THE DATE, PURPOSE, AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE ORIGINAL GREEK AND THE LATIN TRANSLATION OF THE SO-CALLED *EXCERPTA LATINA BARBARI*

By R. W. BURGESS

The *Excerpta Latina barbari*, also known as the *Barbarus Scaligeri*, is a peculiar and unfairly neglected text that has been compared to a Russian nested doll.[1] It survives alone in Parisinus latinus 4884 of the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris, a manuscript of sixty-three folios, usually dated to the late seventh or early eighth century. The nature of the text demonstrates that it was translated from a Greek exemplar, usually dated to the second half of the first quarter of the fifth century, which was lavishly illustrated. Although spaces were left for illustrations in the Latin translation, no attempt was ever made to undertake them. Little is generally known about the origins or purpose of this Latin translation or the Greek original, in spite of a magisterial study by Carl Frick in 1892, and recent renewed interest in this text makes it imperative that it be subjected to a careful analysis in the light of modern paleographical research and a better understanding of the sources of its Greek exemplar.[2]

---

[1] Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. 2, *Historical Chronology* (Oxford, 1993), 569.

The following abbreviations will be employed: Frick, *Chron. min.* = Carl Frick, *Chronica minora* 1 (Leipzig, 1892); Mommsen, *Chron. min.* = Theodor Mommsen, MGH AA 9, *Chronica minora* 1 (Berlin, 1892).

AA = Auctores antiquissimi; SRM = Scriptores rerum Merouingicarum; SS = Scriptores; SS rer. Germ. = Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarium; Epp. = Epistulae.

Page and line citations to the Latin text in the form "236.21" are to the edition of Frick, *Chron. min.*, 184–371. Since Mommsen's texts of the first and third sections of this text are much easier to cite than Frick's, I shall use Mommsen's entry numbers for those portions of the text instead of, and in some cases in addition to, Frick's page numbers. The only exception is the material between Mommsen's entries 257 and 258 (234.19–246.6), which Mommsen omitted (as is explained below). Section one: Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, 91–129 = §§1–315, and section three: Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, 274–85, 290–98 = §§11–329.

[2] The major studies of this work are Heinrich Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie* (Leipzig, 1885–98), 2:316–29 (see n. 98 below); Frick, *Chron. min.*, lxxxiii–ccx, ccxxi–ccxxii (still the most important study, which includes a surprisingly useful and insightful back-translation into Greek on facing

First, I must begin with a description of the text itself. It was given its strange names — "The Barbarian's Latin Excerpts" and "Scaliger's Barbarian" — because in the *editio princeps* in J. J. Scaliger's *Thesaurus temporum* of 1606 it was introduced with the heading "Excerpta utilissima ex priore libro chronologico Eusebii, et Africano, et aliis Latine conuersa ab homine barbaro, inepto, Hellenismi et Latinitatis imperitissimo" ("Quite useful excerpts from the first chronological volume of Eusebius, Africanus, and others, translated into Latin by a senseless ignoramus who had no skill at Greek or Latin").[3] But it is not a set of excerpts, as we shall see, and the derogatory *barbarus* is a typical Scaligerian insult, not a proper title. Nor is it a "world chronicle," as Garstad has recently called it. It is a complete text (except for the loss of the ending) and a compilation of the type that has elsewhere been defined as a chronograph, not

---

pages of the edition); Curt Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1895), 180–84; Johann Joseph Hoeveler, "Die Excerpta Latina Barbari," in *Festschrift der dreiundvierzigsten Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner dargeboten von den höheren Lehranstalten Kölns* (Bonn, 1895), 193–214 (= "Die Excerpta" 1); idem, "Die Excerpta Latina Barbari 2: Die Sprache des Barbarus," *Programm des königlichen Kaiser Wilhelm-Gymnasiums zu Köln* 28 (1896): 1–29 (= "Die Excerpta" 2); Felix Jacoby, "Excerpta Barbari," *RE* (1909), 6:1566–76 = Felix Jacoby, *Griechische Historiker* (Stuttgart, 1956), 257–62, and Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 560–69. The most recent analyses are Pier Franco Beatrice, *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia: An Attempt at Reconstruction*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 56 (Leiden, 2001); Benjamin Garstad, "Barbarian Interest in the *Excerpta Latina Barbari*," *Early Medieval Europe* 19 (2011): 3–42; and Benjamin Garstad, *Apocalypse: Pseudo-Methodius; An Alexandrian World Chronicle*, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 14 (Cambridge, MA, 2012), which contains very useful and detailed notes on the text, 321–35 and 347–87, though it appeared too late to be of use for this paper. A new introduction to, edition and translation of, and commentary on the third section of this text (described below) will appear in R. W. Burgess and Michael Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time: The Latin Chronicle Traditions from the First Century BC to the Sixth Century AD*, vol. 2, *The Earliest Chronicles and the Consularia Traditions*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 34 (Turnhout, forthcoming).

[3] Joseph Justus Scaliger, *Thesaurus temporum* (Leiden, 1606), 2nd part, 44–70 and *Thesaurus temporum*, 2nd ed. (Amsterdam, 1658), 2nd part, 58–85. On 250 (= 1658, 411) he says, "In Excerptis Africani, quae barbarolatinus scriptor conuertit, haec diserte exponebantur. Sed idiota ille, quae intelligere desperauit, omisit: quae putauit intelligere, ineptissime reddidit" ("This is eloquently set out in the Excerpts from Africanus, which the writer of crude Latin translated. But that fool left out what he had no hope of understanding and rendered extremely poorly what he thought he did understand"). He also calls him an *idiota* on 269 (= 1658, 430). Elsewhere in the volume (1606, opposite 238, only), he comments on the translator's "et Graeci et Latini sermonis imperitia." Gelzer called him a "stupid Übersetzer" (*Sextus Julius Africanus*, 1:244).

a chronicle,[4] and so I shall refer to it as the *Chronographia Scaligeriana* (*Chron. Scal.*), in honor of Scaliger's role in both publishing the first edition and recognizing its importance.

That this is a translation of a Greek text is made obvious by many factors. First of all, there are the frequent mentions of Alexandria, Alexandrian bishops and *praefecti augustales* (governors of Egypt), and of events and buildings in Alexandria towards the end of the consularia text in section three, as well as the use of Egyptian day and month dates (see p. 15 below) and the Egyptian Diocletianic Era (see n. 24 below), and the constant reference to Alexander the Great as "conditor" (i.e., of Alexandria; 244.16; 268.15, 16, 24; 270.10, 12–13, 15; 276.1; 310.3; 314.28; 316.15, 20; 320.29). Furthermore, the list of Ptolemaic kings in the original source was replaced by a list of kings of Egypt from the second century AD Alexandrian Canon of Claudius Ptolemaeus ("Ptolemy's Canon," 276.4–280.4 passim, 320.7–18). No other independent late Roman or Byzantine text exhibits this list (see n. 22 below). So strong is the Alexandrian character of this work that the first published reference to it, in 1579, calls it a "chronica Alexandrina."[5] Second, almost all the works that its content parallels are Greek, particularly the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων καὶ ἐτῶν ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου ἕως τῆς ἐνεστώσης ἡμέρας ("A Collection of Chronologies from the Creation of the World to the Present Day"), better known through the Latin translations that are collectively called the *Liber generationis*; the *Chronicon Paschale*; the *breviarium* history of Malalas; the *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus; the *Chronographia* of Eusebius of Caesarea; the *Anonymus Matritensis*; and the apocryphal *Proteuangelium Iacobi* (for all of which, see appendix one). Of the only two Latin works that some of its content parallels, one is itself based on Greek sources, the *Breviarium Vindobonense* (on which see n. 111 below). Third, the text cites only Greek, not Latin, authors as sources: Eurip-

[4] For the definitions of chronicle and chronograph, see R. W. Burgess and Michael Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time: The Latin Chronicle Traditions from the First Century BC to the Sixth Century AD*, vol. 1, *A Historical Introduction to the Chronicle Genre from Its Origins to the High Middle Ages*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 33 (Turnhout, 2013), 20–35, 59–61, esp. 29–30, 61. Briefly stated, a chronicle is a work that reports brief, annually organized accounts of historical events in strict chronological order (a definition derived from Assyrian, Babylonian, Hellenistic, and Roman chronicles), while a chronograph is fundamentally a collection of genealogies and regnal lists, usually in the form of a chronological outline of human history, to which or into which can be added any other sorts of texts that relate to chronology, such as lists of important historical events, episcopal lists, calendars, and consular lists, as well as analyses and discussions of that chronology (thus creating what we call an "annotated chronograph," like the works of Julius Africanus and Syncellus).

[5] Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 564 and n. 10.

ides, Apollonius Rhodius, Manetho, Porphyry, Eusebius, Julius Africanus, and Apion (also an Alexandrian; 228.14, 240.1, 234.11, 280.14 note, 284.27, 288.5, 290.21, 338.12, 264.16, 266.13, 292.10, 286.13) and the text names only Greek, not Latin, philosophers, poets, intellectuals, artists, and leaders (262.9–10, 264.27–28, 266.4–13, 268.4–7, 270.6–8, 276.9, 278.28–29). Fourth, many originally Greek words have been left in Greek and some originally Greek words and even names have rather bizarrely been broken down into their constituent parts and then translated into Latin. Fifth, there are some strange errors, such as calling Aristophanes an architect and confusing Troy with the sun, that can only be explained as errors in a Greek text or as errors in reading a Greek text.[6] Finally, a detailed analysis of the grammar and spelling, which reveals such things as the retention of Greek cases and noun endings, and vowel changes particular to Greek such as itacism, provides conclusive evidence that this is a direct translation of a Greek work.[7]

This original Greek chronographic text was illustrated. This was obvious even before the actual fragments of other illustrated Greek and Latin chronographs and consularia were discovered in the twentieth century — the *Chronographia Golenischevensis* (*Chron. Gol.*), the "original" Alexandrian world chronicle; the *Consularia Berolinensia* (*Cons. Ber.*); and the

[6] For example, the original ὀρτυγομῆτραι, πρωτοπάτωρ, πολυόλβιος, ἀρχιστρατηγός, ποδαλγικός, and πτολίαρχος have been left as *ortygomitrae*, *protopator*, *polyolbus*, *archistratigus*, *podalgiuus*, and *ptoliarchus* (224 n. 6, 234.25 + 280.20, 238.15, 248.9 + 272.16–17 + 324.8, 250.9, and 286.7); ἄρχοντες οἱ διὰ βίου ("archons for life") has been translated as *principes diabii* as if *diabii* were a name or rank (298.8–10); the words χρονογραφία, τραγῳδοποιός, ἀγαλματοποιός, and ὑπομνηματογραφός have been translated as *textus chronicae* (cf. *chronografus* for χρονογράφος, 246.1), *cantoconpositor*, *statuasconpositor*, and *scribamemoratus* (220.2, 266.7, 8, 268.4–5, and 270.27–28); and Ἰχθυοφάγοι, Ἀστυπάλαια, Γυμνοσοφισταί, and Ἀναξαγόρας have been translated as *Piscescomeduli*, *Astauetera*, *Nudisapientes*, and *Princeps Agoras* (200.26 + 212.15, 204.3, 206.7, and 262.9–10). However, ὀρτυγομῆτραι and πολυόλβιος were also translated into Latin, the first as *coturnices*, the second as *multoditatus* (I think the latter was a later replacement for the transliteration *polyolbus*, which was mistakenly kept). Twice ἀλλόφυλοι is translated as *alienigeni* (*sic*; 232.23 [§251, dat.]; 246.11 [§261, gen.]), but twice as *allofyli* (230.13 [§240, gen.]; 234.5 [§253, acc.]), which is a perfectly legitimate form in later Latin, but the variation is interesting. The rather more bizarre errors involving the Argonauts, Troy, and Aristophanes are described below (pp. 26–27 and appendix two). Other such errors include ὃς οὐχ translated as *Osuch* and Ὄθων (Otho) translated as *Stultus* (= Νωθής) (294.27, and 326.5). See also Hoeveler, "Die Excerpta" 1, 201 and Hoeveler, "Die Excerpta" 2, 16.

[7] For this, see particularly Frick, *Chron. min.*, lxxxiii, lxxxv–lxxxvii; Hoeveler, "Die Excerpta" 2, 5–6; and Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 565–69. This fact was recognized immediately by all the early humanists who saw the manuscript.

Consularia Marsiburgensia (*Cons. Mars.*)[8] — because the Latin text was copied out in such a way as to leave both wide margins of varying width and length as well as large interlinear blank spaces, usually between eight and fourteen — though in one case twenty-six — lines high on pages of thirty or thirty-one lines. These were originally intended for marginal and interlinear illustrations that were, as noted above, never added. In addition, on folios 6r, 6v, 8r, 10r, 12r, 12v, 13r, 14r, 14v, 15v, 16r, 16v, and 17r even the captions for these illustrations were copied out, though they now just float on empty parchment.[9] This formatting and these captions can be seen — regularized somewhat by contemporary printing requirements — only in Alfred Schoene's edition of 1875, the true *editio princeps* of the entire text and the source of all later editions.[10] The illus-

[8] *Chron. Gol.*: Adolf Bauer and Josef Strzygowski, *Eine alexandrinische Weltchronik*, Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 51 (Vienna, 1905), 1–204, and R. W. Burgess and Jitse H. F. Dijkstra, "The 'Alexandrian World Chronicle,' Its *Consularia* and the Date of the Destruction of the Serapeum (with an Appendix on the List of *Praefecti Augustales*)," *Millennium* 10 (2013), in press; *Cons. Ber.*: originally published in Hans Lietzmann, "Ein Blatt aus einer antiken Weltchronik," *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends*, ed. Robert P. Casey, Silva Lake, and Agnes K. Lake (London, 1937), 339–48 and reprinted in his *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1958), 1:420–29, but now superseded by R. W. Burgess and Jitse H. F. Dijkstra, "The Berlin 'Chronicle' (P. Berol. inv. 13296): A New Edition of the Earliest Extant Late Antique Consularia," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 58 (2012): 273–301 + Plate XIII; and *Cons. Mars.*: Bernhard Bischoff and Wilhelm Koehler, "Eine illustrierte Ausgabe der spätantiken ravennater Annalen," in *Medieval Studies in Memory of A. Kingsley Porter*, ed. Wilhelm R. W. Koehler (Cambridge, MA, 1939), 1:125–38. New introductions to, editions and translations of, and commentaries on all these texts will appear in Burgess and Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time* 2. There is also the illustrated manuscript of the Chronograph of 354, which is in some ways similar to the eastern chronographs, on which see Michele Renee Salzman, *On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1990), and R. W. Burgess, "The Chronograph of 354: Its Manuscripts, Contents, and History," *Journal of Late Antiquity* 5 (2012): 345–96.

[9] For a detailed list, see n. 76 below. See Frick, *Chron. min.*, lxxxiii–lxxxiv and the *Bulletin de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France* (1904): 152–54 for a notice of a paper presented to the Société nationale by H. Omont concerning these captions, with a photograph of fol. 15v.

[10] Alfred Schoene, *Eusebi Chronicorum libri duo*, vol. 1, *Eusebi Chronicorum liber prior* (Berlin, 1875), Appendices, 177–239. The editions of Frick (*Chron. min.*), Beatrice (*Theosophia*, 75–134), and Garstad (*Alexandrian World Chronicle*, 142–308) are merely transcriptions of Schoene's edition (either directly or via Frick), as can be demonstrated by their repetition of Schoene's errors, though only Frick admits it (*Chron. min.*, ccxxi). In his preface to the *Liber generationis* Mommsen says he saw and collated the manuscript (*Chron. min.*, 84), but his edition of the third, consularia section of the text printed later in the same volume (I have not collated his text

trations and even the use of captions are paralleled in the *Chron. Gol.*, which is not surprising, as we shall see, and this conclusively proves the seventeenth-century hypothesis.

The nature of the extant Latin text suggests that Paris. lat. 4884 is in fact the good copy that was done up from the original rough translation, not a later copy of an earlier manuscript. The translator has always been assumed to be writing in Merovingian Gaul because of the appearance of an otherwise unknown "Francus Silvius" in two lists of Alban kings (242.3 and 302.7). This will be discussed below. Frick was able to add a few Gallic characteristics of the language in support of the translation's Merovingian origin (*Chron. min.*, lxxxiii).

But the question has always been, Who could have been the translator? Scaliger's assault on the author's general lack of intelligence and knowledge of both Latin and Greek arises from the fact that the translation appears to be so shockingly poor and often so bizarre in many places that it has been extremely difficult to work out whether the translator's first language was Latin or Greek, since he seems to have had no facility with either. Mommsen argued that he was Greek, because in one instance he mistakenly wrote "Zaxarias" instead of "Zacharias," substituting a chi for "ch" (340.8 = §86). But the error was made by Schoene, not the translator, and so does not appear in the manuscript.[11]

Three simple examples from the consularia portion will demonstrate the language problems of this text:

> Crispo et Constantio nobilissimos caesares filios augusti secundo (358.6–7 = §220)
> Constantino augusto quinto et Constante secundo inuictissimorum augustorum (358.18–19 = §226)
> Licinio et Crispino nouorum caesarum (358.20 = §227)

---

of the *Lib. gen.*) is so riddled with errors (on top of Schoene's errors) that one can only assume that he had a student transcribe Schoene's text and add the entry numbers (for even they suffer from corruptions). His edition of the consularia should therefore be avoided for the details of the text, even though it is still useful to cite its entry numbers (as it is for his edition of the *Lib. gen.*). Scaliger's edition is the most corrupt of all: in the consularia section of the text alone it suffers from over 150 simple and major errors and deliberate changes to the manuscript text, including missing entries and names. Part of this arises from the fact that it was edited from a transcription of the manuscript made for him in 1602 (Carl Frick, "Joseph Justus Scaliger und die Excerpta Latina Barbari," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 43 [1888]: 123–27; Hoeveler, "Die Excerpta" 1, 204–13; and Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 564–65). A detailed analysis of the consularia section of this manuscript will appear in Burgess and Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time* 2. Frick's edition nevertheless remains the standard edition of the work for citation and I shall continue that tradition.

[11] See also Frick, *Chron. min.*, lxxxvi n. 2 and Hoeveler, "Die Excerpta" 1, 202 n. 6 (continued from 201), who were not aware of this fact.

Since these are consular dates, everything should be in the ablative case, yet here we have ablatives, accusatives, and genitives. The *secundo* and *quinto*, "second" and "fifth," are mistranslations of consular iterations, originally β′ and ε′ in the Greek, and should actually be II and V in Latin, *bis* and *quinquies*, "for a second time" and "for a fifth time." The "nouorum caesarum" should be "nobilissimo caesare," though it would seem that the original Greek was at fault here, mistaking *nob.* (*nobilissimo*) for *nou.* (*nouo*), which was then translated as νέου. At some point, probably in the copying of a Greek manuscript earlier in the tradition, the title that applied only to Crispus and not Licinius was turned into a plural and was thus made to apply to both of them, though this error could be the Latin translator's. As can be seen from §220, the original Greek translator did on occasion understand the use of *nob.* in these titles in his Latin text. The accusative in §220 has no place in a consular date, and the genitive, which appears in the majority of these consular dates, reflects the original's genitive absolute, which is used for such dates in Greek.[12] Although the Latin is poor, much of the confused content of the *Chron. Scal.*, such as the corrupt regnal lists or the fact that Mary is pregnant with Jesus for sixteen years, can be traced back to the original Greek exemplar, as we shall see in the analyses below. But the question of the identity of the translator cannot be pursued in a vacuum and so we must first examine the content of the text and the nature and date of the Greek original. These will clarify much that is opaque about this text and help us to arrive at a better understanding of the circumstances of its translation.

The Content

The Greek original of the *Chron. Scal.* was a compilation, as all such chronographs were by nature, containing little if any original material apart from its chronological calculations (*supputationes*) and some links and transitions, and was made up of three sections: 1) an interpolated and truncated version of the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων/*Liber generationis*, noted above (184.1–258.14), to which has been added a lengthy conclusion that concerns "Chaldaean" and Persian kings, Alexander (in particular), Ptolemaic kings (down to the death of Cleopatra), and Jewish high priests

[12] The translator has problems in general with ablatives absolute, usually preferring the nominative (which is normal: see C. H. Grandgent, *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin* [Boston, 1907], 47 §97 and Albert Blaise, *Manuel du latin chrétien* [Turnhout, 1955], 75 §67). See also Frick, *Chron. min.*, 599 and Hoeveler, "Die Excerpta" 2, 26–27, 29.

(258.14–280.13); 2) a collection of regnal lists compiled chiefly from the *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus (280.14–330.17); and 3) consularia (i.e., a chronicle that has been created from a consular list), derived from an interpolated Alexandrian translation of an originally Latin text closely related to the surviving *Consularia Vindobonensia posteriora* (330.18–370.11; see n. 120 below). This last section is, therefore, a Latin translation of a Greek translation of a Latin original. When treated separately from the *Chron. Scal.* as a whole, I shall refer to section three as the *Consularia Scaligeriana* (*Cons. Scal.*). A detailed listing of sources and parallels, along with descriptions of these texts and their editions, can be found in appendix one below. The description that follows immediately below may seem overly detailed, but there is no equivalent analysis or discussion of the content in the extant literature and it is not an easy text to come to grips with quickly on one's own.

The Συναγωγὴ χρόνων/*Liber generationis* no doubt originated as a quick guide to the genealogies and chronology of the Old Testament (see below).[13] It lists in a straightforward fashion the names of each generation of patriarchs, judges, and kings from the Old Testament (and a few necessary names from other sources that are not found in the Old Testament to maintain the continuous chronology), along with the names of

[13] This work is usually said to be the chronicle of Hippolytus, but in spite of the many convoluted arguments that have been attempted over the years, there is absolutely no connection between any chronicle that Hippolytus (whether one author or two) may have written — and there is little evidence that he did — and this work, apart from the date of 235, which is right at the very end of Hippolytus's reconstructed life. For this, see Burgess and Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time* 1:366–71. The first half of a recension of the original Greek still survives in Matritensis 4701, a tenth- or eleventh-century manuscript of the Biblioteca nacional in Madrid. It cannot be emphasized too strongly, however, that this is not *the* Greek text of this work but a later recension of it, like the extant Latin translations, which are much earlier texts and from earlier manuscripts. The Συναγωγή was first published with the Latin parallels by Adolf Bauer ("Die Chronik des Hippolytos im Matritensis graecus 121," TU NF 14 [1905]: 1–287) and then later republished by Rudolf Helm (*Die Chronik*, Hippolytus Werke 4, GCS 46, ed. Adolf Bauer and Rudolf Helm [Berlin, 1955]). It contains the first part of the work to the end of the *Diamerismos* (on which see below) — that is, to the end of Mommsen's entries *Lib. gen. I* 229 and *Chr. Alex.* 201 (*Chron. min.*, 112) = 218.22 — which is then followed by a recension of a completely unrelated work, found in no other witness to the Συναγωγή/*Lib. gen.*, called the Σταδιασμὸς τῆς θαλάσσης ("The Measurement of the [Mediterranean] Sea"), which makes up the bulk of the text even though it breaks off long before its completion (Bauer-Helm, 43–69 [see Bauer, 243–76, by Otto Cuntz]). The Latin texts of the *Lib. gen.* can be found in Mommsen (*Chron. min.*, 89–140) as well as Bauer (that which parallels the Greek text only) and Bauer-Helm (only after the *Stadiasmos*), both of the latter with a numbering system different from Mommsen's. Along with the Latin text Bauer-Helm also includes a German translation of a partial Armenian witness.

any contemporary prophets. Where possible, the length of each generation or reign is noted, and there are in various places *supputationes* or chronological calculations that keep track of the passing centuries and millennia. There is some narrative in places, especially towards the end, but for the most part it is really just a collection of names and chronologies. This collection continues down to the reign of Cyrus, the return from the Babylonian captivity, and the rebuilding of the Temple, where a collection of *supputationes*, including one based on the celebration of Passover/Easter (*pascha*), completes the biblical account. There then follows, as an appendix, a continuation of the list of Persian kings down to their conquest by Alexander, a short *supputatio* to AD 235 based on Olympiads, Christ's genealogy from Adam to Joseph, and lists of prophets and prophetesses (one tradition of this text includes an interpolated list of the apostles here), early kings of Israel, kings of Samaria, Jewish priests, Alexander and the Ptolemies, and Roman emperors down to the end of the reign of Severus Alexander (March 235).[14] The regnal lists of Persians, Ptolemies, and Romans provide a single continuous chronological thread that serves to connect the biblical account to the original author's own time, while the other lists serve as consolidated summaries of some of what has been presented earlier in the text.

Into this text has been inserted a preexisting work usually referred to as the *Diamerismos* (Διαμερισμὸς τῆς γῆς), the "Division of the World," a description of the world divided according to the three sons of Noah — Shem, Ham, and Japheth — which is an updating and expansion of Genesis 10 (§§24–205 = 192.16–220.11).[15] After describing the portions of the world each son settled (by geography and rivers), it lists in reverse

[14] The tradition that Mommsen labeled *Lib. gen. I* also contains a short series of interpolations, drawn chiefly from Ps.-Josephus and the Pentateuch (§§356–61, *Chron. min.*, 135–37), which Bauer-Helm omits (135–36). Manuscripts B and F note a list of bishops as the last item in the table of contents (*Lib. gen. I* 20), but B breaks off at §331, before that part of the text, and although F does contain such a list, it is not original, being part of a long continuation added to the end of the *Lib. gen.* (see MGH SRM, 34–36; the text of the *Lib. gen.* ends at 33). Mommsen prints "Episcopi Romani" at the end of the emperor list (which survives only in F), but it has no manuscript authority (*Chron. min.*, 138). If such a list of bishops ever appeared in a manuscript of the *Lib. gen.*, it was clearly not original and is quite foreign to the original intent of the work.

[15] For the many traditions of this work, see Alfred von Gutschmid, "Zur Kritik des Διαμερισμὸς τῆς γῆς," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 13 (1858): 377–408, and idem, "Untersuchungen über den Διαμερισμὸς τῆς γῆς und andere Bearbeitungen der Mosaischen Vökertafel," in *Kleine Schriften des Alfred von Gutschmid,* ed. Franz Rühl (Leipzig, 1894), 5:585–717; and Bauer and Strzygowski, *Weltchronik*, 92–105, though they are quite outdated with respect to the relationships among the various witnesses. James M. Scott (*Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book*

order (Japheth, Ham, and Shem) each son's descendants, the people who inhabit his territory (with a separate list of those who could read and write), along with the names of its Roman provinces and islands. Shem's section covers the West and is much more detailed than the other two. This tripartite account ends with a list of the "unknown" peoples beyond the eastern borders, mountains, and rivers of the world.[16]

The text of the Συναγωγή/*Lib. gen.* contained in the *Chron. Scal.*, however, is quite different from the basic text that we know of from the other Latin, Greek, and Armenian traditions. First of all, the table of contents and the preface (§§1–26/1–25 of the two Latin traditions labeled *Lib. gen. I* and *Lib. gen. II* by Mommsen and 1–21 of the Greek recension), as well as the conclusion of the historical account (= *Lib. gen. I* 296–300) and the following rather eclectic collection of lists and various *supputationes* noted above (*Chron. min.*, 128–40), were removed, and some other individual entries were omitted (or had already been lost from the tradition).[17] Second, every entry that mentions an extent of time, such as an age or regnal length, had a running chronological tally from the creation of the world (thus an *annus mundi*) added at the end. The only entries unaffected are those of the *Diamerismos* (§§24–202).[18] Third, along with these running chronological notes, a large number of independent *supputationes* were added throughout the text.[19] Fourth, information from the Old Testament — or, more likely, from a preexisting compilation based upon it — was added throughout the text, in some cases providing details supplemental to what appears in the original Συναγωγή, in other cases providing completely new information.[20] Included among these additions are two long quotations from Genesis. And fifth, start-

---

of Jubilees, Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series 113 [Cambridge, 2002], 135–58) convincingly argues for a Jewish source for the *Diamerismos*.

[16] Introduction: §§24–34, Japheth: 35–67, Ham: 68–127, Shem: 128–89, conclusion: 190–205.

[17] *Lib. gen. I* §§81, 115–16, 152, 156, 162, 182, 186, 216, 230, 238, 248, 269 (partial), and 289. Most of these omissions appear to be accidental (esp. those between 81 and 230 inclusive, from the *Diamerismos*), but others are more likely to be deliberate (e.g., 238, 248, 269) and in at least one case (216) the entry is a unique Spanish addition to part of the *Lib. gen. I* tradition (witnessed only by manuscripts BFO) and so never appeared in any other tradition. Likewise, the *Chron. Scal.* contains entries that appear to have fallen out of the traditions of *Lib. gen. I*: 133 (?), 187–89, 193.

[18] The very end of the *Diamerismos* has been reworked (§§186–201), though, as has the conclusion (§§202–6).

[19] §§2, 15, 203–6 (203 = 2 = *Lib. gen. I* 39; 204 = 15), 213, 215–16, 223, 225, 227–29, 265, and 264.16–18, 274.27–276.3, 280.5–10.

[20] Among the larger additions are §§9, 13, 22, 166, 222–23, 226, 234, 239–40, 255–59, 261, 263–65, 267, 272, 277, 281, 284, 286, 289–91, and 295–315, the latter of

ing in §214 = 222.4–6, entries providing information from non-Old Testament, mostly Greek, history, particularly intellectual history, were added as contemporary parallels to the biblical narrative. In order to extend and fill out the completion of the text, long quotations from Ps.-Callisthenes on Alexander the Great and his will were also added.[21]

The largest interpolation, which I call the "Italian digression" (234.22–246.6), is a compilation drawn from an unknown source or sources that is paralleled by the *Breviarium Vindobonense*, Eusebius's *Chronographia*, and in particular the *breviarium* history of Malalas (see appendix one). It concerns the rulers of Italy, Alba Longa, and Rome from Cronus to Tarquinius Superbus and includes regnal lists of Alban and Roman kings that were also copied into section two. This interpolation and the extended conclusion of section one noted above were not published by Mommsen in his *Chronica minora* edition.

The division between the Συναγωγή/*Lib. gen.* material and the new conclusion is difficult to pinpoint exactly because the rewriting becomes so heavy at the transition. Mommsen continues his edition down to §315 but there really is almost nothing of the original Συναγωγή/*Lib. gen.* to be found after the heavily reworked and augmented quotations of §§294–95 of *Lib. gen. I* in §§293–94 (258.11–21) as the compiler transitions from the Συναγωγή to other sources.

The extension of the Συναγωγή/*Lib. gen.* that brings section one to its conclusion (258.22–280.13) begins with Persian history, for which the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius the Mede act as a sort of preface and link back to the Old Testament narrative. Persian history extends from 260.16 (= §299) to 268.15. At 264.14–15 (= §315) a list of Jewish high priests begins, and they are noted alongside each of the kings of the Persians and Ptolemies.[22] Next follows an expanded account

---

which is mostly Persian history, and the first part of the new conclusion (258.22–280.13).

[21] §§214, 224, 235, 238, 241, 244, 252, 254, 256, 262, 280, 283, 302, and 304, and 264.27–28, 266.4–14, 268.4–7, 16–27, 270.6–9, 10–19, 276.9, 278.28–29, 280.6–7. For these additions, see appendix one.

[22] For the Persian and Ptolemaic lists, see Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus* (n. 2 above), 1:274 n. 2 and 2:154, 322, and 326; Frick, *Chron. min.*, clxiv, cxcv–cxcix; and especially Bauer-Helm, *Die Chronik*, 178–87, which includes a chart ("Tabelle X") comparing extant Ptolemaic lists, including Ptolemy's *Canon*, which correctly lists the Macedonian successors of Alexander as the first two kings of Egypt after Alexander's death, since Ptolemy, son of Lagus, was officially only a satrap of the Macedonian kings until he proclaimed himself king in 305. All later lists retroactively treat him as king from the death of Alexander. For convenience, however, I shall still refer to this as a list of Ptolemaic kings/Ptolemies, even though it begins with Macedonian kings. Only the *Chron. Scal.* and Eutychius (on whom see n. 101 below)

of Alexander, from 268.16 to 276.3, which is followed by the Ptolemaic kings mentioned above, from 276.4 to 280.13. The running total of *anni mundi* (years from Creation) that was established at the beginning of section one is maintained throughout this extension, and the historical interpolations from Greek history that first appeared earlier in section one continue.[23]

The second section (280.14–330.19), which has a title ("Singillatim <nomina> antiquorum regum qui regnauerunt <et> eorundem tempora") and its own introduction of sorts (280.14–24), is a compilation of king lists, mostly, but not entirely, originating in the *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus: the Assyrians, Egyptians, Argives, Sicyonians, Athenians, Latins, Romans, Lacedaemonians, Corinthians, Macedonians, Lydians, Medes, Persians, Seleucids, Egyptians (i.e., Ptolemies), Jewish high priests, and Roman emperors. Each has a short introduction (except the high priests) and a chronological conclusion (except the emperors), which concludes with Anastasius (†518). The lists that derive from Julius Africanus are noted in appendix one.

The third and final section (330.20–370.11) is consularia, closely related to the surviving *Cons. Vind. posteriora*, as noted above. It will be discussed in more detail below, but is a list of Roman consuls from the "accession" of Julius Caesar (i.e., his defeat of Pompey in 46 BC) — though the consuls at the beginning are very confused and corrupted — to 387, at which point it breaks off. Into this list have been inserted a variety of short notices of historical events, chiefly around the time of Christ and from the early fourth century.

This final section is defective both in the middle and at the end. The text begins with Julius Caesar and then breaks off with the consuls of the late 90s (100?) at the bottom of fol. 56v (§189 = 354.1). At the top of the next folio the consular list has jumped to the year 296, and the numbering of the consular years from the accession of Augustus (as far as 129 at the end of the first part) has been converted into years of the Diocletianic era (years twelve and thirteen, counted from Diocletian's accession

---

reflect Ptolemy's *Canon*, and both derive from the same common source as the *Chron. Scal.*, as we shall see. For the lists of high priests and Ptolemaic kings, see R. W. Burgess, "Another Look at Sosates, the 'Jewish Homer,'" *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 44 (2013): 195–217, at 200–208, 213–14.

[23] See n. 21 above. The interpolations on 262.9–10, 266.4–14, 268.4–7, 270.6–9, 276.9, and 278.28–29 relate to Greek philosophy, literature, and intellectual achievement. The latter two, Menander and Sosates, appear because of their appeal to Alexandrian audiences. The information in 276.15–16, 20–22, and 278.13–14 relates to Jewish literature and history, and derives from the list of Jewish high priests (see Burgess, "Sosates"). The last is a note that Cleopatra built the Pharos in Alexandria (280.6–7).

in 284), which were not copied beyond the first two figures (§§190–91 = 354.3, 5).[24] This concluding fragment ends six and a half folios later on fol. 63r with the consuls of 387 (§329 = 370.11) and the verso is blank. There can be no doubt that the Greek original continued into the early sixth century, but just how far is impossible to know since we do not know the exact date of its last full recension.[25]

Like the Συναγωγή/*Lib. gen.*, this section has been heavily interpolated from other sources, but because a witness to the original Latin text survives we can determine very precisely what these interpolations were. They can be divided thematically. The first group of additions recounts the events involving the early foundation of Christianity, from the annunciations of the births of John the Baptist and Jesus to the deaths of Peter and Paul in Rome, some of which were excerpted from the well-known apocryphal work the *Proteuangelium Iacobi,* and some of which also reflect a good knowledge of the Latin text of the New Testament.[26] A large proportion of these notices could not possibly be dated by any usual means, since there are no dates in the New Testament, and the consular dates in *Cons. Scal.* are a complete mess. But even logic is thrown out the window as a chronological tool: for instance, the occasion of the *Magnificat* is said to have taken place six months after the Annunciation, but there are four years in between; Zachariah is told about John's birth six years before Elizabeth is informed; Elizabeth conceives ten years before Mary, her pregnancy lasts twenty years, and John is born six years before Jesus; Mary's pregnancy lasts sixteen years; the wise men arrive when Jesus would have been five; Joseph flees into Egypt when he would have been twenty-one; and the transfiguration, Jesus's arrest, the crucifixion, the martyrdom of Stephen, and Paul's "ordination" are all dated internally "sub consolato Rubellionis" — this date appears six times — yet the last event is dated three years

[24] The Diocletianic Era (later called the "Era of the Martyrs") was a chronological system used only in Egypt that counted years from the accession of Diocletian on 20 November 284. See Roger S. Bagnall and Klaas A. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, 2nd ed. (Leiden, 2004), 63–87.

[25] That both the *Cons. Vind. post.* and the *Chron. Scal.* end in 387 is nothing but a coincidence, since the former picks up again in 438 and eventually continues down to 539. The consularia of the closely related *Chronographia Golenischevensis* (on which see below) continue to 392.

[26] * = *Proteuangelium*; † = New Testament: §§45, 52, 63†, 68*†, 75, 80* (based on an existing entry), 86*†, 91*, 100*†, 106†, 110†, 112, 114†, 117† (based on an existing entry), 118†, 120† (partially based on existing entry), 121, and 149 (based on an existing entry).

after the first.[27] It is the appearance of different consular dates, used internally to date these excerpts, that proves that they must have been copied from an intermediate source that derived from the *Proteuangelium*, because they do not appear in the *Proteuangelium* itself and cannot have been added to the *Chron. Scal.* by the compiler since they did not appear in the *fasti* of his consularia source. As we have seen above, he paid absolutely no attention to the consuls whatsoever, perhaps not even understanding what they were.[28] There are only two further "general" Christian additions in the consularia, entries 219 (Helena's finding of the True Cross) and 224 (the Council of Nicaea), not counting the Alexandrian entries noted below.

The second category of additions is a group of entries relating the deaths and accessions of the emperors.[29] These entries usually include the length of the reign and many, particularly the earlier examples, add the number of times the emperor was consul. These early entries (to §174) derive entirely from the emperor list at the end of the second section. This proves that these entries were added after sections two and three were joined together. The later notices derive from a different source (or sources), and the consulates of Valentinian I, Valens, and Theodosius I are accurately noted (§§273, 316).

Next there is a group of distinctively Alexandrian entries, some with Egyptian dates, including episcopal deaths and accessions from Peter in 302.[30] Two of these entries mention the same types of building projects

---

[27] §§45, 52, 63, 75, 80, 86, 106, 114, 118, 120, 121. Note that Mommsen's edition is missing two pairs of consuls between §§78 and 79 (= 338.7–8). "Rubellio" was one of the consuls of 29, the traditional Western date of the crucifixion, and although these consuls no longer appear, they probably did originally since the *Cons. Vind. post.* (see n. 120) has "Ruffio Gemino et Rubellio Gemino" as consuls at this point (§113, which is between 117 and 118 of the *Chron. Scal.*).

[28] Like *Rubellio* the single consuls *Augusto tertio decimo* (§63 = 6 BC, but *Augusto XIII* = 2 BC) and *Meura* (112 = AD 27 but *[Sillano et] Nerva* = AD 28) appear within entries yet have no parallel in the extant consular list (though they do appear in the *Cons. Vind. post.*). The entry dated internally to *consolato Asiatici et Siluani* (110), the consuls of AD 46 (see §133), appears under *Getulo et Barro*, a combination of the consuls of AD 26 and 24. *Lentulo et Siluano* appears twice, six years apart, in §§45 and 52 (= 24/23 BC and 18 BC), and also appears in the consular list (§51). It is a mistaken combination of the consuls of 18 and 17 BC and was probably copied in the place of *Lentulo et Cornifilo* (*Cons. Vind. post.* 53).

[29] §§331 n. 26 (not in Mommsen), 30, 96, 125, 130 (= Frick, *Chron. min.*, clxiii. no. 164), 145, 160 (based on an existing entry and includes Vespasian, who is missing from the list on 326, though Titus has his consulates), 171, 174, 206, 209, 216, 251, 268, 273, 292, 305, and 316 (based on an existing entry).

[30] * = bishops of Alexandria: §§197*, 198–99, 228*, 258*, 279, 286, 297, 300*, 313*, 325*.

that one notices in Constantinopolitan consularia: the construction of baths (199), and a canal and city gates (297). A similar note is found at the end of section one concerning the construction of the Pharos (280.6–7).

The next category of additions provides a year-by-year listing of the *praefecti augustales* (the new name for the governor of Egypt) from what the original compiler believed was the inception of the office in 367. These have suffered corruptions and confusions over the years as we can tell from independent sources for the *augustales* and were clearly added to the consularia from an independent list.[31]

At entry 40 there appears for the first time an Egyptian equivalent of a Roman date, 18 Epeiph for 15 July, which is incorrect (15 July is 21 Epeiph). We know from the *Cons. Vind.* that 15 July is correct, so either the conversion was done incorrectly or one of the numbers has been corrupted at some point. Other dates appear in §§117 (27 May = 2 Pauni), 120a (25 March = 29 Phamenoth), 149 (29 June = 5 Epeiph), and 286 (9 October = 12 Phaophi), which are correct, and 219 (24 November = 17 Thoth[32]) and 271 (23 July = 27 Epeiph[33]), which are not. There seems to be no rhyme or reason as to why some Roman dates are converted and others not. There are unconverted Egyptian dates in §§228 (22 Pharmouthi), 300 (7 Pachon), 313 (20 Mecheir), and 325 (26 Epeiph), all ordination dates for Alexandrian bishops, which indicates a local Alexandrian source for this material, as one would expect.

Finally, there are three *supputationes* that count up the elapsed number of years from Creation to the location of the *supputatio* (§§30, 80, 269), which are a part of the same system of *anni mundi* we find throughout section one.

The Origin, Date, and Purpose of the Greek Text

As noted above, the *Chron. Scal.* is based upon three quite distinct texts, the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων/*Liber generationis*, a compilation of regnal lists derived chiefly from the *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus, and a

[31] §§279, 281, 283, 285–86, 288, 290, 294, 296, 299, 302, 304, 307, 308, 312, 315, 318, 320, 324, and 327. See now Burgess and Dijkstra, "The 'Alexandrian World Chronicle'" (n. 8 above) for the list of the *augustales*.

[32] The Egyptian date is the correct date for the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 Sept.), which correctly relates to this entry on Helena's discovery of the True Cross. The Latin date should read *XVIII kal. Oct.*, not *VIII kal. Dec.*, a perplexing difference.

[33] Both the *Consularia Vindobonensia priora* (*Cons. Vind. pr.*) and *Cons. Vind. post.* (§278), witnesses to the original Latin text, give the date as *XII kal. Aug.* (21 July), which is correct, not *X kal. Aug.* (23 July), as here. 27 Epeiph is 21 July.

Greek translation of a recension of the *Consularia Vindobonensia posteriora*. The first and last of these texts were subjected to many changes, and for the former it can be proved that these changes had been made before the compiler obtained his copy of the text, since three other surviving chronographic texts used the same interpolated source: the *Chronicon Paschale* of *ca.* 630, the *Anonymus Matritensis* of ca. 886, and the *Annales* of Eutychius of ca. 935 (for which, see nn. 101–2 below). All three of these works contain extensive traces of section one very much as it appears in the *Chron. Scal.* but nothing of sections two or three, which must therefore be independent additions.[34] The parallels in the *Chron. Pasch.* and Eutychius are the most extensive and, combined, cover almost the entire content of section one, while those in the *Anon. Matr.* tend to mirror only the non-Old Testament entries.[35] Their evidence indicates that this independent text was very close to what we find in the *Chron. Scal.*, with the exception of the *anni mundi* and the Italian digression, which must therefore have been added to the text by the compiler of the *Chron. Scal.* or another compiler before him. Frick called this common source the "Chronicon mundi Alexandrinum," but it was a chronograph, not a chronicle, and so we can call it the *Chronographia Alexandrina*.[36]

The *Chronographia Golenischevensis* is another chronographic text that reveals many important parallels with the *Chron. Scal.* It survives only as a small collection of papyrus fragments but was obviously compiled from the same basic text as the *Chron. Scal.* Like the original *Chron. Scal.* it has extensive illustrations and captions. Although in the original publication in 1905 this papyrus text was dated soon after 412,[37] and most historical discussions of it have followed that date, paleographers have always dated it much later, and it has now been conclusively dated to the second half, or even fourth quarter, of the sixth century.[38] The

[34] The few traces of section three in the *Chron. Pasch.* arise from the use of a different common source (see appendix one).

[35] Frick does not mention the *Anon. Matr.* or the *Chron. Gol.* (on which see below), since they were discovered only later.

[36] The unique use of Ptolemy's *Canon* for the Ptolemaic kings and the references to Menander (an extremely popular author in Egypt, to judge from the papyrus finds), the Alexandrian poet Sosates, and the construction of the Pharos (276.9, 278.28–29, and 280.6–7) all suggest an Alexandrian origin for section one, as does the constant reference to Alexander as *conditor* (as noted above).

[37] Bauer and Strzygowski, *Weltchronik* (n. 8 above), 12–16 and 189–202, esp. 13 and 193.

[38] See Burgess and Dijkstra, "The 'Alexandrian World Chronicle'" for the detailed background to this problem and the most recent conclusions, as well as Guglielmo Cavallo, "Per la data e l'origine di P. Golenischev della 'Cronaca universale

following table lists the identifiable fragments of the *Chron. Gol.* and the parallel sections of the *Chron. Scal.*

Chronographia Golenischevensis	*Chronographia Scaligeriana*
Section one	
Ir, depictions of the Roman months (p. 18)[39]	—
Iv, synchronistic list of Hebrew, Egyptian, and Athenian months (p. 18)	—
IIr, islands of the Mediterranean (p. 29)	= 202.26–204.8 n. 5 (= §§125–26)
IIv, provinces of Asia Minor (p. 29)	= 203 n. 24 (= §123 n. 1)[40]
IIIr–v, list of prophets with quotations or descriptions (pp. 35–36, 120)	—
Section two	
IVr, list of Roman kings and chronological summary of Alban and Roman kings (p. 43)	= 302.23–28
IVv, Lacedaemonian kings and chronological summary (p. 43)	= 304.6–23
Vr, Macedonian kings and summary (p. 48)	= 310.16–24
Vv, summary of Lydian kings (p. 48)	= 312.14–17
Section three	
VIr–v: consularia from 383–92 (pp. 73–75, 121–23)	= 368.25–370.11
VIIr–v, New Testament figures: Anna, Elizabeth, Zechariah, John (?), Samuel (?), Mary, and the infant Christ, along with an angel (pp. 80–81, 122–24)	cf. 334.14–342.12 passim

Here we can see that the *Chron. Gol.* is composed of the same three basic texts that appear in the *Chron. Scal.* It also contains two sections that do not appear in the *Chron. Scal.*, a calendrical section (Ir and v), added as a result of the same antiquarian interests that prompted the addition of a section on the Roman calendar at the beginning of the Chronograph of 354,[41] and an illustrated and annotated list of prophets

alessandrina': Una nota," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 49 (2012), in press.

[39] This includes the new fragment published by Ulrike Horak, *Illuminierte Papyri Pergamente und Papiere*, Pegasus Oriens 1 (Vienna, 1992), 1:97–102, no. 19 (*P. Vindob. K* 11.630).

[40] The *Chron. Scal.* is missing the Μυσία δευτέρα/*Mysia alia* of the *Chron. Gol.*/*Lib. gen. I* (§151 no. 11).

[41] See Salzman, *On Roman Time,* and Burgess, "The Chronograph of 354" (n. 8 above).

(III r–v), which may relate to a list of prophets in the *Liber generationis* (§333/168; Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, 133). So even though the *Chron. Gol.* shows signs of additional compilation — as we would expect with any work of Byzantine chronography — both documents must be closely related versions of a common original.

Similarly, the Greek chronographer Malalas, who wrote the first edition of his *breviarium* ca. 532 and the second ca. 565 (see n. 105 below), shows many close parallels to sections one and two, including the Italian digression, as well as a few to section three, but these have been so extensively worked over and expanded that it is very difficult to gauge the nature of the original text that he employed. He may have had a text very much like the *Chron. Scal.*, but he may just as well have been using its sources individually.

The core text, section one, the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων καὶ ἐτῶν, dates to 235, as can be seen from four references to the thirteenth year of Severus Alexander in the *Liber generationis I* (§§303, 314, 331, 398 = Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, 130–32, 138). The original Greek illustrated chronograph, which comprised sections one and two, was compiled, or at least last copied, during the reign of Justin I (518–27), as is demonstrated by the emperor list at the end of section two, which goes down to the death of Anastasius (518; 330.3). Neither Zeno nor Anastasius has a regnal figure, but both have *annos* after their name, which implies that figures once appeared there. This conclusion is supported by the facts that earlier in the list neither Pertinax nor Geta has a regnal figure, and Severus is missing the number of his consulships (326.17–19). Similar examples can be found earlier in the text where Aeschylus and Alexander are missing regnal years and Antiochus Epiphanes is missing an ordinal number, and in the consularia section where Domitian is missing a regnal year (298.22, 316.24, 318.15, and 352.13). It would seem that in some places the translator could not read the numbers well enough to convert them into Latin, or the figures had been lost in earlier copying of the Greek manuscript. However, the possibility cannot be excluded that the text was compiled or copied under Zeno (476–91) and that the names of Zeno and Anastasius were added when the work was recopied or supplemented under Justin by a scribe who knew the names of the emperors but not the lengths of their reigns.

The final version of the text as a whole, however, including section three, the *Cons. Scal.*, cannot date any earlier than the 530s. The original Latin text that lies behind the *Cons. Scal.*, the *Consularia Vindobonensia*, extended down at least to the accession of Justinian (527; §680, Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, 332). Many common errors in the *Cons. Scal.* and the otherwise even more corrupt *Cons. Vind. posteriora*, which ends in 539 —

errors that do not appear in the more accurate *Cons. Vind. priora*, which concludes ca. 575 — prove that the *Cons. Scal.* was derived from an early offshoot of the *posteriora* tradition, which must therefore date between 527 and 539. This date is supported by the paleographical date for the related *Chronographia Golenischevensis*, which was copied in the second half of the sixth century, as we saw above (see n. 38).

So much for the content and date of the work, but what kind of text was it? That is a complicated question because, as we have seen, it is not a single text but a compilation produced over more than three hundred years. Section one, the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων καὶ ἐτῶν, was essentially a "handbook for the study of the Bible."[42] It provided the chronologies, names, and genealogies that allowed readers to follow and understand the Old Testament more easily. The Διαμερισμὸς τῆς γῆς, an addition to the original Συναγωγή, expanded on Genesis 10 and allowed readers to see the contemporary world in terms of its postdiluvian origins from the three sons of Noah. The extensions down to the Roman period then allowed readers to work out the chronological relationships among the people and chronologies of the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the present day. It is the sort of text that would have been extremely useful for anyone studying or teaching the Bible. When it was first written, probably in the late second or early third century, there were no Christian chronicles, and so the types of texts that most influenced it were the chronological analyses of Jewish and Christian apologists, who were the first to establish Jewish chronology in itself and in relation to the chronologies of the rest of the Mediterranean.[43]

This basic biblical study guide attracted other interesting chronological material to it as it was copied and read over the following centuries, gathering accretions through the years like some chronographic snowball. Some of these additions were large, like sections two and three — and the Σταδιασμὸς τῆς θαλάσσης, which we find only in the surviving Greek version — but much of it was just words, phrases, *supputationes*, and short entries, like the notes on Greek intellectual history that were added to section one. The *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus provided a detailed collection of regnal lists that expanded the chronological detail of the work beyond the merely Christian sphere and replaced the various lists that had appeared at the end of the original Συναγωγή/*Lib. gen.* The

[42] Richard Rouse and Charles McNelis, "North African Literary Activity: A Cyprian Fragment, the Stichometric Lists and a Donatist Compendium," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 30 (2000): 189–238, at 207.

[43] See Burgess and Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time* (n. 4 above), 1:99–131 for early Jewish and Christian apologetic chronography before the development of Christian chronicles, of which the first was the *Chronici canones* of Eusebius of Caesarea.

last section, the *Cons. Scal.*, was an addition made after the early 530s when readers would have been more familiar with chronicles and *consularia* than the chronographs and apologetic chronologies of the early third century, and so the addition of a Greek version of the *Consularia Vindobonensia* to bring the narrative down to the present day, rather than just continue or expand the list of Roman emperors, made sense at the time. In a way, we have a kind of history of Christian chronography contained within a single work.

That this text was written in Alexandria should not surprise us, since that seems to have been the home of other Greek consularia from the fifth and sixth centuries. The *Chronographia Golenischevensis* and the fifth-century consularia source used by Theophanes in the early ninth century for his chronicle were also composed in Alexandria, as the *Consularia Berolinensia* may have been as well.[44] Why this should have been so is unknown. It may just be an accident of transmission, but it may be that Alexandria was home to a tradition of such chronography.

The Date and Purpose of the Latin Text

As noted above, Paris. lat. 4884 is usually dated to the late seventh or early eighth century. This date was first advanced by Schoene and supported by Mommsen, and since no one else interested in this text looked at the manuscript afterwards, that date was simply tralatitiously repeated from one of the two.[45]

But unknown to just about everyone, in 1950 the eminent paleographer E. A. Lowe subjected this manuscript to a thorough examination and placed its creation in Corbie around the time of Maurdramnus, who was abbot between 772 and 781.[46] In 1967 Jean Porcher identified the

[44] See Burgess and Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time* 1:54–55, 179. On the other hand, the *Chronicon paschale*, a Greek chronicle based on a Greek translation of different Latin consularia (the *Descriptio consulum*), was composed in the second quarter of the seventh century in Constantinople.

[45] Schoene, *Eusebi Chronicorum* (n. 10 above), xv and Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, 83, 272, and, e.g., Frick, *Chron. min.*, ccxxi; Jacoby, *RE* (n. 2 above), 1566; Bauer-Helm, *Die Chronik* (n. 13 above), xiv; Beatrice, *Theosophia* (n. 2 above), lviii; and Garstad, "Barbarian Interest" (n. 2 above), 3 n. 1.

[46] E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini antiquiores* (Oxford, 1950), 5:13 no. 560. Garstad erroneously cites Lowe for the date of "seventh or eighth century" and then attributes the translation (and one assumes the manuscript) to the first half of the eighth century ("Barbarian Interest," 3 n. 1, 22, 39, 40). In *Alexandrian World Chronicle* he broadens this to "eighth century" (xix, xxx, xxxi, xxxv). He does, however, accept Lowe's attribution of the work to Corbie ("Barbarian Interest," 35–36, and *Alexandrian World Chronicle*, xxx).

artist of the decorated initial P in the top left corner of fol. 1 for "Primus homo factus est a deo" (the only illustration in the entire manuscript) as the artist of the Corbie Psalter (Bibliothèque municipale, Amiens 18), a work also written in the Maurdramnus script.[47] In 1990, in a detailed study of the Carolingian manuscripts of Corbie, David Ganz confirmed that the manuscript was written in the distinctive Maurdramnus script, which was developed by Maurdramnus in the 770s and continued in use at Corbie for about fifty years thereafter. He also linked the illustrator of this manuscript and Amiens 18 with another illustrated Maurdramnus manuscript, Paris. lat. 13025.[48] Paris. lat. 4884 appears tenth in Ganz's chronological list of sixty-five Maurdramnus manuscripts, and since the extant fragments and texts of the famous Maurdramnus Bible of ca. 771–83 take the first six places, the *Chron. Scal.* would therefore seem to have been copied in the 770s or 780s.

As will be discussed below, Paris. lat. 4884 is attributed at the top of the first folio to a George of Amiens by one hand, while another has added "uel sicut alii dicunt Victoris Turonensis episcopi" in a slightly larger script. There never was a Victor who was bishop of Tours, though it has been thought, probably rightly, that this is in fact a reference to the sixth-century chronicle of Victor Tunnunensis, which did not exist outside Spain and could only have been known in Corbie through the *De uiris illustribus* of Isidore of Seville.[49] In two Corbie catalogues, writ-

[47] Jean Porcher, "Les manuscrits à peinture," in *L'Europe des invasions*, ed. Jean Hubert, Jean Porcher, and W. F. Volbach, Univers des formes 12 (Paris, 1967), 105–206, at 202.

[48] See David Ganz, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance* (Sigmaringen, 1990), 43, 46 (for duration of script use), and 133–34, as well as 43–48 on the Maurdramnus script in general. The common artist of Paris. lat. 4884, Amiens 18, and Paris. lat. 13025 had already been noted as early as 1972: Wilhelm Koehler, *Buchmalerei des frühen Mittelalters* (Munich, 1972), 97.

[49] Frick, "Joseph Justus Scaliger" (n. 10 above), 123 n. 1; Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger* (n. 1 above), 563; and the detailed description of the manuscript and its history by Franck Cinato and M.-P. Laffitte, published in PDF form by the Bibliothèque nationale ("Chronica universalis Alexandrina latina sive Cronica Georgii Ambianensis episcopi, quae dicitur Excerpta latina Barbari Scaligeri" at http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ead.html?id=FRBNFEAD000009032), "[c]ette deuxième attribution erronée renvoie vraisemblablement à Victor, évêque de Tunnuna, un Africain (444–567?) auteur d'une chronique différente de celle-ci." I shall refer to this document below as the "BN description" and quote the relevant information since there is no easy way to cite specific portions of its text, and the URL may change or disappear in the future. Isidore, *De uiris illustribus* 38, states, "Victor Tunnunensis ecclesiae Africanae episcopus. Hic a principio mundi usque ad primum Iustini iunioris imperii annum breuem per consules annuos bellicarum ecclesiasticarumque rerum nobilissimam promulgauit historiam laude et notatione illustrem ac memoria dignam." The exactly

ten about one hundred years apart, in 1070–1110 and 1184, we find a notice for a "Victoris chronica" and "cronica Victoris."[50] Since there can be no question of this referring to a copy of Victor Tunnunensis's chronicle, it must be Paris. lat. 4884. Claude Dupuy, in whose possession the manuscript first appears and whose name appears at the bottom of the first folio ("Cl. Puteani"), had acquired other manuscripts from Corbie as well.[51] There can be no doubt, therefore, of Lowe's date or origin.

As noted just above, on the first folio, in a Caroline minuscule hand of the ninth century (of a Corbie librarian, so it would seem[52]), appears "cronica Georgii Ambianensis episcopi." At the bottom, in a small and compact but much later hand is "cronica Georgii Ambione," which is how the chronograph was described before Scaliger.[53] Now later attributions of chronicle authorship are rarely accurate and so this attribution to George of Amiens was routinely dismissed because the only George who was bishop of Amiens held his see between ca. 767 and 798, a century after the supposed date of the copying of the manuscript.[54] But Amiens is only 15 km or so west of Corbie along the Somme as the crow flies, and the true date of the copying of Paris. lat. 4884 falls right into the middle of George's tenure. These facts can hardly be a coincidence. Furthermore, George must have had close contacts with Corbie, since in 790 Alcuin wrote to Abbot Adalhard of Corbie and asked him to pass on

---

matching date and the reference to consuls make the identification with the text in Paris. lat. 4884 a reasonable hypothesis, though anyone who confused *Turonensis* and *Tunnenensis* cannot have been paying close attention to, or must have forgotten, *ecclesiae Africanae*. Victor's chronicle survived in a very few Spanish manuscripts until the sixteenth century, when all but one thirteenth-century manuscript disappeared (though copies of a few earlier manuscripts had been made by then). See Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, *Victoris Tunnunensis Chronicon cum reliquiis ex Consularibus Caesaraugustanis et Iohannis Biclarensis Chronicon*, CCL 173A (Turnhout, 2001), 13*–45*, 76*–93* (manuscripts), 114–15* (knowledge of Victor).

[50] See Léopold Delisle, *Le Cabinet des manuscrits de la bibliothèque impériale* (Paris, 1874), 2:432, no. 303, and 438, no. 232.

[51] BN description, "il avait acquis plusieurs manuscrits provenant de Corbie." Dupuy had had the manuscript since at least 1575, when he had shown it to Scaliger in Paris (Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 75 and 562).

[52] BN description, "de la main d'un bibliothécaire de l'abbaye de Corbie."

[53] See Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 563–64.

[54] Frick, "Joseph Justus Scaliger" (n. 10 above), 123–24 n. 1; Wachsmuth, *Einleitung* (n. 2 above), 181 n. 2; and Jacoby, *RE* (n. 2 above), 1567, all of whom call the attribution "reine Hariolation," as well as Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, 84 n. 1; Frick, *Chron. min.*, lxxxv; and Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 563. For George and his background, see Wilhelm Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford, 1946), 127–29 and Joanna Story, *Carolingian Connections: Anglo-Saxon England and Carolingian Francia, c. 750–870* (Aldershot, 2003), 55–92, esp. 55–56 and 88–90.

greetings to his "father" George from his "spiritual son."[55] George is a Greek name and rare in the West at this date, and so it is possible that he was a Greek from southern Italy — the modern areas of Puglia (in particular), Basilicata, and Calabria — Sicily, or the East.[56] When he was sent to Britain by Pope Hadrian as part of the famous delegation to British churches in 786, his companion was Theophylact, another bishop with probable Greek origins. Is George of Amiens, then, the translator? Porcher, the only scholar to write about the *Chron. Scal.* and accept the ramifications of Lowe's new dating, thought so.[57]

But he cannot be. George was a figure of the utmost importance in his day. He was an intimate and perhaps even mentor of Alcuin and an envoy and diplomat for Popes Stephen II and III, Paul I, and Hadrian I from the 750s to the 780s, traveling to and from the Frankish court and to Britain, and he also acted as envoy for Charlemagne to Italy in 773. He was bishop of Ostia from at least 753, but in 761 was given permission to remain in Francia. It was Pippin III (751–68) himself who ca. 767 asked Pope Paul I to grant him a see in Francia in addition to that of Ostia (which was then vetoed by Constantine, the "antipope," after Paul's death, but he was reinstated by Stephen III in 768). He then ended up spending most of his time in Amiens. Even more important for our purposes than his occupations and associates is that after his return from Britain in 786, he produced a report for Pope Hadrian and Charlemagne that still survives.[58] This long account of the synod held with British bishops is written in a very good Latin that bears no resemblance to what we find in the *Chron. Scal.* George cannot be the "barbarian" translator of the Greek text. Besides, if he was of Greek extraction or was Greek himself (more on Greeks in Rome at this time below), his Greek too would have been better than the Greek we see in the *Chron. Scal.* So George cannot have been the translator. So who was? The language of the text will provide us with a profile.

First of all, we must realize that we are examining the work of someone whose first language was neither Latin nor Greek but either proto-French, *rustica romana lingua*, as it was famously called at the Council

[55] Story, *Carolingian Connections*, 63–64, who expands on the importance of these words for the close relationship between George and Alcuin.

[56] BN description, "L'évêque d'Amiens, dont le prénom était inhabituel en Occident à cette époque, était peut-être d'origine grecque."

[57] Porcher, "Les manuscrits," 202 and 380 ("Georges . . . [t]raducteur en latin d'une *Chronique universelle*"). This is also implied by the BN description.

[58] *Ep.* 3 (MGH Epp. 4:19–29). On this letter, see Story, *Carolingian Connections*, 58–59, 64–78.

of Tours in 813, or German, *lingua thiotisca*, as it was called at Tours.[59] He knew common or vulgar Latin reasonably well, itself perhaps somewhat "Romanized," of the sort that would have been in daily use in the monastery of Corbie, both for speaking and informal writing.[60] Such an individual could have joined his local church or monastery at a young age. His education there would not have included the classics of Roman literature, like Cicero or Virgil, but Christian writings, particularly the Bible. His Latin was learned and experienced through contemporary church life, not the Roman past. To our classically trained eyes his Latin does seem appalling, but such things as changes in the use of cases, in declension, in meaning, in orthography, and in usage were all common in ordinary (not high-level) writing long before the eighth century, as we understand now so much better than Scaliger did. A comparison with Fredegarius, the *Liber Historiae Francorum*, Virgilius Maro grammaticus,

[59] Canon 17 of the Council of Tours (MGH Concilia 2.2:288). This is not the place to enter the debate over the transition from Latin to French, already complicated enough before the appearance of Roger Wright's famous *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France*, ARCA 8 (Liverpool, 1982). On my understanding of the voluminous literature, no one would disagree that in the second half of the eighth century a local Gallic boy would have had to learn to read and write Latin as something distinctly different from what he spoke, even if it may not have been considered as a distinct language by his teachers. Whatever the multitude of problems with the orthography and grammar of the Strasbourg Oaths, sworn about sixty years later, they are clearly not Latin.

That the translator's first language was not Greek, as Mommsen believed, is demonstrated by many misunderstandings of the original Greek text (see n. 6 above), particularly the error at 236.22–24, "illas nobilissimas feminas per magicas et ingenia maligna conuertens et auortiuos faciebat." We can see from the rough parallel in Malalas 1.10 that the original verb must have been διέφθειρε, with the meaning that he was corrupting these women, as a surviving Greek-Latin glossary indicates ("deprauo, corrumpo, prauesco"). But just below that entry are three meanings for the related noun διαφθορά, two linked to the verb's meaning, "corruptus, corruptio interitus" and "stuprum" (διαφθορὰ παιδὸς ἢ παρθένου), the third, however, more clearly related to the Latin translation of the *Chron. Scal.*, "hic abortus" (διαφθορὰ ἐπὶ ἀμβλώσεως; Georg Goetz, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* [Leipzig, 1888], 2:275). The idea of abortion is actually in the ἄμβλωσις not the διαφθορά. The translator's glossary must have been similar. This, and the other misunderstandings presented in n. 6 above, are not the sorts of error that a Greek-speaker would have made. See Frick, *Chron. min.*, lxxxvii and Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 567.

[60] "In the course of the preceding centuries [before the tenth century] people had become increasingly accustomed to using their own vernacular tongues for speech and the necessities of daily life. Latin — the language of religion, scholarship, and government — had to be taught in school. If a knowledge of Latin could be acquired only with effort, a knowledge of Greek was all the more elusive"; Bernice M. Kaczynski, *Greek in the Carolingian Age: The St. Gall Manuscripts* (Cambridge, MA, 1988), 1.

the *Cosmographia* of Aethicus Ister, or other such texts from the seventh and eighth centuries does not show great discrepancies from the Latin we find in the *Chron. Scal.*[61] Added to all this is also the fact that, immersed as he was in Greek, the translator often allowed Greek grammar to show through into the Latin, as we saw with the genitives absolute in the consular dates above.[62] This type of problem is familiar to anyone who has read the New Testament in Latin (though not on this scale, of course). But even so, Scaliger had seen enough medieval manuscripts to have had more than an inkling of these sorts of changes, and it should not have surprised and offended him in quite the way that it did.

Our translator obviously had been taught Greek as well as Latin,[63] but he was no expert: we can observe basic errors of understanding in vocabulary, unusual verb forms, and construction; rigid, sometimes word-for-word translation (and even the translation of the basic components of compound words), and the amateur translator's reliance on a fairly basic Greek-Latin glossary.[64] His Greek would have been geared in the first instance toward reading the New Testament, with the ultimate goal perhaps being able to read eastern imperial correspondence (in view of the

[61] As noted by Hoeveler, "Die Excerpta" 1 (n. 2 above), 200. Both Hoeveler and Frick published detailed analyses that allow one to examine in quite some detail the peculiarities of the translator's Latin: Hoeveler, "Die Excerpta" 2 (n. 2 above) and Frick, *Chron. min.*, 599–625. They are invaluable aids. One can find just about all the translator's errors described in Grandgent, *Vulgar Latin* (n. 12 above) and Blaise, *Manuel* (n. 12 above). For the rather wild Latin of the *Cosmographia* and its pseudonymous author, see Michael W. Herren, *The Cosmography of Aethicus Ister*, Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin 8 (Turnhout, 2011), lxxviii–xcix; and for Fredegarius, see Roger Collins, *Fredegar*, Authors of the Middle Ages: Historical and Religious Writers of the Latin West 4 no. 13 (Aldershot, 1996), 111–12 with bibliography.

[62] Other examples include such things as nouns with the original Greek endings (Frick, *Chron. min.*, 604–5 and Hoeveler, "Die Excerpta" 2, 21–23), the use of *ille* for ὁ (Frick, *Chron. min.*, 611; also very rarely *ipse* and *iste*, 613; Hoeveler, "Die Excerpta" 2, 25), *regnare* with the genitive (Frick, *Chron. min.*, 620), and "ut ne" for ἵνα μή (625).

[63] For his ability to read Greek, which might at first seem surprising in this place and time, see below.

[64] See n. 6 above for some of the more interesting examples as well as Frick, *Chron. min.*, lxxxv–lxxxvii. For evidence for the use of a Greek-Latin glossary, see above, n. 59, and Frick, *Chron. min.*, lxxxvii. For the use of Greek glossaries, dictionaries, and grammars in Carolingian Francia, see A. C. Dionisotti, "Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe," in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Michael W. Herren, King's College London Medieval Studies 2 (London, 1988), 1–56. See appendix two, below, for a discussion of one famous example of apparent mistranslation, "sun" for "Troy," which is not what it is often portrayed to be.

problems that had arisen over the iconoclastic controversy) and other sophisticated works like letters and treatises of the eastern fathers and Ps.-Dionysius, not Homer, Herodotus, or tragedy. This is obvious again from the text: he has no inkling that O ΙΛΙΟC is *Troia* (see appendix two) or that Aristophanes was not an architect (266.12–13). He read ΑΡΓΟΝΑΥΤΩΝ as ΕΡΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΩΝ and translated it as "opus illorum" instead of "Argonautos" (234.11), no doubt because he had never heard of the Argonauts (there would have been no spaces between words in a sixth-century Greek uncial text). Yet when confronted with Greek text from the Old and New Testaments, he can easily fill in the correct Latin, word for word, for long stretches.[65]

As for many of the blunders the translator has made, in both Latin and Greek, we must all admit that we have had students, even good students, who have produced nonsense from straightforward passages of Latin or Greek seemingly without being aware of it. This is the sort of image we must have in mind when studying the language of the *Chron. Scal.*: a graduate research assistant struggling to translate Greek into Latin, from a text that is quite unlike anything she has ever seen and is in many places beyond her capabilities and understanding.[66]

We must also take into account that the Greek manuscript itself must have contained errors. Frick provides a list of the instances where he believed that the original Greek was erroneous (*Chron. min.*, lxxxvi), such as APICTOC (ἄριστος, "best") written as APECTOC (ἀρεστός, translated as "amabilis"; 228.13, with note; a shift of ι to ε), and ὁ κωμῳδός ("comedian," in this case Aristophanes), written first as OKOMOΔOC (through the sound-shift of ω to ο) and then in later copies affected by metathesis and eventually hypercorrected to OIKOΔOMOC (οἰκοδόμος,

[65] See appendix one for a list of Old and New Testament passages. One specific example will suffice. In a caption he writes "ortygomitrae id sunt coturnices" (224 n. 6), transliterating ὀρτυγομῆτραι and then translating it with the word used in the Latin Old Testament, *coturnix*, a quail (Exod. 16:13), even though ὀρτυγομῆτραι are not quails. The extant glossaries have the correct translation, ὄρτυξ/coturnix (Goetz, *Corpus Glossariorum*, 117 and 387).

[66] For examples of some of the problems students had learning Greek in the late seventh and early eighth century in Canterbury, not unlike what we see here, see Michael Lapidge, "The Study of Greek at the School of Canterbury in the Seventh Century," in Herren, *The Sacred Nectar*, 169–94, at 188–89. For a short study, with examples, of the Latin translation of Josephus's Greek *Antiquitates Iudaicae* undertaken by unknown friends of Cassiodorus in the mid-sixth century, see Franz Blatt, *The Latin Josephus*, vol. 1, *Introduction and Text: The Antiquities, Books I–V* (Copenhagen, 1958), 17–22.

translated as "architect"; 266.12–13, with note).[67] The first could be a result of misreading by the translator but the latter certainly could not. Frick also notes a large number of instances where the manuscript contained misspellings that had arisen from the contemporary pronunciation of Greek vowels, chiefly ο for ω (as in the example above), ε for αι, and ι for ει, η, ῃ, οι, υ, υι, and sometimes αι.[68]

There seems no simple way to explain such errors (and others) at the time of translation, so they must have existed in the manuscript. For such errors to appear so frequently in a Greek manuscript would suggest rather poor scribes, ones who relied on copying from a text that was read aloud to them in a group, the quickest and cheapest method of making multiple copies, and who were not used to copying classical, Hellenistic, and Roman texts. It was like a mass-market paperback, not a *de luxe* hardcover. Such mistakes would not make the task easier for any translator.

This then is our "barbarian" — hardly the inept moron that provoked the scorn of Scaliger.[69]

---

[67] Metathesis has caused the swap of the delta and the mu. There are a few examples of metathesis in this text (see Frick, *Chron. min.*, 614), and Frick also notes an example of metathesis and some other confusions of letters in names that must have appeared in the common source since they are shared by both the *Chron. Scal.* and the *Chron. Pasch.*: Νηραία for Ῥηναία (metathesis), Ἄσπορες for Ἄστορες (pi for tau), Τάλλων for Γάλλων, and Ταράμαντες for Γαράμαντες (tau for gamma; *Chron. min.*, civ). So not only was the Greek exemplar corrupt but its source was as well. This shows that in spite of the illustrations, these manuscripts were not the products of high-level scriptoria, but were cheaply and quickly produced (on which see below).

[68] The latter change is the above-named itacism, where all the long vowels and diphthongs end up sounding like iota. See Frick, *Chron. min.*, lxxxvi and 610 (ι for η, particularly in names), e.g., *ritor* for ῥήτωρ (266.8, 10, 268.7), *Itas feras* for εἶτα Σφαῖρος (282.21), *Attosai et* for Ἄτοσσα ἡ καί (282.26), *Ifestum* for Ἥφαιστον (286.3), *isargus* for εἰς Ἄργος (288.21), *Pedes Casandrus* for παῖδες Κασάνδρου (310.9), and *Salinai et* for Σαλίνα ἡ καί (324.5). Note also the famous example in appendix two, below, and the *Ortygomitrae* for ὀρτυγομῆτραι (see nn. 6 and 65 above, and 76 below). In general, see Robert Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* (Cambridge, 1983), 25–26 and 56–57 and Francis Thomas Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, 1, *Phonology*, Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 55 (Milan, 1976), 183–324, 330–33, and specifically for itacism, 235–42 and 330, and confusions between ει and ι, 189–91; αι and ε, 191–93; and ω and ο, 275–77.

[69] See the sensible comments of Frick in defense of the translator, whose Latin he says is no worse than that of Gregory of Tours (sixth century) or Virgilius Maro grammaticus (seventh century) (*Chron. min.*, lxxxv). See also the comments of Noble on the poor translation of the contemporary acts of the Second Council of Nicaea (787), a far more important document than this chronograph: "the Latin

This leaves us in a bit of a quandary, since George of Amiens obviously did not compose the chronicle nor did he translate it. George's position and background, and the milieu in which he lived, make it much more likely that he was the owner of the Greek original.

Rome famously had a series of Greek popes from Sicily and Syria leading up into the middle of the eighth century — Theodore (642–49), Agatho (678–81), Leo II (682–83), John V (685–86), Conon (686–87), Sergius (687–701, Sicilian and Syrian), John VI (701–5), John VII (705–7), Sisinnius (708, a Syrian), Constantine (708–15, a Syrian), Gregory III (731–41, a Syrian), and Zacharias (741–52), who translated the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great into Greek — and so Rome and the church were very welcoming of Greek ideas and culture. Rome at the time was becoming a haven for Greek exiles fleeing from the iconoclastic persecutions of Constantine V starting in the early 750s, and in 761 Paul I turned his home into a monastery dedicated to Sts. Stephen and Silvester and made it available to Greek monks, who had had a strong presence in Rome for over a century.[70] The study of Greek was becoming important in Francia

translation was hastily and poorly done. It seems that someone with connections to the papal court, a modest knowledge of Greek, and glossaries on his desk prepared the Latin version" (Thomas F. X. Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* [Philadelphia, 2009], 160).

[70] See Andrew J. Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes: Eastern Influences on Rome and the Papacy from Gregory the Great to Zacharias, A.D. 590–752* (Lanham, MD, 2007); Michael McCormick, "Byzantium and the West, 700–900," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick, vol. 2, c. *700*–c. *900* (Cambridge, 1995), 349–80, esp. 357–59 on Greek trade with the West and Francia, 363–67 on the involvement of Byzantium in the West in the eighth century, and 373–77 on the influence of Greek culture in Rome and Francia; Walter Berschin, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages from Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa* (Washington, 1988), 86–92 on the importance of Greeks and Greek in Rome in the late seventh and eighth centuries; Marios Costambeys and Conrad Leyser, "To Be the Neighbour of St Stephen: Patronage, Martyr Cult, and Roman Monasteries, *c.* 600–*c.* 900," in *Religion, Dynasty, and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300–900*, ed. Kate Cooper and Julia Hillner (Cambridge, 2007), 262–87, at 271–73 on the Greek monasteries; Jean-Marie Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du VI^e^ s.–fin du IX^e^ s.)*, Mémoires de la classe des lettres de l'Académie royale de Belgique, 2e série, vol. 66, fasc. 1 (Brussels, 1983) for Greek monks in Rome at this time and their influence (see 36 for Paul's monastery), esp. 62–76 on language, 174–86 on books, and 186–205 on culture; and Leslie Brubaker and John Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era* c. *680–850: A History* (Cambridge, 2011), 317–20, for a description of an important Greek manuscript copied in Rome ca. 800. For iconoclasm in the East, see Stephen Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources*, CSCO 384, subsidia 52 (Louvain, 1977), esp. 111–42 and 166–68, and Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era*, 156–286, esp. 168–76, 250–51, 256–60, 266–68, 280–

at this time as well, and this continued through into the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries.[71] At some point between 758 and 763 Pope Paul I, though no Greek, sent a large selection of Greek manuscripts to Pippin III, though we do not know if they were ever translated or not, or why they were even sent.[72]

It is this cultural importance of Greek in Italy and Francia in the eighth century that also explains why our translator had some knowledge of Greek. Even if we discount the importance of Papo-Byzantine and Franco-Byzantine relations, made more important by the iconoclastic movement in the East and the problems with the Lombards in Italy, the need for Greek was everywhere, and a monastery as important as Corbie, with its growing library and contacts with widely traveled or far-flung bishops like George and Alcuin, would have needed to have someone who understood Greek, even if his lessons were unfinished. Such is the context in which this manuscript appeared in the late second or early third quarter of the eighth century.

Now we cannot know how such a manuscript came into the possession of George of Amiens, but almost certainly, in view of the damage it had suffered (see just below), it was an original copy made in the sixth century. It could have made its way west in the luggage of a well-to-do easterner fleeing iconoclastic persecution. It could have been purchased

---

84 for its effects on the West; and for iconoclasm in Francia, see Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*.

[71] For the study of Greek at St. Gall, see Kaczynski, *Greek in the Carolingian Age* (n. 60 above), which discusses such matters as orthography, alphabets, grammars, glossaries, and the specific kinds of Greek texts studied and copied. In general, see Berschin, *Greek Letters*, 106–56 and Pierre Riché, "Le grec dans les centres de culture d'occident," in Herren, *The Sacred Nectar*, 143–68, at 146–50. Because of the presence there of Theodore and Hadrian, Greek monks who had arrived in Britain from Rome and Naples in 669, Canterbury was a major center of Greek learning at the end of the seventh and beginning of the eighth century. It was probably in Canterbury that the other major Greek-to-Latin historical translation of this period was undertaken, the so-called *Laterculus Malalianus*, which in part derives from the sixth-century *breviarium* of Malalas. For a detailed study of this work (often referred to as the *Chronicon Palatinum*, a name no more appropriate than *Laterculus Malalianus*), see Jane Stevenson, *The "Laterculus Malalianus" and the School of Archbishop Theodore*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 14 (Cambridge, 1995), and for an analysis of a collection of glosses from the Canterbury school and what it tells us about the understanding (and misunderstanding) of the translation of Greek and Latin by the teachers and the students, see Lapidge, "The Study of Greek."

[72] *Codex Carolinus* 24 (MGH Epp. 3:529): "Direximus itaque excellentissime praecellentiae uestrae et libros, quantos reperire potuimus: id est antiphonale et responsale, insimul artem gramaticam, Arist<ot>olis <et> Dionisii Ariopagitis <opera>, geometricam, orthografiam, grammaticam, omnes Greco eloquio scriptas, nec non et horologium nocturnum."

by a Roman or Frankish traveler while touring the East or visiting the Holy Land. It could have been sent as a gift from someone in the East to someone in the papal or Frankish court. It may have been brought as a family heirloom when someone moved from the East to Italy or Sicily a generation or more earlier. There are many possibilities. Somehow, most likely in Rome or via Rome, it came into the hands of George, who, as a Greek, would have had little trouble reading it himself. Then ca. 780 he gave or loaned it to the monastery library in Corbie. Such a text would have been a rare prize, and so for the same reasons that Jerome began his program of translating important Greek works into Latin with a chronicle, Eusebius's *Chronici canones*, the monks of Corbie set out as best they could to translate this rare, beautiful, and useful work.[73]

Such is the context for the acquisition of the manuscript and the identity of those who owned it and translated it. We must now turn again to the manuscript itself and determine its actual purpose. Everyone agrees that the *Chron. Scal.* was intended to be a Latin copy of the original Greek manuscript, but it was never completed, since none of the illustrations of the Greek manuscript were ever attempted, let alone finished (the decorated initial P on fol. 1r is not part of these illustrations; it is part of the text ["Primus"] and did not exist in the original). In spite of its apparently incomplete nature the manuscript remained in the Corbie library, and in the early ninth century some still knew that it was a translation of George of Amiens's chronicle. Yet the manuscript still has more to tell us.

The Latin text of Paris. lat. 4884 is complete and unbroken down to the bottom of fol. 56v, approximately AD 100, exactly seven full quires. Then at the top of fol. 57r it jumps to AD 296, a loss of about 200 consular pairs plus any associated historical entries, as we can tell from the *Cons. Vind. post.*, and approximately a single quire or just under.[74] From

[73] A similar interest in the chronology of the Old Testament can be found in the seventh- and eighth-century chronicle epitomes of Isidore (615, 626, and ca. 635) and Bede (703 and 725), and a different translation of the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων καὶ ἐτῶν can be found at the beginning of book one of Fredegarius (= *Lib. gen. I*), which was compiled not long after 660. Two other important manuscripts of the *Liber generationis* can be dated to about the same time as the *Chron. Scal.*: G, St. Gall 133, to the end of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century, and B, Berlin, Phillipps 1829, to the second quarter of the ninth. A different translation of the Συναγωγή from 334 (= *Lib. gen. II*) was discovered in Francia in the late eighth century and first recopied in the early ninth (see Burgess, "The Chronograph of 354" [n. 8 above], 350, 363–68, 391–94).

[74] We know from the *Cons. Vind.* that the section from ca. 100 to 296 contains mostly consuls with only five entries, describing the *duo augusti* in 161, a persecution, and the martyrdoms of Perpetua and Felicitas, Lawrence, and Cyprian, which would

296 the text continues down to the bottom of fol. 63r where it ends in 387. The verso of fol. 63 is blank. There is no damage to the fabric of the codex; the text simply misses a portion, carries on, and then stops, with the back of the last folio blank.[75] There can be no doubt, then, that the Greek exemplar must have been damaged. At some point in its history the back of the codex must have broken off and the last quires of the manuscript come apart. Quires one to seven and nine were saved; eight and the rest were lost. Quire nine was reattached but no further binding was done, leaving the last page of the last quire to substitute for the back cover. Over time the last folio was lost and the verso of the penultimate folio became faded, stained, or damaged to the point that its text could not be read, or at least read well enough to be translated.

We have already seen above that the Latin text is unique in its format on the page, and that it must be copying exactly the arrangement of the Greek text to make room for the marginal and interlinear illustrations. We have just seen that what must have been a missing quire in the Greek manuscript between quires seven and nine is matched exactly by the shifts in the Latin manuscript from quire seven to quire eight and from fol. 56v to fol. 57r. The Latin manuscript must therefore have mirrored the Greek exactly — word for word, line for line, folio for folio — for the Latin text to match exactly the physical structure of the Greek manuscript after fifty-six folios of copying. This is beyond what would be required for a simple translation, with or without illustrations.

This detail suggests that Paris. lat. 4884 is not just a simple translation of the original Greek manuscript; it is a perfect replica of it in

require only five major illustrations, though the surviving text of the *Chron. Scal.* indicates that there were almost certainly other entries and illustrations that do not appear in the *Cons. Vind.* There are twenty-five emperors or sets of emperors between 100 and 296 in the list at the end of section two, and each of these would be present in this missing section. One quire (= eight folios = sixteen pages) at thirty-one lines per page — the first two quires are ruled thirty lines per page, the rest thirty-one — gives a total of 496 lines. We are missing approximately 200 consular pairs, which elsewhere usually take a single line but sometimes two, so we could estimate 250 lines. The regnal introductions before ca. 100 usually take between three and four lines each, thus about eighty-five lines in total. The death notices are longer after 296, but we have no idea where this tendency begins. The five entries would fill between ten and fifteen lines since they are very short. Pictures in the consularia section are usually about twelve lines high, so we should estimate about sixty lines. In total, then, we can account for about 405 of the 496 lines from these known parallels, thus about three pages short of a full quire.

[75] The eighth and last quire is specially made up of seven folios (two bifolia and three singles) glued and stitched together, obviously intended to mirror the last folio of the Greek. The first quire is sixteen folios; the rest are eight: see Schoene, *Eusebi Chronicorum* (n. 10 above), xv–xvi.

Latin. Perfect, except for the illustrations, of which no sign survives. Other examples of illustrations from contemporary Corbie manuscripts at the time show that such illustrations as would have appeared in the Greek manuscript (as evidenced by the *Chron. Gol.* and *Cons. Ber.*) would not have been beyond the skills of the artists of Corbie. It is even stranger that none of the many captions that must have originally been associated with these illustrations were translated either, with the exception of two blocks on folios six to fourteen, and fourteen and seventeen. We know from the *Chron. Gol.* that captions must have existed for most if not all of the illustrations.[76] As we have seen above, the manuscript remained in this state, unfinished, at Corbie until at least the end of the twelfth century, and no attempt was made to complete it.

Any number of possible scenarios for the lack of illustrations and captions can be envisioned. Ganz suggested that the illustrator died before the illustrations could be completed.[77] It may be that the Greek manuscript had simply been loaned by George and was taken back before the illustrations could be finished. The exact correspondence between Greek and Latin, however, suggests that it was intended to be a crib, so that those who had no Greek could understand the original, though in such a case one would have expected all the captions to have been copied as well. If this was so, the Greek text must have eventually been lost since it does not appear in the library catalogues, and the Latin text was

[76] There is a space for an illustration, with no surviving caption, on fol. 1r. Captions then first appear for pictures that illustrate identical lists in the text above: fols. 6r (provinces = 198 n. 9) and 6v (islands = 199 n. 15), 8r (provinces = 203 n. 24 = *Chron. Gol.* IIv), 8v (missing: blank space instead of captions for islands; see 204 n. 5 = *Chron. Gol.* IIr), 10r (provinces = 208 n. 7), 12r (islands = 212 n. 23, 214 n. 2) and v (cities = 214 nn. 7, 14), 13r (islands = 215 n. 15), 14r (mountains = 218 n. 10). These are followed by captions for more straightforward illustrations of events and people mentioned within the text: fols. 14v (*arbor uitae fluens aquas* and *Maria et flumina conuenientes in semet ipsis dant uoces*), 15v (*uox domini*, *Abraham*, *altarium*, *Isaac*, *arbor sabec*, and *oblatio*), 16r (*Mare rubrum* and *filii Israhel transeuntes Rubram mare*), 16v (*ortygomitrae* [*id sunt coturnices*], *columna nubis*, *columna ignis*, *manna*, *Aaron*, *uox domini*, *Moyses*, and *populus Ebreorum*), and 17r (*populus Ebreorum transeuntes Iordanem*). The text in square brackets at 16v has been added by the translator to explain his transliteration of ὀρτυγομῆτραι (see n. 6 above). No further captions appear. For the captions in the *Chron. Gol.*, see Bauer and Strzygowski, *Weltchronik* (n. 8 above), 29 and 119–25. There are also descriptive headings on the top of 9r, 12r, 12v, 13r, 13v, 14r, 14v, 20v, 27r, 28r, 29r, 29v, 30v, 32r, 33r, 33v, 35r (section one); 37r, 39r*, 39v*, 40v*, 41r*, 41v*, 45v*, 46r*, 48r* (section two); 49v and 61v (section three); and footers at 38r*, 39r, and 40r (section two). Most are simply intended to describe the content of the page, but some belong in the text and have mistakenly been written as headers (marked * above).

[77] Ganz, *Corbie* (n. 48 above), 43.

mistakenly attributed to a Victor (of Tunnuna or Tours) who is unlikely to have known Greek. At some date around the middle of the sixteenth century the manuscript appears to have been "liberated" from Corbie by Claude Dupuy (Claudius Puteanus), in whose possession it is recorded in 1575,[78] the first record we have of it after the last catalogue reference to it in 1184.

Francus Silvius

It has often been noted that the appearance of "Francus" in the two lists of Alban kings (242.3, the Italian digression of section one, and 302.7, section two) must be related to the Frankish myth of a Trojan origin. Francus does not appear in any other extant list of Alban kings, including the witness to the common source, the *Breviarium Vindobonense* (see appendix one), and only the subject of a Frankish king would have had the audacity to make such an addition. Here is the list (with the variants from both lists noted):[79]

Aeneas (Silvius)	38 years
Ascanius (Silvius)	35
Albas (Postumius) Silvius	36
Tittus Silvius	38
Francus Silvius	53
Latinus Silvius	56
Procnax Silvius	46
Tarc(y)inius Silvius	18
Ciden(s)us Silvius	32
Abintinus Silvius	21
Rimus Silvius	29

But apart from the Trojan origin story in the chronicle of Fredegarius written at some date after 660,[80] in which the Franks are said to have taken their name from Francio (*Chron.* 2.5 and 3.2; MGH SRM 2:46

[78] See n. 51 above.

[79] This list is completely corrupted, both with respect to the names and the years; it is too short by five names and includes a name from the Roman king list (Tarquinius) and Remus, who was never a king of Alba Longa. For more on this list, see R. W. Burgess, *Roman Imperial Chronology and Early Fourth-Century Historiography: The Regnal Durations of the So-called* Chronica urbis Romae *of the Chronograph of 354*, Historia Einzelschriften (Stuttgart, 2013, in press), chap. 3.

[80] For the date of Fredegarius, see Collins, *Fredegar* (n. 61 above), 81–83, and Roger Collins, *Die Fredegar-Chroniken,* MGH Studien und Texte 44 (Hanover, 2007), 25–27. In the former, Collins argues for a date in the second half of the seventh century and perhaps even the early eighth (between 659 and 714 at the extremes), but in the later work he adopts a less specific "after ca. 660."

and 93 = Klippel no. 1, pp. 7–10[81]), there is little in the way of explicit interest in this concept in the late seventh or early eighth centuries, and there is no evidence of a Francus. But from the second quarter of the eighth century the Trojan origin of the Franks springs to life again.[82] In 727 we have the appearance of the *Liber historiae Francorum* and its famous account of the origins of the Frankish people in the Trojans who fled from Troy with Priam and Antenor (*LHF* 1–4; MGH SRM 2:241–4 = Klippel no. 2, pp. 10–12). Here, however, there is no eponymous founder: after a battle against the Alans "emperor Valentinian" gives them the name Franks, which means *ferus* ("fierce") in Greek.[83] This idea of a link with Troy was taken up and promoted by Charlemagne. While he was living in Francia with Charlemagne between roughly 782 and 786, Paul the Deacon was asked by the king to compose an epitaph for his sister Rothaide, who had died young, perhaps in the 750s.[84] In that epitaph he referred to her great-great-grandfather Ansegis (602–685), calling him Anchises (the father of Aeneas): "Ast abauus Anschisa potens, qui ducit ab illo / Troiano Anschisa longo post tempore nomen" (*Gesta episcoporum Mettensium* 10; MGH SS 2:265.47–48). With this cue, Paul noted in his *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium*, written ca. 783, "[Arnulfus] . . . duos filios procreauit, id est Anschisum et Chlodulfum; cuius Anschisi nomen ab Anchise patre Aeneae, qui a Troia in Italiam olim uenerat, creditur esse deductum. Nam gens Francorum, sicut a ueteribus est traditum, a Troiana prosapia trahit exordium" (8; MGH SS 2:164.37–40). In his *History of the Lombards*, written in the 790s after his return to Italy, Paul included the following historical note on Ansegis: "Hoc tempore aput Gallias in Francorum regnum Anschis, Arnulfi filius, qui de nomine Anschise quondam Troiani creditur appellatus, sub nomine maioris domui gerebat principatum" (*Hist. Lang.* 6.23, MGH SS rer. Germ. 48:221–22; all the above = Klippel no. 5, pp. 14–15). In ca. 790, with a Virgilian allusion, the poet Hibernicus exul addressed the Franks as "O gens regalis, pro-

[81] Maria Klippel, *Die Darstellung der Fränkischen Trojanersage in Geschichtsschreibung und Dichtung vom Mittelalter bis zur Renaissance in Frankreich* (Marburg, 1936).

[82] The background is well set out by Eugen Ewig, "Troiamythos und fränkische Frühgeschichte," in *Die Franken und die Alemannen bis zur "Schlacht bei Zülpich" (496/97)*, ed. Dieter Geuenich, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde 19 (Berlin, 1998), 1–30.

[83] The origin of this etymology was no doubt Isidore, who wrote ca. 635, "Franci a quodam proprio duce uocari putantur. Alii eos a feritate morum nuncupatos existimant. Sunt enim in illis mores inconditi, naturalis ferocitas animorum" (*Etymologiae* 9.2.101).

[84] Pippin married Bertrada in the mid-740s and died in 768. Their children with known birth dates were born between 748 and 759, so Rothaide's birth probably occurred in the 750s.

fecta a moenibus altis Troiae" (*Carm.* 2, MGH Poetae latini 1:398.85–86 = Klippel no. 6, p. 15). The details of this were later confused, and a genealogy of Charlemagne from an eleventh-century manuscript could state that "Franco" was the son of Anchises (and therefore, presumably, the brother of Aeneas), "Anchises exiens de Troia genuit Franconem, a quo Franci nomen sumpserunt" (MGH SS 13:243 n. 2; not in Klippel). So right around the time of the translation of George's chronograph, the Franks' links with Troy were again being promoted in a very public way.

The most important accounts of the Franks' Trojan origins for the *Chron. Scal.*, however, are the *Cosmographia* of Aethicus Ister (a pseudonym) and the *Historia Daretis Frigii de origine Francorum* (Dares Phrygius also being a pseudonym). They provide glimpses of another story that was current in the eighth century but unfortunately does not otherwise survive. The *Cosmographia* is the work of an unknown author during the second quarter to middle of the eighth century, perhaps written in Bobbio.[85] Within this complicated work there is a short account of how Romulus slew Numitor, founded Rome, and captured central and eastern Europe and Gaul through bloody conquest. Within this narrative appear Francus and Vassus, the last of Trojan royalty (*regia prosapia*), who are attacked and defeated by Romulus in a second sack of Troy. They enter into a treaty with the Albans ("Francus et Vassus foeda apud Albanos patrauerant"), the inhabitants of Albania, which is said to lie beyond the Danube, but are again severely defeated by the Romans and forced to retreat north through Raetia, beyond the Meotidan swamps to Germany, where they found a city called Sichambria (*Cosmographia* 102–3a = Klippel no. 3, pp. 12–14). These latter details were taken from the *LHF*, though Germania is substituted for the Tanais River. Romulus then conquers Istria and Albania with a great bloody slaughter on both sides (103b).[86] Nothing is said about the Franks in this account, though the parallel with the *LHF* proves that Francus is to be taken as the eponymous founder of the Frankish race.

Soon after 751 a continuation was added to the chronicle of Fredegarius by Childebrand, perhaps uncle of King Pippin III, who made numerous changes to the entire text, including reorganizing it from five books to three. The most important of these changes for our purposes was the interpolation of the *Historia de origine Francorum* following Fredegarius's discussion of the Trojan War.[87] The *Historia* is a highly condensed ver-

[85] See Herren, *Cosmography* (n. 61 above), xxxi–xxxii, lv–lxxviii.

[86] Herren, *Cosmography*, 202–4.

[87] For Childebrand and his new edition of Fredegarius, which may even have been retitled *Historia uel gesta Francorum* and was ca. 768 continued by Childebrand's son, see Collins, *Fredegar* (n. 61 above), 91, 112–17, and Collins, *Fredegar-Chroniken*,

sion of an existing text usually known under the name of the *De excidio Troiae* and supposedly written by an eyewitness, Dares Phrygius, and it simply tells the story of the Trojan War. This Frankish version, however, continues the story, relying heavily on Jerome's *Chronici canones* (or perhaps more likely the condensed version of Jerome found in Fredegarius, *Chron.* 2.9–16), and it gives us another glimpse of the story of Francus and Vassus, which is found in Aethicus Ister, though with a greater supporting account. After the fall of Troy, Aeneas, with Cassandra and his entire family, comes to the *Albanorum fines*, founds the *praesidium Albanorum* where Rome now is and settles there. (Clearly the author has jumped a generation here and attributes to Aeneas the deeds of his son, Ascanius, who founded Alba Longa). Aeneas was cruel, impious, and proud, and was struck down by God with a thunderbolt (a description actually taken from Aremulus, an Alban king noted by Jerome). He was succeeded by his son, Iulius Proculus. Dares then "returns" to his account of Pherecides, who has not been mentioned before. Pherecides begat "a second" Frigio (*alius Frigio*, later called *Frigio iunior*), who conquered the neighboring territories as far as the *Dalmaciae fines*. Frigio begat the twins Francus and Vassus, who took up power upon the death of their father. Returning to the Julian family, the author notes the accession of Aventinus Silvius, *proximus eius*, who reigned for twenty-seven years, Proquas Silvius, who reigned for twenty-four years, Amulius Silvius, who reigned for forty-four years, and Numitor, who had been exiled by his brother Amulius. The rest of the account follows the events that lead up to the birth of Romulus and Remus and their eventual overthrow of Amulius *aput Albam* (the first mention of its name), though oddly they are never named (MGH SRM 2:199–200 = Klippel no. 4, p. 14). Again, nothing is said about a link between Francus and the Franks apart from the title of the work. This section on Francus has all the hallmarks of an insertion from another work, referring back to Pherecides, who has not been mentioned before; calling Frigio *alius* and *iunior* (thus implying a *primus* and *senior* Frigio); and interrupting the flow of the underlying narrative: Aventinus is said to be *proximus eius* but that would seem to refer not to Francus in the previous paragraph but to Iulius Proculus in the paragraph before that.

There is also a short account preserved in a twelfth-century Bonn manuscript (Bonn University Library 402) that contains texts from the late eighth and early ninth centuries (the latest being Einhard's *Life of*

4–7, 82–145. For the insertion point, see Fredegarius, *Chron.* 2.4, MGH SRM 2:45. See also the separate edition of this *Historia* of Dares by Gaston Paris in *Romania* 3 (1874): 129–44.

Charlemagne of the 820s and Thegan's *Acts of Emperor Louis* of 837), which strongly indicates that this account must be of the same date, placed as it is between the decrees of Charlemagne of 779 and a version of the *Lex Salica Carolina* of 803. This short account, entitled "Origo Francorum," combines the basics of the *LHF* and Fredegarius with the story that lies behind the *Historia* and the *Cosmographia* to produce a composite version, in which it is explicitly stated of Francus, "unde et Franci appellati sunt" (MGH SRM 7:528; not in Klippel). In this account the genealogy runs: Frigius (who marries a relative of Priam), Trofimus, Cassandra, Ascanius, Ilius, Frigius, Francus, and Bassus. Here for the first time we can understand the references in the *Historia* to the *alius Frigio* and *Frigio iunior*. Francus is here the great-grandson of Ascanius, just as he is in the *Chron. Scal.* The Ilius of this text is the Pherecides of Dares, who does not mention any connection between Aeneas or Cassandra and Pherecides.

The author of this late eighth- or perhaps early ninth-century account, "Aethicus," and "Dares" would appear to be witnesses to a story that was prevalent in the second half of the eighth century that has otherwise not survived. There seems to be no further reference to it. It was knowledge of stories like these, which originated and were being promoted at exactly the time the *Chron. Scal.* was being translated, that prompted the translator to substitute Francus for an Alban king, though because of the corruption of the list we cannot tell which one.

So the *Chron. Scal.* gives us another small glimpse at an obscure and idiosyncratic eighth-century account that somehow linked Francus, the eponymous founder of the Frankish people, not only with the Trojans but with the kings of Alba Longa. How this story grew up, and when, we do not know, but once again Lowe's dating of the manuscript is confirmed, since it places the *Chron. Scal.* right in the middle of a new public zeal for linking the Franks with the Trojans and the early Trojan settlers of Italy, an interest that simply did not exist in the late seventh and early eighth centuries.

The list of the Spartan kings provides an interesting parallel for the addition of Francus. Immediately following the Alban and Roman king lists in section two appear the Spartan and Corinthian king lists (304–6). The name of the eleventh and last Spartan king, "Automedus" (304.21) derives from the following Corinthian list, where Automenus is the twelfth and last king (306.18).[88] In the same way that Tarquinius,

[88] See, e.g., Martin Wallraff with Umberto Roberto, Karl Pinggéra, and William Adler, *Iulius Africanus Chronographiae: The Extant Fragments*, GCS NF 15 (Berlin, 2007), 173 n. 8.

the last Roman king, was shifted into the Alban king list ("Tarcinius," 302.10 and 24; cf. 242.6 and 244.5–6), Automenus was shifted into the preceding list. In both cases it would seem to be the fault of the Greek exemplar.

The Spartan list is more famous, however, for its apparent inclusion of Menelaus ("Cemenelaus") as the seventh Spartan king (304.17). He does not appear in any other list, not even the list in the *Chron. Gol.* (IVv, p. 43), which is the nearest surviving relative we have to the *Chron. Scal.* It has been rather cleverly suggested by Ball that "Cemenelaus" is not a translation mistake for καὶ Μενέλαος — as Scaliger suggested and has been accepted ever since but makes no sense in the context[89] — but rather hides the name of Cemenelum, modern Cimiez, a city on the south coast of France, once the capital of Alpes maritimae, home to the monastery of St. Pontius, which at the time the *Chron. Scal.* was being translated had recently been founded by Syagrius, bishop of Nice (d. 787) and nephew of Pippin III (not Charlemagne, as is often stated), and today is just a neighborhood of Nice.[90] The adjective from the noun is *Cemeneleus*, and it simply seems to have been modified to make it look Spartan — it has been added in between "Agisilaus" and "Archelaus" — and to have been added in the same spirit that had just prompted the addition of Francus to the Alban list. That the adjective looks like "Menelaus" is no doubt simply a coincidence: he is mentioned in the chronograph only once, at 246.14, where he is listed with "Agamomnus," "Achilleus" and "quanti alli Danei," and we have already seen that the translator knew little or nothing about the Greek past. As a result, we can probably posit some connection between Cimiez and our translator.

[89] See Wallraff et al., *Iulius Africanus*, 173 n. 7, who quotes this list as a fragment of Africanus (F58). The facts, first, that the Spartan king list starts about eighty years after the Trojan War, so Menelaus cannot ever have been a part of the list, even though he was a Spartan king — cf. Eusebius, *Chron. can.* 59[l] (Menelaus), 61 (capture of Troy), and 66 (the first Spartan king) — and, second, that there is no other suggestion in any ancient source that a Menelaus was ever king with Agesilaus are sufficient grounds to give one pause, but the clinching argument is that both kings have separate regnal years and numbers, which proves it cannot be a joint reign and therefore the "Ce-" cannot be hiding a vowel-shifted καί: cf. 290.15 for the reign of Atreus and Thyestes and 326–28 for the numerous examples in the list of Roman emperors where joint rulers have a single number and single set of regnal years.

[90] R. Ball, "'Menelaos' in the Spartan Agiad King-list," *Classical Quarterly*, n.s. 27 (1977): 312–16.

Modern Analyses

Having established the above facts and hypotheses concerning the Latin text of Paris. lat. 4884 and its Greek original, we must now turn to the most recent analyses of these texts and evaluate them in light of the above. Apart from Lowe's new dating, nothing new has been said about these texts since the end of the nineteenth century, and as a result it is surprising to find two new studies produced so close together in time.

In 2001 Pier Franco Beatrice concluded that the *Chron. Scal.* was in fact the last section of a work usually known under the name of the *Tübingen Theosophy*. The *Theosophy* originally comprised four books that were a sort of appendix to a seven-book text known as Περὶ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως (*On the Correct Faith*). The second part of the fourth book of the addition — as we know from a summary that prefaces the text of an epitome of the *Theosophy* in the sole surviving Tübingen manuscript — contained

> χρονικὸν συντομώτατον . . . ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ ἕως τῶν Ζήνωνος χρόνων, ἐν ᾧ καὶ διισχυρίζεται μετὰ τὴν συμπλήρωσιν τοῦ ἑξακισχιλιαστοῦ ἔτους γενήσεσθαι τὴν συντέλειαν. (*Epit.* 2.15–18; Beatrice, *Theosophia* [n. 2 above], 3)

> an extremely brief chronicle . . . from Adam to Zeno, in which it is affirmed that the end of the world will occur after the completion of the six thousandth year.

Beatrice identifies this chronicle with the Greek original (or a close relative) of the *Chron. Scal.* His reasons for doing so are weak.

First of all, of the *Chron. Scal.* Beatrice says, "it reached Anastasius' reign . . . at precisely the time in which the *Theosophy* was composed" (Beatrice, *Theosophia*, xix). But the *Theosophy*'s chronicle went down to Zeno (i.e., between 476 and 491), not the death of Anastasius (518), and as we saw above the complete text of the *Chron. Scal.* continued down into the reign of Justinian. It is just the emperor list that stops with Anastasius.

Second, he states that the *Chron. Scal.* "placed the Incarnation of the Lord in the year 5500, exactly as the author of the Theosophy does" (ibid.). However, as Beatrice admits (xxxviii), this was a very common chronological belief at the time and can tell us nothing about the relationship of these two works.[91] And while the *Chron. Scal.* does mention

[91] See, for example, Cyril Mango, *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome* (London, 1980), 192, who says, "all the early Christian and Byzantine systems, except that of Eusebius, attempt to come as closely as possible to this figure," and "Chronology," in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. Alexander P. Kazhdan (Oxford, 1991),

the year 5500 once (338.15–16[92]), it says nothing about the end of the world or the year 6000, which is understandable since five hundred years from the birth of Christ was generally calculated to arrive in the mid- to late 490s, which was a plausible date for the end of the world for an author writing during the reign of Zeno (476–91), but completely meaningless for someone writing during the reign of Justinian I (527–65).

Third, Beatrice notes that both texts are aware of the *Proteuangelium Iacobi*, which is quoted extensively in the *Chron. Scal.* (see appendix one) and the title of which is apparently cited in the summary of the Tübingen manuscript (*Epit.* 4) (*ibid.*). However, as J. K. Elliott states, this apocryphal gospel "is one of the most important and influential of the apocryphal gospels" and "the influence of PJ was immense." Over one hundred Greek manuscripts survive and it was translated into Syriac, Ethiopic, Georgian, Sahidic, Old Church Slavonic, Armenian, Arabic, and Latin.[93] That the authors of two Greek texts of the fifth or sixth century should have been aware of this apocryphal text is hardly surprising. However, it must be stated that there is no actual evidence for the use of this work in any surviving fragment of the *Theosophy*; there is only the citation of a title that is taken by Beatrice, not unproblematically, to refer to the *Proteuangelium*.

Fourth, Beatrice claims that the "'telegraphic' style" of the *Barb. Scal.* fits the description of the chronicle as being συντομώτατον (*ibid.*). A "telegraphic style" is one of the definitions of a chronicle, so this is a complete nonstarter for distinguishing one chronicle from another. The adjective simply means that the original chronicle was very short, though we do not know in relation to what. Something the length of the *Chron. Scal.* is very short in comparison to Eusebius's *Chronici canones,* but very long in comparison to the epitome of his own short chronicle that Isidore included in his *Etymologiae*.

Finally, Beatrice points out "the revealing fact that in both we meet the same characters and the same authors" (*ibid.*). Again, this means nothing since a chronograph would be expected to name important figures and influential authors of the past. But there are important differences: we are dealing with only a small overlap between two larger groups of names, and the contexts for those names are completely dif-

---

1:449, "All Byz. era calculations were based on . . . the world era of Julius Africanus (Incarnation in 5500)."

[92] This is in section three. *Lib. gen. II* 148 (Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, 131) likewise reports 5,500 as the number of years between Adam and the birth of Christ, while *Lib. gen. I* 313–15 has a total of 5502 (5738 – 206 – 30 = 5502), but the *Chron. Scal.* makes no reference to either in its version of the *Lib. gen.* (section one).

[93] J. K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford, 1993), 48.

ferent: in the *Chron. Scal.* they are either floruits of famous writers and philosophers (like Anaxagoras, Thucydides, Demosthenes, and Menander) or source references (like Manetho, Euripides, Africanus, and Porphyry); in the *Theosophy* they are sources for quotations (like Plato, Iamblichus, Hermes, Pindar, and Euripides).

There is nothing in Beatrice's arguments to link the lost chronicle of the Tübingen *Theosophy* and the *Chron. Scal.*, and he does admit that it is nothing more than his opinion (lvii–lviii).

In 2011, and repeated in his book of 2012, Benjamin Garstad outlines the following hypotheses. The original Greek chronograph was completed in Alexandria soon after 412. Somewhere between 536 and 539 this text was recopied in Alexandria with an extension of the Roman emperor list down to Anastasius (to make it "more or less up to date") and the additions of the Italian digression, the section on Alexander, and the name Francus in the list of Alban kings. The resulting text was presented as a gift from Justinian to the Frankish king Theudebert I in an attempt to win him over to the Byzantine side in a planned invasion of Italy and to help him convert pagans on his borders. The Euhemeristic Italian digression was "a derogatory description of the gods [that] would . . . bolster the Christian convictions of the Frankish king, at least, and trickle down to his subjects," while the section describing Alexander the Great was "a veiled call upon Theudebert to the pious pursuit of military glory in emulation of Alexander," and the addition of Francus was intended to "unite the Franks and [Byzantine] Romans by bonds of blood and common ancestry." After the failure of the Byzantine effort against Italy, the book remained ignored in Gaul until at some date during the first half of the eighth century, when the Franks were converting "the heathen Germans beyond the Rhine," it was recognized that because the Picus-Zeus and Faunus-Hermes passages in the Italian digression had a "polemical anti-pagan purpose and a number of resonances with Germanic myth" (such as hippomancy), this book would be useful for missionary and conversion work, especially among the Saxons, and so it was translated into Latin in Corbie. But the work was never finished and its later history is a blank.[94]

We have already seen that three fundamental aspects of this reconstruction must be false: the text as we have it was composed no earlier than the 530s, Francus is an addition that can only have been made

[94] Garstad, "Barbarian Interest" (n. 5 above), esp. 25, 39–40, and Garstad, *Alexandrian World Chronicle* (n. 5 above), xviii–xix, xxii–xxiii, xxv–xxxiv. See also Benjamin Garstad, "The *Excerpta Latina Barbari* and the 'Picus-Zeus narrative,'" *Jahrbuch für internationale Germanistik* 34 (2002): 259–313. See also appendix three below.

in Gaul during the second half of the eighth century, and the manuscript dates to the 770s or 780s. Furthermore, there is no reason why an emperor list that originally ended with Arcadius, the last emperor to die before 412, would be updated in the 530s under Justinian only to Anastasius, who died in 518. That is not "up to date."

The major difficulty in presenting an argument against the remainder of Garstad's reconstruction is that not a single example of proof is offered for any of it. We are presented with a series of suppositions in which short passages of the text are presented as being applicable to certain historical events and are then incorporated into a narrative reconstruction of those events. Apart from Francus, there is nothing in the text itself to suggest that any of Garstad's "additions" do not belong to the original Greek text, and there is nothing to connect either the Greek or Latin text as a whole with Theudebert, Byzantine interests in Gaul or Italy, or with Frankish proselytizing.

Summary and Conclusion

At some time during the reign of either Zeno (476–91) or Justin I (518–27) an illustrated historical compendium was assembled in Alexandria. It was made up of two disparate sections: 1) what can be called the *Chronographia Alexandrina*, a heavily augmented and truncated recension of the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων/*Liber generationis*, to which was added a continuous *annus mundi* chronology, the Italian digression, and a conclusion derived from lists of Persian and Alexandrian kings and Jewish high priests, with a large digression on Alexander the Great. The *Chronicon Paschale*, the *Anonymus Matritensis*, and the *Annales* of Eutychius are all witnesses to the original version of this Alexandrian chronograph. And 2) a short collection of regnal lists deriving (ultimately) from the *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus, probably with many changes and substitutions of lists from other sources. The addition of this section was prompted by the various lists, regnal and otherwise, at the end of of the Συναγωγή/*Lib. gen.* Like the original Συναγωγή/*Lib. gen.* this new text ended with a list of Roman emperors.

At some time in the 530s or later, a third section was added, a Greek translation of Latin consularia that had been combined with some form of local Alexandrian chronicle as well as excerpts from the *Proteuangelium Iacobi*, New Testament, and other material. No doubt at least some of these additions were made by the compiler of the *Chronographia Scaligeriana* himself, particularly the death and accession notices for each emperor, which were derived from the emperor list at the end of section two. This emperor list was not updated. The late sixth-century *Chro-*

nographia Golenischevensis is a witness to this tripartite text. A list of sources and witnesses can be found in appendix one.

Around the middle of the eighth century a two-hundred-year-old copy of this illustrated manuscript came into the hands of George, bishop of Ostia and Amiens between ca. 767 and 798, who left it to the monastery library in Corbie in ca. 780. By then it was seriously damaged, having lost a few quires from the back of the codex. It was then translated into Latin by a Frankish or Gaulish monk, perhaps with ties to Cimiez in the south. This monk knew Latin and Greek but both as second languages and neither was particularly strong. He produced the best translation he could with his limited knowledge and resources. This translation was copied into a Latin codex that was an exact copy of the Greek text in its layout and format, perhaps to act as a translation guide to the illustrated Greek original. Over the following decades the connection to George was still remembered, and his name was added to the first page of the manuscript; but years later someone who had read Isidore's *De uiris illustribus* and later noticed the close parallels between the *Chron. Scal.* and Isidore's description of the chronicle of Victor Tunnunensis thought that the text was more likely to be the work of the latter (misremembered as Turonensis, "of Tours") and that name was added to the first page. As a result, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries it was catalogued as "Victor's chronicle." The manuscript next appears in Paris ca. 1575 in the possession of Claude Dupuy.

Carl Frick's 1892 introduction and edition should have resulted in an intensified study of the *Chron. Scal.* But the earlier appearance that year of Theodore Mommsen's own *Chronica minora* volume in the massive and authoritative *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* series, which has never gone out of print, meant that Frick's volume one was the last of the series, went out of print, and was on the whole forgotten along with the *Chron. Scal.*, since Mommsen did not include an edition of it in his three-volume series, only of two of its three parts (and not even all of part one), and he produced no study of the work itself. He was interested only in its sources (the *Liber generationis* and the *Consularia Italica*). Almost 140 years later Schoene's 1875 edition remains the best, even though it suffers from a few misreadings and typographical errors, and no edition based on the manuscript has been published since.[95]

[95] Schoene, *Eusebi Chronicorum* (n. 10 above). The errors that appear in the consularia section of Schoene's edition (the only section I have collated) are as follows, where the number is Mommsen's entry number, the first citation is the manuscript reading, and the second is Schoene's: 11 Caesar] Cesar; 49 Seuero] Seuerio; 68 mihi] mei (this has been taken over from Scaliger's edition); 86 Zacharias] Zaxarias; 90 Cuntilliano] Cyntilliano; 100 Symonem] Symeonem; 104, 173, 184 IIII] IV (it is in

Lowe's new dating for the manuscript, confirmed and refined by later studies, is the most important advance in the study of the text since Frick's edition but has been generally ignored. Such is the tralatitious inertia of Schoene's and Mommsen's verdicts. The time has come for a new study of the *Chron. Scal.* and I hope that the above analysis will provide a basis and impetus for it.

University of Ottawa

these three entries, and these three only, that the manuscript's IIII is written as IV); 112 babtizatus] baptizatus; 162 agusto] augusto; 205 nobile] nobili; 246 Constante] Costante; 252 Constantio] Constantino; 253 Constantio] Constantino; 264 Constantio] Constantino; 269 anno] anni; and 307 Hadriano] Adriano.

Appendix One. General Survey of Sources and Parallels

Ultimate sources are marked ¶. The remainder of citations are witnesses to a common source.

Section One (184.1–280.13)

¶Συναγωγὴ χρόνων/*Liber generationis*[96]
184.1–258.14 = Mommsen, *Chron. min.* 91–127 = §§1–293 ("*Chron[ica] Alex[andrina]*")

¶*Vetus Testamentum*

Chron. Scal.	*VT*
186.19–188.24 (= Mommsen, §13)	Gen. 6:1–4, 11–14; 7:5–6, 12, 17, 21–23; 8:13
190.16–192.11 (22)	Gen. 10:32–11:9

¶Ps.-Callisthenes[97]

Chron. Scal.	Ps.-Callisthenes
266.22–268.2	1.3.1–3
270.24–274.7	3.33.11, 14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 23
274.12–26	3.35

¶Claudius Ptolemaeus, *Canon*
276.5–6, 11–12, 17–18, 23–24, 26–27; 278.1–2, 5–6, 9–10, 15–16, 19–20, 24–25; 280.1–3

¶Julius Africanus[98]

Chron. Scal.	*Chronographiae*
228.6–9 (235)†	F36.1–2 (p. 84); F56.10–12 (p. 168)

[96] See n. 13 above.

[97] Wilhelm Kroll, *Historia Alexandri Magni (Pseudo-Callisthenes)*, vol. 1, *Recensio uetusta* (Berlin, 1958).

[98] Here and below passages from the *Chron. Scal.* that are quoted by Wallraff et al. (*Iulius Africanus* [n. 88 above]) as a primary witness to Africanus are noted with an asterisk next to both Frick's page numbers and Wallraff's fragment/testimonium references. Those that are quoted as secondary witnesses just below the main text under the heading "Exc. Barb." are marked with an obelus. See in particular the short account of the *Chron. Scal.* as a witness to Africanus in Wallraff et al., *Iulius Africanus*, xxxvi–xxxviii. The major starting point for the study of the *Chron. Scal.* and Africanus is Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus* (n. 2 above), 2:316–29 as well as 1:41, 44, 96, 104, 118–19, 177–78, 258 n. 4; Italian digression: 1:82–83, 224–28, 235, 239–45; king lists: 1:137–60, 191–204, 209–22, 272 n. 2, 275–76; 2:55–56. However, Gelzer had no established methodology for making source attributions and proceeded with an unwarranted certainty of approach that led from demonstrable proof to plausible supposition to possibility to outright guesswork. He never faced up to the fact that most minor Byzantine historiography was anonymous (and therefore

228.12–15 (235)†	F56.2–5 (p. 168)
234.13–14 (255)†	T39b.1–3 (p. 88)
234.25–236.22, 238.3–5	F24 (pp. 54–56)
254.3–6 (280)†	F64a (p. 186)
258.1–5 (291)†	T77a.2–4 (pp. 232–34)
260.27–28, 262.14–15, 18–19, 23–24, 28–264.1, 20–25, 266.1–2, 16–17, 21–22, 268.12–15 (301, 305, 307, 310, 312)	F73 (pp. 224–28)
264.13–15 (315)†	F79 (p. 238)
264.16–18†	F78 and 78a (p. 236)
266.4–5, 13–14*	F81b* (p. 244)

¶Eusebius, *Chronici canones*[99]
266.5–13, 268.4–5 = 109^{p}–115^{d}[100]

Chronicon Paschale and Eutychius, *Annales*[101]
184.1–280.3 = Frick, *Chron. min.* xc–clvii.

---

without authorial authority), tralatitious, and the result of frequent compilation and recompilation from multiple sources. See particularly the comments of Wallraff et al., *Iulius Africanus*, liv–lv and Alden A. Mosshammer, *The* Chronicle *of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg, PA, 1979), 147–48. For an early understanding of the use of Africanus by the compiler of the *Chron. Scal.* see Frick, *Chron. min.*, clxv–clxxi, cxci–cci.

[99] Rudolf Helm, ed., *Die Chronik des Hieronymus: Hieronymi Chronicon*, 3rd ed., GCS, Eusebius Werke 7 (Berlin, 1984). No doubt there are other interpolations from Eusebius that have not yet been identified.

[100] Sophocles, 109^{p}; Heraclitus, 111^{c}; Anaxagoras, 111^{d}; Herodotus, 113^{c}; Melissus, 113^{d}; Euripides and Protagoras, 113^{e}; Socrates, labeled incorrectly as a "rhetor" as a result of 114^{e}, "Socrates plurimo sermone celebratur" (probably not "Isocrates rhetor" from 117^{d} or 119^{f}, since those entries are out of sequence for this block of names); Phidias, 113^{g}; Theaetetus, 114^{b}; Democritus and Hippocrates, 114^{d} (perhaps copied from previous reign: see *Anon. Matr.* 36.15–37.2; for which, see n. 102); Thucydides, 115^{b}; Empedocles, Gorgias, Zeno, and Parmenides, 114^{d}; Socrates (copied from previous reign — see *Anon. Matr.* 36.16–37.1 — and not from Eusebius, but located here because of 114^{e}); Pericles, 115^{c}; Eupolis and Aristophanes, 115^{d}. The parallels found in the *Anon. Matr.* for this sequence of interpolations (listed below) prove that Alden A. Mosshammer was correct when he claimed that all these names, assigned by Gelzer to Africanus (*Sextus Julius Africanus* [n. 2 above], 1:177–78), and still assigned to Africanus by Wallraff without comment (F81b), were an interpolation from Eusebius (*The* Chronicle *of Eusebius*, 151–53).

[101] The *Chronicon Paschale* is a Greek chronicle written ca. 630. See Ludwig Dindorf, ed., *Chronicon Paschale*, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae (Bonn, 1832) and Michael and Mary Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale, 284–628 AD*, Translated Texts for Historians 7 (Liverpool, 1989). The *Naẓm al-jawhar* — usually called the *Annales* in English — of Eutychius patriarch of Alexandria, is an Arabic chronicle that extended from Adam down to 935. See *Das Annalenwerk des Eutychios von Alexandrien; ausgewählte Geschichten und Legenden kompiliert von Saʿīd ibn Baṭrīq um 935 AD*, ed. M. Breydy, CSCO 471–72 (Louvain, 1985). See Frick, *Chron. min.*,

Anonymus Matritensis[102]	
Chron. Scal.	*Anon. Matr.*
222.4–5 (214)	8.6–7, 8.12–9.1
224.10–12 (224)	11.15, 12.6–8
228.6–8 (235) + 296.10–11	14.8–11
230.3–5 (238) + 234.23 + 296.11	13.5–7 + 14.14–15[103]
230.15–19 (241) + 230.27–28 (244)	14.18–15.4
232.26 (252)	16.4
234.8–11 (254)	16.7–9
234.16 (256) + 246.15–16	18.1–2 + 18.4–6
248.19–20 (267)	20.1–2
254.3–4	23.4–5
254.16 (283)	25.2–3
262.9–10 (304)	30.2–3
264.10–11 (314)	36.1–2
264.24–25, 27–28 + 266.11–12 + 268.6	36.15–37.2
266.16–17, 268.6–7	37.8, 12
Chronographia Golenischevensis[104]	
202.26–204.8 + n. 5 (125–26)	IIr (p. 29)
203 n. 24 (123 n. 1)	IIv (p. 29)
Malalas[105]	
224.10–14 (224)	3.13.20–21,[106] 4.1.3, 4.2.17–19
228.6–16 (235)	4.3.29–30, 31–32, 33–34, 38

lxxxix–xc, cxc–cxcv, cxcviii–cxcix, cciii. He refers to this common source as the *Chronicon mundi Alexandrinum* and to the author as the *Chronographus Alexandrinus*.

[102] Adolf Bauer, ed., *Anonymi Chronographia syntomos e codice Matritensi no. 121 (nunc 4701)* (Leipzig, 1909). The parallels for the list of Jewish high priests appear below under section two. For the close connections between the *Anon. Matr.* and Africanus, see Wallraff et al., *Iulius Africanus*, 1. Parallels to the *Anon. Matr.* are noted in T16m*, T28b†, T36†, F73†, F81b, F87, F89†, F95, F96† (using the symbols * and † as noted above). Africanus (and Eusebius) are named at 3.9–4.1. The slightly corrupted synchronism of the first year of Moses and the flood of Ogyges (11.16–12.8) provides further evidence that the ultimate source of these additions was Julius Africanus.

[103] See Frick, *Chron. min.*, clxviii–clxix.

[104] See above, n. 8.

[105] Ioannes Thurn, ed., *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 35 (Berlin, 2000). This is only a hint of the many parallels to be found in Malalas (see nn. 109 and 113 below). See also the more detailed parallels below for the Italian digression.

[106] The parallel with the *Chron. Scal.* here shows that Malalas or his source has skipped the Athenians and Beloch: "Eretheus Athineis regnauit, Hilochus autem Assyriis regnauit, Petessonsius autem Farao in Egypto" = ἐβασίλευσεν τῶν Ἀσσυρίων Ἐρεχθεύς, τῶν δὲ Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσεν Πετισσώνιος. See Frick, *Chron. min.*, clxviii.

230.5–6 (238) 4.5.46–47[107]
270.20–23, 274.12–17 8.3.63–68

Italian digression (234.22–246.6)
Frick, *Chron. min.*, pp. clxxi–clxxxv[108]
234.22–238.19 = Malalas 1.8–11, 13, 15[109] = Africanus F24 (pp. 52–56); see also Eusebius, *Chronographia*, Karst, p. 136.7–10/ Syncellus, *Chronographia* 200.14–17[110]
236.18–19 = *Breviarium Vindobonense*, p. 143.4–5[111]
238.22–240.11 = Malalas 6.16.35–44 and 18 = *Breviarium*, p. 143.9–10 = Syncellus, *Chron.* 200.9–10
238.20–22 = *Breviarium*, p. 143.6–8 = Eusebius, *Chron.*, Karst, p. 136.10–12/Syncellus, *Chron.* 200.17–19
240.12–16 = *Breviarium*, p. 143.10–12
240.16–17 = *Breviarium*, p. 143.13 = Eusebius, *Chron.*, Karst, p. 136.16–17/Syncellus, *Chron.* 200.24–25
240.18 and 300.23–24 = Malalas 6.24.88
240.20–21 = *Breviarium*, p. 143.14
240.20–25 = Malalas 6.25, 29
240.23–25, 242.1–9 = 302.3–13 = *Breviarium*, p. 143.16–29

---

[107] See Frick, *Chron. min.*, clxviii.

[108] For some unknown reason Frick quotes the early parallels from the *Chronicon Paschale* (which used Malalas as a source).

[109] See *Studies in John Malalas*, ed. Elizabeth Jeffreys, Brian Croke, and Roger Scott, Byzantina Australiensia 6 (Sydney, 1990), 134–35 and 171, 177, 198–99.

[110] Eusebius's *Chronographia* was the first volume of the two-volume work that was his chronicle. The second volume was the better-known *Chronici canones*. The *Chronographia* survives in an Armenian translation and a few fragmentary and secondary Greek witnesses, of which the largest is an anonymous compilation published in *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis*, ed. J. A. Cramer (Oxford, 1839), 2:118–63. For the Armenian translation, see the German translation by Josef Karst in *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen Übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar*, Eusebius Werke 5, GCS 20 (Leipzig, 1911), 1–143. The ninth-century chronography of George Syncellus is also a witness to Eusebius's *Chronographia*. See Alden A. Mosshammer, *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga Chronographica* (Leipzig, 1984).

[111] The *Breviarium Vindobonense* is a potted history of the rulers of the territory that was to become Rome and of Rome itself from Picus to Licinius. It is found in the same Vienna manuscript that contains an important illustrated text of the Chronograph of 354 (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 3416, fols. 62r–65v, 70r) and so has always been considered a part of that work, though apart from its appearance in the Vienna manuscript, which includes other texts that were never a part of the Chron. 354, there is no evidence to support that hypothesis (see Burgess, "The Chronograph of 354" [n. 8 above], 381–87). It appears in Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, 143–48 as part of the Chron. 354 under the title *Chronica urbis Romae*, though it is not a chronicle by any definition of that word, but a *breviarium* or précis history that is little more than an annotated list of kings and emperors (see Burgess, *Roman Imperial Chronology* [n. 79 above], chap. 1).

242.15–244.6 = 302.16–24 = *Breviarium*, pp. 144.2–145.1[112]
244.10–23, 244.27–246.6 = unknown

Section Two (280.14–330.17)

¶Julius Africanus[113]

Chron. Scal.[114]	*Chronographiae*
284.26–286.19* (Early Egyptians)	F43a, c* (pp. 94–96)
286.20–288.3† (Egyptians)	F46 (pp. 100–106)
288.18–292.3* (Argives)	F50* (pp. 132–36)
292.4–296.2* (Sicyonians)	F51a* (pp. 138–44)
296.3–300.12* (Athenians)	F54a* (pp. 148–58)
304.1–24* (Lacedaemonians)	F58a* (pp. 170–72)
304.25–306.22* (Corinthians)	F59a* (pp. 174–76)
306.23–310.24* (Macedonians)	F82* (pp. 244–50)
310.25–312.17* (Lydians)	F63a* (pp. 182–84)
312.18–314.18* (Medes)	F62* (pp. 180–82)
314.19–316.18* (Persians)	F73* (pp. 224–28)
324.11–13 (High priests)[115]	F87 (p. 258)

¶Claudius Ptolemaeus, *Canon*
320.7–18 (Egyptian kings)

¶*Consularia Vindobonensia posteriora*
324.21–22 = 330.14–16 = *Cons. Vind. post.* 20 (Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, 275)

Chronographia Golenischevensis

Chron. Scal.	*Chron. Gol.*
302.23–28 (Albans and Romans)	IVr (p. 43)
304.6–23 (Lacedaemonians)	IVv (p. 43)
310.16–24 (Macedonians)	Vr (p. 48)
312.14–16 (Lydians)	Vv (p. 48)

[112] This concerns the list of kings only. There are no important parallels in the content.

[113] Note also the parallels between this material and Malalas, whose sources would therefore derive from Africanus: Jeffreys et al., *Studies in John Malalas*, 124–38 passim, which treats material from both section one and section two.

[114] I was misled by the analysis of Jacoby into thinking that this section derived almost entirely from Eusebius's *Chronographia* (R. W. Burgess, *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*, Historia Einzelschriften 135 [Stuttgart, 1999], 31–32 n. 11).

[115] The three lists of high priests in the *Chron. Pasch.* closely parallel the source used for the list of high priests in the *Chron. Scal.* There is a parallel between these lists in the *Chron. Pasch.* and Syncellus, who names Africanus as his source, and so Africanus is probably the common source: *Chron. Scal.* 322.19–20 = *Chron. Pasch.* 346.9, 358.1, 391.7† = Africanus F85a (252).

Malalas
330.14–18 9.3.33–37[116]

High Priests[117]
264.14–15, 26–27, 266.4, 18–19, 268.11, 15, 24, 270.1–5, 10, 14–15, 276.7–8, 13–16, 19–22, 25, 28–29, 278.3–4, 7–8, 11–14, 17–18, 21–23, 26–27 (section one) = 320.22–324.13 (section two)
=
Chron. Pasch. 273.6–7, 302.18, 305.11, 310.11, 314.2, 317.15, 319.19, 323.8, 324.14, 325.15, 329.7, 331.7, 334.4, 337.8, 338.14, 339.3–4, 343.18, 345.12–13, 346.9, 349.2–7, 9–10, 350.14–16, 351.4–8, 356.15–358.8, 390.3–391.18
Anon. Matr. 31.13–33.18
Χρονογραφεῖον σύντομον 95.13–36[118]
Eusebius, *Chronographia,* Karst, pp. 60.21–23, 25–26, 28–29; 61.3–8, 11–21
Eusebius, *Chronographia*, Cramer, pp. 158.27–29, 159.4–7, 10–20[119]
Eusebius, *Chronici canones* 104[d], 111[g], 112[i], 122[g], 123[d], 125[h], 127[e], 128[f], 131[h], 132[b], 133[c], 135[d], 139[b], 141, 141[a], 142, 142[d], 144, 144[a, e], 145, 145[e], 146[f], 148, 148[c], 152, 152[f], 153, 153[f], 154[b] =
Eusebius, *Demonstratio euangelica* 8.2.62, 65–66, 69–75, 77
Syncellus, *Chron.* 288.3, 8–9, 16, 22, 298.9, 11, 306.2–4, 314.8–9, 17, 324.30, 325.2, 6–12, 333.20, 22–24, 334.1, (335.5–8, 340.16–19, 347.8), 346.6–10, 24, 347.9, 19–20, 348.17–18, 349.3–4, 353.16–17, 354.20, 355.17–18, 20, 356.11, 25–26, 358.31–32, 359.7, 361.13–14.

---

[116] See Frick, *Chron. min.*, clxxxvi and Jean-Louis Jouanaud, "Barbarus, Malalas et le *bissextus*: pistes de recherche," in *Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas*, ed. Joëlle Beaucamp et al., Monographies du centre de recherche d'histoire et civilization de Byzance 15 (Paris, 2004), 1:165–80.

[117] These two slightly different lists include the high priests as well as the associated historical notes that obviously were a part of the original source. To this group can be added the list in the unpublished manuscript BN, Parisinus graecus 1773, briefly quoted by Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus* (n. 2 above), 2:175 and an unpublished Armenian translation briefly quoted by Bauer-Helm, *Die Chronik* (n. 13 above), 188 ("A"), which is the only other text to mirror the list in section two. Gelzer (2:174), followed by Frick (*Chron. min.*, clxv), Bauer-Helm, *Die Chronik,* 189, and Shaye J. D. Cohen ("Sosates the Jewish Homer," *Harvard Theological Review* 74 [1981]: 391–96 at 394–95) believe that Eusebius's *Demonstratio euangelica* is the source for the *Chron. Scal.*'s list of high priests, but the differences between them and the additional material in the *Chron. Scal.* make this impossible. They are all relying on various altered recensions of the same earlier text, which I believe derived ultimately from Julius Africanus (see Rudolph Helm, "De Eusebii in Chronicorum libro auctoribus," *Eranos* 22 [1924]: 3–40). See also Bauer-Helm, *Die Chronik*, 188–92 and Burgess, "Another Look at Sosates" (n. 22 above), 200–208, 213–14.

[118] Schoene, *Eusebi Chronicorum* (n. 10 above), Appendix IV, 63–102.

[119] See n. 110 above.

Section Three (330.18–370.11)

¶*Consularia Vindobonensia posteriora*[120]
330.20–370.11 = Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, 274–85, 290–98 = §§11–329 ("*Barbarus Scaligeri*")[121]

¶*Nouum Testamentum*

Chron. Scal.	*NT*
334.14 (45)	Luke 1:9–20
336.10 (63)	Luke 1:26–38
336.17–21 (68)	Luke 1:36, 39, 40, 43–44
338.24, 26–340.3 (86)	Matt. 2:2, 3, 11, 16
342.6–12 (100)	Luke 2:26, 28–32
342.20–21 (106)	Matt. 2:14–15
344.1 (110)	John 2:9, 4:46
344.8 (114)	Matt. 17:1–2, Mark 9:1
344.14–16 (117)	Matt. 14:6, 8, 11
344.22–24 (118)	Matt. 26:70, 73, 74; Luke 22:58, John 18:25, 27
346.8–9 (120)	Matt. 27:5

¶*Proteuangelium Iacobi*[122]

Chron. Scal.	*Prot. Iac.*
336.17–21 (68)	12.2 (118, p. 25.2–4, 8–12)
338.10–14 (80)	17.3 (146, p. 37.9)
338.23–340.10 (86)	21.2 (168, pp. 41.15–42a.1), 22.1 (174, pp. 42.15–43.4), 23.1–3 (176–82, pp. 44.7–13, 45.10–12, 45.14–46.1, 46.3–4)

[120] This is the text that Mommsen called the *Fasti Vindobonenses posteriores* (*Chron. min.*, 263–64, 274–82, 284–98, 301–4, 330–34). A new introduction to, text and translation of, and commentary on this work will appear in Burgess and Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time* 2. For the relationship between the *Chron. Scal.* and the *Cons. Vind. post.*, see R. W. Burgess, "'Non duo Antonini sed duo Augusti': The Consuls of 161 and the Origins and Traditions of the Latin Consular *Fasti* of the Roman Empire," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 132 (2000) = *Chronicles, Consuls, and Coins: Historiography and History in the Later Roman Empire* (Farnham, 2011), Paper XV: 259–90, at 260 n. 9, 264 n. 19, 280, and 290; and R. W. Burgess, "The *Passio S. Artemii*, Philostorgius, and the Dates of the Invention and Translations of the Relics of Sts Andrew and Luke," *Analecta Bollandiana* 121 (2003) = *Chronicles, Consuls, and Coins*, Paper XI: 5–36, at 24–28. For a detailed description of what consularia are and how they form a distinct subgenre of chronicles, see Burgess and Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time* (n. 4 above), 1:35–58, 60.

[121] See also Frick, *Chron. min.*, cci–ccx.

[122] Émile de Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques*, Subsidia hagiographica 33 (Brussels, 1961). On this text, see Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus* (n. 2 above), 2:326–28 and Frick, *Chron. min.*, ccviii and the notes at the foot of 337–47.

340.14–21 (91)
342.3–12 (100)

Chronographia Golenischevensis
Chron. Scal.
368.25–370.11

Chronicon Paschale
354.18 (198) = 514.16–17
358.21–23 (228) = 530.19–21

Theophanes, *Chronographia*[123]
370.3–5 (325) = AM 5879, p. 70.

22.3 (174–76, pp. 43.8–15, 44.2–3)
24.3–4 (186–88, p. 48.7–9, 11–13)

Chron. Gol.
VI and VII (pp. 73–74 and 80–81)

[123] *Theophanis Chronographia* 1, ed. Carl de Boor (Leipzig, 1883; repr. Hildesheim, 1963).

Appendix Two. Troy in the *Chronographia Scaligeriana*: A Cautionary Tale

The best-known example of bizarre translation in the *Chron. Scal.* is the fact that the word Ἴλιον, the Greek name for Troy, is translated as a word that is always said to be the Latin word for *sun*, *sol*, which is ἥλιος in Greek. Since there are many references to the building and destruction of the "sun" (i.e., Ilium/Troy) in the *Chron. Scal.*, the translator ends up looking pretty stupid and "barbarus" indeed if he cannot tell the difference between Ἴλιον and ἥλιος. But things are not as they first appear. The problem was first noticed and explained by Scaliger (the origin of most of what I set forth below is from his marginal comments), but since then it has simply been taken as an example of the gross ignorance of the translator. The situation perhaps requires a more subtle approach.

From the late third or early second century BC, Greek began to be affected with what is known as itacism (or iotacism), by which the vowels and diphthongs η, υ, ει, ῃ, οι, and υι all came to be pronounced like ι (*ee* as in *bee* in English).[124] As a result, the first vowels in both Ἴλιον and ἥλιος would be pronounced the same way. So if someone was writing from dictation or reading a text and then writing it down as he repeated it, one word in an oblique (non-nominative) case could easily be written for the other.

That this spelling error could have existed in the original Greek manuscript can easily be proved. At 196.21–23 the *Chron. Scal.* says,

> Sunt autem termina eorum a Midia usque Garirum quod ad aquilonem, laterae autem a fluuio et fluuium usque Mastusias contra solem.

This is a passage that derives from the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων/*Liber generationis*. We can compare what the translator has written with other witnesses to this passage of the Συναγωγή, starting with the *Liber generationis* and the twelfth-century Byzantine historian Cedrenus, a text that unfortunately suffers from a lacuna at the beginning:

> Sunt autem fines eorum a Media ad borram usque Gadiram a Potameda fluuio usque Mastusia ad Ilion (*Lib. gen. I* 86, Mommsen, *Chron. min.* 98).

> ἕως Μαστουσίας τῆς κατὰ Ἴλιον (ed. Immanuel Bekker, *Georgius Cedrenus*, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae [Bonn, 1838], 1:25.8)

On the other hand, the Greek manuscript of the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων, *the Chronicon Paschale* (which derives from the same source as the *Chron. Scal.*, the *Chronographia Alexandrina*), and Syncellus have something a little different:

> ἔστιν δὲ τὰ ὅρια αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Μηδίας ἕως Γαδείρων τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν, εὖρος δὲ ἀπὸ Ποταμίδος ποταμοῦ ἕως Μαστουσίας τῆς κατὰ ἥλιον (Συναγωγὴ

[124] See n. 68 above.

χρόνων 83, Bauer/Helm, *Die Chronik* [n. 13, above], p. 15 = Bauer, "Die Chronik" [n. 13 above], p. 60).

ἔστιν δὲ κατὰ μῆκος τὰ ὅρια αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Μηδίας ἕως Γαδείρων βλέποντα πρὸς βορρᾶν, εὖρος δὲ ἀπὸ Ποταμίδος ποταμοῦ ἕως Μαστουσίας τῆς κατὰ ἥλιον (*Chron. Pasch.* 48.7–9 [n. 101 above]).

ἔστι δὲ κατὰ μῆκος τὰ ὅρια αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Μηδείας ἕως δυτικοῦ Ὠκεανοῦ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν· εὖρος δὲ ἀπὸ Τανάιδος ποταμοῦ ἕως Μαστουσίας τῆς κατὰ ἥλιον (Syncellus 55.6–8 [n. 110 above]).[125]

Syncellus has clearly changed the reference to Gadeira (Gades), the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων and *Chron. Pach.* have the same corruption of Τανάιδος ποταμοῦ that we see in the Latin texts (a result of a partial dittography from ποταμοῦ), and both κατὰ μῆκος and εὖρος have been missed by the translator of *Lib. gen. I.* The former has been missed by the Greek copyists of the *Chron. Scal.* and the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων. Dindorf translates the *Chron. Pasch.* phrase as "ad Mastusiam quae orientem spectat" (*Chron. Pasch.* 48), and Adler and Tuffin translate Syncellus's phrase as "down to Mastousia lying in the East."[126] But "sun" is not the word for "east" in Greek, and that meaning makes no sense, since Mastusia is the southern point of the Thracian Chersonese, so it looks south.[127] Besides, it is hardly "in the east" in Byzantine terms. But it *is* exactly opposite (κατά) Troy, which must be the original text. So obviously, the problem in the *Chron. Scal.* lies not with the translator, but with the fact that every scribe had to be on the lookout for itacism and had to second guess what was written in his source. In the case of the scribes of the manuscripts behind the Συναγωγή, *Chron. Pasch.*, and Syncellus, ΙΛΙΟΝ did not immediately register and it was assumed that it was a mistake for ΗΛΙΟΝ, and so was written that way. Given that both the *Chron. Scal.* and the *Chron. Pasch.* depended upon the same source, we can see that this same hypercorrection must have existed in the *Chronographia Alexandrina* as well. Modern translators, revealing no more stupidity than our translator, translated the word "sun" to the best of their ability. The other "sun" passages in the *Chron. Scal.* are a result of the same problem.

Although we tend to think that "Ilium" in Greek is neuter (Ἴλιον), the masculine ending (Ἴλιος) is not unusual in later Greek (as a search of the online database *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* shows). This must have been the case in the original Greek manuscript of the *Chron. Scal.* as well for Ἴλιος and ἥλιος to have been confused in the nominative as they were.

---

[125] According to Mosshammer's *apparatus criticus*, Ps.-Symeon contains the same text as Syncellus. For Ps.-Symeon, an unpublished *breviarium* found in BN, Parisinus graecus 1712, see Staffan Wahlgren, *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 44/1 (Berlin, 2006), 46*, 87–89*.

[126] William Adler and Paul Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation* (Oxford, 2002), 70.

[127] *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, ed. Richard J. A. Talbert (Princeton, 2000), 51 G4 and 56 C1–2.

The final point to be made here is that although the word used to translate ἥλιος does look like "sun" in the oblique cases — *solem*, 196.23 and *solis*, 240.17, 18, 246.12, 290.18, 20, 22, 300.24 — and is indeed so written in one instance in the nominative (284.9, *confixus est sol*), in its other two appearances the nominative is not *sol* but *solis* (232.26, *solis aedificatus est*; 234.16, *ille solis confixus est*, the *ille* being a translation of the Greek article), which suggests that the author knew it was not *the* sun but the name of someone or something that he did not know and so translated it as *Solis* in the nominative (we have the advantage in English of capitals for such words). We should thus render *Solis* in an English translation with the rather more old-fashioned looking *Sunne* or (like Garstad) "Sun City" to mark this distinction.

When mentioning *Solis* the translator normally uses words that clearly seem to indicate a place or building: *aedificatus est*, 232.26; *desolatio* 240.17, 290.18; *uastatio* 240.18, 300.24; *exterminatio*, 246.12; *deuastatio* 290.20, 22, yet twice he uses the verb *confixus est*, "fasten together, nail, pierce," and, in later Latin, "crucify" (234.16 and 284.9), seemingly to translate the Greek ἥλω, "it was captured," the usual verb that is used to denote the capture of Troy.[128] But Scaliger saw the problem here as well and realized that the translator had confused this third person aorist indicative passive of ἁλίσκομαι with the same form of ἡλόω, ἡλώθη, which is a later Greek verb that means "to nail."[129] We can now confirm that conjecture from the *Anonymus Matritensis*, which has συνέβη τὸ Ἴλιον ἁλῶναι (18.1–2), and the *Chron. Pasch.*, which has τὸ Ἴλιον ἥλω (152.3 and 526.11) for the "ille solis confixus est" in 234.16. So whatever the translator thought *Solis*/*Sol* was, he believed that it had been nailed together. He obviously did *not* think it was the sun but something or someone called Sunne. It may be that the translator simply saw the odd verb as a variation of "aedificatus est" but perhaps he thought it referred to someone who had been crucified. But more likely than not, he probably did not really think about it at all. As we have seen above, the translator would not have learned his Greek through Homer or in order to read Homer. He no doubt had heard of Troy (*Troia*), but there was no reference to *Troia* in the Greek text since the word used is always Ἴλιος and there is no Ἴλιος in the sorts of texts that he had read in Greek. The name was meaningless. His vocabulary was limited and when he saw ΙΛΙΟC he immediately thought *sol* (ΗΛΙΟC) not *Troia*, like the scribes behind the texts in the Συναγωγή, *Chron. Pasch.*, and *Syncellus* above. Obviously two out of three times he had thought about it enough that he did not translate it directly as *sol*, but as *Solis*, and given his education and background that is probably the best we could have expected from him.

[128] *TLG* gives thirty-nine instances of Ἴλιον/Ἴλιος ἑάλω/ἥλω.

[129] Note Scaliger's comment, τὸ Ἴλιον ἥλω ὑπὸ Ἀχαιῶν, non ἥλιος "ἡλώθη" (Scaliger, *Thesaurus temporum* [1606], second part, 53 and [1658], second part, 67 [both n. 3 above], seen most easily in the margin of Schoene, *Eusebi Chronicorum* [n. 10 above], 196, fol. 20b.5).

Appendix Three. Prophesying Horses

In the middle of a well-known passage about Faunus-Hermes, we have the following passage, which does not appear in the parallel section in Malalas:

> Faunus . . . suspitiones et diuinationes illos dicebat, auium narrationes et opupas adnuntiationes et equorum hinnos discebat et mortuorum diuinationes et alia plura mala (238.8–11).

> Faunus told [the Egyptians] the secret meanings of things[130] and prophecies and taught them the stories told by birds, the announcements of hoopoes, the whinnies of horses, the prophecies of the dead, and many other evil things.

As can be be seen, the *equorum hinnos* does not fit in with "suspitiones . . . diuinationes . . . auium narrationes . . . opupas adnuntiationes . . . mortuorum diuinationes et alia plura mala." We need something that has to do with prophecy. The Greek word for *hinnus*, or rather *hinnitus* (i.e., "whinnying" rather than "a whinny," a distinction obviously lost on the translator), is χρεμετισμός. If we allow for late vowel changes[131] and a slight misreading, we can see that this was originally χρηματισμός, the Greek word for an oracular response or a divine warning. The ἵππων in the text led to the all too obvious error, which may have appeared in the original Greek.[132]

[130] Although Frick suggests ὑποψία as the original Greek in his translation, I think ὑπόνοια is more likely. The glossaries give both for *suspicio,* and *suspicio* and *opinio* for both ὑπόνοια and ὑποψία (Goetz, *Corpus Glossariorum* [n. 59 above], 194, 467, 468). The former, however, is simple suspicion, while the latter is conjecture, guess, or notion. More important, the latter also has a more philosophical idea of true or hidden meaning and that seems to be the sense implied here with *diuinationes*, especially since it is associated with Hermes Trismegistus, the expounder and interpreter of secrets.

[131] For the confusion of η and ε, see Gignac, *Grammar* (n. 68 above), 242–47.

[132] This simple explanation refutes the convoluted claims of Garstad, "Barbarian Interest" (n. 2 above), 7–14, though he does usefully provide some examples of hippomancy (7 n. 19), which is what is being described here.