

TWO FRAGMENTS OF JEROME'S CHRONICLE

The text of Jerome's version of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius rests on fourteen manuscripts of the tenth century or earlier that represent a very complicated textual tradition. Two early fragments, recovered from the binding of codices now in Wroclaw (Breslau) and Karlsruhe, merit inclusion in the analysis of that tradition by reason both of their age and of the texts to which they attest. Neither is of any particular significance, compared with the complete exemplars, for the editorial reconstruction of the archetypal text. Both are of interest, however, for what they add to our knowledge of the early history of one of late antiquity's most influential texts, still extant in more than a hundred medieval witnesses¹). The Karlsruhe fragment derives from a ninth-century manuscript that faithfully reproduced Jerome's complicated chronographic format. Its text has some similarities to that of Paris Lat. 4858 (Q), but the fragment is too insubstantial to permit firm conclusions about its relationship to the rest of the tradition. The Wroclaw fragments contain enough material, however, to show that the codex from which they derive, as old as any other known, presented a text different from that of any of the complete witnesses, but similar in some ways to the texts used by the earliest of Jerome's epitomators, Prosper and Cassiodorus. In fact, the Wroclaw fragments may be our earliest direct witness to the text.

The fourteen most important authorities are, in the order of their age, as follows²): O = Oxford, Bodleian Auct. T. II. 26

1) For lists of the manuscripts see Albert Siegmund, *Die Überlieferung der Griechischen Christlichen Literatur in der Lateinischen Kirche* (Munich 1949) 76–78 and Bernard Lambert, *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta* (The Hague 1969) II, 31–42. Lambert lists 180 witnesses, not all of them direct. I have, of course, not inspected the numerous *recentiores* nor are they usually adduced in editors' apparatus. Hence I must qualify some of the statements that follow by saying „all of the earlier authorities,” rather than “all witnesses.”

2) For description of the manuscripts see the editors' prefaces: Alfred Schoene, *Eusebi Chronicorum Libri Duo* (Berlin 1866, 1875; Zurich 1967); Rudolf Helm, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus* (Leipzig 1913, 1926; Second edition, Berlin 1956); J.K.Fotheringham, *Eusebii Pamphili Chronici*

(*CLA* ii, 233), mid-fifth century; *S* = Floriacensis fragments, Leiden Voss. Lat. Q. 110A + Paris Lat. 6400B + Vatican Reg. Lat. 1709A (*CLA* i, v, x, 563), late fifth century; *B* = Bern 219 (*CLA* vii, 860), late seventh century; *A* = Valenciennes 495 (*CLA* vi, 841), early eighth century; *L* = Lucca Bibl. Capit. 490 (*CLA* iii, 303), late eighth century; *F* = Leiden Scal. 14, early ninth century; *Q* = Paris Lat. 4858, mid-ninth century; *N* = Berlin Staatsbibl. 126 (Phillipps 1872), ninth century; *M* = Berlin Staatsbibl. 127 (Phillipps 1829), ninth century; *P* = Leiden Voss. Lat. Q. 110, ninth century; *T* = Oxford, Merton College 315, ninth century; *C* = Paris Lat. 4859, late ninth or early tenth century; *D* = Paris Lat. 4860, tenth century; *X* = London, Brit. Mus. Add. 16974, tenth century.

No stemma can do justice to the complexity of the relationships among these manuscripts, and no less than a monograph would suffice to discuss even the most important of the variants. Still, the editors have established certain broad classifications. The criterion of format, in particular, must be kept in mind in considering the fragments. *A*, *N*, and *P* are direct copies of *S* and the best representatives of what seems to have been Jerome's organization of the text, an essential feature of a synchronistic chronicle. *S*, *A*, *N*, and *P* agree in the pagination of the work, ruled 26 lines to the leaf. The lines correspond to chronographic content in precise ways, so that there is general agreement among the manuscripts line by line. In the earlier portion of the work, prior to 520 B.C., two facing pages are required to present the content of a given set of years. On each page there are vertical columns of years numbered according to various systems, one year to a line with a space in all columns of both pages whenever any one column is interrupted for notice of a regnal succession. Olympiad numbers occupy a space of their own, interrupting all the columns and effectively dividing the chronographic framework into Olympiads. In the middle of the page is a broad space for historical notices, the date of the notice indicated by the line at which it begins, with notices of sacred history appearing on the left-hand page, secular history on the right. After 520 B.C., Biblical history being at an end and the number of regnal lists fewer, a single page suffices for the

Canones (London 1923). Also see Schoene, *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius* (Berlin 1900); Fotheringham, *The Bodleian Manuscript of Jerome's Version of the Chronicle of Eusebius* (Oxford 1905); Ludwig Traube, *Hieronymi Chronicon codicis Floriacensis fragmenta* (Leyden 1902).

entire display. The use of space on the 26-line page is now dictated by the length and number of the historical notices rather than by the content of the regnal lists. *M* also has this organization and a 26-line text, but differing in the pagination of the latter portion. *O* has the same format, but conserves space by using a 30-line page. *O* and *M* derive from a common exemplar having the format and pagination of *S*, but preserving the archetypal text against *S* in a number of crucial instances. *B* altered the format by compressing the content of facing pages into one in the earlier portion of the work and by using two columns of text in the latter portion. Its transcription is very imprecise, destroying the line-by-line synchronization of the original. *F* is completely and designedly reorganized – alternating columns of numerals and text, giving geometrical configurations to the notices, and introducing a complicated color code for the relationship of numerals to text. *D* is also the product of deliberate redaction. *Q* is very similar to *O* in the format and organization of the earliest portion of the work, but it gradually becomes less and less precise in its rendering of the archetypal arrangement. *T*, *X*, and *C* are the oldest representatives of that numerous class of younger manuscripts having the text and format of the so-called *spatium historicum* group (Scaliger's *priores*) that was the basis of many early editions. *T* and *X* still show the influence of the archetypal arrangement, but in *C* the simplification is complete. The twin-paged arrangement of the early portion is abandoned. Throughout, all numerals appear on the left, text on the right, with especially long notices written along the entire width of the page.

By the combined criteria of format and text, Fotheringham and Helm divided these manuscripts into six classes – *OM*, *SANP*, *BQ*, *FD*, *TXC*, and *L*. *BQ* and *FD* are distinct classes, but more closely related to *OM* and *SANP* than to *TXC*. *L*, according to Fotheringham, is *sui generis*. In an earlier study I reported that *L* in fact derives from an exemplar closely related to *SANP* and *OM*, having the archetypal format and pagination on a 26-line leaf. Its text is, however, different from that of both *SANP* and *OM* and in certain respects superior, carrying a number of notices definitely attested as Eusebian, but not present in the older manuscripts of Jerome³). In the hope of finding

3) "Lucca Bibl. Capit. 490 and the Manuscript Tradition of Hieronymus' (Eusebius) Chronicle," *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 8 (1975) 203–40.

additional evidence for the existence and influence of that text, I decided to examine the Wrocław and Karlsruhe fragments⁴). As it happens, none of the extant leaves of either fragment corresponds to any of the pages where the additional entries occur in *L*, nor to any portion of text containing readings critical to the classification of the manuscripts. The evidence of these fragments is not entirely moot, however. There is enough extant in each case to show that the now lost manuscripts carried the archetypal format, although not the pagination of the 26-line text. Furthermore, the Wrocław fragments have readings sufficiently different from the rest of the tradition to show that the early history of this text is even more complicated than we have thought.

Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, I. Fol. 120d

The older, larger, and more significant of the two fragments is that in the university library in Wrocław, Poland, I. Fol. 120d (*CLA* viii, 1075)⁵). The fragment consists of two leaves, not consecutive, pieced together with some gaps from seventeen long, narrow strips. These strips were recovered in 1910 at what was then Breslau University from the binding material of manuscript IV. Fol. 10, assembled in the fifteenth century and probably brought to Breslau from Paris by Dominicans returning from study there⁶). The first leaf consists of eight such strips, with a gap between the sixth and the seventh. The second leaf has been reconstructed from nine strips, with a gap between the eighth and the ninth. The margins, top and bottom, of the original pages are missing. Strips corresponding to left and right margins are also missing, with the exception of a strip containing the left margin of 2^r and the right of 2^v. The left and right margins of the original included the numerals of the chronological framework, while the top of the leaf contained the regnal titles for those columns of numbers. Top, bottom, and outer margins seem to have been cut off before the binding strips

4) Two other fragments included in *CLA* were excluded from this study. El Escorial R. II. 18 (*CLA* xi, 1631) attests to Isidorus' epitome, rather than directly to Jerome's text. British Museum Harley 3941 (*CLA* Suppl., 1704) is an illegible palimpsest.

5) *Die Handschriften der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Breslau I* (1939) 125.

6) *Ibid.*

were made. As far as the text of the historical notices is concerned, there was little missing from the trimmed page. A few characters do seem to have been trimmed away along with the outer margin, however, so that the ends of the lines were probably not written square. After trimming, the leaves were cut into ten or eleven strips. Two strips are missing from the first leaf as reconstructed. One contained the numerals of the left margin of the recto. The other contained text about three-fourths of the way along the page reading from left to right. Two strips are also missing from the second leaf, those which would have been second and fifth from the right on the recto. The present reconstruction is deceptive, however, since only one of the gaps is apparent on first examination. The reassembled strips measure about 215 mm. high by 130 mm. wide. The complete leaf must have measured about 230×170 , approximately the same as the pages of the Bodleian manuscript (O) and the Floriacensis fragments (S). The material is a parchment of fine quality, lined on the verso with a dry instrument.

Leo Santifaller published the text of the fragment, with plates, in 1939, along with a detailed paleographical discussion⁷). The same hand wrote all four sides, somewhat smaller on 1^r, which has 32 lines of text compared with the others' 26. The hand is clearly a very old uncial, probably Italian; and Lowe (*CLA* viii, 1075) dates it to the fifth century. Santifaller, judging from the formation of individual characters, from the type and relatively spare use of ligatures and abbreviations, and from the alignment of letters with respect to the horizontal, finds the manuscript to be older than the Turin fragments of the Codex Theodosianus (ca. 550, *CLA* iv, 440), older than the Morgan Pliny (ca. 500, *CLA* xi, 1660), and most nearly like the *Liber Paschalis* of 447 (*CLA* viii, 1053)⁸). The only counterindication to an early date is the use of "e caudata". Given the preponderance of paleographical evidence for an early date, Santifaller concludes that we have here the earliest evidence for "e caudata", rather than an argument for a sixth-century date.

Codex Wratislaviensis or "*Wrat.*", to use Santifaller's designation, is at least as old as the Bodleian manuscript and the

7) Leo Santifaller, "Über eine Unzialhandschrift der Chronik des hl. Hieronymus aus dem 5. Jahrhundert," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 59 (1939) 412-43.

8) On old uncial generally, see E. A. Lowe and E. K. Rand, *A Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger* (Washington 1922).

Floriacensis fragments, both of which are dated to the middle or late fifth century. *Wrat.* may, as Santifaller suggests, be in fact our oldest witness to Jerome's text⁹). The Wrocław fragments do not, however, attest to the same text as *OM*, *SANP*, or any of the other older manuscripts; nor do the fragments preserve Jerome's organization of the text as precisely as *OM* and *SANP*. The text on folios 1^v, 2^r, and 2^v is written 26 lines to the page, but neither the pagination nor the lineation corresponds to the archetypal format of *SANP* and of the common exemplar of *OM*. Furthermore, while Olympiad numbers seem to have occupied a line of their own on the first leaf as in the archetypal format, the same is not true of the second leaf. Folio 1^r in fact has 32 lines of text, instead of 26. In other words, the manuscript was inconsistent with itself in the rendering of the chronographic organization, and the 26 lines of *Wrat.*'s text do not have the same very precise relationship to the structure of the work as do the 26 lines of *SANP* and *M* and the 30 lines of *O*. The text of 1^r corresponds to that from p. 170, line 17 to 172, 16 in Helm's reconstruction of the archetypal text and format. Thus the 32 lines of this leaf – 36 if one counts spaces between notices where Olympiads 197 through 200 must have been entered in the lost left margin – contain the equivalent of 52 lines of archetypal text. The 26 lines of 1^v are 28 if Olympiads 201 and 202 had lines of their own, and they correspond to 47 lines in the archetypal format – 172, 17 to 174, 11 Helm. There are clearly not separate spaces for Olympiad numbers on folio 2; and, in fact, the numeral for Olympiad 223 on 2^r is written in smaller characters below the numeral *XV* (Trajan's fifteenth year) alongside a line of text in a long notice (196^a Helm) that began in the third year (Trajan *XIV*) of Olympiad 222. The 26 lines of 2^r correspond to 195, 5 through 196, 23 or 45 lines of archetypal text. The text of 2^v runs in 26 lines from 196, 24 to 198, 16, again 45 lines of archetypal text. In all, the 110 to 116 lines of *Wrat.* correspond to 189 lines of *SANP*.

A 26-line text seems to have been common among manuscripts of this period; but *Wrat.* is not a 26-line text in the same sense as *SANP*, and it does not present as carefully organized an arrangement even within its own lineation. There are no special features of text or space at points corresponding to the

9) For the dating of *O* and *S* see the facsimile editions of Fotheringham and Traube (above, note 2).

ends of pages in *SANP*, so that we cannot be sure that its exemplar had the pagination that seems to have been that of Jerome and his bookman. Still, as the following considerations show, the manuscript did apparently retain the basic organization of the chronographic format, in the relationship of numerals to text, rather than setting all regnal numerals to the left and spreading historical text over the rest of the page like the *TXC* group of younger manuscripts. Neither of the reconstructed leaves is from that portion of the work prior to 520 B.C. that was organized on facing pages with columns of numerals containing exactly 26 lines in the margins of each page. The leaves correspond to the years 7–30 A.D. and 108–121 A.D. For most of this last section of the work there was only a Roman *filum* to be inscribed, so that differences in format among the various classes of manuscripts are not striking. *Wrat.*, however, does not write two columns to the page as, for example, *B* and *L* do. More significantly, folio 1 does cover years prior to the Jewish War, where there was a regnal column for the Jewish kingdom, in this case for Herod the Tetrarch, inscribed in the right margin. The right margin of this leaf is missing on both recto and verso, along with any numerals it contained. The missing left margin, however, does not seem to have been broad enough to contain the Jewish *filum* as well as the Roman. Furthermore, there appears towards the right of the page, about half-way down the recto and clearly legible, part of a notice belonging to the Hebrew *filum* that noted the accession of Herod the Tetrarch: *Iudaeor[um principa] || tum ten[et Herodes] || Tetrarcha an[XXIIII]*. This note and that on the accession of Tiberius, which appears on the left in the same space, are written in red ink, a feature of the archetypal format. Clearly, then, the Jewish column appeared to the right of the historical notices, in agreement with the archetypal arrangement.

As far as the organization and outward appearance of the text are concerned, the Wrocław fragments represent a very old manuscript that preserved the basic arrangement of Jerome's text but with significant departures from the rigorous precision of the original 26-line organization. More interesting is the fact that, orthography aside, the content of the text differs from that of all other extant exemplars. The peculiarities follow, cited by the lineation of the fragments and the corresponding page and line number of the Helm and Fortheringham editions.

1. 1^r, 9 = 171, 2 H; 253, 2 F: ad extremum uoluntaria inedia se

- c[onfe]cit *Wrat.* ad extremum ulcere sibi circa sacram spinam nato inedia se confecit *cett.*
2. 1^r, 22 = 171, 24 H; 253, 25 F: sepelitur [iuxta opp]idum Tomos *Wrat.* iuxta oppidum Tomos sepelitur *cett.*
 3. 1^v, 20 = 173, 25 H; 255, 25 F: et egr[essu I]srahel *Wrat.* et egressu Israhelis *cett.*
 4. 1^v, 21 = 174, 1 H; 256, 1 F: Samiramidis *Wrat.* Semiramidis *cett.*
 5. 1^v, 22 = 174, 3 H; 256, 2 F: [a dilu]uio autem *Wrat.* XC a diluuio *cett.*
 6. 2^r, 10 = 195, 23 H; 277, 23 F: cuius i[n]ge[n]ii plurim[a *Wrat.* cuius plurima ingenii *cett.* .
 7. 2^v, 17-18 = 196, 9 H; 278, 9 F: prouincias] // facit *Wrat.* fecit provincias *cett.*
 8. 2^v, 22 = 196, 17 H; 278, 17 F: in Alexandria par[s ge]ntilium [supe]rat *Wrat.* gentilium pars superat in Alexandria *cett.*
 9. 2^v, 4 = 197, 5 H; 279, 5 F: in urna aurea *Wrat.* in urnam auream *cett.*
 10. 2^v, 11 = 197, 19 H; 279, 19 F: secundo reuellan // [tes *Wrat.* secundo contra Romanos rebellantes *cett.*
 11. 2^v, 23 = 198, 11 H; 280, 13 F: repa[rati]onem *Wrat.* instaurationem *cett.*

For the reconstruction of the archetypal text, these variants are not significant. All but the first and the last may be regarded as scribal errors and/or variants of a common sort, and in the two remaining cases (1 and 11) there is not reason to believe that *Wrat.* transmits the correct reading against the rest. In those two cases the scribe substituted readings of equivalent sense, while at the same time considerably abbreviating the first notice. The fifth case may well be an archetypal reading, since it is an addition and is shared by *X* and *C*. That fifth case aside, there is no parallel to these variants among the extant manuscripts. Such a list is a long one for so small a fragment. We cannot simply characterize *Wrat.* as *sui generis*, however, and let the matter rest. There are many indirect witnesses to Jerome's text through such of his continuators as prefaced their own work with an epitome of Jerome. Among the most important are Prosper of Aquitania, Cassiodorus Senator, the anonymous Gallic chroniclers of 452 and 511, Isidorus of Seville, and Bede¹⁰). In the cases noted, the epitomators, where comparison

10) For the texts, see Theodor Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, 3 vols.,

is possible, generally agree with the mainstream of the manuscript tradition rather than with *Wrat.* In several instances, however, either Prosper or Cassiodorus agrees with *Wrat.* This is significant testimony, as both witnesses are earlier than any complete exemplar except *O* and they are independent of each other. Prosper's chronicle was first published in 433, about the same time that *Wrat.* was composed and probably earlier. Cassiodorus wrote his chronicle in 519, and he used Prosper only for the period after 378, Jerome's terminus. For the earlier period he used Jerome directly¹¹).

Prosper 370 (*Chron. Min.* I p. 408) is an excerpt of the notice involved in case 1, where *Wrat.*'s departure from the tradition is most radical, but Prosper unfortunately did excerpt the crucial clause. The situation is similar in the 8th case (Prosper 577, p. 421). Prosper does share with *Wrat.* the idiosyncratic readings in the chronological summary of 173–174 Helm, cases 3, 4, and 5 (Prosper 382–384, p. 409). He has no excerpt corresponding to the notices of 2 or 7, and he omits the crucial clause in 6 and 8 (569, 577, p. 421). In cases 9 and 11, Prosper reads *in urnam auream* (580, p. 421) and *instaurationem* (598, p. 422). in agreement with the complete manuscripts rather than with *Wrat.* His testimony in the 10th case is moot, reading *aduersum Romanos* (588, p. 422), which may be an editorial addition to a text like *Wrat.*'s or a variant of *contra Romanos*. Of the notices that Prosper excerpted, Cassiodorus (766, *Chron. Min.* II, p. 141) shares only that involved in the 9th case. Here he reads *in urna aurea* with *Wrat.*, rather than *in urnam auream* with Prosper and the rest of the tradition. That variant is not as significant as Cassiodorus' other two agreements with *Wrat.* He has no excerpts corresponding to cases 1 through 5, 8, and 10; and he reads *instaurationem* (774, p. 141) in the last case with Prosper and the rest. In cases 6 and 7, however, he agrees with *Wrat.*, in reading *cuius ingenii plurima* and *prouincias fecit* (*facit Wrat.*) (756, 761, p. 141). Two such agreements in transposed word order in so small a portion of text are not likely to be purely coincidental.

These agreements of Prosper and Cassiodorus show that the peculiar readings of the Wrocław fragments are not entirely

Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 9, 11, 13 (Berlin 1892, 1894, 1898).

11) On the dates of Prosper and Cassiodorus see Mommsen, *Chron. Min.* I, 345 and 2, 111.

without parallel in the textual tradition. Furthermore, they suggest that Prosper, Cassiodorus, and *Wrat.* derive from a common source. That source was an exemplar of Jerome's text written before 433, the date of Prosper's first edition, 55 years after Jerome's terminus. This early copy was therefore composed within a dozen years of Jerome's death, and it may very well have been written during his lifetime¹²). We are accordingly dealing with a text older than any other attested, influential enough to have been read by Prosper and Cassiodorus, one from which the very old copy represented by the Wroclaw fragments was made, yet one that carried a text different from that of all our other early witnesses. Mommsen hypothesized that Prosper and Cassiodorus used an exemplar of Jerome similar to the extant *F* (Leiden, Scal. 14), and he adduced a set of variants to show agreements and differences between that hypothetical exemplar and the most important extant copies in use in Mommsen's time¹³). There are certain readings in the excerpts of Prosper and Cassiodorus that Mommsen found paralleled only in *F*. He seems largely to have been influenced in coming to this hypothesis, however, by the fact that a letter carried at the back of the codex, which includes Prosper for the years 378–445 as well as Jerome, indicates that *F*'s exemplar was at least as old as the early sixth century, and that copy in turn may have been made from one written in 445, the year to which *F* continues Jerome's concluding chronological summary¹⁴). Mommsen based his comparison on Schoene's edition, adding the readings of *O* and *M*. When we include the additional authorities that Fotheringham adduced, however, we find the similarities of *TXC* with Prosper and to a lesser degree with Cassiodorus to be just as striking as those of *F*. The most important of Mommsen's cases follow, cited by Mommsen's editions of Prosper and Cassiodorus, Helm's and Fotheringham's of Jerome.

Pr. 361 = 169, 15 H; 251, 14 F: ab Adam anni VCC *Pr.* ab Adam usque natiuitatem Christi sint an. V̄CXCVIII in *marg. F, omit. cett.*

Pr. 440 = 181, 12 H; 263, 12 F: in quis *Pr. PNQTXC* in quibus *OAM* in qua *F.*

12) Jerome died in 420, according to Prosper 1274 (*Chron. Min.* 1, 469).

13) Mommsen, *Chron. Min.* 1, 347–48 and 2, 111.

14) Schoene, *praeef. ed.* xi; Mommsen, *Chron. Min.* 1, 367.

- Pr. 688 = 206, 13 H; 288, 13 F: Titianus *Pr. F* Titianus *cett*¹⁵).
- Pr. 767 = 213, 5 H; 295, 5 F: ann. VI *Pr. FTXC* ann. VII *cett*.
- Pr. 866 = 220, 7 H; 203, 5 F: ...Xystus... *lemma exhibent Pr. F, omit. cett*.
- Pr. 949 = 226, 18 H; 308, 18 F: ann. VIII *Pr. TXCP^m* VII *F omit. cett*.
- Pr. 999 = 230, 6 H; 312, 6 F: uilla sua Spalato *Pr. OMF* aspalato *TXC* Palatino *cett*.
- Pr. 1070 = 236, 12 H; 318, 12 F: Constanti *Pr. FXC* Constantii *T* Constantis *cett*.
- Ca. 747 = 194, 8 H; 276, 9 F: Etisifontem *Ca. FPBDQ* Tesifontem *TC* Tisifontem *T* Ctesifontem *cett*.
- Ca. 949 = 217, 24 H; 299, 24 F: quadraginta missus *Ca. FANP* athlamus *vel sim. cett*.
- Ca. 1069 = 234, 15 H; 316, 15 F: d. XXIII *Ca. F XII uel XIII Pr. cett*.

To this list should be added the following two cases, where a relationship between Prosper and *TXC* is especially clear:

- Pr. 569 = 195, 23 H; 277, 23 F: perit dum inuisit Vesuuium *add. Pr. TXC*.
- Pr. 1044 = 233, 22 H; 315, 22 F: Eunomia Christiana uirgo *add. Pr. TXC*.

The exemplars of Prosper and Cassiodorus were not identical with each other; but both had affinities with *F* and with *TXC*, and both shared some of the peculiarities of *Wrat. Wrat.*, however, does not have the erroneous addition to the notice on the *floruit* of Pliny the Younger that Prosper (569) and *TXC* read. Neither *F* nor the *TXC* class carries the unusual readings of *Wrat.*, with the exception of the fifth case, where *X* and *C* agree with *Wrat.* in reading *autem*. It is extremely difficult to classify manuscripts on the basis of minor variants alone, especially when one is dealing with so small a fragment as *Wrat.* The extant text has none of the cases that Fotheringham (p. xxi) adduces as examples for his classification of the manuscripts. Nevertheless, the following readings offer some support for the hypothesis that is emerging – namely, that of our three major groups of manuscripts *Wrat.* had a text more nearly akin to that of *TXC* than to that of *OM* or *SANP*.

¹⁵) Fotheringham and Helm note no variants. Schoene cites *F* for *Titianus*.

- 1^r, 9 = 171, 3 H; 253, 3 F: inedia *Wrat.* *APNLXC* in-
aedia *cett.*
- 1^r, 24 = 172, 1 H; 254, 2 F: conruerunt *Wrat.* *BXC*
considerunt *A* ceciderunt *F* corruerunt *cett.*
- 1^r, 25 = 172, 2 H; 254, 3 F: Mos]tene *Wrat.* *MBLTX*
Mustene *C* Mostenes *O* Monosthenae (e *P*) *ANP*
Mosthene *D.*
- 1^r, 26 = 172, 4 H; 254, 5 F: Zmy]rna *Wrat.* *T* Myryna *X*
Myrena *C* Myrina uel Mirina *cett.*
- 1^r, 29 = 172, 10 H; 254, 11 F: blandimentas (a *P*) *ANP*
blanditias uel *sim.* *Wrat.* *cett.*
- 1^r, 31 = 172, 14 H; 254, 14 F: Caesaream *OTXCD* -iam
cett.
- 1^v, 3 = 172, 20 H; 254, 20 F: Q. Aterius *Wrat.* *XC* Qua-
terius *O* Q. Hacterius *P* Quintus Atherius *D* Q. Hate-
rius *cett.*
- 1^v, 7 = 173, 1 H; 255, 2 F: Caesaream *Wrat.* *OMBTXC*
-iam *cett.*
- 2^r, 10 = 195, 23 H; 277, 23 F: exst[ant *Wrat.* *TC*(*corr.*
extant) *D* extant *cett.*

The Wrocław fragments represent a manuscript that carried a text different from that of any of our fourteen older authorities. Although *Wrat.* is perhaps our oldest direct witness to Jerome's chronicle, its text was inferior to that of *OM* and *SANP*. This fact can be seen in the peculiar readings of the 1st, and 11th cases, in mistakes such as the reading *Stocius* for *Stoicus* at 1^r, 2 (170, 19 H), and in the imprecision and idiosyncrasy with which *Wrat.* renders the chronographic format. Nevertheless, the text had affinities with those used by Prosper and Cassiodorus, who share some of the peculiar readings. Its orthography, in the few instances that are at all suggestive, was more nearly akin to the extant *TXC* group than to any other; and the texts that Prosper and Cassiodorus used seem also to have had affinities with *TXC* as well as with *F*. The fragments thus represent a very early and otherwise lost collateral branch of a text that the early epitomators used and to which the numerous manuscripts of the *TXC* class are related. The fact that *Wrat.* renders the format as inconsistently and imprecisely as it does shows that the degeneration in this respect that led eventually to the simplified and inaccurate arrangement of those younger manuscripts had already begun in at least one exemplar of the early fifth century, within a short time of Jerome's death. The fifth-century exem-

plar of *F* perhaps represents another early branch of that tradition. Such readings as *quadraginta missus*, however, also suggest the influence on *F* and Cassiodorus of a text of the *SANP* tradition.

Karlsruhe Aug. Fr. 95

There are fewer clues to the agnation of the second fragment, Karlsruhe Aug. Fr. 95 (*CLA* viii, 1120)¹⁶. The fragment consists of a single leaf, recovered from the binding of Aug. 241, in an Anglo-Saxon maiusculæ that Lowe dates to the late eighth century. The leaf measures 220 × 170 mm. A strip of about 10 mm. was trimmed from the top of the leaf, which must originally have measured about 230 × 170. The recto is well preserved and legible throughout, but the verso has been badly damaged by the glue used in binding. The text of the recto corresponds to 96b, 10 through 97b, 18 Helm. The format is archetypal, apart from the pagination. This is a page from the earlier portion of the work, and *K* preserves the twin-page arrangement with sacred history on verso, secular on the recto. The numerals of the chronographic framework are accurately aligned with one another; and Olympiad numbers occupy a space of their own, as in *OM* and *SANP*. The regnal titles are missing, having been trimmed away with the top of the leaf. The rest of the page contains 34 lines, corresponding exactly to 34 lines of archetypal text. The pagination is, of course, different from both the 26 lines of *SANPM* and the 30 lines of *O*. The use of both red and black ink, to which Jerome refers in his preface (5 Helm), to aid the reader in distinguishing one column of numerals from the next, is also apparent. At least two lines of text are missing from the top of the verso, because of the trimming of the page, and much of the rest has been rendered illegible by the glue. It is clear, however, that the text ended at the point corresponding to 99a, 4 Helm. The first line extant at the top corresponds to 97a, 21, beginning in the middle of a sentence. The page must originally have begun at 97a, 19, since the recto ended at 97b, 18, so that the verso – and, presumably, its corresponding recto – contained 38 lines of text. Despite the illegi-

16) For the full text see Alfred Holder, *Die Handschriften der badischen Landesbibliothek Karlsruhe, VI: die Reichenauer Handschriften*, 2 (Wiesbaden 1971) 519–21.

bility of much of the page, the use of both red and black ink is clear.

In thus preserving the archetypal format, maintaining the distinction between sacred and profane on facing pages, with the numerals of the chronographic framework carefully and precisely aligned, using red ink as well as black, but with a varying number of lines to the page, *K* is most like *Q* among the extant manuscripts. In the placement of the notices with respect to the numerals and in certain of the readings of the text *K* again most nearly approaches *Q*. As it happens, there is remarkable agreement among the manuscripts as to the dating of the notices in this portion of the text, but exact agreement between *K* and *Q* far surpasses that between *K* and any other. *K* is within one year of *O* and *M*, our best witnesses in this respect, in the placement of all nineteen of the notices represented on these pages. There is exact agreement between *K* and *TXC* in only three cases, with *L* in six, with *B* in eight, with (*S*)*ANP* in eight, with *OM* in nine, and with *Q* in thirteen of the nineteen instances. The text is generally archetypal, but the following readings, taken together, suggest a kinship with *Q*. Citation is by line-number of the fragment with the corresponding page and line in the editions of Helm and Fotheringham.

- r 16 = 96b, 25 H; 169, 25 F: apud *KQABLF* apud *OMPNTXCD*
- r 19 = 97b, 1 H; 171, 1 F: Plusias *KNB* Plusia *Q* Pelusias *P* Prusias *cett.*
- r 21 = 97b, 2 H; 171, 2 F: est *K cett.*, *om. ANP*
- r 23 = 97b, 5 H; 171, 5 F: distructa *KQ* destructa *cett.*
- r 30 = 97b, 17 H; 171, 16 F: Taenarum *KQAPNB* Tena-
rum *cett.*
- v 9 = 98a, 4 H; 172, 4 F: Eliacim *KQ* Ioac(h)im *cett.*
- v 13 = 98a, 11 H; 172, 11 F: Nabocodonosor *KQ* Nabu-
chodonosor *APBTD* Nabuchodosor *ON* Nabu-
chodonosor *MF* Nabucodonosor *LC* Nabacodo-
nosor *X*.

K is to be distinguished from *Q* and from all the rest of our fourteen chief authorities, however, by the presence of one error, one transposition of word order, and one interpolation, none of which is elsewhere attested. At r 10 = 96b, 17 H; 169, 17 F, *K* calls Tyrtaeus *profeta*, instead of *poeta*, an understandable error in this type of text. At v 15 = 98a, 14 H; 172, 13 F, *K* reads *uasorum partem*, instead of *partem uasorum*, again an easily under-

stood variant. Most interesting is the reading at v 5, a line corresponding to the page division between 97a-98a Helm, 170-172 Fotheringham. At this point on the archetypal text there was a title within the Hebrew *filum* that announced the accession of Jehoahaz and Eliakim. The title interrupted the flow of numerals for four lines, and the corresponding space of the *spatium historicum* was blank. Here, in *K*, in the same hand as the rest of the fragment, can be read ... *ferunt ophyr* ... The Armenian version (186 Karst) has a notice at this point to which there is nothing corresponding in Jerome: "Nechao führte gefangen den Ioachaz nach Ägyptos, und als König setzte er über Iudenland den Eliakim; und er legte ihm Tribut auf und zog ab." We cannot, however, hypothesize that *K* here preserved an original Eusebian notice that does not appear elsewhere among the manuscripts of Jerome. *K*'s ... *ferunt ophyr* ... was clearly part of a note much shorter than that of the Armenian version. Furthermore, there does not seem to be a word or name, in Latin, Greek, or Hebrew, of which *ophyr* might have been a part. This note, if we could read or reconstruct it, might be decisive for characterizing *K* with respect to the rest of the tradition. As it stands, however, this reading is merely mysterious.

The Karlsruhe fragment, then, attests to an exemplar of the eighth century or earlier, similar, if not identical, to that from which *Q* was copied about fifty years later. *K* itself, however, is apparently without descendants, since it has certain peculiarities (e.g., *profeta*) not otherwise attested. Fotheringham and Helm have noted that *Q* and *B* have many affinities, so that we may add *K* to that "class". *K* did not transmit a very reliable text, but apart from its pagination it was an excellent witness to the archetypal format, including the positioning (dating) of the historical notices with respect to the numerals of the framework. That fact is significant in itself, since the chronographic format was the essence of the work and difficult to reproduce precisely. *B*, although seventh-century, is a very poor witness to the format that must be presumed for its exemplar; and by the tenth century that complicated arrangement was no longer being copied. *K* thus stands with *M*, *N*, *P*, and *Q* as among the last representatives of Jerome's own text and format.

University of California, Alden A. Mosshammer
San Diego