figures; see below). The correction of a possible error in the reign of Decius (see Chapter 3, n. 2, below) would alter this latter discrepancy to a month or less. Interestingly, for the contemporary reign of Diocletian he used just a rounded figure of twenty years, probably because he did not know exactly when Diocletian's reign began or when he abdicated (see below, Chapter 3). Whether this regnal year information from Caesar to Carus derived from a single source or a number of different sources, cannot be known. Judging from the errors that appear for the reigns in the middle period, I suspect two different sources for the accurately recounted reigns, the first of which deriving ultimately from Theophilus, and random sources (including, to Caracalla, the Olympiad source described below), guesswork, and calculation for the others of the middle period.

From Caesar to Caracalla he had another source that provided him with the correct year of accession for each emperor. With the conclusion of this source his chronology goes hopelessly out of synchronization and as we shall see below he is not able to regain control of it until 306. This source was probably the Olympiad chronicle that provided the Olympic victor list that he includes in the *Chronographia*, the first volume of the two-part work of which the *Canones* forms volume two.¹¹

9 This would suggest that he was using Theophilus' *Ad Autolyicum* as a source, since his emperor list stops with Marcus Aurelius, but the figures, though very similar, are not exactly the same, and Theophilus gives year, month, and day figures for each emperor; Eusebius does not, except in three cases. This discrepancy could, nevertheless, be explained by scribal corruption, especially since the figures in Clement's *Stromata* seem to derive from the same source as Theophilus and yet are different in many places as well, in a few cases matching Eusebius where Eusebius differs from Theophilus. Those deriving from other early lists such as those used by Hippolytus, Tertullian, and the author of the exactly contemporary *Chronica urbis Romae* are quite different – not only in their figures but also in the emperors they choose to list – and are so to a greater degree than mere scribal error could account for. All clearly derive from independent traditions, while Eusebius, Theophilus, and Clement are clearly related. In Appendix 3 I have provided the regnal-year figures from all six of these compilations in order to show how close Eusebius and Theophilus are in spite of their discrepancies, and to show the pattern of Eusebius' regnal year information in comparison with other chronological works. Eusebius may have had his figures indirectly through another source, however, which would explain the differences from Theophilus and the missing day totals.

10 His knowledge in the *HE* 7.30.22 that Carus and his sons reigned οὐδ' ὅλοις τρισὶν ἐνιαυτοῖς ('not for three years in total') shows that he had a year and month figure for them as well ('two years and X months').

11 Cramer, 141–53, and Karst, 90–103. The *Chronographia* provides a compilation of rulers and regnal year totals, listed kingdom by kingdom, of which the *Canones* is the synthesis, as well as

This list provided the names of all Olympic victors in the *stadion* from 776 BC to AD 217 (though the original list concluded in 212/3¹²). Entered into this list are the

chronological discussions and analysis copied from the works Eusebius cites. It survives nearly complete in an Armenian translation (Karst) – it is lacking only the outline of Roman history at the end – and in long Greek excerpts that represent much of the work (Cramer). It was also used heavily by the original Greek compiler of what is known as the *Excerpta Latina barbari* or *Barbarus Scaligeri* – so called because it had its *editio princeps* in Scaliger's *Thesaurus temporum* (Scaliger 1606: 44–70, second part, and 1658: 58–85, second part) under the title, 'Excerpta utilissima ex priore libro chronologico Eusebii, et Africano, et aliis Latine conuersa ab homine barbaro, inepto, Hellenismi et Latinitatis imperitissimo' – which now only survives in a poor Latin translation of an early fifth-century Greek original in a manuscript of the seventh or eighth century (though the date of the translation must be earlier than that). The middle section of this work, ff. 37a to 48b (pp. 213–225), the second of three sections, derives almost entirely from the *Chronographia* and is a valuable witness to it, though Jacoby goes too far when he says, 'Es ist wirklich nicht zu bestreiten, daß der Barbarus mehrfach "die beste Überlieferung Eusebs" repräsentiert' (Jacoby 1909: 1570). Jerome only translated the second volume of Eusebius' two-volume work and so the *Chronographia* tends to be much less well-known than the *Canones*. At the beginning of the Roman section of the *Chronographia* Eusebius provided an emperor list from Julius Caesar, again with the Olympiads of accession, but also with the number of consulates held by each emperor. This list is announced at the very end of the Armenian translation (Karst, 143.3–7), but unfortunately the only witness to it is the reworked and extended list in the *Excerpt. Lat. barb.*, which provides only the Olympiad of Caesar's accession (correctly), substituting regnal years for the rest (not all from Eusebius, however), and which continues down to Anastasius, though the consulates cease with Carus and his sons with one further notice for Julian (*Excerpt. Lat. barb.* 48a and b, pp. 224–5). Eusebius must have copied this listing of consulates from another source, for if he himself had correlated Olympiads and accession dates with a consular list, he would have quite quickly discovered his chronological errors in the third century (see Chapter 3) and been able to fix them. Since most emperors took up the consulship on the first of January after their accession Eusebius would have found that according to his chronology each emperor after Caracalla was consistently already consul in the year of his accession (to Philip) or consul a full year before his accession (after Decius). Decius would have been consul two years before he was emperor. Furthermore, Decius was consul in 250 and 251, indicating a reign of more than one year (he is, however, only credited with one consulship in the *Excerpta*, 48b, p. 224.1). It is also impossible to know how far this list originally went, since Eusebius' Olympiads only went as far as Caracalla.

- 12 This Olympic victor list – which Mosshammer unnecessarily believes Eusebius may have had through an intermediary such as Porphyry – had probably been excerpted from an Olympiad chronicle that Eusebius used first hand: see Mosshammer 1979: 137–58, 167. This conclusion is supported by the evidence adduced just below. The preface to the list says that it goes down to Olymp. 247 when Antoninus the son of Severus (i.e. Caracalla) was emperor (Cramer, 141.30–1, and Karst, 90.32–3), yet the *stadion* victors of Olymp. 248 and 249 are included in the list. Since Caracalla became sole emperor only upon the death of Geta in Dec. 211 and the two hundred and forty-eighth Olympiad was celebrated in c. July of 213, the Olympiad chronicle from which the victor list was copied must originally have been written in 212 or the first half of 213. The victor list was copied from that work soon after, later circulating as a document in its own right, and at some point between July 217 and July 221 the victors of the two hundred and forty-eighth and two hundred and forty-ninth Olympiads were added to the list by a continuator who failed to make any historical additions. This simple yet obvious explanation for the nature of the victor list has never before been realized: see Mosshammer 1979: 144–5, 157–8. If the Olympiad chronicle had been written much later (in 250, for example), but had simply stopped with the accession of Caracalla in 211, it is difficult to explain why a continuator of the victor

accessions of the Roman emperors from Julius Caesar to Caracalla, exactly the period of accurate imperial chronology in the *Canones*. Furthermore, the list of emperors is identical to Eusebius', omitting Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Didius Julianus as legitimate emperors, and in spite of including the victor of the *stadion* in 217 does not include the accession of Macrinus.¹³ The list as it stands now notes only the Olympiad of accession, not the exact year within the four-year sequence, but where emperors were proclaimed in the first year of an Olympiad the *Canones* agrees with this list, even when both are apparently incorrect (see below). All of the above makes a strong case for concluding that Eusebius must have derived his imperial chronology for the emperors between Caesar and Caracalla inclusive from the source of this Olympic victor list, an unknown Olympiad chronicler, perhaps to be identified with a Cassius Longinus cited by Eusebius in the *Chronographia* (see n. 12, above). This would account for Eusebius' ability to date the relevant emperor's accessions according to the correct sub-divisions of Olympiads, even when this evidence is lacking in the existing victor list. Unfortunately the section on Roman history from the *Chronographia* that would have told us more about his sources is no longer extant, in Greek, Latin, or Armenian.

In this list, and therefore in the original Olympiad chronicle, each Olympiad was equated with a Syro-Macedonian year – which ran from the autumn of each year, as noted above – but in which city precisely it was composed, and consequently what calendar its author used, we cannot determine since we have so little evidence for contemporary calendars and such calendars varied considerably throughout the East.¹⁴ It was this source that provided Eusebius with the correlation of Syro-Macedonian years and Olympiads noted above, namely that the Olympiad year was equated with the Syro-Macedonian year within which the games themselves or the annual anniversary of the games fell, not the closest correlation of Olympiad and Macedonian year.

The above two conclusions are proved, in reverse order, by empirical analysis of the victor list and the *Canones*. Claudius' accession is assigned to Olymp. 205 in the victor list (Cramer, 151.13–14; Karst, 101₂.12–13), yet the Olympiad began in c. July 41 and Claudius was proclaimed emperor on 24 January 41. M. Aurelius is assigned to Olymp. 235 (Cramer, 152.30–1; Karst, 103₁.13–15), which began in c.

list, a number of years again after the compilation of the chronicle itself (in 275, for example), would have included the victors of Olympiads 248 and 249 but no others between that time (217) and the time of the continuation of the victor list (e.g. in 275 = Olymp. 263.3). Since this is so, if the list does indeed derive from Cassius Longinus' Olympiad chronicle as Mosshammer believes, he cannot be the well-known third-century Longinus who was the teacher of Porphyry and advisor to Zenobia, since he was born c. 213, the date of the compilation of the Olympiad chronicle (*PLRE* I: 514–5, s.v. Cassius Longinus 2).

13 All other writers in Appendix 3 include Galba, Otho, and Vitellius in their lists, and Hippolytus and the *Chron. urb. Rom.* include Didius Julianus. The games of 217 took place in c. July, but Caracalla had been murdered on 8 April of the same year. His successor (Macrinus) should therefore have been noted in the list by the continuator, but was not. Because of this missing accession notice Eusebius misdates the accession of Macrinus (and hence the death of Caracalla) by a year (see below).

14 See Bickerman 1980: 48 and Samuel 1972: 174–87.

July 161, yet Aurelius was proclaimed on 7 March 161. Eusebius follows this chronology in the *Canones* (pp. 179 and 203–4). This might seem to indicate a correspondence with the consular year,¹⁵ but Nero, who was proclaimed augustus on 13 October 54 is assigned to Olymp. 208.3 (began c. July 55) in the *Canones* (p. 181). Nerva, who was proclaimed on 18 Sept. 96 is listed under Olymp. 219 in the victor list (Cramer, 152.6–7; Karst, 102₂.1–2) and under 219.1 in the *Canones*, yet this Olympiad did not begin until c. July of the next year, 97.¹⁶ On the other hand, Domitian, who was proclaimed on 14 September 81 is in the correct Olymp. 215.1 (c. July 81), both in the victor list (Cramer, 151.31–2; Karst, 102₁.23–4) and in the *Canones* (p. 189). No other emperor in the victor list was proclaimed later than 19 August (Tiberius). If we can accept that the author of the victor list knew the correct dates of accession for Nerva and Domitian (this is not certain), this suggests that a Syro-Macedonian calendar that had its New Year between 14 and 18 September was being used here.¹⁷ We thus have the interesting situation of Domitian's coming to the throne (14 Sept. 81) only days or a few weeks before the end of the calendar year that was assigned to him as 'Year 1'. So although it seems that Eusebius' source used a calendar that began in September, Eusebius, obviously, did not know this and he equated all his evidence with his own calendar. Of course, the discrepancy makes no practical difference for the chronology of the *Canones*.

In addition to these sources Eusebius must also have used some kind of era that kept an accurate account of the number of calendar years from the late Republic (and earlier, of course) to his own period, probably the years of Antioch or Edessa – both of which he specifically notes in the *Canones*, Antioch: 156^b and 223^k, and Edessa: 126^h and 223^k, the latter being the well-known Seleucid era¹⁸ – or some

15 That is the conclusion of Samuel 1972: 194 n. 2.

16 Pertinax, who was proclaimed on 31 December of 192, is placed in Olymp. 243 in the victor list (Cramer, 153.9–10; Karst, 103₇.7–9) and 243.1 (c. July 193) by Eusebius (Helm, 210). His accession was so close to the end of the year, however, that it cannot be used to demonstrate that the Olympiads were not based on the consular year.

17 The date for Nerva could, however, be an error on the part of the Olympiad chronicler. Von Gutschmid (1868: 454–5) suggests that the Latin 'XIII kal. Oct.' for 18 Sept. in the compiler's source could have been misread as 14 October, though a unique fundamental misinterpretation of this type is highly unlikely. However, if so, it would make the calendar closer to the Antiochene and Caesarean calendars (New Year on 1 and 3 October), as well as those of Asia minor that began on 23 September, Augustus' birthday; see Ginzel 1914: 19–20; Bickerman 1980: 48; and Samuel 1972: 174–5. For suggestions that Eusebius' regnal years began in mid-September, see Turner 1899–1900: 187–192, who is basing his argument on the imperial dates just discussed with reference to Eusebius' Olympiad source. For 1 October (also noted by Turner) and other possible regnal year calculations, see Schwartz 1909: ccxvii–ccxx. To my knowledge this observation on Eusebius' calendar was first made by Alfred von Gutschmid, whose above-cited work remains the only comprehensive analysis of Eusebius' chronology, though it is marred by the belief that the Armenian translation represents a 'pure' version of the chronicle, superior to Jerome's translation.

18 For the Seleucid era, see Ginzel 1914: 40–3; Grumel 1958: 209–10; Samuel 1972: 142–4, 245–6; Bickerman 1980: 71–2; Meimaris 1992: 53–9, and Study 2, Chapter 3, n. 55. Eusebius also mentions the eras of Tyre, Laodicea, and Ascalon at 223^k (on the first and last of which, see Meimaris 1992: 60–71), any one of which may have been a popular chronological system in the East or in Caesarea and therefore used by Eusebius.

local era whose beginning he could accurately fix at a specific date in the past and whose contemporary dates he knew. This allowed him to keep track of the overall number of calendar years covered by the imperial chronology. There is no evidence that he used or consulted consular *fasti* (see n. 11, above).