

(*Dig.* 48. 19. 6. 1), Modestinus (*Dig.* 4. 6. 32), and Hermogenianus (*Dig.* 27. 1. 41. 2).²⁰ Indeed, *suffragium* operated at levels lower than that of the emperor wherever appointments were to be made.²¹

RANON KATZOFF

*Institute for Advanced Study /
Bar Ilan University*

20. O. Seeck, "Comites, B," *RE* 4 (1900): 623–24.

21. Saller, *Personal Patronage*, pp. 157–66. For appointments made by subordinate officials, cf. *Midrash Deuteronomy Rabbah* 2. 3 (= *Yalkut Shimoni* 812), ascribed to the fourth century.

I wish to express my thanks to G. Bowersock, D. Liebs, and D. Sperber, who read the manuscript and made valuable suggestions, and to friendly colleagues at the Institute for Advanced Study with whom I discussed various individual points.

PROSPER'S *EPITOMA CHRONICON*: WAS THERE AN EDITION OF 443?

The first continuation of Jerome's world chronicle to come out of the western provinces of the Roman Empire was the *Epitoma chronicon* of Prosper of Aquitaine.¹ Prosper issued this work in a number of editions; in other words, after first composing the chronicle in A.D. 433, he updated it several times later in his life. The best-attested editions are those of 445 and the final edition of 455. Each survives in a large number of manuscripts, and each was continued by other hands soon after it was composed. The first edition, dating from 433, does not survive in its original form, but its extent and contents can be ascertained by examining the later versions. There was probably also an edition of 451.²

It has been proposed that Prosper also issued an edition dating from the year 443.³ No such version of the chronicle has come down to us; although there are a number of related manuscripts of Prosper which end in 443, these have been correctly identified as copies of a mutilated archetype which belonged to a later edition of the chronicle.⁴ The evidence for the existence of the edition of 443 is, rather, the present form of Victor of Tunnuna's chronicle, composed around 567. We know from Isidore of Seville that Victor, an African bishop, began his chronicle with the Creation.⁵ Most likely the earlier part of this chronicle was an epitome of earlier works; what we have today is Victor's continuation of Prosper, commencing with the year 444 (*Theodosio XVIII et Albino cons.*). In none of the manuscripts does Victor's chronicle actually follow a copy of Prosper that ends at 443; nevertheless, Victor begins his continuation with the prefatory statement "Up to this point the religious Prosper arranged the order of the preceding years. To this we have added the following material."⁶

1. Edited by Th. Mommsen in *Chronica Minora*, vol. 1 (*MGH:AA*, 9:341–499). Prosper is designated "Prosper Tiro" in some manuscripts of his chronicle; that the church father Prosper of Aquitaine wrote the chronicle is, however, certain. See Mommsen, *MGH:AA*, 9:343–44, and L. Valentin, *St. Prosper d'Aquitaine* (Toulouse, 1900), pp. 122–24, 195–97.

2. On the editions of Prosper, see Mommsen's introduction, *MGH:AA*, 9:345–47.

3. By Mommsen, *MGH:AA*, 9:345, and in his introduction to Victor of Tunnuna, *Chronica a. CCCXLIV–DLXVII* (*MGH:AA*, 11:180).

4. Mommsen, *MGH:AA*, 9:358, 11:180.

5. Isidore *De viris illustribus* 49–50, quoted by Mommsen, *MGH:AA*, 11:178.

6. Victor of Tunnuna, incipit (*MGH:AA*, 11:184): "Hucusque Prosper vir religiosus ordinem praecedentium digessit annorum: cui et nos subiecinus."

Victor's statement seems to be confirmed by his text for the years 444–55. His ecclesiastical account owes nothing to Prosper; it is a description of the Chalcedonian period from the point of view of a sixth-century defender of the Three Chapters and the Council of Chalcedon itself.⁷ There are also differences of chronology, including the omission of two pairs of consulates by Victor.⁸ A close examination of Victor's political notices for these years, however, reveals numerous similarities to Prosper's record.

First, there is not a single political event in Victor's discussion of 444–55 that is not found in Prosper, save the accession of Avitus, which took place after Prosper closed his chronicle; otherwise Victor supplies only one new detail, the age of Theodosius II at his death. It is noteworthy that Victor is the only sixth-century chronicler who mentions, as does Prosper, Pope Leo's intercession with Geiseric at the time of the Vandal sack of Rome.

Second, the detailed coverage that Victor gives to political events up to 455 contrasts sharply with the very brief political notices in his relation of the later fifth century. The later entries are entirely concerned with the imperial succession, attempted usurpations, and the succession of Vandal kings (of interest to Victor as an African), and nearly all are restricted to one sentence each.⁹

Finally, Victor's account of the years 444–55 shows some clear verbal echoes of Prosper. Four examples will demonstrate this point.¹⁰

PROSPER

VICTOR OF TUNNUNA

Valentiniano VII et Avieno

Valentiniano VII et Avieno cons.

Theodosio imperatore defuncto et Chrysafio praeposito, qui *amicitia principis male usus* fuerat, interempto Marcianus *consensione totius* exercitus suscepit regnum . . .

Theodosius imperator anno vitae suae LXII Constantinopoli moritur. Chrysaphius praepositus imperatoris *amicitiis* Eutychetis *male usus* occiditur et Marcianus *totius* rei publicae *consensu* imperator efficitur.

Herculano v.c. cons.

Asturio et Protogene cons.¹¹

. . . Nam tota *legatione* dignanter *accepta* ita summi sacerdotis [Leonis]

. . . Qui Attila Leonis papae *legatione suscepta* non solum a rei publicae

7. On the Three Chapters controversy, see É. Amann, "Trois-chapitres," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, vol. 15, pt. 2 (Paris, 1950): 1868–1924.

8. Victor omits the consulats for 445 and 452 (as well as numerous consulates in the period after 455) and is quite inconsistent in his use of dating (e.g., s.a. 451 [*MGH:AA*, 11:185]). See below, n. 14.

9. E.g., Victor, s.a. 456: "Ricimirus patricius Avitum superat, cuius innocentiae parcens Placentiae civitatis episcopum facit"; s.a. 457, 1: "Marcianus imperator Constantinopoli moritur, et pro eo Leo imperator efficitur"; s.a. 458, 1: "Maorianus Romae imperium sumit" (*MGH:AA*, 11:186). These very brief entries may be contrasted with the fuller political notices cited immediately below.

10. For Prosper, *MGH:AA*, 9:481–84; Victor of Tunnuna, *MGH:AA*, 11:185–86.

11. Attila's invasions of Gaul (451) and Italy (452) are recorded by Prosper in two lengthy entries under the proper years. Victor discusses them in a single entry, incorrectly dated to 449. A possible explanation of Victor's choice of 449 for this entry hangs on Prosper's date for the Council of Chalcedon. Prosper dates the council to 453 instead of 451; Victor dates the council correctly to 451. Both, however,

praesentia rex [Attila] gavisus est, ut et bello abstinere praeciperet et *ultra Danuvium promissa pace discederet*.

vastatione quievit, sed et *trans Danuvium pace data recessit*.

Aetio et Studio

. . . Aetius *imperatoris manu et circumstantium gladiis intra palatii penetralia crudeliter confectus est*, Boetio praetorii praefecto simul perempto, qui eidem multa amicitia copulabatur.

Aetio et Studio cons.

Aetius patricius *Valentiniani Augusti manu intra palatium* primo percussus *circumstantium gladiis crudeli* morte extinguitur Boethiusque praefectus nihilominus occiditur.

Valentiniano VIII et Anthemio (455)

[Amici Aetii confoderunt Valentinianum] Heraclio simul . . . interempto . . . *Maximus vir gemini consulatus et patriciae dignitatis sumpsit imperium*. qui cum periclitanti rei publicae profuturus per omnia crederetur, non sero documento, quid animi haberet, probavit, si quidem interfectores Valentiniani non solum non plecterit, sed etiam in amicitiam receperit uxoremque eius Augustam amissionem viri *lugere prohibitam* intra paucissimos dies in coniugium suum transire coegerit. sed hac incontinentia non diu potitus est. nam post alterum mensem nuntiato ex Africa Gisirici regis adventu multisque nobilibus ac popularibus ex urbe fugientibus cum ipse quoque *data cunctis abeundi licentia* trepide vellet abscedere, *septuagesimo septimo adepti imperii die* a famulis regiis *dilaniatus est et membratim deiectus in Tiberim* sepultura quoque caruit. . . .

Valentiniano et Anthemio cons. (455)

Valentinianus imp. Romae campo Martio dolis Maximi patricii et Heraclii praepositi¹² perimitur, idemque *Maximus exconsule ac patricius sumit imperium diebus LXXVII*. hic itaque malum, quod latebat, apparuit. mox relictam Valentiniani Augustam viri exitum sui *lugere non permittens* in matrimonio sumit. sed his malis peiora succedunt, dum adventum Genserici Wandalarum regis formidat et *cunctis volentibus urbe recedere licentiam tribuit*, priusquam fugam quam cogitabat assumeret, occisus *membratimque concisus in Tiberim fluvium proiectus est*. . . .

The correspondence in points of detail, as well as the more general similarities between Prosper and Victor already noted, could be explained by their dependence on a common source; but no such source is extant. It might be said

place the invasion of Italy before the church council. As we shall see below in the case of Prosper, chroniclers were often quite willing to redate or reorder events if doing so simplified the account or allowed them to place an emphasis. For another example, see S. Muhlberger, "The Gallic Chronicle of 452 and its Authority for British Events," *Britannia* 14 (1983): 31.

12. Victor is in error here. Heraclius was, as Prosper says, killed at the same time as Valentinian. He was not, as far as we know, a plotter against the emperor. This difference from Prosper may indicate contamination from another source or may be the result of carelessness.

that Victor used a lost version of the consular annals also familiar to Prosper; yet this would not account for the contrast between Victor's entries before and after 455. His extremely brief entries after that date are indeed reminiscent of the annals. The same cannot be said for the earlier, more developed notices. Nor is it likely that the annals, with their secular orientation, would have given Pope Leo the prominent place in events that both Victor and Prosper do.¹³ The facts suggest that Victor of Tunnuna used Prosper as his chief political source up to 455.¹⁴ It would appear that Victor followed Prosper in political matters as far as he was able, condensing and rearranging his source, but preserving much of it in recognizable form. If this is so, then the case for an edition of Prosper's chronicle datable to 443 collapses. But then how are we to understand Victor's statement that he started an independent account at 444?

It will be remembered that Victor's ecclesiastical history is in fact independent of Prosper. Victor wrote his chronicle in the 560s while in exile from his native province. He had been condemned by Justinian's government for opposing the emperor's desire to alter the settlement made at the Council of Chalcedon in 451. This theological struggle, known as the Three Chapters controversy, was for Victor the great issue of his lifetime, the defense of the decisions of Chalcedon the most important theme of the past century's history. His chronicle was largely a record of the efforts of the orthodox to resist heretical innovation.

Victor's purpose in writing required him to recast the last few years of Prosper's chronicle. Prosper's treatment of ecclesiastical affairs was inadequate as a basis for Victor's defense of the Chalcedonian settlement. The two men agreed on some substantial issues: Prosper, like Victor, abhorred the heresy of Eutyches and condemned the Second Council of Ephesus (448) that scandalously upheld Eutyches' heterodox teachings. Yet Prosper differed from Victor in attributing the defeat of Eutyches not to the bishops in council at Chalcedon, but rather to Pope Leo, whom Prosper greatly admired. As a papal partisan, Prosper seems to have had reservations about Chalcedon, where Roman privileges were disregarded. Prosper de-emphasized the council that Victor valued so highly, by presenting it as simply a confirmation of Leo's earlier declaration of doctrine. Indeed, Prosper postdated his entry on the council by two years; one suspects that he did this so that nothing should interrupt his dramatic description of Attila's invasions of Gaul and Italy in 451 and 452.¹⁵

Victor believed that the popes of his own time had betrayed Chalcedonian orthodoxy; thus for him, the decisions of the council were of greater authority than those of any bishop, even the great Leo.¹⁶ Since it was impossible for him to

13. The surviving consular annals show that their compilers were primarily interested in affairs of state. Only very rarely are religious matters recorded, and ecclesiastical personages are almost never mentioned. The Italian annals-tradition is edited in Mommsen, *Consularia Italica* (MGH:AA, 9:249–339), the Byzantine tradition in Mommsen, *Consularia Constantinopolitana* (MGH:AA, 9:197–247).

14. It may be that Victor had other sources as well, at least for his (faulty) consular list (see above, nn. 8 and 12). It is worth noting in this connection that Cassiodorus in his chronicle used Prosper for all his notices between 379 and 445 (and perhaps to 455), but attached those notices to a consular list taken from another source. See Mommsen's introduction to Cassiodorus, *Chronica ad a. DXIX* (MGH:AA, 11:111–13).

15. See above, n. 11.

16. Victor, s.a. 553, 1; 557, 1; 558 (MGH:AA, 11:203–4).

adopt Prosper's stance, Victor found it necessary to construct his own history of the rise and fall of Eutyches. This he did very thoroughly, starting in 444, where he notes the accession of Bishop Domnus of Antioch, by his own account a chief actor at Ephesus in 448. Prosper's coverage of the doctrinal battle was discarded and a very detailed, original account substituted.

Nevertheless, Prosper's chronicle was still the fullest political source that Victor had for the years 444–55; the turning back of Attila by Pope Leo, the murders of Aetius and Valentinian III, and Geiseric's sack of Rome were still of interest to him. That Victor used Prosper's well-attested edition of 455 as the basis of his own portrayal of these epochal events is the simplest way to explain the similarity of their accounts.

The originality of Victor's ecclesiastical history from 444 is sufficient to explain his statement that he wrote independently from that year. Victor was taking responsibility for an account that he had revised and supplemented to reflect his own judgments on the past. At the same time his political coverage of 444–55 indicates that he used Prosper's edition of 455 for some of his material. The evidence as a whole supports both Victor's claim of originality and the partial dependence on Prosper, making unnecessary the theory that Prosper produced an edition in 443.

STEVEN MUHLBERGER
Toronto