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JEROME EXPLAINED: AN INTRODUCTION TO HIS CHRONICLE
AND A GUIDE TO ITS USE

It was probably in Antioch that Jerome first came across a copy of Eusebius of Caesarea’s Χρονικοὶ κανώνες (Chronici canones or Chronological Tables) and he set about translating it into Latin in 380 when he had arrived in Constantinople, adding extra material on Roman history and literature, and continuing it from its terminus in 325 down to 378.¹ His work of translation, augmentation, and continuation was completed before the middle of 381. His Latin translation proved to be more popular than the original Greek, for whereas Eusebius’ original has perished almost without a trace, Jerome’s translation survives in dozens of manuscripts and was used by countless Western writers in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages for their histories. Being the only surviving complete and continuous history of the pre-Classical and Classical Mediterranean world it ended up being the foundation of all modern histories of those periods as well:

Eusebius’ Chronological Canons, translated from the original Greek into Latin by St. Jerome, became the basic chronological reference work in the Western world until it was superseded in the seventeenth century. Even then, with improvements by Joseph Scaliger and others, who integrated the various calendar systems into the Julian calendar, Eusebius’ work in its broad outlines formed the basis of most historical writing on the ancient world.²

Eusebius’ Chronicle... was translated into Latin, emended and extended by Jerome and became both a pre-eminent source and an influential model for all later efforts to reconstruct the chronology of the world.³

It is one of the fundamental books upon which all research on the past of mankind has been based.⁴

It is doubtful if any other history has ever exercised an influence comparable to that which it has had upon the western world.⁵

Thus, from the late-fourth to the early-twenty-first century, our view of the past has been shaped by the way Eusebius and Jerome originally described it. Even today the work remains an important historical source, as much for Greek history as for Roman. As Alden Mosshammer says, ‘Sooner or later almost every classicist and historian of antiquity is confronted with evidence drawn from the Chronicle of Eusebius.’⁶

---

¹ See J.N.D. Kelly, Jerome. His Life, Writings, and Controversies (London 1975) 72-5, and A.A. Mosshammer, The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition (Lewisburg PA 1979) 37-8, 67-73. For Jerome’s Chronicle in general, see Alfred Schöne, Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus (Berlin 1900), though in many important respects it has been superseded.
⁴ J. Quasten, Patrology 3 (Utrecht/Antwerp 1960) 313.
⁶ (n. 1) 30.
In spite of the importance of Jerome’s *Chronicle* (as I shall call it here), the work remains little cited and less often consulted or read. Unfortunately the *Chronicle* is a late-fourth-century AD (and, worse, Christian) compilation, the product of a twilight world unknown to most Classicists. How is a Classicist whose idea of ‘late’ is Tacitus or Quintilian (or worse, Herodas) supposed to sort out such a foreign-seeming work? Those who are brave enough to seek out the *Chronicle* are often immediately put off by the complexity of the text and the multitude of arcane matters involved in understanding it, not least its chronology, one of its most important and valuable facets. It has been fairly described as ‘one of the most labyrinthine and controversial texts in the field’.7

Given the importance of this history, the general ignorance amongst Classicists concerning it, and the errors that abound when it is used, it seemed to me that a description and explanation of the *Chronicle* and its manner of compilation might aid those who are unfamiliar with it but who must nevertheless take account of its evidence, whether literary or historical. It is hoped that this will make the use of the *Chronicle* a less formidable and perhaps even enjoyable task.

I should like to begin with three examples that illustrate some of the problems scholars usually encounter with the *Chronicle*: Catullus, Sallust, and fourth-century AD ecclesiastical history, all three illustrating the problems of editions, chronology, and citation. Finally I wish to note the *a priori* assumption of error made by scholars when consulting the *Chronicle* and their hostility towards it. These will set the stage for the analysis and description that follow.

1. The Problems

1.1. Editions

When was Catullus born and when did he die? These are simple questions; the answers are very difficult. Since there is no explicit reference to the former (and certainly not the latter) in Catullus’ own poetry, we must rely on external sources and allusions in Catullus’ poetry for both. Of external sources, there is only one: Jerome’s *Chronicle*. The majority of the works I have consulted that mention the problem of the dates state that Jerome dates Catullus’ birth to 87 BC and his death to 57,8 and most also mention that Jerome says that he was thirty years

7 Mosshammer (n. 1) 30. Note also T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge MA 1981) 111: ‘Eusebius’ Chronicle is not only a historical text of great importance for a wide variety of fields but also a literary text which poses problems of peculiar intricacy on several levels.’

old when he died. A quick check of the best and most recent edition of the Chronicle (published first in 1913 and reprinted in 1956; see p. 9 below), shows that Jerome does date Catullus’ birth to 87 BC but actually places his death in 58 BC, not 57. Jerome also says that Catullus was ‘XXX aetatis anno’, i.e. he was twenty-nine years old, as the dates indicate (87-58 BC).\(^9\) The latter error, that someone in his thirtieth year is thirty years old, is common in the translation and interpretation of Latin.\(^10\) The former error is more peculiar. Could it be a problem of editions? The 1923 edition also indicates 58 BC, as does the edition of 1866. Both will be detailed below. In the second edition of volume 27 of J.-P. Migne’s Patrologia Latina,\(^11\) the next most recently published edition, the entry is also placed under the equivalent of 58 BC, though the second part of the entry does carry over into 57 BC (col. 428). This volume was published in 1866 and reprints an edition by Angelo Mai that was originally published in 1833, though in that edition the entry is completely under the equivalent of 57 BC.\(^12\) The partial correctness of the PL text, therefore, is actually just a typographical error. However, I have never seen the Chronicle cited from this rare 1833 edition, so it is unlikely to be the source of the 58/57 confusion. It is only in the first edition of Vol. 27 of PL that we find unambiguous evidence for Catullus’ birth in 57 BC in a cited edition (coll. 535-6). Unfortunately PL 27 was first published in 1846 and its edition of the Chronicle is reprinted from a collected works of Jerome published in its second edition between 1766 and 1772. The first edition of this text of the Chronicle was originally published in 1740.\(^13\) All these early

Antologia dei Carmi di Catullo (Torino 1947) ix (claims he is quoting Schoene’s 1866 edition (see p. 9); G. Lafaye, Catulle: Poésies (Paris 1932) v; and W.K. Kelly, The Poems of Catullus and Tibullus (London 1891) I. E.T. Merrill, Catullus (Cambridge MA 1893) xiv; F. Plessis, La Poésie latine (Paris 1909) 143; and A.A. Barrett, ‘Catullus 52 and the Consulship of Vatinus’, TAPHA 103 (1972) 23, state 57 but note that some manuscripts have 58.

\(^9\) Since Catullus mentions events after 58 BC Jerome’s dates must be wrong, and so most scholars place his birth in 84 having first fixed his death in 54, a date after the latest reference in his poems, though some scholars suggest 82-52; see D.F.S. Thomson, Catullus. Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary (Toronto 1997) 3-4 (Phoenix Supplementary Volume 34); M. Rambaud, ‘César et Catulle’, BFLM 10 (1980) 38 and 49; and J. Granarolo, Catulle, le vivant (Paris 1982) 19-22. Since Catullus was twenty-nine when he died, the date of his birth should be 83 or 81, respectively. In spite of this the entry in the third edition of the Oxford Classical Dictionary (Oxford 1996), by Hans Peter Syndikus, says, ‘He was probably born in 84 BC or a little earlier, and probably died in 54 BC’ (p. 303). Whatever the dates, one immutable fact derives from Jerome and that is that Catullus was twenty-nine when he died. He could not have been born earlier than 84 BC. In general, see the important analysis of the problem by T.P. Wiseman, Clio’s Cosmetics (Leicester 1979) 179-82.

\(^10\) Thomson (n. 9) 3 claims that ‘XXX aetatis anno’ could mean either ‘twenty-nine years old’ or ‘thirty years old’. There is no such ambiguity in Jerome, here or elsewhere.

\(^11\) Few people realize that there are in fact two separate editions of the Chronicle in PL and, indeed, of the entire series of PL and PG (Patrologia Graeca). The first edition of PL 27 appeared in 1846 and was replaced by a new edition in 1866, which reprinted the text used for the 1857 edition of PG 19. On 12 February 1868 a fire gutted the Ateliers catholiques, Migne’s publishing house, and destroyed the lead printing plates for PL and PG, among many others (see R.H. Bloch, God’s Plagiarist (Chicago 1994) 104-12). Enough copies of the 1866 edition of volume 27 seem to have remained after the fire that it was not reprinted as most other volumes of PL were, starting in 1877.

\(^12\) Angelo Mai, Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus edita, VIII (Rome 1833) 365. Fotheringham described this as the ‘editio omnium praissima’ (p. VII of the work cited on p. 9 below).

\(^13\) Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis presbyteri Opera..., ed. Domenico Vallarsi and Scipione Maffei (Verona 1734-42; second edition, Venice 1766-72), coll. 603-4 of volume eight of the first edition. And to make matters
editions are based on manuscripts that are not even cited in the more recent editions because of their inferiority.

The situation I am describing suggests one of two things. Either the arguments concerning Catullus' death currently presented by most modern scholars date to a period before 1866 (i.e. no one actually bothers to look up the text of the Chronicle but just copies earlier citations), or when most people do seek out the Chronicle to cite it, they use an edition that is over 260 years old, either because that is the edition cited in earlier studies or because it is the only edition that can easily be found. Neither is a creditable practice.14 What self-respecting classicist would use an edition of Aeschyus, Thucydides, Tibullus, Tacitus, or—dare I say it?—Catullus that was originally published in 1740? No one. No one should be citing Jerome from a 260-year-old edition either.15 As Vincent J. Rosivach has said, also with respect to Catullan scholars, ' [W]e philologists are more than occasionally an incestuous and lazy lot, too ready to rely on our predecessors' commentaries instead of checking their sources ourselves.'16

1.2. Chronology

Sallust was born in 86 BC and died in 35. Such is the consensus and so said no less a scholar than Sir Ronald Syme,17 and the two latest editions of the OCD.18 But what is the basis for this? Jerome is our chief, but not our only, source. As Syme observes, Jerome dates Sallust's death to 36 BC, saying that it was a 'quadriennium'-before Actium (31 BC). The year is therefore clearly wrong. The date of Sallust's death is therefore shifted to 35, which is four worse, Vallarsi's edition was simply a revision of Arnaldus Pontacus' Leiden edition of 1606!

14 The honour roll of those who correctly cite 58 BC is rather shorter than the list in n. 8, though most still do not cite the edition they are using: Thomson (n. 9) 3 (but does not give the actual AD equivalent); J.H. Gaissier, Catullus and his Renaissance Readers (Oxford 1993) 2; T.P. Wiseman, Catullus and his World A Reappraisal (Cambridge 1985) 190; K. Quinn, Catullus. The Poems (London 1973) xxxviii n. 5; Rambaud (n. 9) 37; E. Bickel, Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Römischen Literatur (Heidelberg 1961) 491; M. Schanz and C. Hosius, Geschichte der Römischen Literatur I (Munich 1927) 293 (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 7); R. Syme, 'Livy and Augustus', HCP 64 (1959) 40; W. Eisenhut, Catull (Munich 1956) 221; H.J. Rose, A Handbook of Latin Literature (London 1954) 139; R.J.M. Lindsay, The Chronology of Catullus' Life, CPh 43 (1948) 42; and RE 7A.2 (1948) col. 2355. V. Ciaffi, Il mondo di Gaius Valerio Catullo e la sua poesia (Bologna 1987) 5; Granarolo (n. 9) 18; and A.L. Wheeler, Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry (Berkeley 1964) 88, cite both dates ("58 or 57"). Ciaffi accepting 58 but claiming that the manuscripts say 57, Granarolo accepting 57 (see also p. 28) while admitting that the manuscripts say 58.

15 Another egregious example occurs in A.E. Samuel, Greek and Roman Chronology. Calendars and Years in Classical Antiquity (Munich 1972) 251 nn. 1, 2, and 252 n. 3 (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 1.7), who cites and bases his arguments upon the 1866 edition of Alfred Schoene at a point where Schoene's text is demonstrably wrong (the foundation of Rome). He only mentions the 1923 edition twice in asides, and Helm's 1956 standard edition, not at all (on these editions, see p. 9 below). Such an error by a chronographer is surprising.

16 V. J. Rosivach, 'Some Sources of Error in Catullan Commentaries', TAPhA 108 (1978) 216. The article makes the same points I do here, but with regard to Catullan commentaries.

17 R. Syme, Sallust (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1964) 13-14.

years before 31. But Syme and others have never bothered to look at Jerome's date for Actium (or rather the deaths of Cleopatra and Antony, which stand for it). It is placed in the eleventh year of Augustus (= 33 BC), even though Eusebius placed it in his fifteenth year (= 29). Since Actium is dated to 33 BC, Sallust's death in 36 BC is a 'quadriennium' before Actium, an inclusive 'quadriennium' (i.e. 36, 35, 34, and 33). Since the item about Sallust's death's being a 'quadriennium' before Actium is obviously the only information Jerome had to date the event, Sallust must therefore have died in 34 BC. Sallust was therefore born in 86 and died in 34.

The dates are also preserved in two other sources, both deriving from a source that Jerome also had (on this see below, p. 27). Like Jerome, the Descriptio consulium (see n. 62) and the Chronicon Paschale (see n. 34) both date Sallust's birth to 86 BC (pp. 224 and 347.11). They disagree on his death, however. The former dates it to 38 BC (p. 225) and the latter to 39 (p. 359.10). It is more likely that 38 BC appeared in the common source, but we cannot be certain. Jerome, because of his dependence on Suetonius' de viris illustribus (see p. 27, below), is rightly assumed to be the more accurate in this case.

This highlights a further problem with ascertaining exactly what dates Jerome actually assigns to any of his entries. For instance, P. McGushin lays out the information for Sallust's birth and death as follows (p. 1): birth, 'ann. Abr. 1931 = Ol. 173.3/4 = A.U.C. 669 = 85 B.C.' and death, 'ann. Abr. 1981 = Ol. 186.1/2 = A.U.C. 719 = 35 B.C.'. This does not correspond with any of Syme's dates and it incorporates AUC dates that do not even appear in the Chronicle. Seven years later, J.T. Ramsey summed up the same information this way (p. 1): birth, 'ann. Abr. 1931 = Ol. 173.2/3 = 86 B.C.', and death, 'ann. Abr. 1981 = Ol. 185.4/186.1 = 36 B.C.'. The figures start off the same but they end up with completely different Olympiads and dates BC. Something must be wrong here and it seems to do with the relationship between 'ann. Abr.' (years from the birth of the patriarch Abraham; see below) and Olympiads. The answers to these and other puzzles will be provided below.

---

19 Syme also says that Jerome places Sallust's birth in 'the year corresponding to 87' (p. 13), but this is just a typographical error for '86'.
20 This is because Jerome's source for Augustus appears to have dated the beginning of his reign to 722 AUC (ab Urbe condita), which, subtracted from Jerome's date for the foundation of Rome, 755 BC, provides a date of 33 BC, two years early. This source was the now-lost Kaisergrichte (described below), as reported by two witnesses, Aurelius Victor: 'Anno urbis septingentesimo fere uicesimo duobus etiam mos Romae incessit uni prorsus parendi' (1.1) and the anonymous Epitome de caesariis: 'Anno urbis conditae septingentesimo uicesimo secundo, ab exactis uero regibus quadringentesimo octogesimoque, mos Romae repetitur uni prorsus parendi, pro rege imperatori uel sanctori nomine Augusto appellato' (1.1).

In spite of changing the date of the Battle of Actium, Jerome left Cleopatra's regnal years as they appeared in Eusebius. That is why she has four regnal years after her death!
21 On this point, see the highly sensible but almost entirely neglected article by G. Perl, 'Sallusts Todesjahr', Klio 48 (1967) 97-105, though even Perl fails to note Jerome's date for the Battle of Actium.
1.3. Citation

And lest any reader think that I, as a historian, am criticizing just philologists for their sloppy practices, be assured that the same confusion holds true, unfortunately, for many historians who either ignore the text in favour of narrative histories or just copy out old references and cite the ancient text of PL. Even a work as recent as 1988 that deals with fourth-century ecclesiastical history, for which Jerome’s near-contemporary account is of fundamental importance, cites entries in the Chronicle in the following ways: ‘2337 years after Abraham’, ‘sub ann. 328’ (this is the standard formula), ‘sub ann. Constantius XII [353] PL 27: 502-3’, and ‘sub ann. AUC 2370, reign of Constantius XII (353) 239-40’, and cites the title three different ways: Continuation of Eusebius’ Chronicle, Chronicle, and Chronicon. These mixed up references show that the author has confused two completely different editions in his citations, that of PL and Rudolf Helm’s 1956 edition, in the last example above citing the text of PL with Helm’s page numbers. In the first example he shows that he knows that the fundamental dating system used in the chronicle is years since the birth of the Hebrew patriarch Abraham (as we shall see), but in the last he thinks that they are years ab Urbe condita (AUC 2370 is AD 1617). He also states that ‘2337 years after Abraham’ is AD 320, when it is in fact 321. Three of the four examples use the form ‘sub ann.’, yet each refers to a different type of date: years AD, which are editorial additions and appear in the margins of only Helm’s edition; regnal years; and ‘Years of Abraham’. I could continue to cite such examples (a few more are noted below in n. 67), but I think that I have made my point. It is clear that where Jerome’s Chronicle is concerned fear and confusion reign supreme, for philologists and historians alike.

1.4. The Assumption of Error

Jerome compiled and translated the Chronicle very quickly. He admits that himself (see p. 29, below) and observable errors in his translation from the Greek confirm it. Historical analysis has revealed many apparent errors in his chronology as well. The result of these observations is that many of those who use the Chronicle feel compelled to make some kind of derogatory comment about it or Jerome. This is an attitude of long standing, and a latent (and not so latent) hostility towards the chronicler is often revealed as well:

Nam sane si quis hodie ita, ut fecit Hieronymus, Graeca uerteret, non dico alienis, sed ut Actaeon, a suis canibus mordicus discerperetur (If someone translated Greek nowadays as Jerome did, he would be torn apart, not only by the teeth of others’ dogs, but, like Actaeon, by his own). 27

...his carelessness and haste are evident not only in his numerous errors (even of translation), but also in his apparent indifference to exact dating even where the material for it was

24 R.P.C. Hanson, The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God (Edinburgh 1988) 132, 277 n. 5, 341 n. 106, 382 n. 132, 399 n. 72, 461 n. 8, 761 n. 117, 793 n. 12. The author was a respected ecclesiastical historian.
25 On these see Grafton (n. 3) 575-7, and Mosshammer (n. 1) 52-3. There are others.
27 Joseph Scaliger in 1658, quoted and translated by Grafton (n. 3) 577.
provided by his sources and in his refusal to take the trouble to fill obvious gaps in these. Further, had he not been in such a hurry, or had he been interested, he could have made his chronology of Roman history more precise by incorporating references to the consuls. 28

Jerome, it is clear, operated in a casual and careless fashion. Where there are facts to check him, he can be convicted of gross errors... 29

Jerome’s mistakes are notorious and in his treatment of Catullus he has made one blunder of a very elementary nature in the date of the poet’s death. The rest of his information should, in view of this, be regarded with the utmost suspicion. 30

As we shall see, however, in spite of a few truly amazing blunders and mistakes, Jerome was far more accurate and competent than he has ever been given credit for, a conclusion that is revealed through an understanding of the Chronicle and its mysteries.

We must now turn to the Chronicle itself in order to explain these mysteries. I shall begin with an account of its composition by Eusebius and then discuss the most recent and best editions of Jerome’s translation and continuation. I shall then take the reader on a guided tour of the best edition available and explain its content, structure, and chronology, in the hope that it will become more familiar and understandable to the ‘lay reader’. The final sections will deal more specifically with evaluating Eusebius’ original Greek text and Jerome’s additions to it.

2. Eusebius and the Greek Original

Eusebius of Caesarea (260/5-30 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 alike, were in the field of history, for he both brought the Christian world chronicle to its final fruition and almost single-handedly invented the genre of ecclesiastical history. His Canones was probably first composed around 311 as a work of apologetic and scholarship, aimed at Christians and non-Christians alike. 31

The final and most influential edition was published in the latter half of 325 and then

---

28 Kelly (n. 1) 74-5.
29 Syme (n. 14) 40.
30 Barrett (n. 8) 29 n. 23.
modified again slightly in the middle of 326. The Canones was actually the second of two linked works, the first being the Chronographia, a patchwork of narrative and regnal lists setting out nation by nation, as Eusebius himself said, the raw material for a complete chronology of world history from the time of the patriarch Abraham. In this work Eusebius sets out all his sources and the raw information that he derived from them, kingdom by kingdom, in the manner of the works of earlier Christian chroniclers like Julius Africanus. The second volume, the Canones itself, is the synthesis and tabulation of the raw material in the Chronographia. It sets forth all known world (i.e. Mediterranean) history from the birth of Abraham, in what we would call 2016 BC, to AD 325, noting each regnal year of the kings of all the important Mediterranean kingdoms in parallel vertical columns first on double-page spreads, and then on single pages, to a maximum of nine kingdoms at a time. Important events and individuals from secular and Biblical history are noted under their proper regnal years or Olympiads, as well as Eusebius could calculate them on the basis of the often conflicting evidence that he possessed. Eventually all the columns resolved themselves into a single column of text representing the year by year chronology of the Roman Empire, the polytheistic polyarchy of the past resolving itself into the monothestic monarchy of the reign of Constantine. Although Eusebius was writing within definite chronographic traditions, Hellenistic and Christian, no such universal synchronism for world history had ever been written before.

Part of Eusebius' purpose in writing his two-volume chronological work was to oppose what had become a popular eschatological view that the world would last 6,000 years from Creation and that Christ had been born in the year 5,500 (half-way through the metaphorical 'sixth day' of Creation). Unfortunately, his revisionist views on this and other chronological matters were not accepted by most other historians and his new chronology came in for a great deal of criticism. A number of later authors reworked and modified Eusebius' chronology, notably Diodorus of Tarsus in the last quarter of the fourth century, Annianus and Panodorus at the beginning of the fifth century, Andronicus during the reign of Justinian, and Jacob of Edessa, a Syriac chronicler and writer, c. 692. The result of two centuries of intense chronological criticism and revision was that Eusebius' unaltered original became harder and harder to find. Eventually it disappeared altogether and today no longer exists. All that is left of the Canones is Jerome's Latin translation, a reworked Armenian translation in two manuscripts of the twelfth or thirteenth century that is a compilation of an earlier Armenian translation and a Syriac translation,32 two Syriac epitomes,33 and excerpts from later Greek works that used Eusebius as a source.34

34 Chiefly three: Ludwig Dindorf (ed.), Chronicon Paschale (Bonn 1832) (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae); A.A. Mosshammer (ed.), Georgii Syncelli Echelga chronographica (Leipzig 1984); and A. Bauer (ed.), Anonymi Chronographia syntomos c codice Matritensi no. 121 (nunc 470l) (Leipzig 1909).
Chronographia has fared a little better in this regard since large, continuous excerpts still exist in Greek and there is a complete and generally accurate Armenian translation as well. Though most people have never heard of it, Eusebius' Chronici canones is one of the great losses from Greek and Roman antiquity.

3. The Editions

There have been many editions of Jerome's translation, augmentation, and continuation of the Canones since Bonino Mombrizio's edictio princeps of c.1475, but only three are of any value.

1. Eusebi Chronicorum libri duo, edited by Alfred Schoene, Vol. 1: Eusebi Chronicorum liber prior (Berlin 1875) and Vol. 2: Eusebi Chronicorum canonum quae supersunt (Berlin 1866). This is a gold mine of information for the serious scholar of the Chronicle but should be avoided by those unfamiliar with the intricacies of the manuscripts and different translations and traditions. Volume 1 is still the only comprehensive reconstruction of the Chronographia, though there is a more recent and more accurate German translation of the Armenian translation of this work (above, n. 32).

2. Eusebi Pamphili Chronicorum canones, Latine vertit, adduxit, ad sua tempora produxit S. Eusebius Hieronymus, edited by John Knight Fotheringham (London 1923). This was the first complete, printed edition, with text and apparatus, to represent the text as it was when Jerome composed it, with the spatium historicum and the twenty-six-line page (on which, see below). These had appeared in Helm's 1913 edition, but in a hand-written form (in imitation of seventh-century uncial!) with no apparatus criticus. It can still be used with complete confidence for its text (in many matters of textual criticism it is better than Helm's edition) and it is still necessary for its complete apparatus criticus, though it is not normally cited for the text.

3. Die Chronik des Hieronymus. Hieronymi Chronicon, edited by Rudolf Helm (Eusebius, Werke 7: Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte), third edition, Berlin 1984 (first edition: vol. 1, GCS 24, Leipzig 1913 [text], and vol. 2, GCS 34, Leipzig 1926 [apparatus]; second edition [typeset in a single volume]: GCS 47, Berlin 1956). This is the standard edition and normally the only one that should be cited, though only in the second or third editions. It should be treated with respect, for it is a work of immense labour and intellect: the Chronicle of Jerome is the most difficult and complicated text from classical antiquity ever edited, apart from the New Testament. That is why it took over 300 years to work out its structure and content.

Jerome's complete Chronicle has never been translated into any modern language. A translation of Jerome's continuation from 326 has just been published with a commentary and 1

---


36 Actually the 'third edition' is just an uncorrected reprint of the second edition with an extra preface that provides an updated bibliography.

37 On this, see Mosshammer (n. 1) 38-83.

38 M.D. Donalson, A Translation of Jerome's Chronicon with Historical Commentary (Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter 1996), a PhD dissertation published unaltered by the Edwin Mellen Press.
am myself working on a translation of, and commentary on, the text from 284 for the Translated Texts for Historians series.

4. Helm's Edition — An Overview

This section is divided into three parts. The first part, 4.1, is designed to give all readers a general overview of the Chronicle as it appears in this edition. The next two parts, 4.2 and 4.3, are designed for those readers who are more interested in some of the details of the chronological structure of the Chronicle, and these can be skipped by general readers.

4.1. The General Tour

Helm's edition of the Chronicle is divided into four main sections: the introduction, which includes the sigla; the edition itself; an index of names; and a collection of witnesses to Eusebius' text and other parallel sources for the whole text.

The preface extends from p. IX to p. XLVI and does what one would expect a preface to do: it describes the manuscripts and sets out the evidence for the structure and the format adopted in the edition. It also includes a number of figures that give some idea of the original structure of the work in Greek (pp. XXX-XXXI, XXXVII), though the font is rather small and the pages appear more empty than they would have originally.\(^\text{39}\) Most of what Helm argues in his preface is accepted by the majority of modern scholars and so it is really an artefact from an earlier debate that he has now won. Next follows the list of manuscripts cited in the apparatus, with their dates. The most important manuscript here is O, the Bodleian manuscript (MS Auct. T. 2. 26), which was written within 75 years of Jerome's original. Next follow the various abbreviations used in the apparatus and the testimonia at the end of the book (pp. XLVIII to LII).

The edition proper then begins on p. 1 with Jerome's preface to his friends Vincentius and Gallienus. This extends to p. 7 where Jerome's translation of Eusebius' preface begins. This continues to p. 19. In the top corner of each page, opposite the page numbers, are more numbers followed by an F, all in brackets. These continue throughout the text and are cross-references to the equivalent pages in Fotheringham's edition (see p. 9 above, and Figures 1 and 2, below). These prefaces should be cited by page and line number (see the example below). Next comes the beginning of the chronicle itself. The first part, from p. 20 to p. 105, consists of double-page spreads, indicated by Helm with a single page number for each spread and an appended 'a' for the left-hand page and a 'b' for the right-hand page. Thus the first spread is numbered 20a and 20b (I have included a reproduction of these two pages in Figure 1 and a later page, annotated, in Figure 2).

Down each page are two columns of Roman numerals, making four in total for the spread. These are the filia regnorum, the regnal years of the kings and emperors of the important kingdoms of Mediterranean civilization. From left to right we have the kingdom of the Assyrians, the Hebrews, the Sicyonians, and the Egyptians, starting respectively with year

forty-three of Ninus, first king of all Asia except India; year one of Abraham the patriarch; year twenty-two of Europs, the second king of Sicyn; and the beginning of the sixteenth dynasty of Egypt, during which the Thebans ruled Egypt (the actual pharaohs do not appear until the eighteenth dynasty, though they disappear again during the twentieth). The people or kingdom of each fillum is labelled at the top of every new page so that the reader can keep track of them. Each new king, patriarch, high priest, pharaoh, dynasty, judge, or emperor is introduced with a rubric noting the kingdom, the sequence (second king, sixteenth dynasty, and so on, though this is not true for all kingdoms), the leader’s name, and the length of his reign in years. This can be seen at the top of p. 20, but it can also be seen in its more usual form in the left-hand fillum of the Assyrians after the fifty-second year of Ninus, where Semiramis, the second ruler of the Assyrians, who ruled for forty-two years, succeeds Ninus. Individually these filla run from top to bottom, from one double-page spread to the next. Moreover, all four filla line up in sequence across the pages to mark a single calendar year. On the right-hand side Helm notes in a smaller font the equivalent modern dates, starting with 2016 BC. Thus regnal year eight of Semiramis, eighteen of Abraham, thirty-nine of Europs, and eighteen of the sixteenth dynasty of Egypt are the rough equivalent of our year 1999 BC (on this, see pp. 22–4, below). Here it can be seen as well that Helm follows the manuscripts exactly and uses the contemporary Roman numerals with ‘III’ and ‘VIII’ for four and nine, for example, not the familiar ‘IV’ and ‘IX’ forms. These regnal years can be cited by modern scholars in a number of ways: ‘Year 39 of Europs’, ‘39 Europs’ (the simplest), ‘XXXVIII Europs’, ‘Europs 39’, or ‘Europs XXXVIII’. Abbreviations of names are often used when dealing with short chronological periods where the reader would easily understand which fillum is being referred to: ‘39 Eur.’.

On the far left-hand side, on p. 20a, to the left of the fillum for Ninus, there is an underlined ‘X’, and all the Roman numerals across the page to the right are underlined as well. This ‘X’ marks the tenth year of Abraham (usually abbreviated as ‘ann. Abr. 10’, ‘ab Abr. 10’, or ‘10 Abr.’), the standard relative chronology of the entire chronicle. From this point to the end of the chronicle every tenth year is underlined and the associated year from the birth of Abraham appears in the left-hand margin. The distinction helps to keep everything in line across the page.

Since there was a wide diversity of dating systems in use in the classical world and none of them reached back to 2000 BC — the standard system of Olympiads went back only as far as 776 BC — Eusebius had to invent his own chronological system to hold the entire chronicle together. Some chroniclers in the Hellenistic tradition had counted backwards from the time of writing, like our BC system, but this did not appeal to Eusebius, and this is just as well, since each of his numerous updates would have necessitated a complete revision of the chronological accounting of the entire chronicle. Christian chroniclers often started their calculations with the Creation of the World and so used an annus mundi (AM) system that counted forwards from that point, but as was noted above Eusebius was trying to play down the need to calculate the age of the world (though he did include such totals in the Chronicle, as we shall see) and was also trying to avoid the complicated and contradictory chronologies of the early part of the Bible. As a result, he had to begin at some other point.
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Key to Figure 2

A- *Filiaregnorum*: the vertically-listed regnal years of the kings whose people or kingdoms are listed at the top of the column. The synchronism for a single calendar year is achieved by reading across the *fila* horizontally.

B- *spatium historicum*: the space where historical events and individuals are described. The regnal year opposite the first line of each entry is usually the year to which that entry should be dated: e.g. Ennius' birth belongs to 240, not 240-37.

C- Olympiad markers. These note the year of each Olympiad, which is the year immediately following the marker.

D- Years since the birth of Abraham. These are noted every decade and are underlined, as are all figures in that year across the page.

E- modern years (in this case, *BC*, 'ante Christum'). These are the modern equivalents of the regnal years, and were added by the editor, R. Helm.


G- alphabetic markers, by which each entry should be cited, e.g. 133² (since this is page 133) for the entry on Ennius.

H- an asterisk to note that this entry was added by Jerome and did not appear in Eusebius' original.

I- rubrics announcing new kings. Each notice gives the name of the people or kingdom, the name of the king, and the length of his reign. Usually the king's position in the sequence of kings is given as well, though not here. In some instances additional material is included. Such rubrics are almost always followed by regnal year 'I'.

J- *apparatus criticus* noting relative position of the historical entries with respect to the regnal years (in Latin).

K- *apparatus criticus* for the rubrics (I, above) (notes in German).

L- regular *apparatus criticus* (notes in German).

M- indicates that the entry appears in the Armenian translation.

N- indicates that the entry does not appear in the Armenian translation.

*Sigla* not represented in Figure 2

(*)- after an entry indicates that Jerome has modified an entry written by Eusebius, usually by adding material to it (cf. H, above).

†- after the entry letter in *apparatus* 'L', above, indicates that the entry appears in the Syriac epitome of Eusebius (see the *apparatus* to 20² and ⁸ in Figure 1 for examples).

'—)', '—) zu', 'Zu', '— Zu', or '— zu' followed by a date 'Abr.', a German notice, and a *• Arm.* in *apparatus* 'L' indicates that an entry contained in the Armenian translation was missed by Jerome.

Figures 1 and 2 are reproduced with the permission of Akademie Verlag GmbH, Berlin.
He chose Abraham, chiefly because he was regarded by Eusebius and other Christians as either the first Christian or as a proto-Christian. The Chronicle is, therefore, a history of the known world since the first coming of Christianity, and his ‘ann. Abr.’ chronology is therefore a proto-AD system.

Most scholars who mention the Chronicle cite the text strictly from these ‘Years of Abraham’ since in the past there was no other obvious way to cite individual years. Indeed, Schoene printed every Year of Abraham to assist citation, and until Helm’s edition of 1913 all chronological figures in the margins and fila were printed in Arabic not Latin numbers, a practice that also simplified citation in this manner. Unfortunately Helm’s fidelity to the Latin original (i.e. noting Years of Abraham every decade in Roman numerals) makes this method of citation very difficult. Some different methods of citation have been noted above, pp. 5-6. The few modern literary scholars who cite Jerome from Helm’s edition usually just cite the page number followed by an ‘H’ (e.g. p. 171 H), if they bother to cite the entries at all. Ramsey and McGushin, noted on p. 5, above, make no attempt to cite the entries at all apart from the Years of Abraham and Olympiads, and McGushin unfortunately does not even indicate which edition he used.

As can be seen from p. 20, Helm has placed a letter of the alphabet at the beginning of each entry. These entries occupy what is known as the spatium historicum, which runs down the middle of each page between the fila regorum. On p. 20 those entries associated with the filum of the Assyrians are labelled a and c, those with the filum of the Hebrews are b and d, those with the Sicyonians are e and g, and that with the Egyptians is f. Usually there is only one main column of text in each spatium historicum (see Figure 2), but down to p. 105, and perhaps in other detailed sections of the Chronicle, Eusebius used multiple columns within the spatium, which Jerome often seems to reproduce (e.g. pp. 29b, 31b, 40a, 43b, 46b, 47, 49b, 53b, and 64b). Any entry should therefore be cited by its page number and superscript letter thus: 20lf (or just 20f since there is only one alphabetical sequence per spread). Each line is numbered on the inside of the double-page spread (there are twenty six lines per page, which reflects Jerome’s original) for specific reference to lines (e.g. as in the apparatus) or to items that are not labelled with letters, chiefly the introductory material for each new reign (originally in the form of rubrics). Thus the material describing Ninus would be cited as ‘p. 20a.1-6’. There is no need to use any other method of citation.

At the bottom of the page we have a tripartite apparatus criticus. Contrary to normal practice the language of the apparatus is German (in italics), not Latin (except, for some reason, in the first apparatus). The first shows the relationship of the individual entries in the spatium historicum to specific regnal years. On p. 20a we can see that MS O is lacking for these early pages of the chronicle (to 47a, in fact) and that in MS B entry d starts opposite ‘VI’ and in MSS AL it starts opposite ‘X’. This means that in MSS MPN (which are not cited) it starts at ‘VII’, where Helm has placed it. The text of the accession rubrics appears in the second apparatus and is referred to by the abbreviated name of the kingdom in bold, in this case Ass., Hebr., Sic., and Aeg., and by line number. In some cases, for additional support or for parallel

40 It is usually claimed that all Eusebius’ entries were written like this (see Helm’s edition, pp. xxvii-xxxiii, and Mosshammer (n. 1) 62-3, 81-3), but I see no compelling evidence to support this claim.
statements, Helm also cites other witnesses to Jerome’s text. These are set in italics. Here he cites eleven later witnesses to Jerome’s rubric concerning Ninus and his regnal years. Finally we have the *apparatus* proper, which goes in alphabetical order of the entries and by line number. Again, later witnesses to Jerome’s text are cited in italics. A bold dagger (†) after an entry letter indicates that that entry appears in the Syriac epitome of Eusebius’ original Greek chronicle that appears in the *Chronicle of 724* (see n. 33, above). Later on in the text this siglum is joined by one of two others, *Arm.* and *<Arm.*), which indicate that a particular entry either is or is not present in the Armenian translation of Eusebius’ Greek original (see n. 32, above). These are important for establishing the text and chronology of Eusebius’ original work (see pp. 24-5, below), though, strangely, they are never actually quoted anywhere. One also occasionally finds ‘—*), ‘—*), ‘—*), ‘—*), ‘—*), ‘—*), or ‘—*), ‘—*), followed by a date ‘*Abr.*), a German notice, and a ‘*Arm.*’ (e.g. 43a between d) and e); 78b between c) and d); and 87b at end). This indicates an original entry that has been missed by Jerome and appears in the Armenian translation. It is quoted from the German translation of Karst (see n. 32).

One can see how this format of *fila* and *spatium* continues over the following pages. Because the Hebrew *filum* is on the left hand page and the Greek *filum* is on the right (Eusebius did not know much about the Assyrians or the Egyptians), one finds that Biblical history appears in the *spatium historicum* on the left-hand page and material from secular history appears in the *spatium historicum* on the right-hand page. Jerome did not adhere rigorously to this format and filled in many events from Roman history on the Biblical side when he did not have room on the secular side, and even Eusebius put secular material on the left when he did not have room on the right or if it related directly to a kingdom whose *filum* appeared on the left. As one skims through this first section of the chronicle an incongruous aspect that one immediately notices is that Euhemerized figures from Greek mythology cavort opposite figures from the Bible as part of the same ‘reality’. In an apologetic twist, Eusebius makes it seem as though Biblical history is fixed and exact while pagan history is full of uncertainty and contradiction. He does this by offering multiple chronologies for the same people and events, such as Hercules, Homer, Hesiod, and the foundation of Carthage.\(^\text{41}\)

Page 105, the second year of Darius and the beginning of the reconstruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, marks the last of the double-page spreads. From page 106 Jerome allots one *spatium* per page and consequently the modern dates appear on the outside edges of both the left and right pages as the text shifts to single pages for the rest of the chronicle.

Over a space of eighty-six double-page spreads and a further eighty-two single pages the *fila* ebb and flow, there being as many as nine per page (pp. 83-6) and as few as two (pp. 107-15, 122-5, Persians and Macedonians; pp. 150-5, Alexandrians and Judeans; pp. 164-87, Romans and Judeans), though usually there are six, seven, or eight at a time. The polyarchy of the past gives way to the monarchy of the Roman Empire, and with the capture of Jerusalem by Titus in AD 70 (p. 187), but a single *filum* remains, that of the Roman emperors,\(^\text{41}\)

---

\(^{41}\) See esp. 66a\(^a\) and 86a\(^d\), and e.g. 26b\(^f\), 40b\(^e\), 50b\(^d\), 53b\(^4\), 55b\(^e\), 56b\(^e\), 56b\(^f\), 57b\(^d\), 59b\(^e\), 60b\(^4\) (\(1574-1196\) BC); Homer: 63b\(^e\), 65a\(^e\), 69b\(^e\), 71b\(^7\) (\(1160-1017\) BC) (Jerome adds his own dating at 77b\(^e\); Hesiod: 71b\(^8\), 84b\(^e\), 87b\(^7\) (\(1017-767\) BC); and Carthage: 58b\(^e\), 69b\(^e\), 71b\(^8\), 81b\(^b\) (\(1214-850\) BC). The same argument against Greek history is made by Josephus, *Against Apion*, 1.15-27, 37-8.
and it continues down to the end of the work. From the capture of Jerusalem we have only the regnal years of the Roman emperors every year, Olympiads every four years, and Years of Abraham (underlined) every ten years down the left hand side of the page.

At '20 Constantine' Jerome marks the point at which Eusebius concluded his original chronicle and he takes up the continuation (231). The filà and spatia conclude on p. 249 with year fourteen of Valens and Valentinian (378) (the ['XV'] should be ignored) and the text itself concludes on p. 250 with a final chronological suppugatio accounting the years covered by the chronicle from its conclusion backwards to the seven chronological linchpins (these are discussed below, pp. 20-1).

Following the suppugatio on p. 250 are three pages of apparatus critici that were too long to fit at the bottom of preceding pages (as mentioned above, Helm maintained Jerome's original twenty-six-line page format), the index of names (pp. 254-78), and the testimonia of the witnesses and parallels (pp. 279-455). In this latter section close or exact parallels are quoted and close parallels from Eusebius or Jerome's sources (or witnesses to their sources) are cited with spaced text (e.g. Josephus for Eusebius and Eutropius for Jerome).

4.2. The Fila in Detail


2. Hebrews. Begins in 2016 BC with the birth of Abraham. On p. 72a in 996 BC it splits into the Hebrews called Juda, on the left side of the left spatium historicum, and those in Samaria who were called Israel, on the right side. The filum for Israel ends with the capture of Israel by Sennacherib, the king of the Chaldaeans, in 747 BC (p. 88a). The filum for Juda becomes an accounting of the seventy-year Babylonian captivity ('Iudaeorum captituitas') starting on pp. 99a-100a (590 BC). This filum ends in 521 BC on p. 105a. A new filum starts in 160 BC for Iudas, the 'Iudaeorum dux', a position that is elevated to 'rex' in 130 BC (pp. 141 and 145-6). With the Roman conquest of Palestine by Pompey the filum for the Judaean kings shifts to the High Priest Hyrcanus in 67 BC (p. 153) and then to Herod in 33 BC (pp. 160-2). The filum finally ends in AD 70 with the capture of Jerusalem by Titus (p. 187), after a further succession of a dux, a tetrarch, a princeps, and a rex.


4. Egyptians. Begins in 2016 BC (p. 20b) and ends on p. 104b in 525 BC with the capture of Egypt by Cambyses, king of the Persians. It reappears in 413 BC (p. 116), but ends again in 350 BC (p. 121).

5. Argives. Begins on p. 27b with Inachus (1856 BC), and ends on p. 53b with King Acrisius (1313 BC).

6. Athenians. Begins with Cecrops, the first king of Athens, in 1556 BC (p. 41b) and comes to an end in 684 BC with the end of Eryxias and the monarchy (p. 93a).

7. Mycenaecans. Begins in 1306 BC with Eurystheus (p. 54b) and ends just after the capture of Troy under Agamemnon in 1179 BC (60b).

42 The first two Roman numerals have been shifted down two lines because of the length of the rubric and so it at first looks like 1304 BC.
8. Latins. Begins with Aeneas on p. 62b (1178 BC) and on p. 88b Romulus appears as the sixteenth king of the Latins as well as the first king of the Romans (752 BC).

9. Lacedaemonians. Begins in 1101 BC with Eurystheus (p. 66b) and ends in 777 BC with Thalcamenes (p. 86b).

10. Corinthians. Also begins in 1101 BC, with Aletes (p. 66b), and ends in 779 BC with Automenes (p. 85b).

11. Medes. Replaces Assyrians in 819 BC on p. 83a under Arbaces and is replaced by the Persians in 561 BC on p. 102a, when Astyages is king.

12. Macedonians. Begins on p. 83b with Caranus (813 BC) and continues down to p. 140, where it ends in 167 BC under Perses (Perseus).

13. Lydians. Begins with Ardyus in 778 BC (p. 85b) right after the end of the Corinthians and ends in 548 BC with the capture of Croesus by Cyrus (p. 103b).

14. Romans (kings). On p. 88b Romulus appears as the sixteenth king of the Latins as well as the first king of the Romans (752 BC). With the expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus in 513 BC (p. 106) the filum for the Roman kings comes to an end and the spatium historicum, which previously had not been labelled at all, henceforth has the headings ‘Romanorum’ on the top of the left-hand pages and ‘Consules’ on the right-hand pages. There is no evidence that Eusebius (or Jerome) ever included any of the names of the consuls, though Jerome must have used a consular list as a source to correlate his historical material (see below).

15. Persians. Replaces the Medes on p. 102a (560 BC) and ends in 330 BC (p. 124) with the defeat of Darius by Alexander the Great.

16. Alexandrians. The Ptolemaic kingdom of Egypt begins in 324 BC (p. 125) with Ptolemy I and ends in 29 BC (p. 163), even though the deaths of Antony and Cleopatra are recorded in 33 BC (p. 162), the result of the ‘corrections’ by Jerome noted above, on pp. 4-5.

17. Asia. Begins with Antigonus in 318 BC (p. 126) and is merged with Syria in 283 BC (p. 129). The joined filum ends in 93 BC (p. 149).

18. Syria. Begins with Seleucus, king of Syria and Babylon, in 312 BC (p. 126), which then merges into a single filum (Syria and Asia) in 283 BC (p. 129). The joined filum ends in 93 BC (p. 149).

19. Romans (emperors). Julius Caesar is counted as the first Roman emperor and his regnal years begin in 48 BC just before the Battle of Pharsalus. The spatium historicum is no longer headed ‘Romanorum consules’. Normally each rubric for each new king is written in a narrow column just above its own filum. The rubrics for the Roman emperors, however, stretch right across the page, filling the entire space once occupied by the various diverse kingdoms of the past (the Years of Abraham and Olympiads still follow along in the left margin). The filum for the Roman emperors now takes the primary position running down the left-hand side of the page. The fila for the Alexandrians and the Judaeans (the only fila left at this point) are squeezed over to the right-hand edge of the page as the spatium historicum increases in size, and the regnal years are listed further apart to take in the extra historical accounts: for example, pp. 134-5 cover twenty-six years (225-200 BC), 154-5 cover sixteen years (64-49 BC), and pp. 162-3 only six years (33-28 BC).
4.3. The Chronological Linchpins

Eusebius began his researches by establishing seven chronological points on which he could hang his overall chronology. These were famous and well-established dates that he could use to work other more poorly established chronologies backwards and forwards. It also gave him definite blocks of time in which to fit other events of the same *fila*, for instance the number of years between the capture of Troy and the first Olympiad. A number of these linchpins were valuable for coordinating the chronologies of different *fila*, especially those of the Hebrews and the various Greek kingdoms, or *fila* like the *filum* of the Assyrians that could be coordinated with the Greek *fila*.

The first linchpin, of course, as we have already seen, was the birth of Abraham in 43 Ninus.

The accession of King Cecrops in the thirty-fifth year of Moses marks the second linchpin: the synchronism of Moses and Cecrops. In 41a Eusebius notes that there are 375 years from this year to the capture of Troy. At 43a(d) he notes the exodus from Egypt in 45 Cecrops and states that from this year to Solomon and the building of the Temple there are 480 years. Both of these dates will be referred to later in the chronicle.

On pp. 60-1 we meet the third chronological linchpin, the capture of Troy in 835 Abr. (= 1182 BC), 410 years after the birth of Moses, 375 years after the first year of King Cecrops of Athens and the thirty-fifth year of Moses, and 406 years before the first Olympiad.

On p. 70 (esp. 70a) we meet the fourth linchpin, the inception of the construction of the Temple in Jerusalem by Solomon, 480 years from the exodus from Egypt. From the Flood to Moses Eusebius calculates 1,447 years, and from Adam to the Flood 2,242 years, which to the present year (1033 BC) makes a total of 4,169 years.

The first Olympiad, the fifth linchpin, appears in 776 BC (p. 86). From this point Jerome marks every fourth year with an Olympiad in the form 'I-Olym.', 'II-Olym.', and so on, the actual year or anniversary of the games falling in the year immediately following the Olympiad marker (in this case, 776 BC or 1241 Abr.). This is important and will be discussed later (pp. 22-4).

The sixth chronological linchpin, the inception of the rebuilding of the Temple in the second year of King Darius (521 BC), appears on p. 105, the last of the double-page spreads. This is a key date for it precisely synchronizes Greek, Persian, and Biblical history.

In the fifteenth year of Tiberius, AD 28, we meet the seventh and last of Eusebius' linchpins, the beginning of Christ's ministry, 548 years from the rebuilding of the Temple, 1,060 years from Solomon and the first building of the Temple, 1,539 years from Moses and the exodus from Egypt, 2,044 years from the birth of Abraham. From the flood to Abraham there are 942 years and from Adam to the Flood, 2,242 years (pp. 173-4). It is interesting that Eusebius chose Christ's ministry rather than crucifixion as the linchpin here. It was probably because there was no agreement as to the date of the crucifixion, whereas the beginning of his ministry was explicitly dated by Luke 3:1 (or so it was thought; it actually dates the beginning of John's ministry).
The final *supputatio* (p. 250), mentioned above on p. 18, gathers all these linchpins together and calculates the number of years elapsed from the end of the chronicle (AD 378, the end of Jerome’s continuation⁴³) to those points:

- from Tiberius’ fifteenth year and the ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ: 351 years
- from the second year of Darius, king of the Persians, at which time the Temple was rebuilt: 899 years
- from the first Olympiad, at which time Isaiah was prophet amongst the Hebrews: 1,155 years
- from Solomon and the first building of the Temple: 1,411 years
- from the capture of Troy, at which time Samson lived amongst the Hebrews: 1,561 years
- from Moses and Cecrops, the first king of Attica: 1,890 years
- from Abraham and the reign of Nimus and Semiramis: 2,395 years
- Furthermore, from the Flood to Abraham: 942 years
- and from Adam to the Flood: 2,242 years
- From Adam to the fourteenth year of Valens, that is to the consulship of Valens for the sixth time and Valentinian for the second, this makes a total of 5,579 years

There are a number of other scattered chronological markers used in the *Chronicle* and it would be best to mention them here, since they are not explained anywhere and will puzzle unfamiliar readers. The first is the ‘*Iobelaem a maioribus* or ‘*iuxta maioriores nostros* or ‘*secundum maiores*’. It is not known what these are or who the ‘maiores’ are. They have no sequential numbers as the Hebrew Jubilees do and they start in 204: ‘*in hoc anno iobelaem a maioribus inuenimus obseruatum, id est XII anno Seueri et CCLI Antiochenae urbis*’ (212b). This date strongly suggests that they take their origin from the Secular Games celebrated by Severus in 204.⁴⁵ They are noted every fifty years after this, 219⁴, 227, and 238, though Jerome mistakenly labelled the last as ‘*secundum Hebraeos*’ instead of ‘*secundum maiores*’.

---

⁴³ Eusebius’ *supputatio* in 325 was omitted by Jerome. It survives in the epitome in the *Chron. 724* (see above, n. 33).
⁴⁴ This should be Year 252.
5. Determining the Chronology of an Entry

5.1. The Simple Method

For the most part there is a very simple way to establish the date Eusebius or Jerome assigned to any entry: it is the BC (‘a. Chr.’) or AD (‘p. Chr.’) date Helm has provided opposite the regnal year under which the first line of the entry falls. If the entry extends through one or more regnal years (described below), it is usually the regnal year of the first line of the entry, where the superscript letter is, that marks the correct year, though there do appear to be a few exceptions where Jerome was prevented from starting long entries exactly where he wanted because he could not shift or compress Eusebius’ entries sufficiently (e.g. 133\textsuperscript{a} dates to 238 BC and 137\textsuperscript{d} dates to 185). When an entry starts at an Olympiad it is normally to be taken with the following regnal year.

5.2. The Complicated Explanation

Of course, the reality is rather more complicated. Eusebius’ year, that of Caesarea, like most of those in the eastern Roman empire, was based upon the Macedonian calendar. Analysis of Eusebius’ correlations between his own calendar and the Roman calendar in his Martyrs of Palestine shows that his calendar was of the type used in Tyre and therefore probably began on 3 October.\textsuperscript{46} Olympiads ran from July/August of each quadriennium, though for chronological purposes historians and chronographers divided each Olympiad into four calendar years. Each regnal year normally began on the anniversary of the day each king or emperor ascended the throne, except for those such as the Egyptian and Ptolemaic regnal years, for which the beginning of the second regnal year was always calculated from the next New Year’s (however short the first year), so that regnal years and calendar years 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 year to year.\textsuperscript{47} The Years of Abraham were merely notional units designed to give a relative chronological context for the work as a whole and simply counted each passing year from 2016 BC. All these differing calendar systems would have been impossible to calculate, synchronize, and record if they were all treated as accurate representations of reality. In order to work they all had to be coordinated to a single system. Thus all years of Abraham, all regnal years, and all Olympiads were equated with the civic Macedonian calendar year of Caesarea. The various regnal years that are relevant to the suicide of the Vestal virgin in Figure 2 (133\textsuperscript{b}), for instance, ‘XI Alexandrinorum’, ‘XI Syriae et Asiae’, and ‘VIII Macedonum’, as well as the year 1781 Abr. and Olympiad 136.1, were all equated exactly with 3 October 237 BC to 2 October 236 BC by Eusebius, regardless of the exact period of time each represented.

For all his history from 776 BC, Olympiads were Eusebius’ primary chronology, and the correlation of the Olympiads and Macedonian months already existed in his chief source, an

\textsuperscript{46} J.-P. Rey-Coquais, ‘Le calendrier employé par Eusèbe de Césarée dans les Martyrs de Palestine’, AB 96 (1978) 55-64, esp. 62 (I Hyperberctaios - 3 October). For the detailed argument, see Burgess (n. 26) 28,104-6.

\textsuperscript{47} On ancient calendars, see E.J. Bickerman, Chronology of the Ancient World (London 1980) and Samuel (n.15). See also Burgess (n. 26) 28.
Olympiads chronicle.\textsuperscript{48} That the 'real' Olympiad year in this example actually began in July/August of 236, just a few months before the end of the stated 'Olympiads', is completely irrelevant. These are not 'real' Olympiads, but modified Olympiads adjusted to correlate with the Macedonian calendar year, just as the regnal years are not counting from the accession of each individual king or emperor: Eusebius simply equated the first regnal year of each king and emperor with the coordinated Olympiad/Macedonian calendar year in which he became emperor, in the same way that each Olympiad was the calendar year in which the games actually fell every fourth year. For instance, the first regnal year of Domitian is depicted as starting on 3 October AD 80 (189\textsuperscript{b}), even though he became emperor on 14 September 81, fifty weeks later. On the other hand, the last regnal year of each ruler is the calendar year before the one in which he actually died, since the actual year of his death is given over to the first regnal year of his successor. The point was not to represent accurately the exact few years of each king's reign, but to have a system of representation that could keep track of decades, centuries, and millennia of reigns with a minimum of confusion, calculation, and error.

However, when Jerome made his additions to the chronicle he was thinking solely in terms of a consular year, since, as we shall see, he used a consular list to calculate his chronologies. On his counting, the year of the Vestal's suicide began on 1 January 236 BC, not 3 October 237, and for him all years of Abraham, regnal years, and Olympiads began on 1 January. This is why Olympiads cannot be used as if they were exact dates, any more than the regnal years of Roman emperors can be so used later on: each year is exactly equated with a consular year. Consequently Helm's BC and AD dates are exactly correct for Jerome's additions and only a few months too late (October to December) for Eusebius' dates. In the above discussion of Sallust's dates (p. 5), Ramsey gets his 'real' Olympiad calculations correct for Jerome's calendar year (e.g. 173.2-3), but McGushin is off by an entire year (and it is hard to see how this happened).

One needs to be careful, however, when dealing with Olympiad dates that may have been taken from a source that used 'real' Olympiads (i.e. counting from July/August each year, not the previous autumn), since such dates will be a year late. For instance, the foundation of Rome is usually dated by Olympiads. Eusebius included a note on its foundation in the Canones under Olymp. 7.1 (88b.13), which for him corresponds to the calendar year 3 October 753-2 (thus 21 April 752), but in reality that Olympiad is July/August 752-1 BC (thus 21 April 751). Jerome is unlikely to have used sources that dated by Olympiads so this is not a problem for his additions.

Towards the end of the Chronicle, from the accession of Constantine (pp. 228-9), Jerome made a change to Eusebius' method of calculating regnal years. Whereas Eusebius had synchronized the first year of each emperor with the calendar year of his accession, as we have seen, Jerome synchronized the last year of each emperor with the calendar year of his death, which made his first year the calendar year after his accession. For the reign of

\textsuperscript{48} On this source, see Mosshammer (n. 1) 157-67. For the calendar of his Olympiad source (new year starting in mid-September, it would seem), see Burgess (n. 26) 29, 31-4. The calendar can be determined from an examination of the Olympiad to which the first year of each emperor is assigned. On Olympiads in general, see Bickerman (n. 47) 75-6 and Samuel (n. 15) 189-94 (though he is incorrect in his assessment of Eusebius on p. 194 n. 2).
Constantine (to 325, where Eusebius ceased), this meant moving all Eusebius' dates ahead one year during translation: Constantine's accession (25 July 306) was dated to 306 in Eusebius, but to 307 in Jerome, so the Battle of the Milvian Bridge (312), for instance, appears under '6 Const.' in Jerome (229k - 312) but was originally '7 Const.' in Eusebius (= 312). Constantine's final year is 337 and his sons' first regnal year is 338. Eusebius was unusual in his assignment of regnal years, and most later chroniclers employed the method used by Jerome. Other continuators of Eusebius, however, did not change their calculation methods until the death of Constantine, which meant that in these chronicles Constantine is given a reign that is one year too long — thirty-two years instead of the correct thirty-one (actually thirty years and ten months) — because both 306 (his accession year) and 337 (the year of his death) were counted in his reign. Any source that gives Constantine thirty-two years therefore probably derives its information from such a chronicler.

6. The Text and Chronology of Eusebius' *Chronici canones*

Helm has made life much easier for those who study the chronicle by marking all Jerome's additions with an asterisk and those original entries that Jerome augmented or modified with an asterisk in round brackets. Unfortunately, he has not noted where Jerome alters Eusebius' chronology (i.e. moved Eusebius' entries from their original positions) and the asterisks are plagued by typographical errors, forcing one to consult both the pages of the text as well as the associated sections of the *testimonia* at the back of the book, which also include an asterisk or bracketed asterisk at the end of each section added or augmented by Jerome. Towards the end of the *Canones* Helm's judgement was in error as well and this caused him to mislabel many entries there.

That understood, it is usually the case that any item that does not have an asterisk or bracketed asterisk is a translation of the Greek *Canones* of Eusebius. Eusebius' sources were many and varied and his evidence must always be taken in conjunction with other evidence,

49 The following witnesses to Eusebius give an explicit '7 Const.: Socrates, HE 1.2.1; Chron. Pasch. s.a. 305 (518. 17-8); Cedrenus 475.3-4; Elias, Op. chron. 48.4-6; Chron. Scir at 15 (p. 262, 265-6); and Agapius, Kitab al-'Unvan 540. Other sources support the same date indirectly. For a discussion of these sources and for more on Jerome's chronological modifications at this point, see Burgess (n. 26) 42-3, 55, 97, 102 (on the latter two pages '26' is an error for '25').

50 For instance, the following entries should be followed by a '(*): 229g, 229h, 229i, 229j, 230a, 230b, 230c, 231a, 231b, and the following should be followed by a '*: 229f, 227m, 228a, 229a, 229b, 229c, 230a, 230b, 230c, 231a, 231b. These were either missed or incorrectly denoted by Helm. This is an extreme example, from a particularly problematic section of the text. For a few earlier examples, see 201f, 205e, 206d, 213b, 216b, and 223a, which should all be followed by a '(*), and 221k, which should be followed by a '* G. Brugnioli, Curiosissimus Excerptor. Gli 'Additamenta' di Girolamo ai 'Chronica' di Eusebio (Pisa 1995) (Testi e studi di cultura classica 12) 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, CR ns 48 (1998) 68-70. H. Inglebert, *Les Romains chrétiens face à l'histoire de Rome: histoire, christianisme et romanités tardives en Occident dans l'Antiquité tardive (IIIe-Ve siècles)* (Paris 1996) 221-53, also 217-20 and 255-76 (Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 145) is an even less detailed and rigorous attempt to locate Jerome's additions. For a detailed examination of Jerome's changes in a small section of his translation, see Burgess (n. 26) 90-8.
never on its own, unless, of course, the item is unique. The first step is the most complex: one must verify that Jerome’s entry is an accurate representation of Eusebius’ original, both in content and chronology, for as we shall see Jerome could alter either or both. This means checking Jerome’s evidence with the surviving witnesses to Eusebius’ original text. The first and most important is the Armenian translation in the German translation of Josef Karst (above, n. 32), followed by the Latin translations of two Syriac epitomes, the most important being that contained in the Chron. 724, the other in the chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, which is better than most witnesses at preserving the chronology (above, n. 33). The chronology can only be established by comparing the years of Abraham in Jerome, Ps-Dionysius (where it exists), and the Armenian translation. The agreement of two against the other usually indicates Eusebius’ original chronology. The Armenian can be very inaccurate where there is a large amount of text on a page, and can therefore be more reliable where there is more space for the entries, though even here discrepancies from Jerome are the rule.

For instance, on pp. 144–5, chosen at random, of fifteen entries in Jerome that derive from Eusebius, fourteen appear in the Armenian translation and three are dated by Ps-Dionysius. The Armenian agrees with Jerome on six, disagrees by one year on five, by two years on two, and by three years on one. Ps-Dionysius agrees on one, and is out by one year on one and by two years on one. Ps-Dionysius’ two-year error appears for an entry that the Armenian and Jerome agree upon, and one of the Armenian’s two-year errors appears for the entry that Ps-Dionysius and Jerome agree upon. Given the normal errors of manuscript copying (of both Eusebius’ original and the translations) and the original complexity of Eusebius’ original, errors of one or two years are to be expected. The overall combined testimony of the three sources suggests that Jerome is most probably an accurate translation of Eusebius’ text and that his one addition on these pages (on Accius), sandwiched between two entries whose dates are directly confirmed by the Armenian, has not disrupted Eusebius’ chronology (on this, see below).

Next, confirmation should be sought from some of the Greek witnesses to the Canones, chiefly the Chronicon Paschale, the Chronographia of Syncellus, and the Anonymus Matritensis (n. 34, above). Helm has made the comparison of these texts very easy by providing references for all the important witnesses in the testimonia on pp. 279-446. Unfortunately, he has also included unrelated parallels and even citations from Eusebius’ surviving sources: one should not mistake these for witnesses to Eusebius (or Jerome, in the relevant entries). With all this evidence one can then attempt to determine what Eusebius actually said and what his chronology was (following the dates in the margins of Helm, as discussed above). Only with an understanding of Eusebius’ sources and methods (see n. 51, above) can one evaluate this evidence properly.

51 Moshammer (n. 1) devotes the second half of his book to sorting out some of the problems with dating early Greek literary and historical figures, and discusses Eusebius’ sources on pp. 128-68. Anyone wishing to cite Eusebius for any event or individual should consult this material.

52 Jerome complained in his preface: ‘historia multiplex est habens barbara nomina, res incognitas Latinis, numeros inextricabiles, urgulas rebus pariter ac numeris intertextas, ut paene difficilior sit legendi ordinem discernere quam ad lectionis notitiam pertenire’ (5.1-6).
7. Jerome's Contributions to Eusebius' Greek Original\textsuperscript{53}

7.1. Overview

I have already made many references to Jerome's additions to Eusebius' original and noted that he continued it from 326 to 378. It now remains to explain what Jerome added and how he went about doing it.

Jerome has left us an account of what changes he made to Eusebius' original text:

\textit{Sciendum etenim est me et interpretes et scriptoris ex parte officio usum, quia et Graeca fidelissime expressi et nonnulla, quae mihi intermissa uidebantur, adiecti, in Romana maxime historia, quam Eusebius huius conditor libri non tam ignorasse ut eruditus, sed ut Graece scribens parum suis necessariam perstrinxisse mihi uidentur. Itaque a Nino et Abraham usque ad Troiae captivitatem pura Graeca translatio est. A Troia usque ad utoerum Constantinii annum nunc addita, nunc admixa sunt plurima, quae de Tranquillo et ceteris illustribus historiciis curiosissime excerptae. A Constantinii autem supra dicto anno usque ad consultatum 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 [i.e. Suetonius] 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.

The text of the \textit{Chronicle} confirms Jerome's description of his additions and where he made them.

Jerome made a number of different types of addition to Eusebius' original. He added new entries that provided information not included by Eusebius; he added entries that corrected what Eusebius said; he added words, phrases, or clauses to existing entries that supplemented and clarified what Eusebius said; he could completely replace Eusebius' entries with material from his Latin sources that related at least one element similar to Eusebius' original entry; and he could recraft his translations of Eusebius to use words and phrases from his Latin sources. He could also shift the position of Eusebius' entries (intentionally and unintentionally) and thus change Eusebius' chronology. We have seen an example of the latter above with reference to the Battle of Actium; he also changed the date of the foundation of Rome from 752 BC to 755 BC (88\textsuperscript{a} and 88\textsuperscript{b}.10-13) and moved the date of Christ's crucifixion from '19 Tiberius' to '18 Tiberius'.\textsuperscript{54} None of these is indicated by Helm

\textsuperscript{53} A detailed analysis of Jerome's sources, additions, chronology, and methods and procedures for making his additions is too lengthy and complex for a paper of this size and nature.

\textsuperscript{54} Cf. Jerome's date for 174\textsuperscript{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 Olymp. 202 (\textsuperscript{·}19 Tib.) as well as with the Armenian translation ('im neunzehnten Jahre'; Karst p. 213); Syncellus' excerpt from Eusebius' Greek original, \textepsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon \tau\iota\tau\iota\sigma\iota\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon (p. 394.3); Pseudo-
and there are other, similar examples. Close attention must be paid to the evidence in the *testimonia* to evaluate exactly what is Jerome and what is Eusebius; too often Jerome is mistaken for Eusebius.  

7.2. Sources

As far as we can tell, for the period down to 325 (the end of Eusebius’ text) Jerome had four or five major sources. The first was some kind of *Origo gentis Romanae*, though not the existing version since Jerome’s accounts differ substantially from its text, e.g. Jerome’s comments at 66b and the name change at 76b. This could, however, have been just the first part of his second major source, an epitome of Livy, the same one that was used by Eutropius, an epitomator of 369/70, whose work still survives and can be checked with Jerome’s text. His source was not Eutropius himself because Jerome often provides information that Eutropius does not. The third was Suetonius’ *de viris illustribus*, a collection of biographies of famous and not so famous literary Romans in five books: Poets, Orators, Historians, Philosophers, and Grammarians and Rhetoricians. This is the work of ‘Tranquillus’ that he cites in his preface, quoted above. It does not survive, however, apart from the last book and a few other biographies and fragments, and Jerome’s chronicle is really the only record we have of its scope and content. It is as a witness to Suetonius that Jerome’s *Chronicle* is most often cited by classical scholars. The first entry from Suetonius is the birth of Ennius in 240 BC (133a); the last is the *floruit* of Quintilian in AD 88 (190b). The fourth work was a now lost imperial history called the *Kaisergeschichte* (KG). It was used by many other historians in the fourth century and can be partially reconstructed from their accounts. It was an abbreviated series of imperial biographies, starting with Augustus in 31 BC and continuing down to Constantius II, Julian, and the Battle of Strasbourg in 357. It was itself continued down to 366. The first entry from the KG is the Egyptian aftermath of the death of Antony and Cleopatra in 33 BC (162b), the last is Julian’s defeat of the Alamanni at the battle of Strasbourg dated to AD 356 (240b), and the last from the continuation is the defeat of Procopius in 366 (244b). The fifth major source was related to the *Descriptio consulum*, a document better known

Dionysius of Tel-Mahre’s, ‘anno XIX regni Tiberii’ (p. 48), and the other sources cited by Helm in the testimonia, pp. 398-9.


56 The standard account of Jerome’s sources, long since out of date but still cited, is Theodor Mommsen, ‘Über die Quellen der Chronik des Hieronymus’, Gesammelte Schriften 7 (Berlin 1909) 606-32 (originally published in 1850).


58 For this source, see R. Helm, ‘Hieronymus und Eutrop’, *RhM* 76 (1927) 138-70, and 254-306. This source probably also provided the material that is otherwise only paralleled from Cassius Dio (156, 156a, 157b, 157c, 158b, 158c, 158d).

59 On this, see Helm (n. 26).

60 A note on Pliny the Elder, confused by Jerome with Pliny the Younger because of the lack of chronological information in Suetonius, appears later than the *floruit* of Quintilian at 195 (AD 109).

by its unwieldy and inaccurate title of *Consularia Constantinopolitana*. This was a complete consular list from 509 BC to at least AD 378 (the edition of the document that survives today parallels Jerome’s version only to 370 and then continues down to 468) that contained two major blocks of historical notes. The first appears in the last century of the Republic and the second extends from the end of the third century AD to the end of the fourth. In this last section virtually every year has a notice of some historical event or events, usually relating to the emperors, but covering other events as well, often with exact days noted.62 Jerome’s first entry that depends upon the *Descriptio* is the death of Carinus in AD 285 (22565), the last is a famine in Phrygia in 370 (2456m), and the last from the continuation is the Battle of Adrianople in 378 (2496). He probably used it in conjunction with Suetonius for entries on the births and deaths of Cicero, Sallust, and Vergil.

In addition to these major sources Jerome directly called upon certain works relating to third-century Christian leaders, esp. Cyprian, for 212k, 218l, 219a, 219b, 219d, and 220c, and Tertullian’s *Apologia* to replace a similar passage in Eusebius (206c, from ‘Extant...’). He probably had a few other minor sources as well for the period to 325, but the above-mentioned are the most important. He also, of course, included personal knowledge, e.g. 20fc (‘et in fronte...arbitrantur’) and 222c (‘In qua pugna ... descendit’).

After 325, when the *Canones* ran out, Jerome still used the KG and its continuation until 366, and the *Descriptio consulum* and its continuation until 378. Appended to his copy of Eusebius’ *Canones* was a Greek continuation, completed in Antioch in 350, and that provided him with dated information from the refoundation of Drepana as Helenopolis in 327 (231b) to a solar eclipse in 347 (236k).63 This I have called the *Continuatio Antiochiensis*. Jerome had papal and patriarchal lists to continue those of Eusebius (those for Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria to 350 came from the *Cont. Ant.*), much personal information (again seemingly accurate), and what was probably a variety of contemporary anti-Arian ecclesiastical documents, letters, reports, treatises, narrative accounts, and so forth that provided him with ecclesiastical information from the late 330s to c. 370. Most of this religious material appears to be accurate to within a year either way of the correct date, though it is sometimes difficult to say for certain in the instances where Jerome is our only chronological source. He also seems to have had access to some kind of Christian *de viris illustribus* (not his own), that apparently contained undated references to many writers of the time of Constantine. It is unlikely that any of their dates can be accepted in any other than a general way. They are as follows: Lactantius (2306; 317), Nazarius (231f; 324), Arnobius (231g; 327), Iuvenecus (232d; 329), Porphyrius (232c; 329), Pater (233k; 336), ‘Nazarii rhetoris filia’ (i.e. Eunomia) (233l; 336), Tiberianus (233m; 336), and Ablabius (234c; 337). There were probably other minor sources as well.

63 On this see, see the book cited above in n. 39.
7.3. Evaluating Jerome's Additions

Jerome thus had Eusebius' Greek original and four or five other major Latin sources to fill in the gaps left by Eusebius to 325. He calls the final product a 'tumultuarium opus' (2.18), a 'confused' / 'haphazard' / 'make-shift work', and says that he dictated it 'velocissime' to a notarius ('amanuensis' / 'stenographer'; 2.19-20). The 'tumultuarium' comment, though partly a captatio benevolentiae, shows that Jerome himself was in some way aware of the work's shortcomings, but he certainly needed to do more than just sit down with Eusebius' text and a few books and start dictating. The project he had set himself was far too complicated for that.

Before he could reach the dictation stage, he had to complete three major tasks: select and recopy his additions and modifications, establish their chronological position within the context of Eusebius' Olympiads and Years of Abraham, and have the chronological structure of the filae regnorum and accession rubrics translated by his notarius. The latter was particularly important for he could not have dictated the immensely complicated filae regnorum of the first two-thirds of the work.\(^{64}\) The evidence suggests that he could probably only have begun dictating the filae along with the entries at about p. 150 of Helm's edition.

Next he had to have all his additional material worked out and ready to be dictated with the appropriate chronological location noted. As we have seen above, he claims he did this 'curiosissime' and the evidence of the Chronicle bears him out. This material must have already been selected and composed, written on separate sheets of papyrus or wax tablets with numbers keyed to the appropriate spots in the Greek text, ready to be dictated at the appropriate moment. Otherwise he could not have juggled his different sources and kept everything the appropriate length and in the correct year. His chief problem was that the Canones was dated by Years of Abraham and Olympiads, and his Livian epitome and the de uris illustribus were dated by years AUC and/or consul. We know he had a consular list, the Descriptio consulum, but it was corrupt in many places,\(^{65}\) so he must have compared it with a consular list derived from Livy, like the one found in the Chronicle of Cassiodorus (MGH: AA II = Chron. min. 2, pp. 123-35), which he could have correlated with his Livian epitome. His final list appears to have been perfectly accurate since analysis shows that from 453 BC (the decemvirs) his dates are in perfect synchronization with modern chronological reconstruction (i.e. he does not accumulate or lose years as he progresses) and most of his dates are either exactly correct or out by one year (usually late until 106 BC) whether his source used dates AUC or consul. The AUC dates were first added to this consular list, probably starting with the decemvirs in AUC 302 (the only major AUC date that Jerome quotes in the entire Chronicle), an easy year to find in a consular list. From that year onward all consular dates were converted to dates AUC and then to Olympiads for insertion into the

\(^{64}\) On this, see Schoene (n. 1) 76-9, and Mosshammer (n. 1) 68-9, 72-3, and 80.

\(^{65}\) The missing and duplicated consuls are apparent from an examination of the marginal BC and AD dates in the edition of the Descriptio cited in n. 62, above, pp. 215-36. We cannot, of course, know any errors inherent to Jerome's particular copy, only the tradition to which it belonged. Many differences between the existing text and Jerome's can be established by comparing the Descriptio with the text of the Chronicon Paschale (compiled in 630), which used an edition based on the same text as Jerome's. Any common errors must have existed in Jerome's text as well. On this, see pp. 195 and 197 of the edition cited in n. 62.
spatium historicum. Many perceived errors in Jerome’s dates in fact derive from incorrect AUC dates in his Livian epitome, not his own calculation errors, though he commits these as well, especially during the last 75 years of the Republic, often for no clear reason.

Jerome’s consular list with appended AUC dates worked fine for dating material from the Livian epitome and Suetonius, since their data were dated by consuls and years AUC, but once he switched over to the KG (by which I mean the KG and its continuation) he was almost completely without any chronological guidance since this work contained no dates except its starting date, 722 AUC. This point cannot be emphasized too strongly: from the beginning of the reign of Augustus (33 BC) until the usurpation of Procopius (AD 366) Jerome had no way of dating any of his additions from the KG apart from context, either the context of the KG or that of Eusebius’ Canones itself, unless he had a parallel entry in the Descriptio consulum, which dated events by consular years. Consequently from 162 to 244 one cannot accept the chronology of anything that derives solely from the KG, which is everything secular that Jerome adds until 226 (the settlement of the Carpi and Basterni in 295), when he starts using his version of the Descriptio consulum to date his entries. This problem is particularly acute for Jerome’s architectural notices since it has always been assumed that his dates are accurate, except where they are contradicted by other sources. Unfortunately not a single date can be accepted. Jerome simply placed the entries in what were originally empty spaces in Eusebius’ text or where it seemed appropriate. Sometimes, by adding phrases like ‘sub Hadriano’ (200) or ‘Seuero imperante’ (212), he tried to avoid the chronological precision forced upon him by Eusebius’ format.

There were a number of different ways in which Jerome added new entries. First of all, as noted just above, he added them where space already existed in the format of Eusebius’ text. Other short entries he could slip in between Eusebius’ entries or in the blank page-wide spaces that normally existed opposite Olympiad markers, which in Eusebius’ original served to visually demarcate each new Olympiad. Longer entries must originally have been written in a tiny script or shorthand and squeezed into the available space. They would then have been written in the proper size with the proper spacing when the dictated text was recopied for publication. Often, in order to make space for his entries in the correct year, he had the notarius compress or shift Eusebius’ original entries higher or lower as they were dictated, thus disrupting Eusebius’ original chronology.

The chronological accuracy of Jerome’s historical entries is often easier to evaluate than that of his literary entries, simply because there is more evidence against which to evaluate them, including witnesses to his sources. These entries rarely are misdated by more than a

66 For instance, Jerome dates 128, the arrival of legates from Ptolemy, to 293 BC. Eutropius gives a consular date of 273 BC (2.15), which must derive from Livy, and so any historian would condemn Jerome’s dating. But Eutropius gives 461 AUC as the equivalent of the consular date. If we apply Jerome’s standard method of calculation to this AUC date (from Olymp. 6.3), his date of 293 BC turns out to be perfectly ‘correct’, even though it is twenty years from the correct date.

67 For example, L. Richardson, Jr., A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome (Baltimore 1992) 142, 223, 253, 350, 387, 393-4, 394, and 409, accepts Jerome’s dates as the dates of dedication, though not without some serious confusion in places. Note that on these and other pages Richardson’s conversions from years of Abraham to years AD are often incorrect as sometimes are even the figures themselves.
year, two at the most, though some are seriously and inexplicably incorrect. His literary entries, on the other hand, are often the only evidence we possess on the subjects and so his information is all that more precious. But in spite of the opinions of modern critics most of Jerome’s dates for literary figures appear to be correct within a year as well, and the evidence shows that Jerome copied their ages from Suetonius — he did not calculate them himself — so this material should be taken as correct as well. Questions have been raised about many of his dates, but in the case of, for example, Messalla Corvinus, Livy, and Lucilius, these have not found wide acceptance or have been proven incorrect. 68 It can be shown, for instance, that his date for Lucretius is correct (94-51/0 BC) 69 and that his birth dates for Lucilius and Varro are only one year too late (they should be 149-103 and 117-28 BC, respectively). Sallust’s death has been explained above. The placing of Asinius Gallus’ death (AD 33) in AD 14 is explicable (it was obviously not dated by Suetonius), but Jerome was sloppy and forgot to add ‘sub Tiberio’ at the beginning of the entry (171). 70 Where many scholars have assumed Jerome to be incorrect until proven otherwise (see the quotations above), changing his dates on the basis of similar- (and not-so-similar-) appearing consular names and emending his age-figures to suit these modifications, the evidence does not support this approach: in every example where we have Jerome’s source or a witness to it, he is usually accurate to within one year of the correct date, two years at the most. How can it be that Jerome is ‘cursory and careless’ only when we do not know what his source said? What proof is there that Suetonius never made a mistake or was never ambiguous? Suetonius was not all-knowing and sometimes had no more information than we have. For instance, in his Vita Tibulli he says about Tibullus’ death, ‘Obiit adulescens, ut indicat epigramma supra scriptum [i.e. ‘te...mors iuuenem campos misit ad Elysios’]. In this case Jerome felt he could not include Tibullus because of Suetonius’ lack of chronological indicators. In other cases, where Suetonius was incomplete or vague he simply had to do the best he could. Eusebius’ chronological format did not allow for vagueness; entries always appeared next to a specific year, whether they belonged to that year or not. H. J. Rose, discussing the death of Catullus, is alone in drawing the right conclusion regarding Jerome’s data, though as I noted above the problem is one of format not zeal: ‘Common sense suggests that some one, either Suetonius or an authority on whom he drew, had said that Catullus was about thirty when he died, and chronologizing

68 For Messalla, see Roland Jeffreys, ‘The Date of Messalla’s Death’, CQ ns 35 (1985) 140-8. Since Jerome’s date for Messalla’s death is correct, and since his age must be correct, his birth must be placed in 60 BC (Jerome is one year out). I see no serious objection to Messalla’s birth in 60 BC, but if it cannot be accepted then the fault must lie with Suetonius, not Jerome (see below). For Livy, see Ronald Syme, ‘Livy and Augustus’, HCPH 64 (1959) 40-1. Syme is correct about connecting Livy and Messalla’s birth years, but since Messalla’s birth is incorrect by only a year (60 instead of 59 BC) one needs only to anedate Livy’s birth by a year. There is no need to move the date of his death (AD 17). Note also the acute observations of E. Badian, ‘Livy and Augustus’, in W. Scholler (ed.), Livius. Aspekte seines Werkes (Konstanz 1993) 10-11 and 30-1 (Xenia 31). G. Herbert-Brown (‘Jerome’s Dates for Gaius Lucilius, satyrorum scriptor’, CQ 49 (1999) 335-43) defends the dates of Lucilius.

69 Jerome’s chronology and parallels demonstrate that the clauses containing the date of Lucretius’ death in Donatus, VVerg 6 (‘jisdem...decaderet’) are a later interpolation into Suetonius’ text and that the manuscripts’ figure of ‘XVII’ for Vergil’s age is correct.

70 See Helm (n. 26) 77-1.
zeal made the rough estimate into a semblance of an exact one.\(^71\) Indeed, the birth and death of Catullus should not be made the paradigm for Jerome's chronological accuracy: in my opinion it is the most difficult and intractable example in the entire chronicle.\(^72\) Unless there are strong reasons for doing otherwise, one should assume that Jerome's dates are accurate to within a year. If errors and inconsistencies arise (as is the case with Catullus) the blame for the error should not automatically fall on him, as if he were just some Christian half-wit.

8. Conclusion

And so it can be seen that Jerome's *Chronicle* is not so difficult to use or understand as might be expected. It is a complicated document, that is certain. But a familiarity with the most recent edition and an understanding of the structure of the work make it a much less daunting and difficult text to use for both philologists and historians. It can also provide scholars with a more serious and sound basis for understanding, evaluating, and correcting possible error. The interpretation of the material the *Chronicle* contains, however, is most difficult, since we cannot be certain whether Jerome was using absolute or relative dating, or whether his dates are simply the result of error. Nor can we be certain of the accuracy of his sources. Being aware of the way that Jerome compiled the *Chronicle* can help us to understand his evidence and to help us determine whether he is in error or not, but often we just cannot be certain, no matter how well we understand the work and its composition. And admitting to uncertainty is always a better approach than emending a false solution into existence.\(^73\)

---

\(^{71}\) Cit. n. 14, p. 139 n. 60.

\(^{72}\) Though I believe that it can be demonstrated that Jerome's evidence supports a date of 53/2 BC.

\(^{73}\) I should like to thank John Yardley and Geraldine Herbert-Brown for reading and making many helpful comments upon a number of drafts of this paper, and the former especially for suggesting the idea of the paper in the first place.