

# JORDANES AND THE DATE OF THE *EPITOME DE CAESARIBUS*\*

---

*Abstract:* The *Epitome de Caesaribus* is universally assumed to be a work of the late fourth or early fifth centuries. In this article, we demonstrate that the *Epitome* was in fact compiled at some point after the middle of the sixth century, by showing, on textual and philological grounds, that it has drawn extensively on the *Romana* of Jordanes (written c. 551/2). We then explore some of the implications of this re-dating for our understanding of the text and its reception in late antiquity.

---

*Keywords:* *Epitome de Caesaribus*, Jordanes, transmission, prose rhythm, later Latin literature, Roman historians

## I. The *Epitome de Caesaribus* and Jordanes

For a bantam-weight text (c. 9,500 words), the *Epitome de Caesaribus* is full of fight.<sup>1</sup> A brisk but not ineffective overview of the emperors from Augustus to Theodosius, with a particular emphasis on their *mores*, almost everything about the work is murky and has been the subject of often rather vigorous debate. There is no consensus on where the *Epitome* was written, what agenda it has (if any), or, especially, what its sources were.<sup>2</sup> For a significant number of continental scholars, the *Epitome* is a ‘western’ (that is, generally, an Italian) text, with pagan and senatorial sympathies, inextricably interlinked with the lost *Annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus, on which it drew extensively.<sup>3</sup> In (largely) Anglophone scholarship these propositions have been

\* We would like to thank Gavin Kelly for initial inspiration and encouragement, as well as for his expertise on prose rhythm, Justin Lake and Aaron Peltari for careful commentary on drafts, Oliver Thomas and Aneurin Ellis-Evans for guidance on matters Greek, Chris Wickham for advice on Adria, and Alan Ross for considerable aid with bibliography. We would like also to acknowledge the two very helpful reports from the reviewers for *Histos*. All translations are our own.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Syme (1971) 235: ‘The *Epitome*, for all its exiguity, is a perplexing document’.

<sup>2</sup> We do not pretend to be bibliographically comprehensive on these vexed questions (such would probably be impossible), nor to imply that those we collocate below agree on all points. The following notes highlight some of the most important contributions to debate, which themselves provide further references.

<sup>3</sup> The features of Nicomachus Flavianus and of the author of the *Epitome* are not always clearly distinguished in this tradition. Schlumberger (1974) is its modern starting point (though it has deeper roots): see 233–46, esp. 239ff. for Flavianus as the pagan, senatorial source of the *Epitome* (himself an anonymous pagan bureaucrat, 244–5). See also Schlumberger (1976) 201, for the *Epitome* as one of the last pagan historical works, written in Rome. Schlumberger reinforced and modified some of his conclusions in (1985) (a work

sharply assailed, both individually and as a bundle: not obviously western, not obtrusively pagan or senatorial, and certainly nothing to do with Nicomachus Flavianus.<sup>4</sup> The argument has often been rather heated and it shows no signs of cooling down.

The fact that decades of intensive scholarly investigation have produced little broad agreement makes it all the more surprising that on one very important point there is near unanimity. Logically prior to the issue of agenda, sources, and the rest is the matter of the *Epitome's* date. Yet, there is remarkably little and rather limited discussion of this central question. Since no one in late antiquity refers to the text explicitly, its date has generally been inferred from internal evidence and from the alleged use of it in other, more securely dated works. The *Epitome's* terminal event is the burial of the emperor Theodosius in A.D. 395 (48.20), while it mentions his son Arcadius as emperor without any hint that he died in A.D. 408 (48.19). These two *data* have framed discussion of the *Epitome's* date: within their limits there is plenty of disagreement, but about them there is consensus.<sup>5</sup> Partial confirmation has been found (not that it is

mostly devoted to attempting to prove that Flavianus' *Annales* covered imperial history). Michel Festy has been influential in disseminating this thesis: Festy (1997); id. (1999) vii, xliii–xlix (paganism), xlix (senatorial viewpoint), xv–xx (esp. xviii), xxviii–xxix, xxxii–xxxv, xxxviii (Flavianus as one of the major sources of the *Epitome*, from the reign of Severus Alexander), xlvi (Rome or its vicinity as the location of its author). Bruno Bleckmann has also played an important role, though with a much greater focus on the Greek than the Latin sources: Bleckmann (1992) 173, 244, 368, 387–8, 396–7, 400 and n. 17 (for the *Epitome's* links to the tradition of the *Leoquele*), 400–3 (for the identification of Flavianus as the source and the 'senatorial' viewpoint reflected in the *Epitome*); cf., e.g., Bleckmann (1995) 93–9; id. (1999). The same might be said of François Paschoud, as can be seen from his collected papers (2006), e.g., 309–11 (originally a review article of Bleckmann (1992)), 376 ('*Epitome de Caesaribus* du Pseudo-Aurélius Victor s'inspire essentiellement d'une source prosénatoriale et propaïenne ...'), cf. 397, 401, 494 with very similar formulations), cf. Paschoud (1992). These ideas have also attracted strong support in Italy: Zecchini (1993) 51–64; Baldini (1999) 14–31. They have even made their way into English-language works of reference: Bonamente (2003) 100–3; Birley (2003) 129–32 (a rare Anglophone endorser of Nicomachus Flavianus).

<sup>4</sup> Barnes (1976), a review of Schlumberger, is perhaps the recent origin of this tendency: generally positive, it reserves criticism for the treatment of Flavianus. Cameron (2011) 627–90 is its culmination: a systematic and devastating refutation of the Flavianus thesis, which touches on the *Epitome* at several important points. Cameron argues (669–70) that the work was in fact produced in the East, using at least some Greek sources.

<sup>5</sup> Syme (1971) 102: 'composed in the near aftermath of Theodosius' decease' (cf. 128 n. 2 'written shortly after 395', 231; Syme (1980) 269). Schlumberger (1974) 245: probably between 395 and 400, certainly before 408. Schlumberger (1976) 201, turn of the fourth and fifth centuries. Barnes (1976) 266: not long after the funeral of Theodosius (8 November 395). Festy (1999) liii–lvi: between 402 and 408, perhaps even 406 to 408 (cf. 237). Cameron (2001): 395 itself. Bonamente (2003) 100: 395–408. Cameron (2012) 351: 'in or soon after

generally sought) in faint traces of the *Epitome* detected in Orosius, writing his *Historiae adversus paganos* in the mid-410s.<sup>6</sup>

These are not solid grounds on which to date the *Epitome*. Ancient works of history were often written soon after the events they described, but that was obviously not always the case. Arrian's histories were written centuries after the events they describe and Sallust's *Bellum Jugurthinum* was composed over sixty years after its terminus.<sup>7</sup> The precise date at which Florus wrote his summary history of Rome's wars is murky, but even though the text ends with Augustus, the author certainly lived after Trajan (*pref.* 8). The narrative of the *Origo Constantini Imperatoris* stops in 337, but the text as we have it is a product of the fifth century at the very earliest.<sup>8</sup> Paul the Deacon's *Historia Romana* ends with Narses' victory over Totila in 552 (16.23), but Paul wrote it in the years around 770.<sup>9</sup> The historical compilation called the *Romuleon* covers the millennium from Romulus to Constantine, but was written a millennium later by Benvenuto da Imola.<sup>10</sup> Equally, the alleged echoes of the *Epitome* in Orosius (to which we will return) do not show that the text was in circulation as he was writing. There is nothing, in other words, that actually requires us to put the composition of the *Epitome* in the fourth or fifth centuries. Surprising as it may

395'. Burgess (2018): soon after 395. Kulikowski (2018) 150: 'a late fourth-century production'.

<sup>6</sup> On Orosius and the *Epitome*, see, e.g., Festy (1999) lxi.

<sup>7</sup> On Arrian's life and times, see Stadter (1980), esp. 1–18; on Sallust's *Jugurtha* and its ending, see Stover and Woudhuysen (2015 [2020]).

<sup>8</sup> The date of the original (so to speak) *Origo Constantini Imperatoris* is a vexed question, tied up with the equally murky matter of its sources. Klebs (1889) argued for composition soon after 337, an influential position: Barnes (1970a) 27, though note the caution of Momigliano (1963) 88 (Moreau (1968) v–vi leaves the matter ambiguous). König (1987) 19–28 preferred a Theodosian date, while, after an exhaustive discussion, Neri (1992) (summary 279–82) advanced a more complex theory, with the main text composed only under Valentinian I (364–75), but based on earlier Constantinian works. Neither of these ideas has found much favour and a date not long after 337 is now something like the consensus: Barnes (1989); Zecchini (1993) 35; Aussenac (2001); Barnes (2011) 27. In its current state, however, the text appears to have been both redacted and interpolated from Orosius (though brief, the demonstration of this in Mommsen (1892) 5–6 remains compelling; cf. Klebs (1889)) and so must date to after the early fifth century. Zecchini (1993) 21–3 favours the supremacy of Constantius III (417–21) for the activity of the redactor; König (1987) 19 puts him vaguely 'nach ca. 420' (cf. 26). The interpolations are in italics in the edition of Moreau (1968). Den Boer (1972) 102, 167ff. appears to be alone in suggesting that the *Origo* as a whole was written after Orosius. We might wonder about whether the redactor is rightly situated so soon after Orosius.

<sup>9</sup> The precise date of Paul's *Historia Romana* is slightly opaque, but the likely *termini* are 761 and 774 (see the discussion in Crivellucci's edition (1914) xxviii–xxxvi).

<sup>10</sup> On Benvenuto, his work, and its dissemination, see briefly Sarasini (2006); Colombo (2019).

seem, our first apparently solid foothold in dating the text falls as late as the reign of Justinian.<sup>11</sup> It is found in the work of Jordanes, the Gothic historian from Moesia, most famous for the *Getica* and the enduring scholarly controversy over its relationship to Cassiodorus' lost history of the Goths.<sup>12</sup> His other, much less studied work, the *Romana*, finished in Constantinople in (probably) A.D. 551 or 552, has significant *verbatim* overlaps with the *Epitome* in its account of the late fourth century (*Romana* 314–18 = *Epitome* 46, 48).<sup>13</sup> The descriptions of the death of Valens at Adrianople in A.D. 378 and of key episodes in the career of Theodosius are almost identical, considerable stretches of shared text interrupted by only occasional and relatively minor differences. Jordanes would seem to present a solid *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the *Epitome*.

Unfortunately, there are complications. There is no consensus on whether Jordanes drew directly or indirectly on the *Epitome*, for that question has been subsumed into broader scholarly discussion of the relationship between Jordanes' work and the *Historia Romana* of Memmius Symmachus, written in the early sixth century.<sup>14</sup> To simplify a rather free-wheeling debate, which has often seen conjecture piled on conjecture, Enßlin argued in 1949 that the *Romana* of Jordanes was little more than a summary extracted from Symmachus. That being so, the Gothic historian did not know the *Epitome* directly—it was Symmachus who had used it.<sup>15</sup> Enßlin's thesis was swiftly controversial and few today would accept it in its original, unadulterated

<sup>11</sup> Jakobi (2012) has argued for use of the *Epitome* by Marcellinus *comes*, but see below, pp. 176–7.

<sup>12</sup> For a suitably cautious overview of Jordanes' life, see Van Nuffelen and Van Hoof (2020) 2–9.

<sup>13</sup> See Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017) 277–9 for a survey of scholarly opinions on the date of the *Romana*, along with perceptive comments on the environment in which Jordanes was writing. The designation *Historia Romana* is not original (Croke (1983) 95–6), the manuscripts giving *de summa temporum vel origine actibusque gentis Romanorum*, but is used here for convenience. We are only considering here extensive *verbatim* overlaps, not parallel content with occasional lexical resonances, as in *Epit.* 43.23 and *Rom.* 305 (cf. Jerome, *Chron.* 363<sup>b</sup>).

<sup>14</sup> The question has attracted much attention and we do not pretend to be bibliographically comprehensive in what follows. Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2020) 146–8, 148–53 provide an overview of Symmachus' life and work, as well as a succinct and lucid introduction to the controversy, with reference to earlier literature.

<sup>15</sup> Enßlin (1949) does not say this explicitly (he comes closest on 63), though it follows necessarily from his conclusions, but he clearly regarded the overlaps between the *Epitome* and Jordanes as particularly revealing for his thesis: see 61–4 (for treatment of these passages), 84–8 (for more general conclusions about the work's sources from the death of Valens to the accession of Anastasius).

form.<sup>16</sup> However, the idea that Jordanes' apparent knowledge of the *Epitome* really goes back to Symmachus continues to attract support.<sup>17</sup> It has been endorsed by Georg Schlumberger, whose monograph on the *Epitome* has been particularly influential in European scholarship, by J.-P. Callu, one of the major figures in the study of late-ancient historiography, and by Michel Festy, the editor of the text in the *Budé* series.<sup>18</sup> There has, however, always been a current of scepticism running against this view, arguing or assuming that Jordanes had a copy of the *Epitome* before him as he worked.<sup>19</sup> Recent work by Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen has done much to vindicate the idea that Jordanes owes little, if anything, to Symmachus and certainly not his knowledge of the *Epitome*.<sup>20</sup> In either case, the sixth century would appear to be the earliest period at which we can be reasonably sure that the *Epitome* was circulating.

The whole question, however, depends on the direction of the textual relationship between Jordanes and the *Epitome*, as (more broadly) does the *Romana*'s status as a *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the latter. Even though we know nothing solid about the date at which the *Epitome* was written, no one has ever considered the possibility that it could be the debtor. That the *Epitome* is the source and Jordanes, by whatever route, the recipient is assumed

<sup>16</sup> Croke (1983) 92–115 (esp. 92–103 on Jordanes) was a particularly important treatment of the Symmachus question, with good discussion of earlier approaches, which reached minimalist conclusions: it is somewhat surprising that it did not settle the matter. The glancing endorsement of Momigliano (1955) 190 and n. 56 perhaps lent undue weight to Enßlin's thesis.

<sup>17</sup> Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2020) 152 evocatively describe the chapters in which the *Romana* overlaps with the *Epitome* as the 'stronghold' of the Symmachian faction.

<sup>18</sup> Schlumberger (1974) 248–9. Callu (1985), esp. 94 n. 16 ('Par contre, nous restons convaincu par les analyses d'Enßlin, quand il croit découvrir qu'Éutrope, Orose et l'Épitome de Caesaribus ont déjà été amalgamés au niveau symmachien'), 104 n. 50 (specifically on *Romana* 314–15 and 317–18: 'Cet amalgame d'Orose et de l'Épitome résulte de l'initiative de Symmaque). Festy (1999) lxi–lxii, who cites *Romana* 314–15 as a combination of the *Epitome* and Orosius that can only have its origin in Symmachus and concludes: 'Jordanès, selon toute probabilité, n'a donc qu'une connaissance indirecte du texte de l'Épitome, qu'il cite d'après Memmius Symmachus'. See also Festy (2003), esp. 253 (n. 13 concedes that Enßlin (1949) was 'trop systématique', but says his theory is 'very solidly established' for the Theodosian portion of Jordanes), cf. Festy (2014) 248–9, reinforcing the same ideas.

<sup>19</sup> Following the lead of Mommsen (1882) xxvii, xliii–xliv who suggested direct acquaintance (interesting, because he was (e.g., xxiii) very open to the idea that Jordanes had often used his sources only indirectly). See also Croke (1975) and (1976) 239 n. 42.

<sup>20</sup> Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2020), a *bravura* performance, esp. 152–3 (cf. Van Nuffelen and Van Hoof (2020) 80). Their scepticism (147–8) about whether Jordanes could have had direct access to the *Historia* of Symmachus at all (cf. Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017) 289 which accepted the possibility) is refreshing, but might go a little too far.

to be obvious: if the former is a text of the late fourth or early fifth centuries, then the situation can hardly be otherwise. The neglect of the *Romana*, generally passed over by authors hastening to the more familiar battle-ground of the *Getica*, has not helped here, nor has the perception of Jordanes as an author who ‘could hardly keep his Latin together’.<sup>21</sup> In this article, however, we demonstrate purely on internal and textual grounds that the shared passages in the two texts come originally from Jordanes’ *Romana*. This in turn has serious repercussions for our understanding of the date and nature of the *Epitome*.

## II. The Fate of Valens and the *Chronicon* of Jerome

We can start our investigation with the passage describing the battle of Adrianople and the grisly fate of Valens in its aftermath.<sup>22</sup>

Jordanes, <i>Romana</i> 314	<i>Epitome</i> 46.2
Contra quos Valens ab Antiocia exire compulsus in Thraciam proficiscitur, ibique <i>lacrimabili bello commisso imperator sagitta saucius in casa deportatur vilissima, ubi supervenientibus Gothic igneque supposito incendio concrematus est.</i> <sup>23</sup>	Hic Valens cum Gothic <i>lacrimabili bello commisso sagittis saucius in casa deportatur vilissima; ubi supervenientibus Gothic igneque</i> <sup>24</sup> <i>supposito incendio concrematus est.</i> <sup>25</sup>

Here, Jerome’s *Chronicon* (Helm 249<sup>c</sup>) can aid us in determining who was drawing on whom, for its account of that episode is clearly related:

*Lacrimabile bellum* in Thracia. In quo deserente equitum praesidio Romanae legiones a Gothic cinctae usque ad internecionem caesae sunt. Ipse imperator Valens, cum *sagitta saucius* fugeret et ob dolorem

<sup>21</sup> Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017) is a welcome correction to the tendency to neglect the *Romana*; they provide abundant references to earlier literature on Jordanes. The quotation is from Momigliano (1955) 196: as we show below, Jordanes took great care about his Latin, just not in ways that modern scholars have always appreciated.

<sup>22</sup> On the campaign, see Lenski (2002) 335–41.

<sup>23</sup> ‘Valens, forced to depart from Antioch to resist them [*sc.* the Goths], set out for Thrace, and there, when mournful war had begun, the emperor, wounded by an arrow, was carried along to a most worthless hovel, which was set aflame when the Goths arrived; he was consumed by the conflagration’.

<sup>24</sup> Festy prints *ignique* against the evidence of the earliest manuscripts for *igneque* (see his apparatus *ad loc.*).

<sup>25</sup> The text of the *Epitome* is almost identical with Jordanes here, but for a translation see Codrington (1654).

nimum saepe equo laberetur, ad cuiusdam *villulae casam deportatus est*. Quo persequentibus barbaris et incensa domo sepultura quoque caruit.<sup>26</sup>

There are of course only so many ways you can say that Valens was wounded by an arrow and fled to a building, which was then surrounded by Goths who burnt it down, incinerating the emperor in the process. Here, however, there are enough verbal overlaps to guarantee some textual relationship: *sagitta saucius*, a surprisingly rare phrase, is particularly revealing.<sup>27</sup> Moreover, a subtle difference in wording between the *Chronicon* and the *Romana/Epitome* points us to the conclusion that Jerome is the source here. The case is slightly complex, but worth unravelling.

Precisely what had happened to Valens after Adrianople was controversial: there appear to have been different versions of his fate in circulation soon after the actual event. Some thought he had fallen on the field of battle, his body lost in the confusion, while others said he had fled to some rural settlement, where he was trapped in a building which was then set on fire.<sup>28</sup> Where the sources give any precise information about the building, they make it a farmhouse or other agrarian structure, or (in one case) a tower.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>26</sup> ‘There was a mournful war in Thrace [*sc.* in this year]. In this conflict, after their supporting cavalry deserted them, the Roman legions were encircled by the Goths and cut down in a massacre. The Emperor Valens himself, as he fled wounded by an arrow, falling often from his horse due to the great pain, was carried along to the home of a small farmstead. In that spot, as the house was set on fire when the barbarians arrived, he lacked even a grave’. As has been noted often, there are resemblances here to Ammianus: *lacrimosis in Thracia discriminibus* (29.1.15—n.b. not in the description of Adrianople itself, a point sometimes elided); *sagitta perniciose saucius* (31.13.12); *prope ad agrestem casam relatum ... flammaque supposita, aedificium cum hominibus torruerunt* (31.13.14–15).

<sup>27</sup> In spite of its deployment by Virgil, *Aen.* 12.651–2, the phrase *sagitta saucius* found few users in antiquity, most of them inspired directly or indirectly by Jerome on Adrianople (Orosius 7.33.15; Prosper, *Epitome chronicarum* (ed. Mommsen (1892) 460); Gregory of Tours, *Histories* 1.41—all describing the fate of Valens). Ammianus 31.13.12 also uses it in his account of the aftermath of the battle. Otherwise, only Tertullian (*Ad Nationes* 1.10; *Apologeticum* 14—the text is identical) seems to have deployed it. It is curious to note that *lacrimabile bellum* is also a Virgilian phrase (*Aen.* 7.604, perhaps significantly, there of war against the *Getae*). Whatever Jordanes’ knowledge and use of Vergil (see Swain (2010), Cristini (2020)), these two reminiscences are owed to Jerome.

<sup>28</sup> On the controversial fate of Valens, see Lenski (1997) 150–5.

<sup>29</sup> Rufinus, *HE* 11.13 calls it a *praedium* (‘estate’ or ‘farmhouse’). Soon after the events, John Chrysostom, *Ad vid. iun.* 5 (*PG* 48.606) called it a *κώμη* (‘village’), and later (*In Epist. ad Phil. Hom.* 15.5 (*PG* 62.295)) spoke of Valens (not named) being burnt *μετὰ ἵππων καὶ δοκῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων* (‘with his horses and the beams and everything else’), which seems to suggest a substantial building. Socr. *HE* 4.38.8 also has *κώμη* as does Zos. 4.24.2 (and Theodoret 4.37.1, 2). Philostorg. *HE* 9.17 seems to have offered *οἴκημα* (a building, here for

Ammianus (31.13.14–16) provides the most detail, apparently based on an interview with the lone survivor of the episode. He tells us that the emperor was *prope ad agrestem casam relatum* (‘brought back to a nearby rustic farmhouse’) and goes on to describe the building as having a second storey that was fortified (hence, perhaps, the idea of a tower). Jerome, whose *Chronicon* says that Valens ‘was carried along to the home of a small farmstead’ (*ad cuiusdam villulae casam deportatus est*), later calling it a *domus* (‘house’), is clearly describing something very similar to what we find specifically in Ammianus and more generally in the other sources.<sup>30</sup> He uses the relatively vague *casa* and *domus*, adding a little scenic colour with the rarer *villula*.

In contrast to all this, Jordanes and the *Epitome* have Valens *in casa deportatur vilissima* (‘carried along to a most worthless hovel’). This is a shift in emphasis from the nature of the site at which the emperor was killed, to the low quality of the building—one quite without parallel in our numerous other accounts of these events.<sup>31</sup> The crucial thing about this unique version of the emperor’s fate is that while it is factually incompatible with the other sources for the death of Valens, it is a perfectly defensible interpretation of the text of Jerome. A *casa* in some small nameless Thracian village might well be thought *vilissima*: it just happened to be the case that the one to which Valens fled, with its fortified second storey, was not. That Jerome was liable to misinterpretation on this point can be confirmed from Gregory of Tours. In his *Histories* 1.41, Gregory offers us an account of the end of Valens taken, as he says explicitly, from Jerome.<sup>32</sup> In this, Valens seeks refuge in a building described as both a *parvum tugurium* (‘little hut’) and a *casula* (‘cottage’). Once again, these are reasonable interpretations of the text of the *Chronicon*—they are just not accurate summaries of what contemporaries believed had happened in the aftermath of Adrianople. Like Gregory’s, the version in the *Romana/Epitome* is simply a rewriting of Jerome. It was no doubt tempting to accentuate the misery of the circumstances in which Valens, never a popular emperor, had died and the sound and shape of *villula* probably inspired *vilissima*.<sup>33</sup>

storing fodder). Sozomen, *HE* 6.40.3 describes a *δομάτιον* (‘structure’) or *πύργος* (‘tower’). All this might make us wonder whether *κώμη* uniformly meant ‘village’ in later Greek (perhaps its meaning was influenced by the semantic range of *villa*).

<sup>30</sup> The word *casa* was very commonly used to describe a rural building (*TLL*, s.v. ‘casa’ I.C, III.509.73–510.19 (Elsperger)), such that it almost does not need Ammianus’ complement of *agrestis*.

<sup>31</sup> Somewhat surprisingly, the *casa vilissima* has attracted little attention: it is unmentioned by Festy (1999) 221–2 (the note to this passage).

<sup>32</sup> *Hist.* 1.41: *Hucusque Hieronimus; ab hoc vero tempore Horosius presbiter plus scripsit.*

<sup>33</sup> Brepols *Cross Database Searchtool* suggests that no other ancient texts ever described a *casa* as *vilis*, so this was not a case of a common collocation being inserted. It is noteworthy that the eleventh-century chronicler Hermannus Contractus, *Chronicon* 378a adapted

Now, the fact that this episode was drawn from the *Chronicon* is significant, for Jerome was one of the major sources for Jordanes, who cited him by name as a model for his own work (*Romana* 11). The Gothic historian used the *Chronicon* so extensively in the *Romana* that, as Mommsen observed, some parts of the work are almost a summary of Jerome, into which fragments from other sources had been inserted.<sup>34</sup> Jordanes relies particularly heavily on the *Chronicon* in his account of the period from Augustus to Theodosius, especially so in what he says about the fourth century.<sup>35</sup> The tale of Valens' death comes just after several sections strung together from the *Chronicon* (*Romana* 312–13 = Jerome, Helm 248–9). The first part of *Romana* 314 (*Valens ab Antiochia exire compulsus*), where the overlap between *Epitome* and Jordanes begins, is taken almost *verbatim* from Jerome (Helm 249<sup>b</sup>—*Valens de Antiochia exire compulsus*). It is also worth noting that Jerome gives the (rather important) detail that the battle of Adrianople took place in Thrace, which is reproduced in Jordanes but (oddly) entirely omitted in the *Epitome*. In a similar line, Jerome and Jordanes make *imperator* the subject of the key sentence, not Valens, and say he was wounded by 'an arrow' (*sagitta*) rather than a whole sheaf of them (*sagittis*), as the *Epitome* does. In other words, the conventional view that the *Epitome* is prior here requires us to believe that Jordanes turned aside from his principal source, the *Chronicon*, to use another text which gave almost the same information, though in less complete form, in very similar words to it. He then turned back to Jerome and tweaked one or two details of his composite account to make it more resemble the *Chronicon*. This seems somewhat unlikely.

If Jordanes was not using the *Epitome* here, can it be shown that the latter actually depends on the former? A telling detail points in precisely that direction. Let us look again at the claim in both texts that Valens was *in casa deportatur vilissima* ('carried along to a most worthless hovel'). As we have seen already, this is clearly a rephrasing of the entry in Jerome's *Chronicon*, but the construction had been subtly altered, from *ad ... casam* to *in casa*. This is the only point in the *Epitome* at which *in* is used with the ablative and a verb of motion: *in* is always otherwise deployed with the accusative.<sup>36</sup> In contrast to

Jerome (again, he is explicit about his source) to say that Valens fled *in vilem casam* (ed. Pertz (1843) 80).

<sup>34</sup> Mommsen (1882) xxvi.

<sup>35</sup> Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017) 281; Croke (1983) 98. Fourth century: *Romana* 304–14, the sources are given in the margin by Mommsen (1882). There is of course an extensive *lacuna* in the *Romana*'s account of the fourth century: its coverage of the period from the Great Persecution to A.D. 361 is lost.

<sup>36</sup> *Epitome* 13.11, *in urbem invecta*; 19.3, *in abditas palatii balneas ductus*; 23.6, *in fluvium proiectum est*; 39.4, *in ignem se abiecit*; 40.7, *in profundum demersus est*; 41.2, *in Britanniam pervenit*; 41.12, *Faustam in balneas ardentis coniectam*; 41.21, *in aliena irrui, obruncatus est proiectusque in fluvium*; 43.4, *relatusque in tabernaculum*; 47.7, *in Galliam transmisisset*.

the *Epitome*'s rigidity, Jordanes was quite relaxed about this point of usage: sometimes he opted for *in* with the accusative, sometimes with the ablative.<sup>37</sup> In short, the peculiarities of this shared passage—both source and usage—are specific to Jordanes, not the *Epitome*. The only logical conclusion is that the *Romana* used Jerome's *Chronicon* as the basis of its account of what happened to Valens and that that account then made its way into the *Epitome*.

### III. The Reign of Theodosius

We can find further confirmation that the *Epitome* is drawing on Jordanes if we turn to the overlapping account of the reign of Theodosius:

Jordanes, <i>Romana</i> 315–18	<i>Epitome</i> 48.5–7, 19–20
<p>enituit <i>propagator rei publiceque</i><sup>38</sup> <i>defensor eximius. Nam Hunnos et Gothos, qui eam sub Valente defetigassent, diversis proeliis vicit atque a prava vastatione conpescuit.</i></p> <p><i>Cum Persis quoque petitus pacem pepigit.</i> [316] <i>Maximum autem tyrannum, qui Gratianum interfecerat et sibi Gallias vindicabat, apud Mediolanum una cum Valentiniano imperatore adgrediens ab Oriente, clausit cepit occidit.</i> [317] <i>Eugenium quoque tyrannum atque Arbogasten divino auxilio praeditus vicit, deletis eorum decem milibus pugnatorum. Hic etenim Eugenius confisus viribus Arbogasti, postquam apud Viennam Valentinianum extinxerat, regnum invasit, sed mox simul cum vita imperium perdidit.</i></p> <p>Nam occiso Arbogaste desperans sua se manu peremit.</p> <p>[318] <i>Omnisque inimicos Theodosius superatos in pace rebus humanis apud Mediolanum excessit utramque rem publicam utrisque filiis quietam relinquens.</i></p>	<p>Fuit autem Theodosius <i>propagator reipublicae atque defensor eximius. Nam Hunnos et Gothos, qui eam sub Valente defatigassent, diversis proeliis vicit. Cum Persis quoque petitus pacem pepigit.</i> [6] <i>Maximum autem tyrannum, qui Gratianum interfecerat et sibi Gallias vindicabat, apud Aquileiam exstinxit Victoremque eius filium, intra infantiae annos a Maximo patre Augustum factum, necavit.</i> [7] <i>Eugenium quoque tyrannum atque Arbogasten superavit deletis eorum decem milibus pugnatorum. Hic etenim Eugenius, confisus viribus Arbogastis, postquam apud Viennam Valentinianum exstinxerat, regnum invasit; sed mox simul cum vita imperium perdidit.</i></p> <p>[19] ... sicque <i>in pace rebus humanis</i> annum agens quinquagesimum <i>apud Mediolanum excessit utramque rempublicam utrisque filiis, id est Arcadio et Honorio, quietam relinquens.</i> [20]</p>

<sup>37</sup> *In* with the ablative (e.g.): *Rom.* 27, *Moses occiso Egyptio in terra fugit Madia. Get.* 131, *legatos in Romania direxerunt*; 155, *et in Liguria post se, unde iam transierant, revertuntur*; 185, *legatos in Italia ad Valentinianum principem misit*; 239, *nam Marcus Antonius in Madianea ingressus ... vix in Armenia Parthis sequentibus fugit*; 274, *remisit cum suis in Suavia*. With accusative (e.g.): *Romana* 38, *unde Aeneas fugiens in Italiam venit. Getica* 50, *novum genus exercitui duxit in Asiam*. Cf. Galdi (2010) 369 and n. 30 who suggests Jordanes has lifted the 'ungrammatical construction' from the *Epitome*. The literature on the style and language of the *Epitome* is rather limited: see Wölfflin (1902), Galdi (2012).

<sup>38</sup> Even without the evidence of the *Epitome*, we might read ... *publice <at>que defensor* ....

<i>Corpus eius eodem anno Constantinopolim adlatum atque sepultum.</i> <sup>39</sup>	<i>Corpus eius eodem anno Constantinopolim translatum atque sepultum est.</i> <sup>40</sup>
--	---

That something is not quite right with the *Epitome* here has already been persuasively argued by Alan Cameron.<sup>41</sup> He focused on the final sentence of the text (48.20), noting that it overlapped almost *verbatim* with a line in the *Chronicle* of Marcellinus *comes*: *Corpus eius eodem anno Constantinopolim adlatum atque sepultum* (*s.a.* 395.2, Mommsen (1894) 62). Since that line, especially the specification of *eodem anno*, fitted more naturally into a chronicle (organised by consular years) than the *Epitome* (which never gives consular dates), he argued that Marcellinus was the original and the *Epitome* had been interpolated from him.<sup>42</sup>

Cameron's arguments in favour of this interpolation are strong and his suspicion of the *Epitome* is certainly the correct instinct. If we treat the *Epitome* and Marcellinus in isolation, then interpolation of the former from the latter is a neat solution. It is much less helpful in trying to work out why Jordanes has a line about Theodosius' funeral that is verbally closer to Marcellinus, but which came at the end of a longish section apparently derived from the *Epitome*. Read straight, Jordanes appeared to suggest that the *Epitome* already had its

<sup>39</sup> 'He was an outstanding enlarger and exceptional defender of the state. For in many battles he defeated the Huns and the Goths, who had worn it out under Valens, and he curbed their wicked ravaging of it. With the Persians also he fixed a peace. [316] Moreover, approaching from the east (together with the emperor Valentinian [II]), at Milan he cornered, captured, and killed the tyrant Maximus, who had murdered Gratian and laid claim to Gaul as his own. [317] Provided with God's aid, he also defeated the tyrant Eugenius and Arbogast: ten thousand of their men were wiped out. As a matter of fact, this Eugenius, who relied on the support of Arbogast, after he had killed Valentinian [II] at Vienne, usurped royal power, but soon lost his empire together with his life. For when Arbogast had been killed, in despair Eugenius slayed himself by his own hand. [318] Theodosius, after all his enemies had been defeated, departed from human affairs in peace at Milan, leaving one of the two [*sc.* Roman] states to each of his two sons. In the same year, his body was conveyed to Constantinople and buried'. *Omnesque inimicos ... superatos* is an accusative absolute, an acknowledged feature of Jordanes' style: Helttula (1987) 56–77 (this instance noted at 69).

<sup>40</sup> *Epitome* 48.6, the portion only partly identical to Jordanes, can be rendered: 'Moreover, at Aquileia he rubbed out the tyrant Maximus, who had murdered Gratian and laid claim to Gaul as his own, and he executed his son Victor, who had been made an Augustus by his father Maximus while still in his infant years'.

<sup>41</sup> Cameron (2001), endorsed by Barnes (2002) 27, but critiqued by Festy (2003), especially for his use of Landolfus Sagax. Cameron (2011) 670 and n. 67 expresses some doubt about his own conclusions.

<sup>42</sup> All this was in the service of demonstrating that the *Epitome* was written in the year 395 itself: Cameron (2001) 327. Jakobi (2012) subsequently argued that Marcellinus had used the *Epitome* as a source, hence the overlap, but on the relationship between the two texts, see below, pp. 176–7.

last sentence by the time it was circulating in sixth-century Constantinople, precisely the environment in which Marcellinus worked.<sup>43</sup> To evade this difficulty, Cameron was forced to propose an implausibly elaborate series of coincidences. He suggested that Jordanes' copy of the *Epitome* actually ended at *quietam relinquens*. Keen to know what happened after the death of Theodosius, the Gothic historian turned to his next major source, Marcellinus, and found a note on the emperor's funeral, which he incorporated: that sentence formed the bridge between the '*Epitome*' and the 'Marcellinus' sections of the *Romana*.<sup>44</sup> Later, by a happy coincidence, some other different reader of both Marcellinus and the *Epitome*, who was also dissatisfied with the ending of the latter text, independently interpolated the final sentence of the *Epitome* from the *Chronicle*.<sup>45</sup> Fortuitously, this just happened to be virtually identical to the sentence in the *Romana* that followed a series of *verbatim* extracts from the *Epitome*. Again, this seems somewhat unlikely.

If we take a second look at the Theodosian section of the *Epitome*, adopting Cameron's scepticism but not his conclusions, we can see fairly quickly that something both simpler and more extensive than he supposed is going on here. Jordanes has drawn some of his Theodosian material from Marcellinus *comes*: the use of *adlatum* all but guarantees this. In turn, the *Romana* is the source from which the *Epitome* has taken material, which is why it is reminiscent of Marcellinus. Two main points demonstrate that this is what has happened.

First, the phrase immediately preceding the notice of the funeral, *utramque rempublicam utrisque filiis relinquens*, could simply not have been written at the end of the fourth century. Contemporaries did not know that the division of 395 would prove permanent: as far as they were concerned, there was only one *Res publica Romana* and people went on stubbornly believing that long after we might have expected them to acknowledge what seems to us (and perhaps only to us) like the reality of division.<sup>46</sup> As Orosius explained (7.36.1), Arcadius and

<sup>43</sup> On Marcellinus, see Croke (2001) 17–47.

<sup>44</sup> As the notes in Mommsen (1882) make clear, Marcellinus was the *Romana*'s main, though not sole, source for events after 395 (*Romana* 319ff.). Partly in consequence of the Symmachus thesis, some scholars have denied that Jordanes used Marcellinus *comes*, suggesting a common source instead. The case was always weak, given what we know of Jordanes' methods in the *Romana* and the extent of *verbatim* overlap with the work of Marcellinus, but the disposal of the Symmachus thesis (above, pp. 153–4) ought to put the matter beyond doubt. See Van Nuffelen and Van Hoof (2020) 88–9, who briskly survey the issue (with references to earlier literature).

<sup>45</sup> Before, Cameron (2001) 326 suggests, Paul the Deacon was active, for his copy of the *Epitome* had the 'interpolated' sentence.

<sup>46</sup> We thank Gavin Kelly for first pointing this out to us. As Festy (1999) 237 puts it (in n. 28 on this passage): 'rien n'est plus étranger à la mentalité et à la perception des contemporains qu'une telle conception'. He does not follow this through, concluding (238) that the compiler of the *Epitome* has used the phrase without really understanding its

Honorius ‘ruled a shared empire, though their residences were separated’ (*commune imperium, divisis tamen sedibus*).<sup>47</sup> Eunapius puts into the mouth of Fravitta, the Gothic general whom he presented as ‘the incarnation of virtue and military expertise’, a speech moments before his death which rousingly concludes: ‘It is a truly blessed thing and wall unbroken and adamantine that the emperors manifestly possess a single empire in two bodies’.<sup>48</sup> There can have been little in the recent history or present politics of the Roman world in the early fifth century on which Eunapius and Orosius saw eye to eye, but on this they were (like the Empire) united. It was only in the early sixth century that people began to think that there had been two halves of the Roman Empire and (for the ideas were often connected) that one of those halves had fallen.<sup>49</sup> It is then that we find authors speaking of twin Roman *res publicae* and it is probably significant that the early attestations are all from diplomatic letters.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, Jordanes was unusually fond of the phrase, using it four times in his works, more than any other author.<sup>51</sup>

Second, *humanis rebus excedere* as a periphrasis for death is an exclusively Christian formulation. Attested otherwise in Sulpicius Severus, Salvian of Marseilles, Dionysius Exiguus, and an inscription dated 438, it fits rather poorly into the non-Christian *Epitome*.<sup>52</sup> It was also one of Jordanes’ favourite

meaning. On evolving conceptions of the unity of the Roman Empire, see Potter (2010). Matthews (1970) remains a brilliant attempt to recover a contemporary perspective on the Empire’s political troubles, rightly noting Olympiodorus’ emphasis on newfound unity in the 420s. For the unity of the Empire in the late fourth and early fifth century, see in general Cameron and Long (1993) 3, 246–50, 301–5.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. *Narratio de imperatoribus domus Valentinianae et Theodosianae* 5 (Mommsen (1892) 629): *Arcadius regnavit annis XII in Orientis partibus, cum Honorius frater divisis sedibus consors esset imperii*.

<sup>48</sup> Eunapius, *Excerpta de sententiis* 77 = Blockley 71.3: ἔστι δὲ πανόλβιον τι χρῆμα καὶ τεῖχος ἄρρηκτον καὶ ἀδαμάντινον τοὺς βασιλέας ἐν δύο σώμασι μίαν βασιλείαν ἔχοντας φαίνεσθαι. The description of Eunapius’ Fravitta is from Cameron and Long (1993) 237: the section (236–52) in which it occurs is an expert unpicking of the murky circumstances of his death.

<sup>49</sup> The classic treatment of this development is Croke (1983), esp. 87ff., 115–19, identifying Marcellinus *comes* as the first extant author to hold something like this view (though it can be traced earlier). Note especially his use of *Occidentalis res publica* (434, 454.1). On conceptions of the Roman past in the sixth century, see now Kruse (2019).

<sup>50</sup> Cassiod. *Var.* 2.1 (from Theoderic to Anastasius), 10.32 (Witiges to Justinian); *Collectio Avellana* 113 *bis* (Anastasius to the Roman senate), 114 (the Roman Senate to Anastasius). On these exchanges, and what they imply about the unity of the Roman Empire, see Arnold (2014) 77–83. As Festy (1999) 238 notes, the phrase *utrumque imperium* to refer to different *partes* of the Empire (without implying a permanent division) is attested much earlier (*ILS* 1283 of 437), but still decades after the supposed date of the *Epitome*.

<sup>51</sup> Besides *Rom.* 318, see also *Get.* 146, 244, 258.

<sup>52</sup> Sulp. Sev. *Vita S. Mart.* 7.2; Salvian, *Ad eccl.* 3.15.65–6; Dionys. Exig. *Vita S. Pachomii* 18; Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* 5.22; *ILCV* 2783 B. The one dubious exception is a constitution of Constantine, dated 326 (*Cod. Theod.* 9.12.2), but it would be unwise to assume that this is the

expressions. He uses it far more than any other extant author: eight times in the *Romana* and eleven in the *Getica*.<sup>53</sup> In one instance from the latter, he uses precisely the same formulation for Theodosius' death (146): *Theodosius amator pacis generisque Gothorum rebus excessit humanis coeperuntque eius filii utramque rem publicam* .... Once again, the stylistic quirks of the shared account of the death of Theodosius are Jordanes' idiosyncratic usages and the very ideas that they convey suit him much better than the *Epitome*: his *Romana* is clearly its source here.<sup>54</sup>

If we move back through the account of Theodosius in the *Romana/Epitome* we find further confirmation that Jordanes is the original, especially in the narrative of the 390s, where some curious 'facts' point in precisely that direction. The overlapping portion says clearly that it was Eugenius who killed Valentinian II, before he seized power, reliant on the support of Arbogast the Frankish *magister militum*. This is an extraordinary claim for a contemporary to make about the famously murky circumstances in which the young emperor met his end.<sup>55</sup> Doubt, uncertainty, and ambiguity about what exactly had happened are the dominant notes in those accounts that were certainly written soon afterwards.<sup>56</sup> Over time, the idea emerged that Valentinian had been murdered by Arbogast, sometimes in a conspiracy that involved Eugenius—the plot grew more baroque as the decades passed.<sup>57</sup> Yet no one ever made the teacher of rhetoric—as obvious a front-man as Roman history had ever

original text of the law, rather than a fifth-century paraphrase. The phrase also appears in the (late) *Synonoma Ciceronis* (ed. Barwick p. 431); on the date and transmission of the *Synonoma*, see Cinato (forthcoming). See in general *TLL*, s.v. 'excedo' V.2, 1207.26–30 (Leumann). The specifically Christian usage of *humanis rebus excedere* can also be seen by comparing it to the one definite non-Christian usage, Sen. *Phaed.* 469: *Excedat agedum rebus humanis Venus*, where Venus is literally withdrawing from human affairs. Other expressions for 'removal from human affairs' as a periphrasis for death did exist and were occasionally used by non-Christian authors. Of these, the most common was *humanis rebus exemptum*: Sen. *ep.* 76.28; *CTh* 5.6.1; SHA *Geta* 1.1; Aug. *De Haeres. praef.* 6; Ennod. *Vita Antonii monachi Lirinensis*, ed. Vogel p. 186; [Euseb.] tr. Rufinus, *HE* 7.10.1 (cf. Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* 2.29.2, *humanis rebus eximitur*; *Fragmenta Vaticana* 42, *humanis rebus eximitur*). The phrase also turns up in inscriptions: *CIL* 6.15316; *ILCV* 2783. A few authors favoured *humanis rebus eripi* (Sen. *De prov.* 2.10, Curt. Ruf. 10.5.10) and it was also used epigraphically (*ILS* 2040; *CIL* 6.33929). Cassiodorus and one inscription use *humanis rebus subtrahi* (*Var.* 10.9; *ILCV* 314).

<sup>53</sup> *Rom.* 222, 257, 318, 326, 340, 347, 359, 362. *Get.* 73, 81, 116, 146, 157, 173–4, 222, 284, 288, 305, 313.

<sup>54</sup> As Justin Lake has pointed out to us (*per litteras*), it also seems much more likely that one would go from the brilliant *enituit* to the plain *fuit* than the reverse.

<sup>55</sup> Croke (1976) is the classic and persuasive treatment, on which this section depends.

<sup>56</sup> Rufinus, *HE* 11.31; Ambrose, *De ob. Valent.* 3, e.g.

<sup>57</sup> Orosius 7.35.10 is the first extant account to blame Arbogast, indeed to take a definite position on the death, though Eunapius may of course lie behind the account in Zosimus 4.53–4.

seen—the prime mover in these events.<sup>58</sup> It is relatively easy to understand how this idea might emerge in a compressed sixth-century narrative of events like the *Romana*. It is much harder to see how a contemporary text would make such a bombshell claim when most were doubtful, which was then entirely ignored as the hunt for a villain intensified. Similarly, the shared account contains what Festy called (in the context of the *Epitome*) ‘une erreur tout à fait surprenante pour un contemporain’ about the battle of the Frigidus (curiously unnamed).<sup>59</sup> The passage says that 10,000 of the troops of Eugenius and Arbogast were killed. This is uncomfortably close to the account of Orosius, who notes that, besides Eugenius and Arbogast, the only casualties of the civil war were precisely this number of Theodosius’ Gothic auxiliaries, killed in the battle. This, he writes in a slightly convoluted sentence, was really a victory for the Empire.<sup>60</sup> Since Jordanes made extensive use of Orosius in his works and since he would have an obvious motive to silently delete Orosius’ distasteful jubilation at the death of so many Goths, the logical solution here is that he is primary.<sup>61</sup>

This can be further confirmed if we look at style and wording. The *Epitome* and Jordanes also offer a snappy description of the demise of Eugenius: *mox simul cum vita imperium perdidit*. This is a classical turn of phrase, which ultimately goes back to Sallust (*Iug.* 5.5) *sed imperii vitaeque eius finis idem fuit* (describing Masinissa). Amongst the historians of late antiquity, it was also imitated by Ammianus (16.5.15: *ad usque imperii finem et uitae*) and the *De excidio* ascribed to Hegesippus (1, p. 12: *his dictis finem imperio uitaeque dedit*)—in both, the expression is clearly modelled directly on Sallust.<sup>62</sup> Jordanes was, however, the author

<sup>58</sup> The fifth-century source that comes closest to making Eugenius primary is Socr. *HE* 5.25.4, but even he is emphatic that the plot against Valentinian was the joint work of the rhetorician and Arbogast.

<sup>59</sup> Festy (1999) 230 n. 10 to *Epitome* 48.7. On the battle in general, see now the exhaustive treatment of Cameron (2011) 93–131. Appendix C in Paschoud (2003) collects the key textual sources and offers much other useful illustrative material.

<sup>60</sup> Oros. 7.35.19: *Ita et hic duorum sanguine bellum civile restinctum est, absque illis decem milibus Gothorum quos praemissos a Theodosio Arbogastes delesse funditus fertur: quos utique perdidisse lucrum et vinci vincere fuit*. Orosius alone gives a figure, though Rufin. *HE* 11.33, Zos. 4.58, and Socr. 5.25 also mention the role of the emperor’s barbarian auxiliaries (without Orosius’ other peculiarities).

<sup>61</sup> On Jordanes and Orosius, see below, pp. 176–7.

<sup>62</sup> For Ammianus and Sallust, see Ross (2016) 105–22 (an incisive comparison of adoption speeches in Sallust, Tacitus, and Ammianus); G. Kelly (2008) 74, 211–12 (esp.), Fornara (1992) 429–33, Owens (1958) 152–91. Earlier foundational work (not all of which has weathered well) was done by Wirz (1877) 628–33 and Hertz (1874). On Sallust in the *De Excidio* see Stover and Woudhuysen (2015) 105–7. On the transmission of Hegesippus, see Gitner (forthcoming).

who used it by far the most frequently in his works. He deployed it on no fewer than seven other occasions:

*Rom.* 324: regnum cum vita amiserunt.

*Rom.* 343: vitamque cum regno amiserunt.

*Get.* 83: imperium simul et vitam amisit.

*Get.* 103: imperii finem vitaeque terminum faciens.

*Get.* 105: et vitam et imperium, quod inhiabat, amisit.

*Get.* 163: regnum cum vita reliquid.

*Get.* 302: regnum cum vita amisit.

The distinct but overlapping forms of expression used by Jordanes here (often with *cum*) may have been inspired by Justin's epitome of Trogus.<sup>63</sup> No other late-antique author, however, uses it with the enthusiasm that Jordanes does—it is clearly his stylistic tic.<sup>64</sup>

The description of the fate of Eugenius is almost by itself proof that the *Romana* is prior here. Two more minor details in the account of the life and times of Theodosius support the same conclusion. First, the unobtrusive conjunction *etenim*. The *Epitome* only uses it once outside the overlapping account of Theodosius.<sup>65</sup> In contrast, Jordanes uses it twenty-six times in total.<sup>66</sup> Second, the description of how Magnus Maximus *sibi Gallias vindicabat*. The *Epitome* never otherwise uses this formulation, in fact, it never otherwise uses the verb *vindicare*. In contrast, Jordanes was quite fond of this turn of phrase:

*Get.* 68: Caesar vero, qui sibi primus omnium Romanum vindicavit imperium.

*Get.* 153: [of Gaul and Spain] Halaricus sua cum gente sibi tamquam lares proprias vindicaret.

<sup>63</sup> Just. *Epit.* 17.2.4: *regnumque Macedonia, quod Lysimacho eripuerat, cum vita pariter amittit*. There are other potential Latin sources: Hil. Pict. *Tract. super psalm.* 54.11, *in omnes linguas ... divisi amitterent vitae ac regni sui dignitatem* (of mankind after the Tower of Babel). It is also possible that Jordanes derived the phrase from a Greek source, since the saying in a form close to his is found in Herodian, describing Opilius Macrinus (5.3.1: ἅμα τῷ βίῳ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν καταλύσαι), and Zosimus, of Clodius Albinus (1.8.1: καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον Ἀλβίνου μετὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ τὸν βίον ἀπολιπόντος).

<sup>64</sup> This vindicates Mastandrea (2011) 223–4, despite the objections of Festy (2014) 249. Festy is, however, right to treat Mastandrea's general thesis (that Memmius Symmachus was a redactor of the *Historia Augusta*) with scepticism. The only other instances of the phrase seem to be Greg. *Dial.* 2.15, *regnum cum vita perdidit* (of Totila) and *Lives of the Fathers of Mérida* 5.9, *regnum simul cum vita infeliciter perdidit* (of Leovigild).

<sup>65</sup> *Epitome* 16.2.

<sup>66</sup> *Get.* 16, 73, 75, 95, 112, 135, 187, 217, 229, 244. *Rom.* 7, 51, 69, 233, 261, 274, 275, 277, 282, 283, 293, 296, 299, 317, 332, 341.

*Get.* 264: Nam Gepidi Hunnorum sibi sedes viribus vindicantes ...

*Rom.* 85: [Augustus] singularem sibi vindicat principatum.

Once again, when we examine the details, the style, and the wording of the overlapping portions of the *Romana* and *Epitome*, the only logical conclusion is that Jordanes is the original here and that the *Epitome* has drawn material from him.

#### IV. Prose Rhythm

Thus far, we have shown that a close reading of the parallel passages in the *Romana* and the *Epitome* reveals that the latter text has drawn from the former. The sources, the lexical choices, the stylistic tics, even the ideas of the overlap between the two works all show very clearly that it is Jordanes who has priority here. These are rather detailed proofs, but they are backed up by one general feature that should remove any lingering doubts about the argument here advanced: the passages common to the *Romana* and *Epitome* are rhythmically clausulated. Rhythmical endings to clauses are a persistent feature of much of Latin prose after Ammianus, all the way through the Middle Ages. In brief, *cursus* (as this system is referred to) involves the use of four stress accent patterns at the endings of clauses: '∪∪'∪ (*planus*), '∪∪'∪∪ (*tardus*), '∪∪∪∪'∪ (*velox*), and '∪∪∪∪'∪∪ (*octosyllabicus*) (with ' for a stressed syllable and ∪ for an unstressed one). One can immediately see that this system generalises to a preference for an even number of unstressed syllables between the final two stressed syllables; as a result, endings such as '∪∪∪'∪ (*trispodiacus*) tend to be disfavoured.<sup>67</sup> A sample from the shared passage:

*deportátur vilíssima* (*tardus*), *incéndio concremátus est* (*octosyllabicus*), *defénsor exímíus* (*tardus*), *proéliis vícit* (*planus*), *mílibus pugnatórum* (*velox*), *Valentiniánum extínxerat* (*tardus*), *régnum invásit* (*planus*), *impérium pérdidit* (*tardus*), etc.

As has been amply demonstrated in existing scholarship, accentual rhythm is a standard feature of Jordanes' prose.<sup>68</sup> It is not characteristic of the *Epitome*. Consider the parts of the *Epitome's* life of Theodosius which are not common with Jordanes, where no consistent *cursus* is found (48.8): *Fuit autem Theodosius moribus et corpore Traiáno símilis* (not a preferred form), *quantum scripta veterum et*

<sup>67</sup> G. Kelly (2013) 72–4 offers an accessible overview.

<sup>68</sup> On Jordanes' use of *cursus*, see Paschoud (2018) 25–44, Bianchi (1956), Clark (1915), and Bradley (1997) 217, (1993) 220–1, and (1963) 367. It is curious that Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017) neglect prose rhythm in their analyses of Jordanes' borrowings from his sources.

*pictúrae dócent* (not a preferred form).<sup>69</sup> In other words, not only does this overlapping passage have the specific characteristics of Jordanes, it has one of the general features of his prose style, otherwise alien to the *Epitome*. Significantly, where the *Epitome* varies in wording from Jordanes, it sometimes fails to use the correct *clausulae*. For example, Jordanes' *praéditus vícit*, a planus, has been adapted by the *Epitome* (to get rid of its Christian elements) to *Arbogásten superávit*, a trispondaicus, which most writers of accentual prose tried to avoid.

With this in mind, we can take a second look at one of the phrases examined above and find final confirmation that Jordanes is the original here. It is clear that one of the factors which drove Jordanes to change the wording of his sources was prose rhythm. As an example, consider his surprisingly positive judgement of the emperor Julian (*Romana* 304): *vir egregius et rei públicae necessarius*.<sup>70</sup> This is drawn from Eutropius (10.16.2): *vir egregius et rem publicam insigniter moderaturus*. Jordanes has reworded the *Breviarium* here, but significantly he has not changed its basically admiring opinion of the last pagan emperor. His concern was clearly not historical, theological, or philosophical: it was stylistic. The modification is motivated by prose rhythm: *insígniter moderatúrus* has no preferred rhythmic form, but *públicae necessarius* is an *octosyllabicus*. Jordanes was not apparently worried about inserting praise of Julian into his *Romana*, but he evidently took care that his use of rhythmless sources should not disfigure his prose.<sup>71</sup> Much has already been said about the *casa vilissima* into which Jordanes and the *Epitome* have Valens meet his fiery fate. That it is indeed proof that Jordanes used Jerome here and was in turn used by the *Epitome* can also be shown from the prose rhythm. Jerome's *ad cuiusdam villulae casam deportátus est* is not metrical, and indeed, the *Chronicon* is obviously not a rhythmical text. Jordanes' *in casa deportátur vilissima*, however, makes a regular *tardus* (with the hyperbaton characteristic of rhythmical prose). The need for rhythm motivated the shift from *villula* to *vilissima*.

The prose rhythm of the passage shared by the *Romana* and the *Epitome* provides final confirmation, were confirmation needed, that the former is the

<sup>69</sup> The (lack of) prose rhythm in the *Epitome* appears never to have been specially studied. It is very clear that it has neither metrical nor accentual *clausulae*. As a further sample, examine the chapter preceding the overlap with Jordanes, on Valentinian I (45): *diébus céntum* ('∪∪), *nequírent extorquére* ('∪∪∪∪), *poténtiam conscéndit* ('∪∪∪∪), *resisténti oggéritur* ('∪∪∪∪), *império ascívít* ('∪∪∪∪), *Augústum creávit* ('∪∪∪∪), *maximéque avarítiae* ('∪∪∪∪), *Hadriáno próximus* ('∪∪∪), *tempóribus sermóne* ('∪∪∪∪), *prínceps enitúisset* ('∪∪∪∪), *ínvadens exstínguitur* ('∪∪∪∪), *ínteger exspirávit* ('∪∪∪∪), *plúres retulére* ('∪∪∪∪), *creátur imperátor* ('∪∪∪∪). In these fourteen endings, five (36%) are in one of the three preferred forms, which is in the range of random occurrence.

<sup>70</sup> The surprising nature of this judgement rightly attracts the attention of Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017) 281.

<sup>71</sup> Perplexingly, Galdi (2010) makes no comment on prose rhythm in Jordanes.

source and the latter the debtor. It also demonstrates that the passage is Jordanes' own composition. It reflects his meticulous attention to this feature of late-Latin style: the text cannot have been derived from some putative lost source, on which both Jordanes and the *Epitome* drew. This may all seem rather radical, but that is only so if one assumes that the *Epitome* (as we have it) must be the earlier work: the case is incontestable.

## V. The Date of the *Epitome* and its Consequences

That Jordanes is the source, not the user, of the *Epitome* has major implications for the latter's date: as we have it, the text must have been put together after the middle of the sixth century. The material drawn *verbatim* from the *Romana* has not been clumsily interpolated into, or added inexpertly to supplement, some pre-existing version of the *Epitome*.<sup>72</sup> The use of Jordanes at two distinct points in the narrative of the late fourth century shows that this was not a simple attempt to patch up a deficient ending.<sup>73</sup> Equally, it is not possible to remove the Jordanes material and be left with a thinner, but more coherent version of the *Epitome*. As a glance at the passages above shows, without the sentences from the *Romana*, the text's final chapter becomes a set of stray facts about the *mores* of Theodosius without any framing narrative of events (*Epitome* 48.1–4, 8–19). The work would close, somewhat bathetically, with the revelation that Theodosius liked walks and watched his weight.<sup>74</sup> As an account of the emperor's character this is more than serviceable, indeed fascinating, but as the Theodosian portion of an imperial history, it does not really work. Equally, without Jordanes, the text's coverage of Valens would omit the single most important event of his reign—the battle of Adrianople—and would not tell us that he died. The *Romana* sections are integral to the *Epitome* in its current form, so they give us a *terminus post quem* for its redaction.<sup>75</sup>

Can we say anything more about when the *Epitome* as we have it was put together? With the knowledge that it was compiled after the 550s and that its redactor was willing to simply insert *verbatim* portions from other texts, there is

<sup>72</sup> If it had been, someone might have earlier on raised the possibility that it was not original.

<sup>73</sup> A common phenomenon in the transmission of ancient texts in *codices*: see, e.g., Stover and Woudhuysen (2017) on the *DVI* or *eid.* (2015) for Sallust's *Jugurtha*.

<sup>74</sup> *Epitome* 48.19: *ambulationibus magis, cum esset otium, reficiebat animum et uescendi continentia valitudinem regebat.*

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Galdi (2012) whose study of dependent clauses suggests a work of relatively uniform style, certainly not one where portions have been ineptly interpolated into a coherent predecessor. Similar conclusions can be drawn from Wölflinn (1902), who offers a detailed treatment of prepositions and pronouns in the *Epitome*, which also demonstrates the unity of the text as we have it.

another passage in it that stands out and is of potentially considerable significance. The *Epitome* says, rather oddly, that the Adriatic sea derived its name not from the famous ancient Adria in the Veneto, but rather from the much more obscure one (modern Atri) in the Abruzzo, the Picenum of antiquity (14.1): *Adriae ... quod oppidum agri Piceni etiam mari Adriatico nomen dedit.*<sup>76</sup> This is a curious claim, for it was well established in the ancient world that Venetian Adria was the source of the name, while no ancient text makes that claim for Atri.<sup>77</sup> This looks like a mistake that someone would make only after the town of Adria had ceased to be remotely important, probably after the fourth century, certainly after the devastating flood along the nearby Adige in the late sixth century turned the area into both a literal and a figurative backwater.<sup>78</sup> Once Adria had ceased to be of much importance in the early Middle Ages, it must have seemed equally plausible that Atri had produced the name. It is striking that wording of the *Epitome* at this point overlaps *verbatim* with Isidore of Seville (who knew that it was Adria, not Atri): *Nam Adria quaedam civitas Illyrico mari proxima fuit, quae **Adriatico mari nomen dedit*** (*Etym.* 13.16.6).<sup>79</sup> By itself, the belief that Atri was the source of the Adriatic's name points to a late date for the redaction of the *Epitome*. The overlap with Isidore perhaps even suggests that it belongs to the period after the early seventh century.<sup>80</sup> At the other end, Paul the Deacon, whose copy of the *Epitome* certainly included the material from Jordanes, provides us with a *terminus ante quem* of the mid to late eighth century—within a generation of Paul our first

<sup>76</sup> 'Adria ... this town of the Picene country also gave its name to the Adriatic Sea'. There seems little warrant for Festy's ((1999) 22) decision to prefix an H- to the key words here, even if Absternius did it in the *editio princeps*.

<sup>77</sup> Plin. *HN* 3.120; Liv. 5.33.7; Just. *Epit.* 20.1.7. Festy (1999) 108 n. 2 to this passage, claims that the *Oracula Sibyllina* 5.47–8 *et passim* holds this view, but the text (really 5.46–7) has nothing about the town: μετ' αὐτὸν δ' ἄλλος ἀνάξει, ἀργυρόκρανος ἀνὴρ· τῷ δ' ἔσσειται οὖνομα πόντου. It specifies that a silver-haired man (Hadrian, presumably) will have the same name as the (Adriatic) sea.

<sup>78</sup> Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum* 3.23. On Adria's decline, see La Rocca (1994) (with a more medieval focus and placing it in the regional context) and de Min (1986) (devoted to Adria itself and with an earlier chronological emphasis).

<sup>79</sup> 'For a certain city called Adria was next to the Illyrian sea; this gave its name to the Adriatic Sea'. The wording is shared also with Just. *Epit.* 20.1.7, Isidore's source. It is worth noting that while the formula *mari nomen dedit* was used in antiquity, it was not that common and was generally confined to the geographical tradition (Plin. *HN* 4.51, 68, 71; 5.133; 6.45; Vell. Pat. 1.1.4; Solin. 11.30, but perhaps from Plin. 4.68; Ps.-Acro on Hor. *Carm.* 4.2.2; Isid. *Etym.* 13.16.8 and 14.6.26, from Solinus (?)). Brepols' *Crossdatabase Search-Tool* suggests it was almost unused in the Middle Ages.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Wölfflin (1902) ((1874) 292–3) and Galdi (2012). While both of these studies accept a conventional date for the *Epitome*, the implication of their conclusions is that the text's language is difficult to square with it being ancient.

surviving manuscript copies of the *Epitome* were written in Northern Europe, all derived from a single damaged exemplar.<sup>81</sup> While a seventh- or eighth-century date for the redaction of the *Epitome* is a large shift from the perspective of current scholarship, the text would hardly be unparalleled as an early medieval collection of late-antique material.<sup>82</sup> As Paul the Deacon's *Historia Romana* shows, there was an appetite for combining various late-Roman historical texts into a single narrative.

This re-dating has obvious implications for how the *Epitome* has been understood in its putative late-fourth- or early-fifth-century context. A text compiled after 551/2, perhaps even in the seventh century, cannot be the product of the circle of Nicomachus Flavianus, designed to keep the memory of the man and his *Annales* alive, as Schlumberger and Festy have argued.<sup>83</sup> Equally, however, the arguments that led Cameron to locate the *Epitome*'s author in Constantinople fall away. Cameron rested his case on the interest the author took in Theodosius being buried in Constantinople and on his alleged use of a consular list maintained in that city from 356–88.<sup>84</sup> That the *Epitome* was interested in the burial of Theodosius does reveal an Eastern perspective: it is just the perspective of Jordanes.<sup>85</sup> The proof that the *Epitome* used an eastern consular list also evaporates. Leave to one side that Orosius, Prosper, and Hydatius also had access to such a document, the *Epitome*'s acquaintance with the list is based on reminiscences found in the section taken from Jordanes.<sup>86</sup> Any new hunt for the *Epitome*'s compiler will have to start elsewhere and from rather different assumptions about the nature of his project. The obvious place to look for him would be Italy. The idiosyncratic

<sup>81</sup> Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana* 12.5–8 draws extensively on the *Epitome* for its narrative of Theodosius, including material *verbatim* from Jordanes: e.g., *in pace apud Mediolanium rebus excessit humanis utramque rem publicam utrisque filiis Archadio et Honorio quietam relinquens*. On the manuscripts and transmission of the *Epitome*, see Stover (2017).

<sup>82</sup> The *Etymologiae* of Isidore spring to mind. On Isidore, his sources, and his project, see now the important essay by Barrett (2019). Still later collections of (often rare) late-antique material were assembled well into the Carolingian period: see, e.g., Barrett and Woudhuysen (2016a) on the *Austrasian Letters*; or Holtz (1975) on the Montecassino florilegium.

<sup>83</sup> Schlumberger (1974) 245–6. Festy (1999) lv. The idea was endorsed by Bonamente (2003) 100.

<sup>84</sup> Cameron (2011) 670.

<sup>85</sup> Cameron (2011) 670 also mentions the burial of Constantine (*Epitome* 41.17), but Aurelius Victor, hardly an eastern author, also remarked on that (*Caes.* 41.17).

<sup>86</sup> Cameron cites Burgess (1993a) 201–2. While this does say that the *Epitome* is a user of the consular list, the actual basis for that judgement is to be found in Burgess (1988) i, 39–45, which offers *Epitome* 48.1 (rather different from the other parallel texts), and 48.5, 6, 7 (all from Jordanes). Burgess makes explicit (49) that it is the parallels for 379 to 387–94 that for him demonstrate the use of a common source.

view of Atri's significance would make most sense in an Italian environment, while the fact that Paul the Deacon was the first to draw on the *Epitome* also locates us south of the Alps. In fact, the very use of Jordanes itself points to Italy, which provides our earliest evidence for the reception of the Gothic historian's work. The final of the three classes into which Mommsen divided the manuscripts of Jordanes identifies him as bishop of Ravenna: a very early manuscript of this class (the *Codice Basile*) was written at Bobbio in an Irish minuscule in the second half of the eighth century.<sup>87</sup> The indirect evidence for the early transmission of Jordanes also has a strong Italian flavour: his work was known to the compiler of the *Origo gentis Langobardorum* (composed in the late seventh century), the Ravenna Cosmographer (conventionally dated to ca. 700, but written no earlier than the early ninth century in the form that we have it), Paul the Deacon, and the compiler of the early-ninth-century miscellany of historical texts produced at Verona, sometimes referred to as the *Epitome Philippsiana* (most famous for transmitting the *Origo Constantini Imperatoris*).<sup>88</sup>

In spite of its composition after the sixth or perhaps even the seventh century, the obvious and indisputable quality of the historical information in the *Epitome*, much of it otherwise unattested, can only really be explained by its access to a lost source—and we ought probably to think of only *a single lost source*—that included a great deal of material from the fourth century.<sup>89</sup> There

<sup>87</sup> Mommsen (1882) lxi–lxii: the extant manuscripts of this class contain only the *Getica*, but the archetype of the tradition clearly also had the *Romana*. It is worth pointing out that the extensive lacuna between *Rom.* 302 and 303 (covering the first half of the fourth century) guarantees that the work's entire tradition descends from a single damaged archetype. The early manuscript is Palermo, Archivio di Stato, Codice Basile (Lowe, *CLA Supplement* 1741). Recently, Van Nuffelen and Van Hoof (2020) 100–1, who provide a very helpful overview of the transmission of Jordanes, suggest that Class III (which offers a classicising text of the *Getica*) was the result of corrections by Carolingian scholars, but the provenance and early date of the Palermo manuscript would seem to rule that out: we ought perhaps to be looking in Italy and even earlier for the production of this distinct version.

<sup>88</sup> These readers of Jordanes are briefly surveyed in Mommsen (1882) xlv–xlv (where the *Origo gentis Langobardorum* appears as Secundinus of Trent), lvii–lvix. On the date of the *Origo gentis Langobardorum* see Bracciotti (1998) 7–21, 9–10 for use of Jordanes. The Ravenna Cosmographer's work was edited by Schnetz (1942): he refers to Jordanes by name (1.12) and was certainly writing in Ravenna (4.31), but his date is a rather murkier matter. Dillemann (1997) 26–7 adds to the reference to Venice (4.40, already signalled by Schnetz) the mention of the *Dani* as *Nordomanni* (4.13), which ought to situate us a little after 800 at the earliest; he also offers (46–7) a concise overview of the cosmographer's debt to Jordanes. For Paul the Deacon, see the notes to the edition of Crivellucci (1914): the *Romana* was one of Paul's major sources. The most recent and thorough study of the *Epitome Philippsiana* is Tondini (2011), esp. chapter IV: the Jordanes sections of the (now divided) miscellany are in Berlin, SB MSS Phillipps 1885 and 1896.

<sup>89</sup> Festy (1999) 279–86 usefully collects the information transmitted only by the *Epitome*.

is a long tradition in the study of the *Epitome* that makes it the product of a surprisingly large number of different sources (Greek and Latin), deployed in varying combinations throughout the work.<sup>90</sup> We are to envisage an individual with access to a well-stocked library who wrote with plenty of books around him.<sup>91</sup> His sources included, on any account, several works that have since been lost or largely lost. It is extremely unlikely that an author working in the sixth, let alone the seventh or eighth century would have had access to so many different lost historical works of the fourth century. It is much more economical to suppose that the redactor used a single lost work as his major source for such material as cannot be ascribed to extant texts.

It is to this source that the various first-person statements about, and other evidence of autopsy of, the Roman world as it existed in the later fourth century are to be attributed.<sup>92</sup> The realisation that large portions of the end of the *Epitome* are really from Jordanes has important ramifications for its date. The last historical event that occurs in the text of the *Epitome* (and which is not drawn from Jordanes) is this account of Theodosius' liberality after the defeat of an unnamed *tyrannus* in civil war (48.16–17). We are told:

[16] Melior haud dubie, quod est rarae virtutis, post auctam annis potentiam regalem multoque maxime post civilem victoriam: [17] nam et annonae curam sollicitius attendere et auri argentique grande pondus sublatis atque expensi a tyranno multis e suo restituere, cum benigni principum et quidem vix fundos solerent nudos ac deformata praedia concedere.<sup>93</sup>

<sup>90</sup> Schlumberger (1974) *passim* (with particular emphasis on Nicomachus Flavianus); id. (1976); Barnes (1976) (tending to simplify Schlumberger's thesis, but accepting direct use of at least Marius Maximus and Eunapius); Festy (1999) xii–xxxviii (perhaps the most complex account); Bonamente (2003) 101–3; Cameron (2011) 669–70 for direct use of Greek sources, Marius Maximus, and the common Latin tradition. Contrast Baldwin (1993), a sharply perceptive paper, which (though limited to the emperors from Augustus to Domitian) minimised the number of lost sources and was careful to explain why the *Epitome's* author might have had access to them.

<sup>91</sup> A point made most explicitly by Festy (1999) xlix–l.

<sup>92</sup> E.g., *Epitome* 14.11, on Roman bureaucracy, is particularly revealing because while someone writing in the late fourth century might reasonably (if idiosyncratically) say that it owed much to Hadrian, though Constantine had changed a few things, it is hard to imagine someone saying the same in the late sixth, let alone the seventh, century. Cf. 16.4; 40.10.

<sup>93</sup> Festy punctuates '... *victoriam. Nam ...*', but *attendere* and *restituere* ought probably to be understood as explanatory infinitives, expanding on the idea of the previous section: 'He was undoubtedly better, which is a mark of rare virtue, after his royal power had grown with the years and much better especially after his victory in civil war: [17] for he gave close and careful attention to managing the food supply and restored from his own resources a great weight of gold and of silver stolen or confiscated by the tyrant, while even the

This is a slightly tricky passage to interpret. To this point, the *Epitome* has mentioned, in the section drawn from Jordanes, not one (as here) but two usurpers, defeated in two civil wars: Magnus Maximus and Eugenius. This passage clearly refers to a single usurper and a single civil war, but it is not immediately obvious which one is meant. Examination of sources contemporary with Theodosius shows, however, that it must be Maximus, defeated (finally) in 388.<sup>94</sup> First the *annona*: two letters of Symmachus from 389 mention serious food shortages at Rome, relieved by Theodosius, who supplied the city from the bounty of Macedonia.<sup>95</sup> Second, the restitutions to those whose property had been seized by the *tyrannus*: Pacatus developed the theme of Maximus' confiscations at some length and with considerable colour.<sup>96</sup> While less expansive, he also noted that Theodosius' victory had been marked by a wonderful absence of confiscations and by a series of restorations:

Cuncti domibus suis, cuncti coniugibus ac liberis, cuncti denique (quod est dulcius) innocentiae restituti sunt.<sup>97</sup>

This is not quite what the *Epitome* says happened, but the two texts are natural complements for each other and the presence of the keyword *restituere* is interesting.<sup>98</sup> The aftermath of the civil war with Maximus would thus seem to be the last event known to the *Epitome*'s source: certainly nothing later is mentioned. This fits well with the fact that the text summarises what happened to the usurper and his son without reference to Jordanes (48.6): *apud Aquileiam exstinxit Victoremque eius filium, intra infantiae annos a Maximo patre Augustum factum, necavit*. Significantly, the *Epitome* uses the verb *necare* four other times (I.28; 8.4; 41.18), on another occasion also of the death of a princeling (Crispus, 41.11); in

benevolent among previous emperors were scarcely accustomed to grant back farms stripped bare and estates which had been despoiled'.

<sup>94</sup> As Festy (1999) 235 n. 21 saw.

<sup>95</sup> Sym. *Ep.* 3.55 (to Ricomer), 82 (to Rufinus). See Sogno (2006) 71–6 (with the caution of C. Kelly (2015) 221 n. 39 on Symmachus' movements at the time). Seeck (1883) allowed a date of 382–91 (the appointment of Rufinus as *magister officiorum* and the usurpation of Eugenius as *termini*) in both cases *ad loc.*, but his careful discussion (cxxxv–cxxxvi) puts them 'magna cum probabilitate' in autumn 389. Cameron (2011) 632 makes an extremely convincing case that the acquaintance of Symmachus and Rufinus began in 389 at the earliest, so Seeck's *termini* can be narrowed in a way that makes his judgement certain.

<sup>96</sup> *Pan. Lat.* 2.25–28.3.

<sup>97</sup> *Pan. Lat.* 2.45.6: 'All have been restored to their homes, all to their wives and children, all, finally, (which is sweeter) to their innocence'.

<sup>98</sup> Festy (1999) 235 n. 21 says 'Pacatus dit seulement que les spoliés récupèrent leurs biens (45,6: *Cuncti domibus suis ... restituti sunt*)', but that is not really what Pacatus is saying.

contrast, Jordanes entirely avoids the word. The fate of Victor thus looks very much like it belongs to the *Epitome's* fourth-century source. If so, then the years 388–9 are its *terminus post quem*. Perched between two brutal civil wars, this is a rather odd point for an historical work to have terminated, unless it was written very soon after that date. Given that it seems to have omitted the rather eventful early 390s, we might reasonably wonder whether the *Epitome's* source was finished soon after the defeat of Maximus.<sup>99</sup> It is curious to note that this is a period when the historian Sextus Aurelius Victor was urban prefect at Rome and that the manuscript title of the *Epitome* claims it is derived from his work.<sup>100</sup>

If the *Epitome's* main source stopped in roughly 389 and was written fairly soon after that date, that might have major implications for its links to other historical works written in the last decade of the fourth century: three examples can perhaps illustrate the point. The *Epitome* has been frequently invoked in discussion of both Nicomachus Flavianus, whose *Annales* have been argued to be the text's major source, and Ammianus Marcellinus, with whose *Res Gestae* it has certain factual and verbal overlaps.<sup>101</sup> In all of these efforts, it has seemed obvious that the *Epitome* is later than (and hence ultimately derivative of) the more substantial writings of less anonymous historians.<sup>102</sup> Ammianus completed his *Res Gestae* in or very soon after 390, while, as Cameron has definitively demonstrated, the *Annales* of Nicomachus Flavianus appeared in or just after that same year.<sup>103</sup> On the conventional dating, the *Epitome* falls clearly after both of these works, but in light of what we have demonstrated above, it seems possible that the main source of the text was in fact roughly contemporary with them, perhaps even slightly earlier than them. In a similar vein, Alan Cameron argued in 2011 that the *Epitome* drew on the *Historia Augusta* and thus provided a *terminus ante quem* of 395 for that most controversial work—this could perhaps be moved a few years earlier.<sup>104</sup> Finally, the *Epitome* has often featured in the vigorous arguments over the date at which the *History* of Eunapius of

<sup>99</sup> We intend to investigate the identity and nature of this source in greater detail in a future publication.

<sup>100</sup> Victor: *PLRE* I.960 ('Victor 13'). The manuscript title can be found in Festy (1999) 2.

<sup>101</sup> On Nicomachus Flavianus, see above, pp. 150–1. On Ammianus, see Matthews (2007) 476 n. 6 for a brief and careful discussion. He identifies the following parallels: the obituary of Constantius II (esp. *Epitome* 42.18 and *Amm.* 21.16.4); the elder Gratian (45.2 and 30.7.2); the obituary of Valentinian (45.5–6 and 30.9.4; 45.8 and 30.6.6).

<sup>102</sup> For example, even Cameron (2011) 669 accepted that it was chronologically possible for the *Epitome* to have drawn on Flavianus. Barnes, otherwise a great advocate of common lost sources, held that the *Epitome* might have drawn directly on Ammianus ((1970a) 22–3).

<sup>103</sup> Ammianus: Matthews (2007) 20–7, which remains a compelling demonstration; see also G. Kelly (2008) 8 and Cameron (2012). Flavianus: Cameron (2011) 629–33 (cf. Cameron (2012)).

<sup>104</sup> Cameron (2011) 759–61.

Sardis was published, for the text has been thought to draw on the work.<sup>105</sup> A different date for the major source of the *Epitome* might change how the issue is understood. Future studies of Theodosian historiography can perhaps revisit some of these questions.

The later date for the redaction of the *Epitome* also has important consequences for its *Nachleben*. Three works earlier than Jordanes have been said to show knowledge of the *Epitome*: the Gallic *Chronicle of 511* (an intermittently supplemented version of Jerome's *Chronicon*), the *Historiae adversus paganos* of Orosius, and the *Chronicle* of Marcellinus *comes*. The *Chronicle of 511*'s alleged acquaintance can be dismissed without reference to Jordanes, for it rests on very slender foundations. Festy has argued that the text drew unobtrusively but certainly on the *Epitome*, citing five examples.<sup>106</sup> Two of these relate to calculations: the length of Diocletian's reign as twenty-five years (*Chron. 511* §442 = *Epitome* 39.1) and Julian's age when he was named Caesar (§483 = *Epitome* 42.12). In the first case, there is merely a numeral's difference between the *Chronicle of 511* (*ann. XXV*) and its source, Jerome, *Chron. 225* (*ann. XX*)—since numbers are famously fluid in transmission, it seems unwise to put too much weight on this. In the second case, the two texts actually say something slightly different: the *Chronicle of 511* that Julian was *annorum XXIII*, the *Epitome* that he was *annos natum fere tres atque viginti*. The three other examples Festy gives are equally unpersuasive. The *Chronicle of 511* does indeed say (§457) that Maxentius died *lapsus in Tiberim* and the *Epitome* (40.7) says *lapsu equi in profundum demersus est*. Other than the word *lapsus* (in one case a participle, in the other a noun), there is no common ground here: there are also only so many ways in Latin to say that someone fell. Equally, the *Chronicle of 511*'s description of Julian's proclamation (§487: *Iulianus a militibus Augustus appellatur*) is not drawn from the *Epitome*'s (42.15) *hic a militibus gallicanis Augustus pronuntiat*. The two lines share nothing but *Augustus* and *milites* and since Julian was proclaimed Augustus by the soldiers, it would be more surprising if either had an entry

<sup>105</sup> This is much-disputed territory and we highlight only some of the landmarks. It was long assumed that Eunapius' work terminated in 395, but in the 1970s Barnes (1976) 266 and (1978) 114–23 argued that it in fact finished with the battle of Adrianople and was issued not long after. This case was assailed by Paschoud (2006) 93–106 and 153–94 (essays originally published in the 1980s, but reissued more recently with additional material), who argued strongly for a first edition terminating in 395. The question has recently been reviewed by Cameron (2011) 668–78, with a preference for an earlier date.

<sup>106</sup> Festy (1999) lxi: 'Les points de contact avec l'*Epitome*, qui ont échappé à Mommsen, sont peu nombreux, mais certains'. Three of Festy's five (the two Julianic and the Maxentian passages) were also spotted by Holder-Egger (1875) 15, who accepted use of the *Epitome* by the *Chronicle of 511* 'auf diese geringen Anzeichen'. *Pace* Holder-Egger, it is not clear that knowledge of 'die Compilationsweise des Chronisten' does license us to draw firm conclusions from this meagre evidence. The Hieronymian portion of the *Chronicle of 511* (the part relevant here) was edited in Mommsen (1892) 632–44.

that omitted those two words. Finally, while both the *Chronicle of 511* (§329) and the *Epitome* (10.9) record the emperor Titus saying of a day in which he had granted no man anything *amici, hodie diem perdidimus*, the line was (with a first-person singular verb) in Jerome (*Chronicon* 189<sup>a</sup>, the major source of the *Chronicle of 511*; *Commentarii in IV epistulas Paulinas, Ad Galatas* 3.6.10) and Eutropius (7.21.4).<sup>107</sup> We may not think much of the compiler of the *Chronicle of 511*, but even he was presumably capable of changing the number of a verb without a textual source.<sup>108</sup> There is no reason to think that the author of the text, whoever he may have been and wherever he was working, knew the *Epitome*.<sup>109</sup>

Orosius and Marcellinus *comes* are slightly more complex cases, but here Jordanes can lend considerable aid. Festy noted that Orosius' use of the text was 'discrete and limited to the reign of Theodosius', singling out two important convergences.<sup>110</sup> Even the sceptical Van Nuffelen is persuaded that 'Orosius heavily relied on the work ... especially for the reigns of Gratian and Theodosius'.<sup>111</sup> There is, however, a simple explanation for those passages where Orosius and the *Epitome* seem to resemble each other: Jordanes drew extensively on the work of Orosius in the *Romana* and also cited him four times by name in the *Getica*.<sup>112</sup> The faint traces of the text in the *Historiae adversus paganos* are actually the result of Jordanes using that text, rather than Orosius using the *Epitome*.<sup>113</sup> Similarly, building on a suggestion of O. Holder-Egger,

<sup>107</sup> It also occurs (reported, rather than direct speech) in Auson. *Grat. act.* 16.72.

<sup>108</sup> He may well have thought that the plural *amici* required it. The advice was, in any case, completely conventional in early-sixth-century Gaul, see Barrett and Woudhuysen (2016b), esp. ll. 17–18 of Remigius' letter.

<sup>109</sup> Almost everything about the text is murky: see Burgess (2001) 85–92, who makes a case for Arles (or somewhere nearby) as the place of composition.

<sup>110</sup> Festy (1999) lxi: 'discrète et limitée au règne de Théodose'. Oros. 7.34.3, *propagator Ecclesiae* vs *Epitome* 48.5, *propagator rei publicae*; Oros. 7.35.33, *Theodosius autem composita tranquillataque republica apud Mediolanum constitutus diem obiit* vs *Epitome* 48.19, *utramque rem publicam ... quietam relinquens*. The *Epitome* is not listed as one of Orosius' sources in Arnaud-Lindet (1991).

<sup>111</sup> Van Nuffelen (2012) 105, with tables of parallels on 106–8.

<sup>112</sup> Mommsen (1882) xxvii; *Get.* 4, 44, 58, 121.

<sup>113</sup> Prose rhythm can help confirm this. For example, of Festy's two proofs, it is worth noting that *quietam relinquens* (◡'◡◡'◡◡ or ◡'◡◡'◡) has an accentual rhythm (a *tardus* or a *planus* depending on whether Jordanes counted *-qu-* as a distinct syllable) and so is likely Jordanic; *propagator rei publicae* is not the end of a clause, so its lack of rhythm is unsurprising. Most of the examples in Van Nuffelen (2012) 106–8 come from the passages common to the *Romana/Epitome* given in full above (Oros. 7.33.13–15 vs *Epitome* 46.2 on the battle of Adrianople; Oros. 7.35.10 vs *Epitome* 48.7, on the defeat of Maximus) and do not require detailed treatment. The others are not more convincing. The key details of Oros. 7.33.8 on Gratian's victory at the battle of Argentaria come not from the *Epitome* 47.2 (as Van Nuffelen suggests), but from Jerome, *Chron.* 248<sup>f</sup>. The connection between Oros. 7.34.1–2 vs *Epitome* 48.1 (the proclamation of Theodosius) is weak. There is little reason to think Orosius needed

Rainer Jakobi has argued that Marcellinus *comes* shows the impress of the *Epitome* on four occasions in his account of Theodosius.<sup>114</sup> Once again, Jordanes made extensive use of the *Chronicle* of Marcellinus in the *Romana*: he is probably one of the authors who lies concealed beneath a general reference to *annales consulumque series* in the epilogue to the work.<sup>115</sup> So, repetitively but not unimportantly, the apparent use of the *Epitome* by Marcellinus is really a case of Jordanes reading the latter's *Chronicle*.<sup>116</sup> The alleged use of the *Epitome* by Orosius and Marcellinus, far from being evidence that the text circulated before Jordanes was writing, actually helps to demonstrate the opposite. One important consequence of this is that, for the residue of facts that cannot be explained by use of Orosius or Marcellinus, Jordanes' account of the usurper Eugenius needs to be carefully examined, while the *Epitome* can be removed from the list of contemporary witnesses.<sup>117</sup> Another is that the strongest proof (as it is argued) for the dependency of Jordanes on the *Historia Romana* of Symmachus vanishes: there is no characteristically Symmachian amalgam of the *Epitome* and Orosius in Jordanes.<sup>118</sup> There is just Jordanes.

a written source to write that Theodosius was a Spaniard who claimed descent from Trajan and who was proclaimed emperor at Sirmium by Gratian, or that the latter reigned with his uncle (Valens) and brother (Valentinian II). The same is true of Oros. 7.34.9 vs *Epitome* 47.7 on Magnus Maximus seizing power in Britain and crossing to Gaul.

<sup>114</sup> Jakobi (2012) 126–8. Holder-Egger (1877) 103ff. Jakobi was arguing against Croke (2001) 206–7 on the question of sources and Cameron (2001) on the issue of possible interpolation. The four passages are: Marcellinus 395.2, *corpus eius eodem anno Constantinopolim adlatum atque sepultum* vs *Epitome* 48.20, *corpus eius eodem anno Constantinopolim translatum atque sepultum est* (Jakobi also notes the use of *corpus eius* at *Epitome* 27.3); 391.3, **Eugenius Arbogasti favore confisus imperium sibi usurpavit** vs 48.7, **hic etenim Eugenius confisus viribus Arbogastis, postquam apud Viennam Valentinianum extinxerat, regnum invasit, sed mox simul cum vita imperium perdidit**; 392.1, *Arbogastes Valentiniano imperatore extincto et Eugenio Caesare facto innumeras invictasque copias undique in Gallias contraxit, Occidentale sibi imperium utpote vindicaturus* vs 48.7, for the use of *extinguere* (though noting Oros. 7.35.11 as the main source); 395.1, *Theodosius Magnus apud Mediolanum vita decessit. Imperavit annos decem et septem* vs 48.19, **apud Mediolanum excessit** and 48.1, *imperator effectus regnavit annos decem et septem*.

<sup>115</sup> Mommsen (1882) xxix; *Romana* 388. See also Croke (1983), esp. 90–1 (though attributing some things to a common source).

<sup>116</sup> Once again, prose rhythm helps: compare Marcellinus, *Eugenius Arbogastis favore confisus* (∪'∪∪∪, with no rhythm) with Jordanes and the *Epitome*, *Eugenius confisus viribus Arbogastis* (∪∪∪∪'∪, a *velox*). This is clearly Jordanes rewriting his non-rhythmical source.

<sup>117</sup> This runs counter to the arguments of Croke (1975) on Jordanes and (very briefly) Croke (1976) 239 (on the contemporary *Epitome*). Croke may of course still be right that Jordanes' account is hopelessly riddled with error, but if so, the reason is not merely incompetent use of the *Epitome*. Cf. Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2020) 153 for the idea that all of Jordanes' sources for these events can be identified.

<sup>118</sup> See above, p. 154 and n. 18.

While one tangle of textual overlaps can henceforth be ignored, the realisation that the *Epitome de Caesaribus* has drawn from Jordanes should make us take a closer look at another. Some extended stretches of the *Epitome* overlap *verbatim* with portions of the *Breviarium* of Eutropius (see the ‘Appendix’, below, pp. 180–2, where the two are compared). These passages have not attracted that much attention, largely because, when they are considered at all, it is generally with the idea that much fourth-century historical writing shared a common source.<sup>119</sup> In this context, specific *verbatim* overlaps between any two texts have perhaps received less scrutiny than they deserve.<sup>120</sup> Since Eutropius completed his work in 369/70, it is possible that the *verbatim* overlaps between the *Breviarium* and the *Epitome* go back to the latter’s source, rather than being a product of its post-550 redaction. Having seen how the redactor manipulated parts of the *Romana*, however, it seems methodologically sounder to take a more sceptical approach to these verbal overlaps than previous scholarship has done. If the compiler of the *Epitome* as we have it was happy to insert passages from Jordanes with only very light retouching, then he may well have done the same thing with Eutropius—that would, again, be the economical conclusion. Eutropius’s *Breviarium*, ‘the most influential textbook of Roman history ever produced’, was a popular and widely-read work throughout late antiquity and the early Middle Ages, so (unlike Marius Maximus or Nicomachus Flavianus), it does not strain plausibility to suppose that a later redactor had access to him.<sup>121</sup> The idea is supported, moreover, by the way that Eutropius has been used in the text: not as a block insert at some point where information was lacking, but carefully threaded through the work. Like the passages taken from the *Romana*, the bits of the *Epitome* derived from the *Breviarium* are integral to the text as we have it. Without them, the *Epitome* would have no real account of Probus or of Carus and his sons, Carinus and Numerian, just as without Jordanes it would have little to say about Valens. In the *Epitome*’s narrative of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, sections of Eutropius have been skilfully inserted out of their original order, just as the *Romana* has

<sup>119</sup> In general, Barnes (1970a) (with extensive discussion of earlier work); cf. id. (1970b), (1978) 91–4; Syme (1980); see also id. (1968) 105–6. More recently, this is an idea which R. W. Burgess (1993b), (1995a), (1995b), and (2005) has pursued most doggedly and systematically.

<sup>120</sup> A salutary twentieth-century exception is Hartke (1932) 16, who provided (essentially irrefutable) evidence for direct use of Eutropius by the *Epitome* on textual grounds. Schlumberger (1974) 66–8 and (1976) 202–4 was inclined to see the *Epitome* as drawing directly on Eutropius, but Barnes (1976) 263 preferred a common source (though cf. Barnes (1970a) 22–3 and (1978) 104–6, 119) as did Syme (1980) (in general, e.g., 274, but 273 for one *verbatim* overlap). Festy (1999) xxvi, xxx–xxxii, xxxviii, professing great uncertainty, favours some direct acquaintance with Eutropius.

<sup>121</sup> The quotation is from Kulikowski (2018) 150. On the work’s popularity, see briefly Hellegouarc’h (1999) lv–lviii.

been manipulated to frame the text's account of Theodosius. It is hard to be certain, but there is a striking reminiscence between the way that the late redactor of the *Epitome* has used Jordanes and what we see in the text's overlaps with Eutropius. If the redactor of the *Epitome* is responsible for the inclusion of chunks of Eutropius in the text, then that has quite serious implications for the study of connections between historical works written in the fourth century. The overlap between *Epitome* and *Breviarium* would reflect not shared access to a widely used common source, but direct use of one text by the compiler of another. It might be worth revisiting the assumption that has driven so much modern work on the subject: that most fourth-century Latin historians were largely in the business of adapting a text fundamentally similar to their own that does not survive and which we can only approach indirectly.

Much about the *Epitome de Caesaribus* is still uncertain: the familiar scholarly debatable land of sources, *Tendenz*, and compositional context. On one very important question, however, much greater certainty is now possible: as we have it, the *Epitome* was compiled after the middle decades of the sixth century, quite possibly even after the life and times of Isidore of Seville. It offers us a great deal of important information about the fourth century, but that is because of its source, not the *Epitome* as we read it today. The nature of its relationship to other works of history written in the fourth century needs to be carefully rethought, for it is not itself a fourth-century production. Instead, the text offers us a fascinating insight into the way that Roman history was read, compiled, and adapted at the very end of late antiquity, perhaps even in the early Middle Ages. The question of where it was compiled, by whom, and with what materials is tantalising. Bantam, in other words, but punching above its weight.

*University of Edinburgh*

JUSTIN A. STOVER  
Justin.Stover@ed.ac.uk

*University of Nottingham*

GEORGE WOULDHUYSEN  
George.Woudhuysen@nottingham.ac.uk

## APPENDIX

## EUTROPIUS AND THE EPITOME

The table below lays out only the *verbatim* or near-*verbatim* overlaps between the *Epitome* and the *Breviarium* of Eutropius (in italics, embedded in their broader context).<sup>122</sup> It does not seek to catalogue those passages where they share facts, details, or ideas.

<i>Epitome de Caesaribus</i>	Eutropius, <i>Breviarium</i>
[16.5] Qui Verus inter Altinum atque Concordiam iter faciens, <i>ictu sanguinis, quem morbum Graeci ἀπόπληξιν vocant ...</i>	[8.10.3] obiit tamen in Venetia, cum a Concordia civitate Altinum proficisceretur et cum fratre in vehiculo sederet, subito <i>sanguine ictus casu morbi, quem Graeci apoplexin vocant.</i>
[16.7] Post cuius obitum <i>Marcus Antoninus rem publicam solus tenuit. A principio vitae tranquillissimus, adeo ut ab infantia vultum nec ex gaudio nec ex maerore mutaverit</i> , philosophiae studens litterarumque Graecarum.	[8.11.1] Post eum <i>Marcus Antoninus solus rem publicam tenuit, vir quem mirari facilius quisquam laudare possit. A principio vitae tranquillissimus, adeo ut ex infantia quoque vultum nec ex gaudio nec ex maerore mutaverit.</i> Philosophiae deditus Stoicae, ipse etiam non solum vitae moribus, sed etiam eruditione philosophus.
[16.8] <i>Hic permisit viris clarioribus ut convivia eodem cultu quo ipse et ministris similibus exhiberent.</i>	[8.14.1] <i>Hic permisit viris clarioribus, ut convivia eodem cultu quo ipse et ministris similibus exhiberent.</i>
[16.9–10] <i>Hic, cum aerario exhausto largitiones quas militibus impenderet non haberet, neque indicare provincialibus aut senatui aliquid vellet, instrumentum regii cultus facta in foro Traiani sectione distraxit, vasa aurea, pocula crystallina et murrina, uxoriam ac suam sericam et auream vestem, multa ornamenta gemmarum, ac per duos continuos menses venditio habita est multumque auri redactum. [10] Post victoriam tamen, emptoribus pretia restituit qui reddere comparata voluerunt; molestus nulli fuit qui maluit semel empta retinere.</i>	[8.13.2] Ad huius belli sumptum <i>cum aerario exhausto largitiones nullas haberet neque indicare provincialibus aut senatui aliquid vellet, instrumentum regii cultus facta in foro divi Traiani sectione distraxit, vasa aurea, pocula crystallina et murrina, uxoriam ac suam sericam et auream vestem, multa ornamenta gemmarum. Ac per duos continuos menses ea venditio habita est multumque auri redactum. Post victoriam tamen emptoribus pretia restituit, qui reddere comparata voluerunt; molestus nulli fuit, qui maluit semel empta retinere.</i>
[17.4] In tantum <i>depravatus [sc. Commodus] ut gladiatoriiis armis saepissime in amphitheatro dimicaverit.</i>	[8.15] sed luxuria et obscenitate <i>depravatus gladiatoriiis armis saepissime in ludo, deinceps</i>

<sup>122</sup> The text is that of Festy (1999) and Santini (1979), respectively.

	etiam <i>in amphitheatro</i> cum huiusmodi hominibus saepe <i>dimicavit</i> .
[19.1] Didius Iulianus, ortu Mediolanensis, imperavit mensibus septem; <i>vir nobilis, iure peritissimus</i> , factiosus, praeceps, regnis avidus.	[8.17] Post eum Salvius Iulianus rem publicam invasit, <i>vir nobilis et iure peritissimus</i> , nepos Salvi Iuliani, qui sub divo Hadriano perpetuum composuit edictum.
[20.2] Hic [Severus] Pescennium interemit, hominem omnium turpitudinum. <i>Sub eo etiam Albinus</i> , qui <i>in Gallia se Caesarem fecerat</i> , <i>apud Lugdunum</i> occiditur.	[8.18.4] Pescennium Nigrum, qui in Aegypto et Syria rebellaverat, apud Cyzicum interfecit ... Sub eo etiam Clodius Albinus, qui in occidendo Pertinace socius fuerat Iuliano, Caesarem <i>se in Gallia fecit</i> , victusque <i>apud Lugdunum</i> est interfectus.
[20.3] Hic Severus <i>filios</i> suos <i>successores reliquit</i> .	[8.19.2] [Nam] <i>filios</i> duos <i>successores reliquit</i> , Bassianum et Getam ...
[20.4] Hic [Severus] in Britannia <i>vallum per triginta duo passuum milia a mari ad mare deduxit</i> .	[8.19.1] Novissimum bellum in Britannia habuit, utque receptas provincias omni securitate muniret, <i>vallum per CXXXII passuum milia a mari ad mare deduxit</i> .
[21.5] [ <i>sc.</i> Caracalla] Fuit <i>impatiens libidinis</i> , quippe <i>qui novercam suam duxit uxorem</i> .	[8.20.1] <i>Inpatientis libidinis</i> , <i>qui novercam suam Iuliam uxorem duxerit</i> .
[23.3] <i>is</i> [ <i>sc.</i> Heliogabalus] <i>cum Romam ingenti militum et senatus expectatione venisset, probris se omnibus contaminavit ...</i> [23.5] ipse <i>tumultu militari interfectus est</i> .	[8.22] <i>is cum Romam ingenti et militum et senatus expectatione venisset, probris se omnibus contaminavit ...</i> biennio post et octo mensibus <i>tumultu interfectus est militari</i>
[29.1–2] <i>Decius e Pannonia inferiore, Bubaliae natus</i> . [2] Hic Decium <i>filium suum Caesarem fecit ...</i>	[9.4] Post hos <i>Decius e Pannonia inferiore Budaliae natus</i> imperium sumpsit. Bellum civile quod in Gallia motum fuerat oppressit. <i>Filium suum Caesarem fecit</i> .
[31.1] <i>Sub his</i> [ <i>sc.</i> Gallus et Volusianus] etiam <i>Aemilianus in Moesia</i> imperator effectus est. Contra quem <i>ambo profecti</i> , apud <i>Interamnam</i> ab exercitu suo caeduntur ...	[9.5] Mox imperatores creati sunt Gallus Hostilianus et Galli filius Volusianus. <i>Sub iis Aemilianus in Moesia</i> res novas molitus est; ad quem opprimendum cum <i>ambo profecti</i> essent, <i>Interamnae</i> interfecti sunt non completo biennio.
[32.5] <i>Valerianus</i> vero, <i>in Mesopotamia bellum gerens, a Sapore Persarum rege superatus, mox etiam captus, apud Parthos ignobili servitute consenuit</i> .	[9.7] <i>Valerianus in Mesopotamia bellum gerens a Sapore Persarum rege superatus est, mox etiam captus apud Parthos ignobili servitute consenuit</i> .
[35.4] Hoc tempore <i>in urbe Roma monetarii rebellaverunt, quos Aurelianus victos ultima crudelitate compescuit</i> .	[9.14] Hoc imperante etiam <i>in urbe monetarii rebellaverunt</i> vitiatas pecuniis et Felicissimo rationali interfecto, <i>quos Aurelianus victos ultima crudelitate compescuit</i> .

<p>[35.8–9] <i>Novissime fraude servi sui, qui ad quosdam militares viros, amicos ipsius, nomina pertulit annotata, falso manum eius imitatus tamquam Aurelianus ipsos pararet occidere, ab isdem interfectus est in itineris medio quod inter Constantinopolim et Heracleam est. [9] Fuit saevus et sanguinarius et trux omni tempore, etiam filii sororis interfector.</i></p>	<p>[9.15.2] <i>Occiditur servi sui fraude, qui ad quosdam militares viros amicos ipsius nomina pertulit adnotata falso manum eius imitatus, tamquam Aurelianus ipsos pararet occidere; itaque ut praeveniretur, ab isdem interfectus est in itineris medio, quod inter Constantinopolim et Heracleam est stratae veteris. [9.14] Saevus et sanguinarius ac necessarius magis in quibusdam quam in ullo amabilis imperator. Trux omni tempore, etiam filii sororis interfector ...</i></p>
<p>[36.1] <i>Tacitus post hunc suscepit imperium, vir egregie moratus ...</i></p>	<p>[9.16] <i>Tacitus post hunc suscepit imperium, vir egregie moratus ...</i></p>
<p>[37.1] <i>Probus, genitus patre agresti hortorum studioso Dalmatio nomine, imperavit annos sex. [2] Iste Saturninum in Oriente, Proculum et Bonosum Agrippinae imperatores effectos oppressit. [3] Vineas Gallos et Pannonios habere permisit. Opere militari Almam montem apud Sirmium et Aureum apud Moesiam superiorem vineis conseruit. [4] Hic Sirmii in turri ferrata occiditur.</i></p>	<p>[9.17] <i>Post hunc Probus, vir inlustris gloria militari, ad administrationem rei publicae accessit. Gallias a barbaris occupatas ingenti proeliorum felicitate restituit, quosdam imperium usurpare conatos, scilicet Saturninum in Oriente, Proculum et Bonosum Agrippinae, certaminibus oppressit. [2] Vineas Gallos et Pannonios habere permisit, opere militari Almam montem apud Sirmium et Aureum apud Moesiam superiorem vineis conseruit et provincialibus colendos dedit ... [3] interfectus tamen Sirmi tumultu militari in turri ferrata.</i></p>
<p>[38.1] <i>Carus, Narbonae natus, imperavit annos duos. [2] Iste confestim Carinum et Numerianum Caesares fecit. [3] Hic apud Ctesiphonta ictu fulminis interiit. [4] Numerianus quoque, filius eius, cum oculorum dolore correptus in lecticula veheretur, impulsore Apro, qui socer eius erat, per insidias occisus est. [5] Cum dolo occultaretur ipsius mors quousque Aper invadere posset imperium, foetore cadaveris scelus est proditum. [6] Hinc Sabinus Iulianus invadens imperium a Carino in campis Veronensibus occiditur. [7] Hic Carinus omnibus se sceleribus inquinavit; plurimos innoxios fictis criminibus occidit; matrimonia nobilium corrumpit; condiscipulis quoque, qui eum in auditorio verbi fatigatione taxaverunt, perniciosus fuit.</i></p>	<p>[9.18] <i>Post hunc Carus est factus Augustus, Narbone natus in Gallia. Is confestim Carinum et Numerianum filios Caesares fecit ... Et cum castra supra Tigridem haberet, vi divini fulminis periit. [2] Numerianus quoque filius eius, quem secum Caesarem ad Persas duxerat, adulescens egregiae indolis, cum oculorum dolore correptus in lecticula veheretur, impulsore Apro qui socer eius erat per insidias occisus est. Et cum dolo occultaretur ipsius mors, quousque Aper invadere posset imperium, foetore cadaveris prodita est ... [9.18] Interea Carinus, quem Caesarem ad Parthos proficiscens Carus in Illyrico Gallia Italia reliquerat, omnibus se sceleribus inquinavit; plurimos innoxios fictis criminibus occidit, matrimonia nobilia corrumpit, condiscipulis quoque qui eum in auditorio vel levi fatigatione taxaverant perniciosus fuit.</i></p>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnaud-Lindet, M.-P. (1991) *Orose: Histoires (Contre les Païens). Tome III: Livre VII, Index* (Paris).
- Arnold, J. J. (2014) *Theoderic and the Roman Imperial Restoration* (Cambridge).
- Aussenac, E. (2001) 'L'*Origo Constantini*: rétroaction et approche d'une datation', *Latomus* 60: 671–6.
- Baldini, A. (1999) 'Un'ipotesi su una tradizione occidentale post-Flaviana', in F. Paschoud, ed., *Historia Augusta Colloquium Genevense* (Bari) 14–31.
- Baldwin, B. (1993) 'The *Epitome de Caesaribus*, from Augustus to Domitian', *QUCC* 43: 81–101.
- Barnes, T. D. (1970a) 'The Lost *Kaisergeschichte* and the Latin Historical Tradition', in J. Straub, ed., *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1968/1969* (Bonn) 13–43.
- (1970b) 'Three Notes on the *Vita Probi*', *CQ* 20: 198–203.
- (1976) 'The *Epitome de Caesaribus* and its Sources', *CPh* 71: 258–68.
- (1978) *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Brussels).
- (1989) 'Jerome and the *Origo Constantini Imperatoris*', *Phoenix* 43: 158–61.
- (2002) 'Review of Festy (1999)', *CR* 52: 25–7.
- (2011) *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire* (Chichester).
- Barrett, G. (2019) 'God's Librarian: Isidore of Seville and His Literary Agenda', in A. Fear and J. Wood, edd., *A Companion to Isidore of Seville* (Leiden and Boston) 42–100.
- and G. Woudhuysen (2016a) 'Assembling the *Austrasian Letters* at Trier and Lorsch', *Early Medieval Europe* 24: 3–57.
- (2016b) 'Remigius and the "Important News" of Clovis Rewritten', *Antiquité Tardive* 24: 471–500.
- Bianchi, D. (1956) 'Note sui *Getica* di Giordane e loro clausule', *Aevum* 30: 239–46.
- Birley, A. R. (2003) 'The *Historia Augusta* and Pagan Historiography', in Marasco (2003) 127–49.
- Bleckmann, B. (1992) *Die Reichskrise des III. Jahrhunderts in der spätantiken und byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung: Untersuchungen zu den nachdionischen Quellen der Chronik des Johannes Zonaras* (Munich).
- (1995) 'Bemerkungen zu den *Annales* des Nicomachus Flavianus', *Historia* 44: 83–99.
- (1999) 'Decentius, Bruder oder Cousin des Magnentius', *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 2: 85–7.
- den Boer, W. (1972) *Some Minor Roman Historians* (Leiden).
- Bonamente, G. (2003) 'Minor Latin Historians of the Fourth Century A.D.', in Marasco (2003) 85–125.

- Bracciotti, A. (1998) *Origo gentis Langobardorum: introduzione, testo critico, commento* (Rome).
- Bradley, D. R. (1963) 'The Getica-fragments in Codex Palatinus Latinus 927', *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 5: 366–82.
- (1993) 'In altum laxare vela compulsus: The "Getica" of Jordanes', *Hermes* 121: 211–36.
- (1997) 'Some Textual Problems in the "Getica" of Jordanes', *Hermes* 125: 215–30.
- Burgess, R. W. (1988) *Hydatius: A Late Roman Chronicler in Post-Roman Spain. An Historiographical Study and New Critical Edition of the Chronicle*, 2 vols (DPhil thesis, Oxford).
- (1993a) *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana: Two Contemporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire* (Oxford).
- (1993b) 'Principes cum Tyrannis: Two Studies on the Kaisergeschichte and its Tradition', *CQ* 43: 491–500.
- (1995a) 'Jerome and the *Kaisergeschichte*', *Historia* 44: 349–69.
- (1995b) 'On the Date of the *Kaisergeschichte*', *CPh* 90: 111–28.
- (2001) 'The Gallic Chronicle of 511: A New Critical Edition with a Brief Introduction', in R. W. Mathisen and D. Shanzer, edd., *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul: Revisiting the Sources* (Aldershot) 85–100.
- (2005) 'A Common Source for Jerome, Eutropius, Festus, Ammianus, and the *Epitome de Caesaribus* between 358 and 378, along with Further Thoughts on the Date and Nature of the *Kaisergeschichte*', *CPh* 100: 166–92.
- (2018) '*Epitome de Caesaribus*', in Nicholson (2018) I.551.
- Callu, J.-P. (1985) 'La premiere diffusion de "l'Histoire Auguste" (VI<sup>e</sup>-IX<sup>e</sup> S.)', in J. Straub, ed., *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1982/1983* (Bonn) 89–129.
- Cameron, A. D. E. (2001) 'The *Epitome de Caesaribus* and the *Chronicle* of Marcellinus', *CQ* 51: 324–7.
- (2011) *The Last Pagans of Rome* (New York and Oxford).
- (2012) 'Nicomachus Flavianus and the Date of Ammianus's Last Books', *Athenaeum* 100: 337–58.
- and J. Long (1993) *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Cinato, F. (forthcoming) '*Synonoma Ciceronis*', in Stover (forthcoming).
- Clark, C. U. (1915) 'Review of C. C. Mierow, *The Gothic History of Jordanes* (Princeton, 1915)', *Classical Weekly* 9: 15–16.
- Codrington, R. (1654) *The History of Iustine, Taken Out of the Four and Forty Books of Trogus Pompeius: Contaning [sic] the Affairs of All Ages and Countryes, Both in Peace and War, From the Beginning of the World Until the Time of the Roman Emperors. Together, With the Epitomie of the Lives and Manners of the Roman Emperors, from Octavius Augustus Caesar, to the Emperor Theodosius* (London).

- Colombo, M. (2019) 'Il *Romuleon* di Benvenuto da Imola, la storia di Roma e un'epistola di Petrarca', *Filologicamente: Studi e testi romanzi* 3: 11–31
- Cristini, M. (2020) 'Vergil Among the Goths: A Note on Jordanes, *Getica* 44', *Rh. Mus.* 163: 235–40.
- Crivellucci, A. (1914) *Pauli Diaconi Historia Romana* (Rome).
- Croke, B. (1975) 'Jordanes' Understanding of the Usurpation of Eugenius', *Antichthon* 9: 81–3.
- (1976) 'Arbogast and the Death of Valentinian II', *Historia* 25: 235–44.
- (1983) 'A.D. 476: The Manufacture of a Turning Point', *Chiron* 13: 81–119.
- (2001) *Count Marcellinus and His Chronicle* (Oxford).
- Dillemann, L., with Y. Janvier (1997) *La Cosmographie du Ravennate* (Brussels).
- Enßlin, W. (1949) *Des Symmachus Historia Romana als Quelle für Jordanes* (SB Bayer. Akad., Phil-hist. Kl. Jhg. 1948, Heft 3; Munich).
- Festy, M. (1997) 'Le début et la fin des *Annales* de Nicomaque Flavien', *Historia* 46: 465–78.
- (1999) *Pseudo-Aurélius Victor: Abrégé des Césars* (Paris).
- (2003) 'De l'*Epitome de Caesaribus* à la *Chronique* de Marcellin: l'*Historia Romana* de Symmaque le Jeune', *Historia* 52: 251–5.
- (2014) 'Autour de l'*Historia romana* de Symmaque le Jeune', in C. Bertrand and F. Chausson, edd., *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Nanceiense* (Bari) 243–64.
- Fornara, C. W. (1992) 'Studies in Ammianus Marcellinus II: Ammianus' Knowledge and Use of Greek and Latin Literature', *Historia* 41: 420–38.
- Galdi, G. (2010) 'Late *sparsa collegimus*: the Influence of Sources on the Language of Jordanes', in E. Dickey and A. Chahoud, edd., *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (Cambridge) 357–75.
- (2012) 'Syntactic and Stylistic Remarks on the *Epitome de Caesaribus*', in F. Biville, M.-K. Lhommé, and D. Vallat, edd., *Latin Vulgaire–Latin Tardif IX. Actes du IX<sup>e</sup> colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Lyon 2–6 septembre 2009* (Lyon) 921–32.
- Gitner, A. (forthcoming) 'Hegesippus', in Stover (forthcoming).
- Hartke, W. (1932) *De saeculi quarti exeuntis historiarum scriptoribus quaestiones dissertatio inauguralis quam consensu et auctoritate amplissimi philosophorum ordinis in litterarum universitate Friderica Guilelma Berolinensi ad summos in philosophia honores rite impretandos* (Leipzig).
- Hellegouarc'h, J. (1999) *Eutrope: Abrégé d'Histoire Romaine* (Paris).
- Helttula, A. (1987) *Studies on the Latin Accusative Absolute* (*Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 81) (Helsinki).
- Hertz, M. (1874) *De Ammiani Marcellinis studiis Sallustianis dissertatio* (Breslau [Wrocław]).
- Holder-Egger, O. (1875) *Über die Weltchronik des sogenannten Severus Sulpitius und südgalischen Annalen des fünften Jahrhunderts: eine Quellenuntersuchung* (Göttingen).

- (1877) ‘Untersuchungen über einige annalistische Quellen zur Geschichte des fünften und sechsten Jahrhunderts’, *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde* 2: 47–109.
- Holtz, L. (1975) ‘Le Parisinus latinus 7530, synthèse cassinienne des arts libéraux’, *Studi Medievali* 16: 97–152.
- Jakobi, R. (2012) ‘Adnoten zu den Quellen der Chronik des Marcellinus Comes’, *Hermes* 140: 126–9.
- Kelly, C. (2015) ‘Pliny and Pacatus: Past and Present in Imperial Panegyric’, in J. Wienand, ed., *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century A.D.* (Oxford) 215–38.
- Kelly, G. (2008) *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian* (Cambridge).
- (2013) ‘Ammianus’ Greek Accent’, *Talanta* 45: 67–79.
- Klebs, E. (1889) ‘Das Valesische Bruchstück zur Geschichte Constantins’, *Philologus* 47: 53–80.
- König, I. (1987) *Origo Constantini. Anonymus Valesianus, Teil 1: Text und Kommentar* (Trier).
- Kruse, M. (2019) *The Politics of Roman Memory: From the Fall of the Western Empire to the Age of Justinian* (Philadelphia).
- Kulikowski, M. (2018) ‘Classicizing History and Historical Epitomes’, in S. McGill and E. J. Watts, ed., *A Companion to Late Antique Literature* (Hoboken, N.J.) 143–59.
- La Rocca, C. (1994) ‘Castrum vel potius civitas’, in R. Francovich and G. Noyé, ed., *La storia dell’alto medioevo italiano* (Florence) 545–54.
- Lenski, N. (1997) ‘Initium mali Romano imperio: Contemporary Reactions to the Battle of Adrianople’, *TAPhA* 127: 129–68.
- (2002) *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).
- Marasco, G., ed. (2003) *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.* (Leiden and Boston).
- Mastandrea, P. (2011) ‘Vita dei principi e Storia Romana, tra Simmaco e Giordane’, in L. Cristane and S. Ravalico, ed., *Il calamo della memoria IV: Riuso di testi e mestiere letterario nella tarda antichità* (Trieste) 207–45.
- Matthews, J. F. (1970) ‘Olympiodorus of Thebes and the History of the West (A.D. 407–425)’, *JRS* 60: 79–97.
- (2007) *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*, rev. ed. (Ann Arbor).
- de Min, M. (1986) ‘Adria’, in G. Cavalieri Manasse, ed., *Il Veneto in età Romana*, vol. 2 (Verona) 255–68.
- Momigliano, A. (1955) ‘Cassiodorus and Italian Culture of His Time’, *PBA* 41: 218–45; repr. in and cited from id., *Studies in Historiography* (London, 1966) 181–210.

- (1963) ‘Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.’, in id., ed., *The Conflict between Christianity and Paganism in the Fourth Century* (Oxford) 79–99.
- Mommsen, Th. (1882) *Iordanis Romana et Getica* (MGH AA 5.1; Berlin).
- (1892) *Chronica Minora saec. IV. V. VI. VII. Volumen I* (MGH AA 9; Berlin).
- (1894) *Chronica Minora saec. IV. V. VI. VII. Volumen II* (MGH AA 11; Berlin).
- Moreau, J. (1968) *Excerpta Valesiana* (Leipzig).
- Neri, V. (1992) *Medius Princeps: storia e immagine di Costantino nella storiografia latina pagana* (Bologna).
- Nicholson, O., ed. (2018) *The Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity*, 2 vols (Oxford).
- Owens, E. L. (1958) *Phraseological Parallels and Borrowings in Ammianus Marcellinus From Earlier Latin Authors* (diss., Birkbeck, London).
- Paschoud, F. (1992) ‘Valentinien travesti, ou: De la malignité d’Ammien’, in J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, and H. C. Teitler, edd., *Cognitio Gestorum: The Historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus* (Amsterdam) 67–84.
- (2003) *Zosime: Histoire Nouvelle II.2, Livre IV<sup>2</sup>* (Paris).
- (2006) *Eunape, Olympiodore, Zosime: Scripta minora* (Bari).
- (2018) *Histoire auguste IV.1: Vie des deux Maximins, des trois Gordiens, de Maxime et Balbin* (Paris).
- Pertz, G. H. (1843) *Scriptores, Tomus V* (MGH; Hannover).
- Potter, D. S. (2010) ‘The Unity of the Roman Empire’, in S. McGill, C. Sogno, and E. Watts, edd., *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians: Later Roman History and Culture 284–450 CE* (= *YCS* 34; Cambridge) 13–32.
- Ross, A. (2016) *Ammianus’ Julian: Narrative and Genre in the Res Gestae* (Oxford).
- Santini, C. (1979) *Eutropii Breviarium ab urbe condita* (Stuttgart and Leipzig).
- Sarasini, L. (2006) ‘La tradizione manoscritta del “Romuleon” di Benvenuto da Imola’, *Acme* 69: 301–15.
- Schlumberger, J. (1974) *Die Epitome de Caesaribus: Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Munich).
- (1976) ‘Die Epitome de Caesaribus und die Historia Augusta’, in J. Straub, ed., *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1972/1974* (Bonn) 201–19.
- (1985) ‘Die verlorenen Annalen des Nicomachus Flavianus: Ein Werk über Geschichte der Römischen Republik oder Kaiserzeit?’, in J. Straub, ed., *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1982/1983* (Bonn) 305–29.
- Schnetz, J. (1942) *Itineraria Romana II: Ravennatis Anonymi Cosmographia et Guidonis Geographica* (Stuttgart; repr. 1990).
- Seeck, O. (1883) *Q. Aurelii Symmachi quae supersunt* (MGH AA 6.1; Berlin).
- Sogno, C. (2006) *Q. Aurelius Symmachus: A Political Biography* (Ann Arbor).
- Stadter, P. A. (1980) *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill and London).
- Stover, J. A. (2017) ‘*Epitome de Caesaribus* 1.24 and Ovid’s Exile’, *CPh* 112: 267–75.
- , ed. (forthcoming) *Oxford Guide to the Latin Classics* (Oxford).

- and G. Woudhuysen (2015 [2020]) ‘Aurelius Victor and the Ending of Sallust’s *Jugurtha*’, *Hermathena* 199: 93–134.
- (2017) ‘Giovanni de Matociis and the *Codex Oratorianus* of the *De viris illustribus urbis Romae*’, *Exemplaria Classica* 21: 125–48.
- Swain, B. (2010) ‘Jordanes and Virgil: A Case Study of Intertextuality in the *Getica*’, *CQ* 60: 243–9.
- Syme, R. (1968) *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford).
- (1971) *Emperors and Biography: Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford).
- (1980) ‘Fiction in the Epitomators’, in J. Straub, ed., *Bonner Historia Augusta-Colloquium 1977/1978* (Bonn) 267–78.
- Tondini, G. (2011) *Un modello per il regno dei Carolingi in Italia: l’Epitome Phillipsiana e l’identità urbana di Verona dopo il 774* (diss., Padua).
- Van Hoof, L. and P. Van Nuffelen (2017) ‘The Historiography of Crisis: Jordanes, Cassiodorus and Justinian in Mid-Sixth-Century Constantinople’, *JRS* 107: 275–300.
- (2020) *The Fragmentary Latin Histories of Late Antiquity (AD 300–620): Edition, Translation and Commentary* (Cambridge).
- Van Nuffelen, P. (2012) *Orosius and the Rhetoric of History* (Oxford).
- and L. Van Hoof (2020) *Jordanes: Romana and Getica* (Liverpool).
- Wirz, H. (1877) ‘Ammianus’ beziehungen zu seinen vorbildern, Cicero, Sallustius, Livius, Tacitus’, *Philologus* 36: 627–36.
- Wölfflin, E. (1874) ‘Aurelius Victor’, *Rh. Mus.* 29: 282–308.
- (1902) ‘Zur Latinität der Epitome Caesarum’, *ALLG* 12: 445–53.
- Zecchini, G. (1993) *Ricerche di storiografia latina tardoantica* (Rome).