

## THE EARLY EPISCOPAL LISTS.

CHRONOLOGY is the indispensable groundwork of history, and it is natural therefore that the great Berlin edition of the ante-Nicene writers now in progress should be preceded not only by Professor Harnack's monumental work on the history and transmission of the literature of the first three centuries, but also by the same writer's companion work on its chronology<sup>1</sup>. For such a general work, both the accessions of new material and the multiplication of special studies on points of detail, which have marked the generation now elapsed, offered a special opportunity, and Professor Harnack has not been slow to seize it. It is no part of my intention to make any detailed estimate of the success of his venture over ground that any one less encyclopaedic than himself could hardly have covered<sup>2</sup>. His book, if it has defects,

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius: Erster Theil, Die Ueberlieferung und der Bestand*, 2 voll. Leipzig, 1893; *Zweiter Theil, Die Chronologie*, vol. i, *Die Chronologie der Litteratur bis Irenäus nebst einleitenden Untersuchungen*, Leipzig, 1897.

<sup>2</sup> One or two remarks may be hazarded on points unconnected with the special topic of this article. (1) With regard to Harnack's chronology of the apostolic age, I have already expressed elsewhere (*Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, i 415-425, especially 418, 419) the opinion that his revolt from what may be called the received chronology—that of Wieseler, followed for instance throughout by Lightfoot—though justifiable up to a certain point, is carried too far. (2) In discussing at length the chronology of St. Polycarp's martyrdom, pp. 334-356, he calls attention to new researches into the connected topic of the writings of the *rhetor* Aristides, and after some beating about the bush, comes back to Waddington and Lightfoot's year, 155 A. D.; he does not, however, mention the objection (as I think the fatal objection) raised by Dr. Salmon (*Dict. Christ. Biogr.* iv 430) to that year, or the solution offered by myself in *Studia Biblica*, ii 105-155 (Oxford, 1890), which made the year 156 possible. (3) With regard to the important date of Justin Martyr's two Apologies, the discovery that the date of office of L. Munatius Felix, probably the procurator of Egypt mentioned in *Apol.* i 29, falls between A. D. 148 and 154 (announced by F. G. Kenyon in the *Academy* for Feb. 1, 1896: see now *Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, ii 171 [A. D. 1898], No. cccclviii: from the new volume of *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* [part II, ed. Grenfell and Hunt, A. D. 1899], No. cccxxvii, col. 8, ll. 18, 20, we further learn that he was in office on

has also signal merits, chief among them being his resolute determination to take nothing for granted, but to subject every point to a fresh and rigorous examination. In any case, its appearance marks the importance which the leading scholars of the day attach to chronological inquiries, and may serve as some sort of justification for the particular attention which I desire to draw to one corner of the chronological field, namely, the episcopal lists of the great churches and their historical trustworthiness. The subject is indeed so nearly related to the *origines* of episcopacy itself that it may well make a more than ordinary claim on the time and research of historical and theological students.

Forty or fifty years ago it would have seemed a rash undertaking to compass in any form or to any degree the rehabilitation of these lists. The controversy raged round the main documents of Christianity, and evidence so indirect and secondary as the traditions of the churches about their early rulers would have been refused a hearing as the interested inventions of ecclesiastics in search of support for their pretensions. It would be unjust not to emphasize the enormous value of Baur's works in calling (or rather recalling) into view the truth, forgotten for many centuries, that New Testament documents cannot historically be isolated from other documents of primitive Christianity, that both must be studied as other historical documents are studied, and differences and developments fairly recognized. But Baur himself with all the energy of a new discoverer applied his principle in a fashion which admitted only five books of the New Testament, and very little else from the first century of the Church, as genuine productions of the authors whose names they bear. Nothing shows better how far we have moved in a constructive direction since Baur than the preface to this very work of Harnack's on chronology: the following sentences from it have been quoted often enough in the last two years, but they will bear quoting again:

'There was a period—the public at large is still living in it—when people thought they had no choice but to look on the earliest Christian documents, those of the New Testament included, as a tissue of decep-

Sept. 13, A. D. 151) gives a *terminus a quo* for the *Apology* which agrees fairly with Harnack's dating (A. D. 152–153), but appears to be unknown to him.

tions and falsifications. That period is now past and gone. For science it was only an episode, in which indeed it learnt much, but at the end of which it must forget much. But the results of the following inquiries go in a "reactionary" direction, even beyond what might be termed the average position of contemporary criticism. The primitive literature of the Church as a whole and most of the individual parts of it are, from the standpoint of literary history, trustworthy and authentic. In all the New Testament there is probably only a single writing which quite strictly deserves the epithet "pseudonymous," the Second Epistle of Peter: and apart from Gnostic forgeries the whole number of pseudonymous ecclesiastical writings as far as the age of Irenaeus is small and easily enumerated. . . . Even the number of documents which suffered interpolation in the second century, like the Pastoral Epistles, is very trifling, while some of the interpolations are as harmless as those made in our hymn-books and catechisms.'

In the comprehensive volume which follows this preface and forms the justification for its statement, the 200 pages of 'introductory studies' deal for the most part with the same subject as this article. For the Roman Church, Harnack starts from the results obtained by the researches of Mommsen, Lipsius, Duchesne, and above all, Lightfoot.<sup>1</sup> But he has this advantage over all his predecessors, at least in respect to the treatment of our primary authority, the historian Eusebius of Caesarea, that the evidence is considered throughout as a whole: the *Chronicle* and the *History* of Eusebius are brought into close relation with one another, and the episcopal lists of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem are taken into account equally with the Roman. I shall have occasion from time to time to express dissent from Harnack's conclusions: it is only right therefore to take this opportunity of stating my general indebtedness to his method.

The present paper deals with the preliminary questions necessary to the appreciation of the evidence of Eusebius, especially of his *Chronicle*; the next will treat of the episcopal lists themselves, in the order Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Rome.

<sup>1</sup> Th. Mommsen, *Ueber den Chronographen von J.* 354 (A. D. 1850), R. A. Lipsius, *Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe* (1869), Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis* (1886), J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome*, ed. 2 (1886), &c. For fuller bibliographies of the many important works devoted to the episcopal lists by recent critics see Lightfoot, *op. cit.* p. 201, Harnack, p. 70.

I. *Eusebius of Caesarae and his 'Chronicle.'*

The *Chronicle*—for the present purpose the more important of Eusebius' two great historical works—is preserved entire in Armenian and in Latin, partially in two Syriac epitomes, and in numerous, for the most part unacknowledged, quotations in Byzantine writers such as George Syncellus. The chronological framework which binds the whole together, from its commencement at the dawn of history to its close at the *Vicennalia* of Constantine, is supplied by years counted from Abraham: but with the Abrahamic years are co-ordinated such other methods of reckoning as are from time to time applicable—for the Christian centuries these are the Olympiads and the years of the emperors—and it is to them that we must turn in order to translate Eusebius' notices into a reckoning intelligible to ourselves. This preliminary inquiry into the method of Eusebius, out of which grows the further question to what extent he borrowed his method from older chronographers, is almost as necessary a prelude to the effective study of the episcopal lists as the sister problem of the relative value for the text of the Armenian and Latin versions.

1. Is the Armenian or the Latin version the more trustworthy?

That St. Jerome, to whom we owe the Latin version, was something else than a mere translator, was clear enough; he amplified the notices relating to the West, and continued the *Chronicle* down to 378 A. D., fifty years beyond the point where Eusebius stopped. So it was perhaps not unnatural that the scholars who first had to face the question of relative value pinned their faith almost exclusively on the Armenian. Truer views were enforced by Hort and Lightfoot, although neither they nor Harnack, who on this head admits himself a complete convert<sup>1</sup>, have fully realized the inferiority of this version at almost every point. Three crucial instances may be given: in the first Hort and Lightfoot saw the truth, and are now followed by Harnack; the second has not before been fully treated; as regards the third, Lightfoot and Harnack still take the wrong side.

(i) The Armenian version differs from Jerome and the *History*

<sup>1</sup> *Chronologie*, p. 52, n. 1, p. 113.

by several years—generally four—in its dates of the popes; its supporters therefore—Lipsius, von Gutschmid, and formerly Harnack—were forced to hold, not only that Eusebius in the interval between writing the *Chronicle* and the *History* had altered his views or bettered his information about the papal chronology (this would be possible enough), but that Jerome had substituted this revised chronology in his version of the *Chronicle*, and further, that the Syriac translator—for the Syriac epitomes too agree with Jerome and the *Chronicle*—had independently done exactly the same thing, an almost impossible combination<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, the acceptance of the Latin and Syriac as evidence for the true text of the *Chronicle* carries with it this important simplification of the problems of Eusebian criticism, that Eusebius is not to be supposed, except in very rare cases<sup>2</sup>, to make one statement in his *Chronicle* and another in his *History*.

(ii) The Armenian differs from Jerome by one year throughout in its synchronisms of the Olympiads; thus Tiberius 1 = Ann. Abr. 2030 (in both versions) = Ol. 198.2 in Jerome, Ol. 198.3 in the Armenian. Here the doubt is solved in favour of Jerome by two other synchronisms found in Eusebius between Olympiad years and years of Tiberius. In the first case Eusebius in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* equates Tiberius 15, the starting-point of our Lord's ministry, with Ol. 201.4<sup>3</sup>; in the second case he appeals in the *Chronicle* (both Armenian and Jerome) to the great eclipse recorded by Phlegon under Ol. 202.4 and identifies it with the darkness of the Crucifixion, and since he certainly placed the Crucifixion in Tiberius 19<sup>4</sup>, he must have equated Tib. 19 with Ol. 202.4. Both these equations, Ol. 201.4 = Tib. 15, Ol. 202.4 = Tib. 19, agree with Jerome's reckoning, and disagree with the Armenian.

(iii) The Armenian and Jerome differ again in a series of

<sup>1</sup> See further on this Lightfoot, *S. Clement of Rome*, ed. 2, pp. 222-232.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Chronicle* the date of Musanus is given as Severus 11 = Ann. Abr. 2220, in the *History* as under M. Aurelius (*H. E.* iv 21, 28); in the *Chronicle* the martyrdoms at Lyons are dated Ann. Abr. 2183 = M. Aurelius 7, in the *History* in M. Aurelius 17 (*H. E.* v pref.).

<sup>3</sup> Τιβερίου δὲ τὸ πεντεκαίδεκατον τῆς Ῥωμαίων βασιλείας κατὰ τὸ δ' τῆς σα' Ὀλυμπιάδος συμπίπτει. *Praep. Ev.* X ix 1.

<sup>4</sup> See my article *Chronology of the New Testament* in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, i 413 a; and with regard to the Olympiads *ib.* 418.

notices which Jerome assigns (like all other notices) to a particular year, but which the Armenian places exceptionally, not opposite any particular year, but between two years. In these cases both Lightfoot and Harnack assume the correctness of the Armenian: and both build important conclusions on the assumption. Thus Lightfoot, from the fact that the martyrdoms of Ignatius (Trajan 10 in Jerome) and Polycarp (M. Aurelius 7 in Jerome) are recorded in the Armenian not opposite any special year, but between Trajan 8, 9 and M. Aurelius 6, 7 respectively, concludes that Eusebius intended to express ignorance of the exact dates of these martyrdoms. Harnack goes further and draws two sweeping deductions as to this class of notices: the first, that Eusebius found these notices in the source of his *Chronicle* in a separate column, attached to the reign of a particular emperor, but not to any particular year in it<sup>1</sup>; the second—perhaps not strictly consistent with the first—that as Eusebius in these instances avoids a date and so admits his ignorance, in all other notices he had, or believed he had, definite reasons for the particular year specified. This theory fails to explain why events which are dated specifically in the *Chronicle* are dated quite vaguely in the *History*: e. g. Basilides is in the *Chronicle* under Hadrian 17, in the *History* undated: Justin Martyr in the one under Pius 4, in the other undated: the Jerusalem bishops from Symeon to Narcissus are in five groups assigned to five specific years in the *Chronicle*, in two groups only in the *History*. A different, much simpler, and as I still believe much truer explanation was given by me some years ago in the pages of the *Church Quarterly Review*<sup>2</sup>. It is in general the more bulky notices—as any one can see by looking at Schoene's edition—which are not compressed into the column properly reserved for them: they are written right across the page, and the motive appears to be mere economy of space. The device may even be as modern as the scribe of the thirteenth-century MS at Etchmiadzin, which is said to be the archetype of all known MSS of the Armenian version<sup>3</sup>. Harnack's volume marks a great

<sup>1</sup> *Chronologie*, pp. 55 n. 1, 57 n. 1. As we shall see, he supposes Eusebius to make systematic use of this grouping by emperors in the *History*.

<sup>2</sup> October, 1892, *Early Chronicles of the Western Church*, p. 121.

<sup>3</sup> This was shown by Mommsen in *Hermes*, 1895, p. 321 ff. (Harnack, p. 113).

step in advance in the criticism of the *Chronicle*: but this unfortunate superstition about the undated notices in the Armenian haunts his reasoning at every turn. He himself uses of another chronicle, the *Paschal Chronicle*, the pregnant argument that for every event chronicled some date or other must be given, *es brauchte ein bestimmtes Jahr* (p. 347 n.). There is no ground whatever for supposing that Eusebius was an exception to the general rule of chroniclers in this respect, or that the Armenian represents him more correctly than Jerome even in a single class of cases.

Our first question then is answered. The result to which the most recent investigators have been feeling their way has proved itself more universally true than perhaps any of them had yet seen. For the true text and chronology of Eusebius we turn in the first place to St. Jerome<sup>1</sup>.

## 2. The chronological framework of the *Chronicle*.

Having thus settled the basis of the text of Eusebius, we pass to the second subject of preliminary inquiry, and ask, What are the mutual relations of his Abrahamic years, his Olympiad years, and his regnal years of emperors?

(i) The years of Abraham, if not a device first invented by Eusebius himself, are in any case employed by him first among extant chronological writers, and can therefore supply no external standard for testing the system of chronology used.

(ii) The Olympiads on the other hand have a known starting-point from July, B.C. 776, and so from the synchronisms with them we ought to be able to fix the precise meaning of each year of Abraham. Harnack however asserts, though without giving any reasons, that Eusebius' Olympiad years are wrongly reckoned by two years in the Armenian and by one even in Jerome (p. 115): on which statement the obvious comment is that if the Eusebian

<sup>1</sup> Of course it is not meant that Jerome made no alterations—he certainly changed Eusebius' date for the Passion from Tib. 19 to Tib. 18, because, from the common starting-point in Tib. 15, he only reckoned three years for the ministry against Eusebius' four—but only that his alterations are few in the Christian notices and easily recognisable.

Unfortunately, as Harnack reminds us (p. 115), there is still no satisfactory edition of Jerome's version; none of them, for instance, down to the latest—that of Schoene in 1866—took any account of the Bodleian MS, which appears to be the oldest of all extant MSS.

Abrahamic year began on January 1 (as Harnack seems to assume)<sup>1</sup>, the synchronism with the Olympiad year, which began in July, must be either six months or eighteen months out—it cannot be exactly right, and it cannot be exactly twelve months or two years wrong. Now in the first place, there seems no possible reason for supposing that Eusebius would or did reckon from January 1: all analogy would suggest some point in the early autumn. No doubt the Roman year began on January 1: but Eusebius was an Eastern and not a Roman, and in the East the year almost universally commenced about September.

‘The Jewish civil year began in September: the old Attic lunar year in July: the old Macedonian lunar year in October: the calendars of Asia Minor in imperial times used the Macedonian months made into a solar year commencing September 23: the similar calendar of Syria used the same months in the same way, only that each month was pushed down one place, so that the year presumably began at the end of October: the Alexandrian year began on August 29: the era of Alexander or the Greeks was reckoned from September, B.C. 312: the Indictions, an invention of Eusebius’ own day, were counted certainly from September, probably from September, A.D. 312<sup>1</sup>.’

If Eusebius then followed the general practice of his countrymen, his year and the Olympiad year would begin at points not far removed from one another; which indeed is what we should expect, seeing that he uses the Olympiads, year by year, as parallel with his own years of Abraham. It may no doubt be asserted that by an error of Eusebius the parallelism between the two was just a year wrong: but what evidence is there in support of an assertion so improbable?

(iii) What has perhaps misled Harnack here is a hasty comparison of the Olympiad with the imperial regnal years. He would find for instance that, whereas Claudius began to reign in January, A.D. 41, and Nero in October, A.D. 54, in the *Chronicle* Claudius 1 = Ol. 205.1 = July 41–July 42 and Nero 1

<sup>1</sup> Harnack is probably following von Gutschmid, *De temporum notis quibus Eusebius utitur*, p. 8 ff. This writer, it may be here remarked, was a thorough-going believer in the Armenian: and his work is in consequence antiquated to a large extent.

<sup>2</sup> I repeat these sentences from my article on New Testament Chronology in Hastings’ *Dictionary of the Bible*, i 418; and add that the Antiochene year began on Oct. 1.



=Ol. 208.3=July 55–July 56: and it might not unnaturally be concluded that the Olympiads were a year wrong. But it is not so much Eusebius who is wrongly reckoning his Olympiads, as those moderns who have forgotten to ask how Eusebius was reckoning his regnal years. Thus Harnack assumes (*Chronologie*, p. 234) that as Nero came to the throne in October, 54 A.D., Nero 2 in the *Chronicle* must mean October 55–October 56, though it is in the last degree unlikely that a chronicle where the years, reckoned continuously from Abraham and from the Olympiads, run of course from fixed starting-points, should admit in the parallel column a reckoning of regnal years that was perpetually changing, as would be the case if each emperor began his first year on the day of his accession and his succeeding years on its anniversaries. If Trajan, whose reign is (correctly) given as xix years vi months, is allowed only 19 regnal years (Ann. Abr. 2114–2132), while Domitian, whose reign is given as xv years v months, is allowed 16 (Ann. Abr. 2097–2112), it seems clear that (as was to be expected) the imperial years are brought into definite and fixed relation with the continuous reckoning. In other words, each regnal year must have begun at the same point as the Abrahamic year, that is, about September<sup>1</sup>: and the only question is whether the first year of each emperor was reckoned to begin in the September *before* or the September *after* his accession—i. e. whether Claudius I began in September 40 or September 41, Nero I in September 54 or September 55. If the former, then the synchronism with the Olympiads is, as Harnack says, wrong by one year: if the latter, the synchronism is correct, for in the *Chronicle*, as we have just seen, Claudius I=Ol. 205.1=July 41–July 42, Nero I=Ol. 208.3=July 55–July 56.

The conclusion that Eusebius commences the regnal year of each emperor in the September following his accession, and that the synchronisms of regnal and Olympiad years are approximately correct, is not a mere hypothesis; for it admits of at least partial verification, as the following table will show. The first

<sup>1</sup> Von Gutschmid (*op. cit.*) agrees, I find, with the view here maintained that the regnal years of the earlier emperors are reckoned from the autumn—he supposes, perhaps rightly, from October 1, the new year day of the Antiochene era. But he holds that Eusebius' Abrahamic year was Julian, and began on the January preceding, so that the regnal years would differ by nine months!

and second columns give the actual dates—the first the duration of each reign, the second the number of Septembers (in other words, of years reckoned from September) in it; the third and fourth columns give the data of Jerome's version—the third the summary of the duration of the reign which accompanies each emperor's name, the fourth the number of years of Abraham or Olympiad years allotted to the reign. I have borrowed the dates from Goyau's convenient *Chronologie de l'Empire Romain* (Paris, 1891).

	Column 1				Col. 2	Column 3	Col.
	A. D.	A. D.	Y.	M. D.			
1. Tiberius	14 Aug. 19—37	Mar. 16	(22	6 25)	23	XXIII	23
2. Gaius	37 Mar. 16—41	Jan. 24	( 3	10 8)	4	III X	4
3. Claudius	41 Jan. 24—54	Oct. 13	(13	8 19)	14	XIII VIII XXIX	14
4. Nero	54 Oct. 13—68	June 9	(13	7 27)	14	XIII VII XXVIII	14 <sup>1</sup>
Ephemeral emperors	68 June 9—69	July 1	( 1	0 22)			
5. Vespasian	69 July 1—79	June 23	( 9	11 22)	10	IX XI XXII	10
6. Titus	79 June 23—81	Sept. 13	( 2	2 21)	2 <sup>2</sup>	II II	2
7. Domitian	81 Sept. 13—96	Sept. 18	(15	0 5)	16 <sup>3</sup>	XV V	16
8. Nerva	96 Sept. 18—98	Jan. 25	( 1	4 7)	1 <sup>4</sup>	I IV	1
9. Trajan	98 Jan. 25—117	Aug. 9	(19	6 15)	19	XIX VI	19
10. Hadrian	117 Aug. 9—138	July 10	(20	11 1)	21	XXI	21
11. Ant. Pius	138 July 10—161	Mar. 7	(22	8 25)	23	XXII VI <sup>5</sup>	23
12. M. Aurelius	161 Mar. 7—180	Mar. 17	(19	0 10)	19	XIX I	19
13. Commodus	180 Mar. 17—193	Jan. 1	(12	9 15)	13	XIII	13

<sup>1</sup> Of the interregnum between Nero and Vespasian, which lasted just a year, nothing is said, nor are the ephemeral rulers, Galba, Otho, or Vitellius, reckoned in the series of emperors; but as they are mentioned under Nero 14 it is probable that that year is meant to extend as far as Vespasian's accession, and I have reckoned accordingly: see also p. 191 n. 8. The Bodleian MS, however, marks a year 1—presumably Vespasian's—opposite the notice of Galba's death: and if Vespasian was looked upon as Galba's legitimate successor, this arrangement may possibly be the original one. The notice of Vespasian's accession comes (as in Schoene's edition) at a later stage: in the MS it is marked—just as in Severus' case, see p. 191 n. 2—as year 2.

<sup>2</sup> As the figures stand, if Titus is to have only two years, the commencement of a new year's reckoning must fall after Sept. 13: see also next note.

<sup>3</sup> As a matter of fact Domitian reigned only fifteen years and five days; and as sixteen years (Ann. Abr. 2097–2112) are assigned him, the commencement of the new year reckoning ought strictly to fall between September 13 (see last note) and 18. But as Eusebius has made the fifteen years five days into fifteen years five months, he must have either antedated his accession or postdated his death.

<sup>4</sup> Again, if Nerva is to have only one year, the new year reckoning must not commence after September 18.

<sup>5</sup> I have corrected Jerome's three months into six (m. III into m. VI) in accordance with the Armenian, which is nearer the facts (8 m. 25 d.).

Column 1					Col. 2	Column 3	Col. 4							
	A. D.	A. D.	Y.	M. D.										
14. Pertinax	193 Jan.	1—193 Mar. 28	(0 2 27)		—	m. vi	} 18 <sup>2</sup>							
15. Sept. Severus	193 [Mar. 28] <sup>1</sup>	—211 Feb. 4	(17 10 7)		18	xviii								
16. Caracalla	211 Feb.	4—217 Apr. 8	(6 2 4)		6	vii <sup>3</sup>	7 <sup>3</sup>							
17. Macrinus	217 Apr.	8—218 [Apr. 16] <sup>4</sup>	(1 0 8)		1	i	1							
18. Elagabalus	218 Apr. 16 <sup>4</sup>	—222 Mar. 11	(3 10 23)		4	iv	4							
19. Alex. Severus	222 Mar.	11—235 Mar. 18	(13 0 7)		13	xiii	13							
20. Maximin	235 Mar.	18—238 [Mar. 16] <sup>5</sup>	(2 11 26)		3	iii	3							
21. Gordian	238 [Mar. 16] <sup>5</sup>	—244 c. Mar. 1	(c. 5 11 13)		6	vi	6							
22. Philip	244 c. Mar. 1	—249 c. Oct. 1	(c. 5 7 0)		6	vii <sup>6</sup>	7 <sup>6</sup>							
23. Decius	249 c. Oct. 1	—251 summer	(c. 1 9 0)		1	i iii <sup>7</sup>	1							
24. Gallus Volusianus	} 251 summer—253 May	(c. 1 10 0)			2	ii iv <sup>7</sup>	2							
25. Valerian Gallienus								} 253 May—268 Mar. 4	(c. 14 10 0)			15	xv	15
26. Claudius	268 Mar.—270 Apr.	(c. 2 1 0)		2	i ix	2								
27. Aurelian	270 May—275 [Sept.] <sup>8</sup>	(c. 5 4 0)			6 <sup>9</sup>	v vi	5							
28. Tacitus	275 Sept. 25—276 Apr.	(c. 0 7 0)				m. vi	1							
29. Probus	276 Apr.—282 Oct.	(c. 6 6 0)			7	vi iv	6 <sup>10</sup>							
30. Carus Carinus Numerian	} 282 Oct.—284 [Sept. 17]	(c. 1 11 0) <sup>11</sup>			2	ii	2							
31. Diocletian								284 Sept. 17—305 Mar.	(c. 20 6 0)			20	xx	20

<sup>1</sup> I reckon Severus from the date of the death of Pertinax, whose representative he claimed to be.

<sup>2</sup> The Armenian gives Pertinax one year and Severus eighteen, thus getting a year out of accord with Jerome, who (no doubt rightly) gives eighteen to the two together—Pertinax still has one, but Severus begins with year 2.

<sup>3</sup> The cypher for the regnal years (and the number of years of Abraham), which has been strictly correct hitherto on the assumption of a new year's day about Sept. 15, is wrong for the first time with Caracalla: seven should be six. See below, note 6.

<sup>4</sup> I reckon Macrinus' reign not down to his death, but to the proclamation of his successor: see next note.

<sup>5</sup> As in the last case I reckon Maximin only down to the proclamation of the Gordians, who were at once recognized in Rome.

<sup>6</sup> As with Caracalla, so with Philip, the *Chronicle* gives one year too many: seven for six. Except with a new year day between March and October not even six could be reached.

<sup>7</sup> The reign of Decius is too short by just as much as that of Gallus and Volusianus is too long. Perhaps Eusebius dated the death of the Decii six months too early.

<sup>8</sup> The interregnum between Aurelian, who died in January, and Tacitus, who consented to reign in September, seems to be reckoned to the former: cf. p. 190 n. 1.

<sup>9</sup> The sixth new year day appears to belong properly to Aurelian rather than to Tacitus; and Aurelian actually has six years (and Tacitus none) in the Armenian: see next note.

<sup>10</sup> Probus ought strictly to have seven years (with the Armenian) rather than six (with Jerome). But we have seen that both Caracalla and Philip (notes 3 and 6 above) have a year too many, and it is safest therefore to suppose that Eusebius is getting back towards a correct calculation by giving Probus a year too few.

<sup>11</sup> As for Macrinus and Maximin, so here the reign is probably held to end

On a comparison of the actual chronology in columns 1 and 2 of this list with Eusebius' representation of it in columns 3 and 4, two points at once arrest attention. (1) The number of years of Abraham allotted to each reign (col. 4) shows itself to be in absolute accord with the facts (col. 2) from Tiberius to Septimius Severus inclusive; in the third century, on the other hand, the agreement is marred by three mistakes—the addition of a year each to Caracalla and Philip, and the loss of a year to Probus. (2) Similarly, the duration expressly assigned to each reign (col. 3) attains almost minute exactness (compare col. 1) from Gaius down to M. Aurelius<sup>1</sup>; conversely again for the later reigns years only as a rule are assigned, or if months as well as years, the months are generally wrong.

No doubt the third century with the multiplication of ephemeral emperors offered a chronographer more chances of going wrong than the first or second; yet even taking that into account, the contrast is marked enough to suggest a possibility which there has so far been no occasion to consider, but which must be borne in mind at every stage of the criticism of literature such as this—the possibility, namely, that sources different in origin and value lie behind different parts of the *Chronicle*. It may, indeed, be assumed that for events and dates that belonged to his own times Eusebius was his own authority; it may be assumed too that a scholar of his prodigious erudition must have amassed from his own reading many items of information for every period and generation, ancient or modern; but it has yet to be asked what predecessors he had had in the series of Christian chroniclers, and whether, and to what extent, he borrowed his material or his system from them.

### 3. Eusebius and the Christian chroniclers before him.

(i) Of unknown date is the chronographer Bruttius, quoted once by Eusebius (*Chronicle*, Domitian 16), and three times by the sixth-century chronographer, Malalas. There is nothing to show that either quotes him first-hand, and it is probable that Julius Africanus (see No. vi) was the intermediary through

with the new emperor's claim to the throne, September, A. D. 284, not with his predecessor's death: Carinus was reigning in the West till March, A. D. 285.

<sup>1</sup> The apparent exception in Domitian's case admits of easy explanation: see p. 190 n. 3.

whom both Eusebius and Malalas derived their notices. If so, Bruttius must have written between the times of Domitian and of Africanus, somewhere in the second century; and this seems to be just the time when the family of the Bruttii was at the height of its importance in Rome. A comparison of the parallel passage in the *History* (iii 18) seems to prove that Eusebius reckoned Bruttius for a heathen; but Lightfoot (*S. Clement*, i 48) gives reasons for thinking him really a Christian. If Eusebius was mistaken in a point of such capital importance, it would be certain (what is in any case probable) that Bruttius was not one of his direct authorities.

(ii) The *Exegetica* of Julius Cassianus are quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i 21 101) as fixing the date of Moses. Eusebius in his *History* (vi 13 § 7) has noted Clement's reference; but as he appears to know nothing else whatever about Cassianus, he cannot have used him as one of his authorities in the *Chronicle*.

(iii) Judas, a Jewish Christian (as would appear from his name), published a system of chronology which brought the close of Daniel's seventy weeks to the tenth year of Severus, A. D. 202. Eusebius, to whom indeed we owe this information (*H. E.* vi 7), had apparently had the work in his hands; but we should gather from his brief description that the author was one of that class of apocalyptic writers whom he held in special detestation, and it is therefore improbable that he would have drawn much on it, even if what Judas published was a chronicle in our sense at all, a supposition which is more than doubtful.

(iv) The existence of a chronographer of the tenth year of Antoninus Pius (A. D. 147-148) has been assumed in explanation of the curious coincidence that both Clement of Alexandria (once) and Epiphanius (once) employ this year as a term in chronological calculations. The latter interrupts his series of bishops of Jerusalem, after the twentieth bishop Julianus, with the note, 'all these down to the tenth year of A. Pius,' *Haer.* lxvi 1. The former tells us that 'Josephus reckons from Moses to David 585 years, from David to the second year of Vespasian 1179 years, and from that to the tenth of Antoninus seventy-two years,' *Strom.* i 21 147; and as the mention of this last date cannot come either from Josephus, who wrote half a century before it, or from Clement himself, who wrote half a century

after it, it is a reasonable supposition that it is borrowed from some other intermediate writer, who will also have been the source of Epiphanius. This lost writer is conjectured by Schlatter<sup>1</sup>, following von Gutschmid, to be identical with the Judas mentioned above; but something more than mere conjecture is wanted before we can accuse Eusebius of mistaking the tenth year of Severus for the tenth of A. Pius. With better judgement, Harnack suggests Cassianus. In neither of these cases can Eusebius have been acquainted with the lost chronography; if Cassianus was the author, we have seen that Eusebius knew nothing of him; if Judas, we must conclude that Eusebius knew next to nothing of a book which *ex hypothesi* he dated fifty years too late.

(v) Hippolytus, the last great Greek writer of the Roman Church, was a prolific contributor to the studies that border on chronology. His Paschal cycle was published in the first year of Alexander Severus, A. D. 222; his Chronicle, in the thirteenth year of the same emperor, A. D. 234. But the Latin translations of this Chronicle of Hippolytus (for the book is lost in the original Greek) show that it was rather a collection of materials for chronology than a chronicle like that of Eusebius. The only materials given for the centuries after Christ were lists of emperors and of popes with length of tenure, *imperatores Romanorum ab Augusto et quis quot annis imperavit, nomina episcoporum Romae et quis quot annis praefuit*. The list of emperors is extant<sup>2</sup>, and it presents no points of contact whatever with Eusebius. At best then he can have been but slightly indebted to Hippolytus<sup>3</sup>.

(vi) What was much more likely to serve Eusebius in the way of a source lay near his hand in the shape of the last Chronicle of this list, that of Julius Africanus of Nicopolis (Emmaus) in Palestine. Africanus is a personage of more than ordinary interest, for he combined the widest Christian culture and scholarship with an active participation in civil life. In the one capacity he headed the embassy of his fellow-citizens which

<sup>1</sup> *Texte und Untersuchungen*, XII i p. 28 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Chronica Minora*, ed. Mommsen, I i 137, 138 (in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*).

<sup>3</sup> I might perhaps have spoken more strongly, but I prefer to leave open at this point all questions relating to the episcopal lists.

obtained a new foundation for their town; in the other, he demonstrated the impossibility of identifying the darkness of the Crucifixion with an eclipse, and disproved the Hebrew authorship of the story of Susanna against an opponent as redoubtable as Origen. It is certain then that his *Chronicle* (published in the fourth year of Elagabalus, A.D. 221<sup>1</sup>) represented the highest attainable standard of the day; it is certain also that Eusebius was familiar with it, for he not only mentions it in the *History* (vi 31), but alludes to Africanus in the *Chronicle* as 'the chronographer<sup>2</sup>.' To what extent Eusebius may have borrowed from him, it is less easy to say. If Africanus was, as Photius says, very brief for the Christian period, the debt to him in the way of material cannot have been large; how far it may have included the episcopal lists will appear in the sequel. On the other hand, the debt in the way of method and system may easily have been larger, for these are not matters affected by brevity or prolixity. And it is natural to believe that the accuracy of arrangement from Tiberius to Septimius Severus which we have noted in Eusebius' *Chronicle* derives directly from a chronographer of the early third century: from whom then so likely as from Africanus?

The broad results then of this inquiry into the relation of Eusebius to the older chronographers are, firstly, that no direct contact can be shown to exist, and none probably did exist, between him and the chronographers of the second century; secondly, that, as for those of the third century, he did borrow some part of the framework of his chronological system from Africanus, while with regard to the episcopal lists his relation to Africanus (and Hippolytus) will call for examination at a later point; thirdly, that for the rest of his material no general dependence on any of his predecessors can be established or even made probable. For the bulk of his notices of persons and events Eusebius appears to have been indebted to nothing beyond his own reading.

These preliminary inquiries have dealt in turn with the text

<sup>1</sup> Photius however (*cod.* 34) speaks of it as cataloguing events only down to Macrinus (A. D. 217), *ἐπιτροχάδην δὲ διαλαμβάνει καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ μέχρι τῆς Μακρινῶν τοῦ Ρωμαίων βασιλέως βασιλείας.*

<sup>2</sup> *Iulio Africano scriptore temporum* (Jerome), 'Ιουλίῳ Ἀφρικανῷ τοῦ τὰ χρονικά συγγραφεμένου (*Chron. Pasch.*, doubtless from Eus.).

of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, with its chronological method, and with its relation to older chronographers. It has been shown, first, that the true text is to be looked for primarily in Jerome's version: secondly, that the year of the three systems, Abrahamic Olympiad and Imperial, of which the chronological framework consists, is probably identical and is reckoned from the early autumn, and that each emperor commences his first year in the autumn following his accession: thirdly, that of this framework at least the imperial years down to the beginning of the third century may probably have been derived from the chronographer Julius Africanus. The results of these inquiries form the necessary equipment for the task of investigating and weighing the evidence of Eusebius on the main subject of this paper. It only remains to conclude this prefatory matter with a brief estimate of the value which Eusebius himself attached to his lists of the episcopal successions in the great sees.

As is well known, Eusebius gives both in the *Chronicle* and in the *History* complete lists of the succession of bishops in the four churches of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, from the apostles' days down to his own. Their supreme importance in his eyes appears to be proved, as to the *Chronicle*, from the fact that the entries about these successions outnumber all the other Christian notices put together, and as to the *History* from the opening words, where the 'successions from the holy apostles' stand first among the objects which the author declares that he has set himself to record. Yet Harnack—desirous, as may be gathered from his language, that one whom he admires so greatly should not be allowed to pass as a 'catholic' thinker in the sense of Irenaeus and Tertullian—has asserted (p. 64) that the real reason why Eusebius used imperial rather than episcopal chronology for his framework was that the 'successions from the holy apostles' were for him the lines not only of bishops but of teachers, and that as he did not possess a complete chronology of the latter he determined to make only a subordinate use of the chronology of the former.

Now, in the first place, common sense suggests that Eusebius could not, even if he had desired to do so, have used the 'episcopal successions' as his principal framework of chronology, for the sufficient ground that these were not one but four in



number, and who would date every event by synchronisms with four different persons? In this lies the simple explanation of the use of the imperial chronology—not in any doubt as to the meaning of ‘the successions from the apostles.’ In the second place, it is indeed true that Eusebius occasionally uses the phrase *διαδοχή, ἢ τῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχή*, in a wide sense, in which the ‘succession’ or ‘succession from the apostles’ applies to the faithful generally (*H. E.* vi 9, vii 19, and perhaps viii praef.) as the embodied tradition of the Christian life and creed from the apostles’ time onward: this is the natural language of emphasis on the continuity of the Church as a whole, and in no way excludes a special and unique sense in which the ‘succession’ from the apostles is preserved and represented in the ‘successions’ of the bishops of the various churches. But it is untrue that a ‘succession of teachers’ is even remotely suggested as a rival to the ‘succession of bishops’: in the solitary passage which could seem to give any colour to this view (*H. E.* v 11), the ‘apostolic succession’ cannot be that of ‘teachers’ only, since it is hereditary from ‘father to son.’ And it is untrue also, as far as I can see, that *διαδοχαί* in the plural, the definite ‘lines of succession,’ is ever used of anything but the episcopal successions. At least the opening words of the *History*, already referred to, are patient of only one meaning: ‘the successions of the apostles with the chronology of the period since Christ, the chief events of ecclesiastical history, the leading men in the most illustrious churches, those who came forward to represent our religion whether by word of mouth or in writings; the heretics; the Jews and their calamities; the persecutions and the martyrs.’ Eusebius here sums up the subject-matter of his history under four heads: the life of the Church in itself, and its external relations with heretics, with the Jews, and with the State; the first and most important head being subdivided into four again: episcopal successions, leading facts, leading men, apologists. No other interpretation explains the connexion of the ‘successions’ with the chronology, for it is the bishops of the great sees alone (apart from the emperors) whose dates are continuously recorded ‘since Christ’; while Harnack’s interpretation makes the fourth sub-division meaningless, for to him the ‘teachers’ or ‘ambassadors’ of the Christian religion, *ἄνθρωποι κατὰ γενεὰν ἐκδοσθη*

ἀγράφως ἢ καὶ διὰ συγγραμμάτων τῶν θεῶν ἐπέσβευσαν λόγον, are integral constituents of the 'lines of succession,' and not a separate class at all<sup>1</sup>.

Just then as Eusebius crowded his *Chronicle* with the episcopal successions, so too he placed them in the very forefront of his *History*; the one process interprets and confirms the other. Nor was the place thus allotted to them disproportionate to his underlying thought. To him, as to Irenaeus<sup>2</sup>, the successions of bishops in the apostolic sees were the most tangible and trustworthy proof of the continuity of the Church of the apostles with the Church of later days. We shall but be carrying out his own leading ideas if we proceed to test with some minuteness the accuracy and historical value of the lists he has thus compiled.

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES ON HARNACK AND EUSEBIUS.

With the principle laid down above as to the independence of Eusebius for most of his subject-matter Harnack agrees (p. 45): 'The great majority of these [dates] postulate no chronographical tradition, but are the outcome of Eusebius' own study' of original documents. He finds, indeed, three apparent exceptions in the three pairs of references to Valentinus, to Justin, and to Clement of Alexandria; for since Eusebius cannot be supposed to have had two views himself about the date of the same personage, it would be natural to suppose that the alternative date is repeated from some older chronicle. But, as he then points out (p. 53), all the double dates recur in the *History*, and a comparison of the details shows that Eusebius had good reason for the duplication in each case. The whole matter indeed is far simpler than Harnack's rather laboured treatment of it would suggest: he is haunted by the chimera of a distinction between dated and undated notices, and the consequent belief that in every dated notice Eusebius had some reason, good or bad, for selecting the particular

<sup>1</sup> What is to be said of the argument (p. 66 n. 1) that 'Heinrici rightly refers to Eusebius' quotation (*H. E.* iii 10) of the phrase ἡ τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβὴς διαδοχὴ from Josephus: Eusebius was able to repeat it without remark because he knew of other [Christian] successions than the single one of bishops'? The words occur in the middle of Josephus' enumeration of the canonical books. Does either Harnack or Heinrici gravely suppose that if Irenaeus or any other 'catholic' theologian had desired to quote this list of the Old Testament writings, he would have felt bound to subjoin the caution that Josephus used the word 'succession' in a loose and inadequate sense?

<sup>2</sup> It need hardly be added that Eusebius looked at the matter rather from a historical, Irenaeus rather from a doctrinal, point of view.

year. (1) Of Valentinus it is said under A. Pius 3—exactly in the middle of the episcopate of Hyginus—that he ‘came to Rome under Hyginus,’ and under A. Pius 6—after the accession of bishop Pius—that he ‘is famous and remains till Anicetus.’ These are simply the two limbs of a single sentence of Irenaeus, quoted as a whole in the *History* (iv 11: ‘Valentinus came to Rome under Hyginus, flourished under Pius, and remained till Anicetus’), but resolved into its component chronological parts in the *Chronicle*. (2) In the case of Justin, the first notice under A. Pius 4 relates to his Apology, the second under A. Pius 17 to his martyrdom: the dates are no doubt wrong, but they refer to different events which are naturally enough distinguished from one another. (3) In the case of Clement, the earlier notice under Severus 2 marks his connexion with Pantaenus his predecessor and teacher, the later under Severus 12 his connexion with Alexander his friend and contemporary. When once it is realized that Eusebius, like other chronographers, often had to assign to some definite year or other things which, like the *floruit* of a writer, belong rather to a period than a year, and sometimes, even for things which did belong to particular years, had to invent the exact date if he was unable to discover it, there can be no difficulty in admitting that all these pairs of synchronisms could have been constructed by him on his own account.

On this question, the authority Eusebius attributed to his own dates as given in the *Chronicle* can be tested in a very instructive way by a comparison with the *History*: it is one of the special merits of Harnack’s book that it brings into such strong relief the need for combined treatment of the two works. Speaking generally, then, Eusebius will be found to repeat in the *History* the exact dating of the *Chronicle* when, and only when, it was more than guess-work: for the remainder he employs vaguer synchronisms with the persons or events last mentioned, or with the emperor whose reign he is narrating.

Here, again, Harnack has discovered a rule which, though not without some foundation in fact, is far from having the universal validity he seeks to establish for it. According to him the entire chronology of the *History* is ranged round the emperors, and he shows himself as anxious here to magnify Eusebius’ interest in the imperial succession as he is elsewhere to minimize his interest in the episcopal succession. No one, indeed, would deny that the succession of the emperors is the ‘backbone,’ as Bishop Lightfoot calls it, of the chronology in the *History*: in a history, where rough synchronisms are what is wanted (as opposed to a chronicle), some such arrangement was inevitable, and the only alternative to a continuous use of the emperors would have been a continuous use of the popes. It is true that distinct traces of the latter use are found in the West long before Eusebius’ time (see an

excellent *catena* in Harnack, pp. 164-171): it is true also that the Acts of the martyrs by their emphatic assertion of the 'reign of our Lord Jesus Christ' bear witness to a reluctance on the part of their authors to reckon simply according to the years of the persecuting world-power: but after all even the Acts do mention at the same time the imperial reigns, and it surely would have been much more surprising to find in an eastern writer of Eusebius' day, whatever his views, a system of papal than one of imperial chronology. Thus Eusebius' use of the emperors is perfectly natural as far as it goes: it must, however, be pointed out that, in spite of Harnack, it is not consistent or thoroughgoing. The division of the *History* into books is independent of the secular chronology: Book v, for instance, cuts right across the reign of M. Aurelius, for its first chapters deal with events belonging to his seventeenth year. If the vague date for a bishop or writer is generally measured by an emperor's reign, it is at least occasionally measured by his contemporaries. Sometimes, indeed, it may be doubted whether *κατὰ τοῦτον*, 'in his time,' refers to an emperor mentioned some time before or to a Christian contemporary just mentioned: but in other cases where the plural is used (*καθ' οὓς, ἐπὶ τῶνδε*, or the like) of a time when the imperial power was held by a single ruler, the reference to Christian contemporaries is undeniable. Yet even here Harnack sticks to his thesis and would supply *χρόνους, χρόνων*, 'in these times,' i.e. 'in the times of this emperor': but 'this explanation is impossible' (Lightfoot, *S. Clement*, i 165). In fact the illustrious Berlin professor is greater as a historian than as a scholar: he consistently makes *ἐν τούτῳ* mean 'under this emperor,' and *ἐπὶ τούτοις* 'at this time' (pp. 14, 15), and bases important conclusions on these mistranslations; and, worst of all, he turns (p. 220) Philip of Side's definition of Emmaus as the village 'where Cleopas and his companion[s] were going' (*Ἐμμαοῦς τῆς κόμης τῆς ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ ἐν ἧ ὁὶ περὶ Κλεόπαν ἐπορεύοντο*, cf. Luc. xxiv 13) into the historical statement that 'the descendants of Cleopas had removed to Emmaus'!

C. H. TURNER.

[*To be continued.*]