

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

THE EARLY EPISCOPAL LISTS

III. THE EVIDENCE OF EUSEBIUS: COMPARISON OF THE *CHRONICLE* AND THE *HISTORY*.

TO the first volume of this JOURNAL I contributed, under the general heading 'Early Episcopal Lists', two articles, the one an introductory study on Eusebius of Caesarea and his *Chronicle*, the other a criticism of the list of the bishops of Jerusalem. At that time, seventeen years ago, it was my intention to treat similarly of the lists of Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome. That intention has never been fulfilled, though I made considerable preparations for the third article of the series, on the episcopal line of Antioch. Now I am trying to resume the unfulfilled enquiry; but as I have come to feel more and more strongly that the key of the position lies in the Roman succession, I shall propose to say more about that and less about Alexandria and Antioch than I should originally have intended to do. And even at this moment I am only breaking the ground with two preliminary discussions; the first, a comparison of the evidence of Eusebius in his two great works, the *Chronicle* and the *History*, for the three lists of Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome; the second, a conspectus and critical account of the authorities other than Eusebius who have transmitted the list of the Roman succession only.

It would be superfluous to repeat here the whole argument of the two articles contributed to the opening numbers of the JOURNAL: I must be content, for much of the argument and for all the detail, to refer to the articles themselves.¹ I will only

¹ Some errors or imperfections in the two articles may be briefly corrected here: I (Jan. 1900) p. 183 n. 1 l. 3 for 1886 read 1890: p. 184 l. 2 for 'The Chronicle . . . is preserved entire . . . in Latin' read 'The chronological tables which form the second part of the Chronicle as Eusebius published it . . . are preserved entire . . . in Latin': p. 190, l. 11 of the table, the duration numbers of A. Pius should be 22. 7. 25, not 22. 8. 25: p. 193, six lines from the end, the citation of Epiphanius

summarize in the next few pages the broad historical considerations which must be borne in mind before we approach the study of the episcopal lists in general and the evidence of Eusebius in particular.

There can be no sort of doubt that the Catholic writers of the end of the second century, Hegesippus, Irenaeus, and Tertullian, were not only themselves convinced that the episcopal successions in the 'apostolic' churches could be traced back to the apostles' day, but supposed that the claim was universally admitted. The bottom would have been knocked out of their whole argument, if their opponents could have retorted that episcopacy was not after all the primitive institution which they assumed it to be. And in fact the Gnostics, to judge from the material that has come down to us, did let the case go by default. So far from raising any demurrer against the apostolic scriptures or apostolic successions of the Church, their line of attack was to circumvent these publicly attested traditions by propounding as rivals to them private successions and secret scriptures of their own.

This unchallenged assertion of the antiquity of the Church's ministry is of itself an argument of which the force cannot easily be over-rated; but weighty as it is, it cannot be left to stand alone. We must face the task which the Gnostics evaded, and must test as far as we can the validity of the lists of bishops given for the apostolic churches. In so doing, however, proportion demands that distinction should be made between the relative importance of different lists. Even for the four great churches of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, the traditions to be investigated stand by no means on the same level. The list of Jerusalem comes to us, as a whole, with a markedly inferior guarantee of trustworthiness to the rest; while at the other end the evidence for the Roman Church is so much the largest in bulk and the most varied in character, that though the Roman list is not necessarily either more ancient or more accurate than the lists of Alexandria and Antioch, for which

should read '*Haer.* lxvi 20 (ed. Oehler II 434)': p. 197 l. 6, on the use of *διαδοχή* in Eusebius I may refer to my note in the forthcoming volume of *Essays on the Early History of the Church and Ministry*, edited by Dr Swete: II (July 1900) p. 533 l. 5, I have no idea what induced me to lay claim to precise knowledge of the year of Eusebius's birth, but in fixing it at A. D. 274 I put it perhaps ten years too late.

Eusebius is more or less our sole authority, yet since only in this case is there a sufficiency of evidence from other sources to be compared with the evidence of Eusebius and to confirm it, the proof can here be carried to a higher degree of certainty at a more remote period than for the other churches. The core and centre of the problem is the antiquity and authenticity of the episcopal list in the 'greatest, most ancient, and most famous of all churches', the Church of Rome.

Of all these lists the ultimate guarantee must of course reside in local tradition. Yet it is notorious that local patriotism has often, whether consciously or unconsciously, developed the record of its own antiquities on quite unhistorical lines, and some tests must therefore be found by which we may satisfy ourselves of its presumptive trustworthiness. Unconscious development is the natural result of lapse of time: we begin then by asking how nearly contemporary the tradition at each point can claim to be. Conscious manipulation cannot always be the subject of demonstrative proof; but careful insight into the surroundings will generally reveal the weakness of a tradition that is rightly suspect.

Since Eusebius only wrote at the beginning of the fourth century, his own unaided testimony, good for the latter part of the third century and adequate perhaps right back to the beginning of it, would not carry conviction for the earlier period, unless we had reason to suppose either that he depended for this part of his work on chroniclers anterior to himself or that the churches whose traditions he embodies would be likely to have preserved authentic records from a comparatively remote past. And it happens that there is, in what Eusebius gives us, ample material for discriminating between the degrees of credit that attach to different lists, or even to different elements in a single list. Here we may reasonably suppose that the historian had access to earlier literary material: there his own statements shew him to have relied on contemporary information only. In some churches there is good ground for accepting the existence of a tradition as *prima facie* evidence of its truth: elsewhere the tradition when we first meet it is perhaps improbable in itself, and we may be able to put our finger on the actual cause of the defect.

The two great predecessors of Eusebius in the domain of Christian chronology were Julius Africanus and Hippolytus,

of whom the latter published his Paschal cycle in A. D. 222 and (at the end of his life) his Chronicle in A. D. 234, while the Chronicle of Julius Africanus brings events down to the reign of Macrinus, A. D. 217-218.

Hippolytus's Chronicle has only survived in Latin translations: these serve, however, to assure us that among the miscellaneous material of which it was composed were included lists both of emperors and popes with their respective terms of office, 'imperatores Romanorum ab Augusto et quis quot annis praefuit' 'nomina episcoporum Romae et quis quot annis praefuit.' Unfortunately, though the list of emperors is extant, the list of popes has dropped out from the Chronicle as we have it¹; but in any case there is nothing to suggest that lists of the Alexandrine or Antiochene bishops were ever included in the work of this Western and Roman writer. What is more, there is no reason to think that Eusebius knew of the existence of this Chronicle, much less used it. Undoubtedly he had heard of Hippolytus, had come across some half-dozen of his writings, and was aware that many more were in circulation. But his acquaintance with Hippolytus's personal history was so vague that he can only call him 'bishop of some church or other'; and while he briefly summarizes the contents of the *Περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα*, he entirely ignores the more important of the two chronological works.² If ever the argument from silence is valid, it is valid to prove that the Chronicle of Hippolytus was not one of the sources tapped by Eusebius.

On the other hand it is certain that Eusebius knew and highly regarded the Chronicle of Julius Africanus. In the *History* (vi. 31. 2) he speaks of 'that monument of accurate labour, the five books of the Chronographies': in the *Chronicle* (Ann. Abr. 2237) Africanus is described simply as 'the Chronicler'³. Everything

¹ It is not impossible that it has survived in another form, in what is called the Liberian list: see below, pp. 128-130.

² Eus. *H. E.* vi 20. 2 *ἑτέρας που . . . προστάως ἐκκλησίας*, and 22. In the *Chronicle* Hippolytus is only mentioned (Ann. Abr. 2244) as one of three writers who 'clari habentur': moreover, it seems not unlikely that this particular notice is one of Jerome's additions to the text of Eusebius.

³ 'Scriptor temporum' in Jerome's rendering: and the Greek phrase in the Paschal Chronicle *ὁ τὰ χρονικά συγγραψάμενος* is probably taken straight from Eusebius.

points to the conclusion that the *Chronicle* of Eusebius did draw largely on the *Chronicle* of Africanus: and though we have no direct proof that the older *Chronicle* included the episcopal successions of the three great sees (we do know that Africanus was very sparing in his notices of events for the period after Christ), yet such lists of bishops were already fashionable in Christian circles before the third century, and there are other features in the work of Eusebius which tally with the conclusion that he depended for the earlier portion of the chronology of the successions on some first-rate authority not later than the earlier part of the third century.¹ And if so, that authority was almost certainly Julius Africanus.

In any case, Eusebius was so sure, for three of his four lists, of their authority and credit, that he has not even troubled to say what the grounds of his confidence were. Conversely he is scrupulous to tell us that the Jerusalem list was a list of names only without dates—so far it was no worse off than the equally dateless list of Antioch—and that he had got it from the Christians of the local church.² It seems likely that he would not have dwelt on these details if he had not felt that for one reason or other this list stood on a lower level of credit than the rest. It was devoid of any historical guarantee in the sense that it was entirely absent from the older chronicles; and its unconscionable length for the second century—thirty-one bishops in not much more than a hundred years—was obviously a feature which left him a little uneasy.

And there is nothing to counterbalance this unfavourable impression when we take a broad view of the circumstances under which this Jerusalem list comes to light. The two outstanding characteristics of Aelia-Jerusalem were the obscurity of its early history, after the time of the first two bishops, and the inconvenient break in continuity when in A. D. 135 a Jewish-Christian church was replaced by a Gentile-Christian church. In spite of these deficiencies, its associations with the most sacred memories of Christianity gave it, as pilgrimages multiplied, a position of dignity of which it was not slow to take advantage. The move-

¹ It is notorious, in regard to the Roman list, how much more trustworthy Eusebius's information is before the year 250 than after it.

² *H. E.* iv 5. 1; *Demonstratio Evangelica* iii 5.

ment which ended in the acquisition at Chalcedon of patriarchal rights was in its infancy when Eusebius visited the church. But the beginnings were of a piece with the later developement. The wonderful stories related to the visitor about bishop Narcissus were not improbably symptomatic: in any case, when we remember how regularly the device of a multiplication of names in the early stages of an episcopal list has been employed in the interests of local ambitions, it is difficult to believe that the preposterous list supplied by the Jerusalem Christians was not part and parcel of the campaign of aggrandisement. We have no security that it corresponded to the sober facts of history.¹

For the first beginnings of episcopacy at Jerusalem we are fortunately independent of the list supplied to Eusebius at the end of the third century. We have the authority of Josephus and Hegesippus for dating the martyrdom of James the Just before the siege of Jerusalem, and the authority of Hegesippus for dating the martyrdom of his successor Symeon in the reign of Trajan (A. D. 98-117). Where the origins are so clearly visible, it matters less that later on the mists should gather thickly and conceal from our sight during well-nigh a century the subsequent developement of the Jerusalem episcopate.

Thus we find ourselves, as regards any continuous treatment of the succession-lists, reduced to a consideration of the data bearing on three churches only, Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. On the opposite page will be found a conspectus of the evidence supplied by Eusebius for these churches down to the outbreak of the Great Persecution—though in fact it is not necessary to pursue the enquiry beyond the middle of the third century (since no one doubts that by that time episcopacy was fully and universally organized), and the persecution of Decius offers a convenient *terminus ad quem* in the year 250.

Our first and preliminary task will be to examine the lists in Eusebius, with a view to clearing out of the way any apparent discrepancies between the testimony of his two works. This task is immensely simplified by what is now an assured result of the most recent investigations, the proof of the inferiority and

¹ I have treated of this question at length in the article already named, *J. T. S.* i (1900) pp. 529-553, and more summarily in the *Cambridge Medieval History* i pp. 174, 175.

comparative worthlessness of the Armenian version of the *Chronicle*.¹ Jerome's translation will be taken as in each case presumptively a true rendering of the Greek original: where the names or numbers given by Jerome differ from those given in the *History*, we must look to see if there is reason to think that one or the other is in error, and when we have done this, we shall find that the remaining and insoluble differences are few indeed.

1. For the church of Antioch we have to do with names only: Eusebius or his source possessed no duration-numbers attached to the names of the bishops. But even so the variations are considerable between the *History* and the *Chronicle*. Neither work makes any definite statement about the Petrine origin of the episcopal succession of Antioch at the place where we should look for it, namely at the starting-point of the line, but in both it is quite clearly implied elsewhere—in the *Chronicle* in connexion with the notice of the foundation of the Roman Church, in the *History* in connexion with the position of St Ignatius in the Petrine succession.² Of the names of the bishops no less than five out of the twelve which cover the period down to A.D. 250 are diversely given in some or other of our printed texts. Yet on further inspection most of these diversities melt away, and there is nothing left to lead us to think that the real testimony is other than homogeneous. Thus the name of the third bishop should be changed to Heron in the *History*,³ and that of the seventh should be changed to Maximin in the *Chronicle*.⁴ Σεραπίων is the true form in the Greek of the *History*,

¹ See *J. T. S.* i 184-187.

² *Chron. Ann. Abr.* 2058 = Claudius 2, 'Petrus apostolus cum primus Antiochenam ecclesiam fundasset': *H. E.* iii 36. 2 τῆς κατὰ Ἀντιόχειαν Πέτρου διαδοχῆς δεύτερος.

³ Heron (Hieron, Oron) in the *Chronicle*, *Ann. Abr.* 2123, except one MS Hero: Heros (Eros) in all MSS of the *History*, iii 36. 15, save that one gives Heron. Heros (Eros) is the *fifth* bishop in all authorities of both works: but it is only in the Latinized forms of their names that any confusion can arise between the two bishops, since the latter is Ἐρως with *epsilon*, the other Ἡρων or Ἡρως with *eta*. But Ἡρως is a blunder in *H. E.* iii 36. 15, even if it be a blunder of Eusebius himself: and we must correct him for himself, for he distinguishes the names rightly in *H. E.* iv 20 μετὰ Ἡρώνα καταστάντος Κορνηλίου, μετὰ δὲ αὐτὸν . . . Ἐρωτος διαδεξαμένου.

⁴ Maximinus in the *History* v 19. 1, according to the consentient testimony of the MSS, Maximus in Schoene's edition of the *Chronicle*, *Ann. Abr.* 2193. But Maximinus is read by one of Schoene's four MSS and by the Bodleian MS which he did not use, and this reading should be put into the text.

of which Serapio is the natural rendering in the Latin of the *Chronicle*. Zebinus of the older editions of the *History* (vi 23. 3, 29. 4) should probably be corrected, with some of the MSS, to Zebennus. Only with regard to the twelfth bishop, Babylas, who died as a confessor under Decius in A. D. 250, is the divergence real. He is duly recorded in the *History* (vi 29. 4, 39. 4), but in the *Chronicle* he is unaccountably omitted at the point where his accession to office and his number in the episcopal line should have been noted. Since, however, his death is mentioned, at the same time that the name of his successor is given, under Ann. Abr. 2268, it is obvious that the omission of his accession, whether due to the carelessness of Jerome or of Eusebius, cannot be of any real significance. At no place then is there the least reason to think that divergent traditions as to either the names or the order of the bishops of Antioch are represented by the *History* and the *Chronicle* respectively.

2. For Alexandria, as for Rome, Eusebius had at his command something more than a mere list of names; his information included also the number of years of office of each bishop. Between the *History* and the *Chronicle* there is practically absolute agreement of testimony as to names, order, and length of office. It is true that in the case of the third bishop, Cerdo, the *History* (iv 1) omits, no doubt by accident, to record the years of his episcopate, which, on the evidence of the *Chronicle*, should be eleven. It is true, too, that while in the *Chronicle*, where each bishop is only once named, on the occasion of his accession, his years of office are mentioned at that point, in the *History*, where each bishop is named both at the beginning and end of his term, the duration-number is given in the latter connexion: this is the case for the Roman equally with the Alexandrine list. These slight variations are no more than one might expect, and they cannot qualify the certainty of the conclusion that Eusebius had at his disposal, when composing both his great works, at least a list corresponding exactly with that printed on p. 108—names, order, and duration or term-number attached to each name.

3. The differences between the forms of the Roman list in the *History* and in the *Chronicle* respectively are no doubt more considerable: four with regard to the names and no less than twelve with regard to the duration-numbers, if we take into account

the whole list printed on p. 108, or if we confine ourselves to the period before 250, two only as to names and eight as to numbers.

Of the most important of these, the discrepancy between the Peter and Paul of the *History* and the Peter alone of the *Chronicle*, it will be convenient to speak in connexion with the clearly not independent variation as to the years of Peter (p. 115 *infra*).

We are still in the dim atmosphere of the origins of the Roman see in the only other discrepancy between our two authorities as to the names which concerns us—the rival orthographies of the second pope, the successor of Linus and predecessor of Clement. Fortunately the explanation, so far as Eusebius and Jerome are concerned, is quite easy. That Eusebius in the *History* wrote Ἀνέγκλητος, there is no doubt at all: that he used the same form in the *Chronicle* is proved by the evidence of his Greek copyists such as Syncellus, and by those MSS of the Latin *Chronicle* which give Anacletus or Anicletus, for they stand outside the central tradition of the work in this respect and can only have got the form by recourse to the original Greek. The true nomenclature of the second pope is everywhere in Jerome not Anencletus or Anacletus but Cletus.¹ That he should intentionally substitute this form in rendering the *Chronicle* from Greek into Latin is nothing odd, seeing that, though Anencletus is the only form known (apart from Epiphanius) to Greek Church writers, Cletus was equally the only form recognized in Rome. The Canon of the Mass, the list of which no doubt goes back to primitive diptychs, has ‘memoriam venerantes . . . Petri et Pauli . . . Lini Cleti Clementis, Xysti Cornelii Cypriani Laurentii,’ &c.: Rufinus, like Jerome, reflects Roman use when he writes in the preface to his translation of the Clementine *Recognitions* ‘Linus et Cletus in urbe Roma ante Clementem hunc fuerunt episcopi.’

¹ In the *Chronicle*, Ann. Abr. 2096, Schoene reads Anacletus, but of his four MSS two give Cletus, one Clemens, one Anicletus. The Bodleian MS gives Clemens by the first hand, Cletus by the second. My friend, Dr Fotheringham, informs me that the MS authority for Cletus (to which also Clemens really witnesses) is overwhelming. In the *de viris illustribus* § 15 the state of things is somewhat similar: the MSS differ, but there seems to me very little doubt that Cletus is original. [Lightfoot *S. Clement* i 332 must be corrected on these points in the light of our fuller knowledge.]

If we go on to ask what is the relation between the Anencletus of Eusebius and the Greeks on the one hand, and the Cletus of Jerome and the Roman Church on the other, there are two alternative answers possible: either Cletus and Anencletus were two different people, or the two names are variant forms for the same person. Now the authorities who give only one or other of the two names are both more ancient and more numerous than those who give both: the Anencletus category is headed by Irenaeus, the Cletus category possibly by Hegesippus, or, if not, then by the Roman Canon of the Mass: but Cletus and Anencletus in combination are first found among extant authorities in the Liberian list of A. D. 354 (p. 118). Moreover, reduplication of names is in itself a much more likely thing than omission of names—a stately completeness was everywhere the dominant passion of the compilers of lists—so that, if we can offer any reasonable explanation of the coexistence of the two names for one person, it may be taken as certain that neither Cletus nor Anencletus possessed an individuality apart from the other. And such an explanation lies close at hand. Anencletus is of the type of servile names drawn from the presumed virtues of the person designated, just as Tryphaena and Tryphosa of Rom. xvi 12 were so named, we may suppose, by a more cynical or less sympathetic master from the presumed vices of their class. 'Blamelessness' was a description which no Christian would willingly see applied to himself; while on the other hand by cutting the name in half a favourite phrase of St Paul's would be substituted, indicative no longer of virtues in the sight of man but of 'calling' in the sight of God. We may conjecture then that Anencletus, slave or freedman, became known in Christian circles by the alternative name of Cletus; and if so, we have here the first example known to us of a 'Christian' name.

So much for the names. With regard to the chronology of the Roman succession down to A. D. 250, four of the eight discrepancies between the two works of Eusebius are in themselves relatively unimportant, extending only to the difference of a single cypher, one way or the other, in the years of Linus Euarestus Urbanus and Pontianus; the other four are more serious, and these may be dealt with first: (1) the years for

Peter, xxv in the *Chronicle*, Ann. Abr. 2058, are omitted in *H. E.*; (2) the years of Eleutherus differ by two, being XIII in *H. E.* v 22, xv in *Chronicle* A. A. 2193; (3) the years for Zephyrinus, XVIII in *H. E.* vi 21. 1, are absent from the *Chronicle* A. A. 2217; (4) the years for Fabian, XIII in the *Chronicle* A. A. 2255, are absent from *H. E.* vi 39. 1.

The last of these variations is doubtless as purely accidental as the similar omission in *H. E.* of the years of the Alexandrine bishop Cerdo (p. 111 *supra*). One might have been tempted to say the same thing of the omission, in Jerome's version of the *Chronicle*, of the years of Zephyrinus: but it is not quite so easy to omit such figures in a chronicle as it is in a narrative, and as both the Armenian version 'Zephrius annis XII' and the chronographer Syncellus Ζεφυρίνος . . . κατὰ Εὐσέβιον ἔτη δώδεκα agree in attributing to Eusebius's *Chronicle* the number twelve, it is possible that (whether by an original slip of Eusebius, or by the blunder of an early copyist) the same figure really stood also in the copy that lay before Jerome, and that Jerome, noticing that this was irreconcilable with the interval between the accession of Zephyrinus, A. A. 2217, and the accession of his successor, A. A. 2236, simply dropped it out of the text. However this may be, there can be no doubt that the figure in the *Chronicle* ought to be XVIII as in *H. E.*, or possibly XVIII.

The discrepancy over the figures of Eleutherus is puzzling, not from any hesitation as to which of our two authorities is right—there is a *consensus* of the Armenian version and Syriac epitome of the *Chronicle* with all outside testimony (see the tables on p. 118 *infra*) in support of Jerome's figure xv—but from the difficulty of explaining the genesis of the rival figure XIII of the *History*. It cannot be a mere slip, since it is carried through into the imperial synchronisms: Eleutherus accedes in M. Aurelius 17 (*H. E.* v 1. 1) and dies in Commodus 10 (*ib.* v 22), the interval implied being that of thirteen, not fifteen, years. In fact, the imperial synchronism for the death of Eleutherus shews a difference of no less than four years between the Commodus 10 of the *History* and the Pertinax 1 of the *Chronicle*, Ann. Abr. 2205 and 2209. Is it possible that Eusebius learnt from the *Philo-*

*sophumena*¹ of Hippolytus that Victor was already pope while Commodus was still emperor; that therefore Eleutherus's death must be pushed back into the same reign, and if Eleutherus's accession remained unaltered (it is placed under M. Aurelius 17 in both works) the length of his episcopate must be reduced?

There remains only the variation between the undated 'Peter and Paul' of the *History* and the 'Peter' alone, with date of 25 years attached, under A. A. 2058 of the *Chronicle*: and this variation must be referred to Eusebius himself. Both the Armenian version and the Syriac epitome of the *Chronicle* here support Jerome²; and it is not difficult to see how in the *Chronicle*, where a continuous chronology is needed, Eusebius elected to give the dates of the first and chief apostle-founder, while for the plain narrative of the *History* he preferred to emphasize the credit which accrued to the Roman succession through its common descent from both St Peter and St Paul. It is not unlikely that as in the joint Petro-Pauline conception of the *History* he seems to be depending on Irenaeus,³ so in the Petrine chronology of the *Chronicle* he may be following Africanus. The tradition of St. Peter's twenty-five years' oversight of the Roman Church seems to have been already well established in the third century⁴: and its origin is probably to be sought, not so much in any development of papal claims, as in the desire of Christian scholars and antiquaries to effect a completed scheme of the successions from the Ascension to their own day: for twelve years our Lord had commanded the Apostles to remain in Jerusalem as their headquarters; for twenty-five years Peter, transferring his work to 'another place' (Acts xii 17), lived on, the first apostle-founder of the Roman Church; from the time of his martyrdom were reckoned the successive terms of the Roman bishops from Linus onwards.

These, then, are the only serious discrepancies between the two forms in which the tradition of the Roman succession, as

¹ Or, to give it the name by which Eusebius knew it (*H. E.* vi 22), *Ἰπὸς ἀνάσας τὰς ἀπέσας*.

² The actual figure is corrupted to '20' in the Armenian.

³ *Iren. adv. Haer.* iii 1. 1; 3. 2, 3.

⁴ It is found in the Syriac *Teaching of Addai*; Peter had been designated by our Lord, and was bishop of Rome during twenty-five years in the time of the Caesar who reigned thirteen years. See Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity* (1904), p. 26.

recorded by Eusebius, has come down to us. Of the lesser variations it would seem that (1) Jerome is wrong in the cypher XI for Linus, since both Syriac epitomes of the *Chronicle* agree with the XII of *H. E.*, while the figures of the Armenian (XIII) and of Syncellus (*ιη'*) are at any rate nearer to XII than to XI¹; (2) Jerome is more likely wrong than right in the cypher VIII for Euarestus, since against the *θ'* of Syncellus we have to set the agreement of both Armenian and Syriac with the VIII of *H. E.*; (3) (4) on the other hand, for the two bishops at the end of our period, Urbanus and Pontianus, the VIII and v of Jerome are supported by the Syriac and presumably represent the genuine text of the *Chronicle*, against the VIII and VI of *H. E.* For these two bishops we must suppose that Eusebius did alter his chronology: but as they come next to one another in the succession, and the sum of their terms is the same, fourteen years, in both works, the difference reduces itself to the moving backwards or forwards by one year of the death of Urbanus and accession of Pontianus. The commencement of Urbanus's term, and the close of that of Pontianus, remain the same in the *History* and the *Chronicle*.

Thus, for the period down to A. D. 250, the cases in which Eusebius gives a different witness in his two works are (a) the omission of St Paul's name, and the dating by St Peter only, at the head of the Roman line in the *Chronicle*, (b) the reduction of the traditional figure for Eleutherus, XV years, to XIII years in the *History*, (c) the transference of a single year from Urbanus to Pontianus in the *History*, or from Pontianus to Urbanus in the *Chronicle*, according to whichever of the two chronologies we regard as the standard. Similarly, the cases in which Jerome has substituted a different name or date in translating the Roman list of the *Chronicle* are also three—the name of Cletus, and the years of Linus and Euarestus—and all three belong to the same early part of the list. If the two latter

¹ It may be added that the interval resulting from the dates of accession given by Jerome's version for Linus, Ann. Abr. 2084, and for his successor, Ann. Abr. 2096, is also XII: but these synchronisms with the secular chronology, and their relation to the duration-numbers for the Roman and Alexandrine bishops, form a problem too complicated to be considered here (see note at the foot of p. 134). In the next case, that of Euarestus, the interval 2116-2125 supports Jerome's VIII, though VIII is probably correct.

variations are intentional, as the change of Anencletus into Cletus undoubtedly is, then it would seem that Jerome must have been depending on his own knowledge of what he took to be the genuine form of the Roman tradition: and it is therefore at least a striking coincidence that all the three variations reappear in one of the local Roman lists (no. 4, p. 122) that will be described in the next section of our enquiry.

IV. AUTHORITIES (OTHER THAN EUSEBIUS) FOR THE ROMAN EPISCOPAL LIST.

It would be disrespectful to the memory of the great scholars—one of them happily still with us—who have within the last two generations done so much to elucidate the problem of the early Roman succession, if I did not commence this section of the present enquiry by enumerating briefly their contributions to the subject. The ball was set rolling by the most illustrious of modern scholars, Theodor Mommsen, whose epoch-making study 'Ueber den Chronographen vom J. 354' (in the *Abhandlungen der K. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 1850) is still the indispensable avenue to any complete treatment of the documents. In his maturer years Mommsen returned to the subject with editions of the Chronicle of 354 (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Chronica Minora* i [1891] pp. 13-148) and of the Liber Pontificalis (*M. G. H., Gesta Pontificum Romanorum* i [1898], see especially Prolegomena, pp. xxviii-lxii). Another eminent German scholar who devoted much labour to the problem was R. A. Lipsius: his *Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe* appeared in 1869, but in later articles he largely modified his conclusions. Few things could shew better how far we have moved from the critical standpoint of fifty years ago than the blunt statement—as a matter to be assumed, not argued—in Lipsius's preface: 'Der Apostel Petrus ist niemals in Rom gewesen'. More important are the writings of Mgr Duchesne, *Étude sur le Liber Pontificalis* (1877) and, fifteen years later, the complete and monumental edition, *Le Liber Pontificalis* (1892). But the most comprehensive survey of the whole field is that by bishop Lightfoot in the chapter, 'Early Roman Succession', in his edition of *S. Clement of Rome* (1890: i 201-345): it is a serious drawback to its permanent usefulness that so much space is occupied with

1. *Epiphanius*
Haer. xxvii 6
(? from *Hege-*
sippus)
see p. 119

2. *Irenaeus*
Haer. iii 3. 3
see p. 121

3. *Eusebius*
Chronicle
see pp. 108, 111

4. 'Index' or 'Leonine list'
(cf. *Th. Mommsen Liber*
Pontificalis, 1898, p. xxxiii)
see p. 122

5. 'Liberian list' or
chronographer of A. D. 354
(cf. *Th. Mommsen Chronica*
Minora i, 1891, p. 73)
see p. 124

6. *Optatus*
Milevi-
tanus
lib. ii c. 3
see p. 130

Peter and Paul
Linus ^{18'}
Cletus ^{18'}
Clement
Euarestus
Alexander
Xystus
Telesphorus
Hyginus
Pius
Anicetus

Peter and Paul
Linus
Anencletus
Clement
Euarestus
Alexander
Xystus
Telesphorus
Hyginus
Pius
Anicetus
Soter
Eleutherus

Petrus xxv
Linus xi[xii]
Anencletus xii
Clemens viiii
Euarestus viiii[viii]
Alexander x
Xystus x
Telesphorus xi
Hyginus iii
Pius xv
Anicetus xi
Soter viii
Eleutherus xv[xiii]
Victor x
Zephyrinus [xviii]
Callistus v
Urbanus viiii[viii]
Pontianus v[vi]
Anteros m. i
Fabianus xiii [om.]

The figures added in square brackets represent the variant numbers given in the Church History.

Petrus xxv
Linus xi
Cletus xii
Clemens viiii
Euuaristus viiii
Alexander xii
Xystus x
Telesfor xi
Ygenus iii
Pius xviii
Anicetus xi
Soter viiii
Eleutherus xv
Victor xv[x]
Zeferinus xviii vi x
Calistus v x x
Urbanus viiii i ii
Pontianus vii x[v]xxii
Anterus i xviii
Fabianus xiii ii x

This like the following list gives months and days as well as years from *St Peter* onwards: but they are only recorded here from the beginning of the third century.

Petrus xxv i viiii
Linus xii iii xii
Clemens viiii xi xii
Cletus vi[vii] ii x
Anaclitus xii x iii
Aristus xiii vii ii
Alexander vii ii i
Sixtus x iii xxi
Telesforus xi iii iii
Higinus xii iii vi
[Anicetus iii]
Pius xx[xvi] iii xxi
Soter viiii
[Eleutherus xv] iii ii
Victor viiii[xii] ii x
[Zephyrinus xx]
Calixtus v ii x
Urbanus viii xi xii
Pontianus v ii vii
Antheros i x
Fabius xiii i x

The figures added in square brackets are corrections indicated by the consuls given for each pope: the names similarly added are not now in the list, but the consuls given shew that they were originally there.

Petrus
Linus
Clemens
Anicetus
Euarestus
Syxtus
Telesforus
Higinus
Anicetus
Pius
Soter
Alexander
Victor
Zefirinus
Callistus
Urbanus
Pontianus
Anterus
Favianus

The same list in *Augustine* ep. liii 2

the refutation of impossible and now long superseded theories, and there are (as is natural in a posthumously published book) a few small slips here and there, but after all possible qualifications it remains a masterly achievement.

In the tables on the opposite page there is set out in compact form the testimony of all the early lists of the Roman succession, and it is to the consideration and criticism of these that we must now proceed. For the other churches Eusebius is, as we have seen, the only guarantor of anything like a continuous list: alone of the great sees Rome was fortunate enough to find her succession transmitted to posterity through numerous channels. Irenaeus was not the only scholar or theologian of the Western world for whom the appeal came handy to the apostolic tradition of the 'great and glorious and ancient' church of the capital.

1. The first of the seven lists is taken from Epiphanius's book *Against Heresies*. Of one Marcellina, a female adherent of the Carpocratians, he tells us, in the chapter devoted to that sect, that 'she arrived among us a while back, and in the times of Anicetus, who came after Pius and the predecessors of Pius in the succession, she corrupted many persons'¹: and then he takes advantage of this mention of 'succession' to enumerate the names of the Roman bishops from 'Peter and Paul, apostles and bishops' onwards, 'Peter and Paul, Linus and Cletus, Clement, Euarestus, Alexander, Xystus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus—the same who has been already named in the catalogue.' Since the second bishop is called Cletus, a form which (as we saw on p. 112) is characteristic of Western as opposed to Eastern writers, the source from which the list was derived must presumably have been Western also. But documents of Western *provenance* and Greek language were not being produced in the fourth century: what Epiphanius was here using must have been something that had come down from earlier times. Now such a list of the Roman succession as far as Anicetus was actually drawn up by

¹ *Haer.* xxvii 6. ἡλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἤδη πως Μαρκελλίνα τις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπατηθεῖσα, ἣ πολλοὺς ἐλυμήνατο ἐν χρόνοις Ἀνικητοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης τοῦ μετὰ τὴν διαδοχὴν Πίου καὶ τῶν ἀνωτέρω. With the older reading καὶ πολλοὺς for ἣ πολλοὺς it might have been possible perhaps to translate 'It has come down to our time how a certain Marcellina . . . corrupted even many': but from the new Berlin edition (vol. 1, 1915, *Ancoratus* and *Panarion haer.* 1-33) by Dr Karl Holl, it appears that ἣ is certainly right.

Hegesippus—'when I arrived in Rome, I made for myself a succession-list down to Anicetus', *γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ διαδοχὴν*¹ *ἐποιησάμην μέχρις Ἀνικίτου* (ap. Eus. *H. E.* iv 22. 3)—and there is every reason to suppose that Epiphanius was acquainted with Hegesippus's *Memoirs*: what, then, more likely than that this Roman catalogue in Epiphanius should be the very catalogue which we know was contained in the work of the older writer?²

In the same context Epiphanius gives us also some chronological *data* in respect to the Roman succession, which have seemed to suggest that the list he used was equipped with duration-numbers and imperial synchronisms: 'Peter and Paul were martyred in the twelfth year of Nero; after the apostles' martyrdom Linus and Cletus were each bishop for twelve years.' But it would be an anachronism to suppose that Hegesippus had any interest in chronology as such: that form of literature took its rise in Christian circles, with other forms of Greek Christian scholarship, during the Long Peace that intervened between the reigns of Severus and Decius, A. D. 211–249, and Julius Africanus was in all likelihood its first exponent. It is more probable that these *data* were isolated pieces of information, brought forward by Hegesippus as bearing on the question of the relationship of Clement, third bishop, to the apostles, with which the context in Epiphanius is as a matter of fact concerned.³ Even so, it would follow that chronological material about the earlier popes was accessible at Rome in Hegesippus's day, a conclusion which has an important bearing on the problem before us.

¹ The reading *διαδοχὴν* is quite certain: I do not think it would ever have been doubted if people had sufficiently studied the wide uses of *διαδοχὴ* in early writers, pagan as well as Christian. In the Berlin edition of Eusebius *H. E.* Schwartz accepts *διαδοχὴ* without a word of question, but (if I understand him rightly) suspects *ἐποιησάμην*.

² This identification is one of the most brilliant features of bishop Lightfoot's treatment in *S. Clement of Rome*, i 327–333.

³ The question was one which interested other early writers: Irenaeus speaks of Clement as having known the apostles and having their preaching still ringing in his ears, *Haer.* iii 3. 3; Tertullian of the Roman tradition as claiming Clement to have been 'a Petro ordinatum', *Praesc. Haer.* 32. Epiphanius tries to reconcile the divergent traditions about Clement by suggesting that Clement was ordained bishop by St Peter, perhaps on the occasion of one of his departures from the city, that he declined the episcopate after the apostle's death, but was pressed to take it up after the death of Linus and Cletus. The author of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vii 46. 6) makes Linus to have been consecrated by St Paul, and Clement after Linus's death by St Peter as second bishop: the same author, as pseudo-Ignatius,

2. The next list in order of time is that of Irenaeus, which includes two more names than the list of Epiphanius-Hegesippus, those of Soter and Eleutherus, making twelve in all after the two apostles. On the other hand, Irenaeus provides no chronological material, except that (like Epiphanius) he brings Clement, the third bishop, into direct connexion with the apostle-founders of the Roman Church. To Irenaeus the episcopal successions from the apostles constitute one of his main lines of argument against the Gnostic heretics of his day. Men like Ptolemaeus the Valentinian were not only claiming to be the teachers of the true Christianity, but they spoke of themselves as inheriting by succession the apostolic tradition.¹ Against such assertions it was an obvious answer to point to the historical lines of succession in the episcopate of the apostolic churches, one name preceding another until at the head of the list comes the name of the apostle who organized the particular church and left the first bishop in charge, and to challenge Gnostic opponents to produce on their side anything of the same sort. Irenaeus knows many such successions in the apostolic churches, but not to burden his readers with too much detail he selects for transcription one single list, that from the greatest and most ancient and best known of all churches, the church founded at Rome by the two pillar apostles, St Peter and St Paul, 'the blessed apostles, who, having laid the foundations and built up the walls of the church, entrusted to that Linus whom Paul mentions in his epistles to Timothy the ministry of its oversight.'² He was succeeded by Anencletus, and after Anencletus at the third stage from the apostles the episcopate fell to Clement. Clement had both seen and lived with the blessed apostles, their preaching was still ringing in his ears, and their tradition was still alive before his eyes—and not his only, for many were still left at that date who had been taught by the apostles. . . . This Clement was succeeded by

ad Trall. 7. 4, brings in the missing name of Anencletus, by saying that Linus served St Paul as minister, Anencletus and Clement St Peter. So again Rufinus, in the preface to his version of the Clementine *Recognitions*, suggests that Linus and Cletus were St Peter's suffragans during his lifetime, Clement his successor after his death.

¹ Ptolemaeus *Ep. ad Floram* ap. Epiphanius *Haer.* xxxiii 7. 9 τῆς ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως ἣν ἐκ διαδοχῆς καὶ ἡμεῖς παρειλήφαμεν.

² Τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν, *Iren. adv. Haer.* iii 3. 3. The passage is preserved in the original Greek by Eusebius *H. E.* v 6.

Euarestus, and he by Alexander: next, sixth from the apostles, Xystus was appointed, and after him Telesphorus, who bore a glorious witness in martyrdom: then Hyginus, then Pius, and after him Anicetus. Soter succeeded Anicetus, and at the present moment in the twelfth place from the apostles the post of the episcopate is held by Eleutherus. In this order and succession both the tradition from the apostles in the church and the preaching of the truth has come down to our time.'

The witness of St Irenaeus to the Roman succession is quite definite whether as regards time or place. He wrote at Lyons, and under the episcopate of Eleutherus, therefore not later than A. D. 190. He had visited Rome in the year 177, when the martyrs of Lyons sent from their prison a commendatory letter with him to the pope: he was then still a presbyter but succeeded Pothinus, who died a victim of the same persecution. According to one story, which there is in itself no reason to suspect, he was in Rome also at a considerably earlier period, on the occasion of St Polycarp's martyrdom in A. D. 156. In any case his testimony is amply adequate to guarantee to us the tradition of the Roman Church, some years before the close of the second century, as to its own origin and history.

3. The list of Eusebius has been examined in detail in the previous section of this enquiry, and it is only named here because it was of course necessary for purposes of comparison to include it in the tables on p. 118.

4. The fourth list is the only one which is not drawn direct from a single literary source, and is therefore naturally the one about the origin and value of which there is most divergence between the scholars who have treated of the problem of the Roman succession. To some, such as Duchesne and Lightfoot, its sources, for the period which concerns us, seem to be nothing more than Jerome's version of the *Chronicle* and the Liberian chronographer who comes fifth in our series. For Lipsius and Mommsen, on the other hand, it is an independent witness to the early tradition of the Roman Church, parallel and in some respects superior to the Liberian list. Let us begin then by looking at the admitted facts.

We notice, in the first place, that a number of *manuscripts* of early Latin Canon Law include a table of the Roman succession,

and it is clear that the forms in which this table appears are mutually related and point back to a common original.¹ The manuscripts in question range in date from the second half of the sixth to the end of the ninth century: but all of them are copies of collections older than themselves, and speaking generally these collections were made in Gaul between the end of the fifth and the end of the sixth century. The prominence thus given to the papal succession is a more or less conscious indication of the Romanizing tendency that made itself felt in Gaul from the time of Caesarius of Arles onwards: the constitutions of the Apostolic See, it is implied, possess equal validity with the canons of the councils.²

The common source of these tables of the succession being thus not later than about the middle of the fifth century—for they shew numerous divergences in detail—the question was next asked whether there was any known document of that date which may have served as their original. Now in the year 447 a book on the Paschal cycle was published, dedicated to the reigning pope, Leo the Great, and it did contain a chronology of both popes and emperors.³ The papal list itself is lost, and we have no means of reconstructing its testimony: but it is obviously just the sort of document that we desiderate as the parent of the lists that were current in Gaul half a century later, and so the list that is put together from the Gallican MSS of Canon Law has come to be known as the Leonine catalogue.

Whether we give this particular name to the parent list or not

¹ The lists are printed separately according to the different MSS in Duchesne's *Liber Pontificalis* i 13 ff. The MSS are (1) St Vaast, now Arras 644, of the Quesnel group (Ψ in my *Ecd. Occid. Mon. Iur. Ant.*); (2) Corbie, now Paris lat. 12097, my C; (3) Chieti, now Vat. Reg. 1997, my I; (4) Reims, now Berlin Phillipps. lat. 84, my R; (5) Laon, from a MS now lost; (6) Cologne, Chapter Library ccxii, my K; (7) Albi cod. 2, my A—CK and the exemplar of A were closely connected MSS; (8) Chronicle of Fredegar, now Paris lat. 10910; (9) another Corbie MS, now Paris lat. 12205; the common original of all these lists is restored by Mommsen, *Liber Pontificalis* I xxxiii ff., after whom I repeat it in the table, p. 118 *supra*.

² See my paper 'Arles and Rome: the first developments of Canon Law in Gaul,' *J. T. S.* xvii (April 1916) 236. The desire to possess a continuous chronology of the Christian centuries, from the time of the apostles down to the writers' own day, was no doubt also a contributory cause.

³ Among the few fragments of the book that have survived (they were found at Zeitz in Saxony) is the following sentence from the prologue: 'huic autem collectioni paschalium dierum non solum seriem consulum conexuimus sed etiam annos apostolicae sedis antistitum et aetates regni principum Romanorum diligentissima adnotatione subdidimus.'

does not in itself greatly matter: it is in any case certain that the list cannot have originated at any much later date, nor, ultimately, away from Rome. What does matter is whether in giving this name we mean to assume that the author, whoever he was (it is likely enough that Duchesne is right in suggesting the name of the chronicler Prosper, the friend of St Leo) depended only on the fourth-century sources that are as accessible to us as they were to him—the Liberian chronographer immediately to be mentioned, and the *Chronicle* of Jerome—or whether he drew from lost documents like the *Chronicle* of Hippolytus or even direct from the archives of the Roman Church. And therefore while Lightfoot calls the parent list the 'Leonine Catalogue', Mommsen, believing that the nucleus of the list was in existence a century or more before the papacy of Leo, prefers the non-committal title of 'the Index'.

5. The fifth list presents the most complex problem of them all. In two quite late copies, preserved respectively at Brussels and at Vienna, we have the débris of an important collection of material bearing on the past history, sacred and profane, and on the then existing condition, of the City of Rome—a sort of *Whitaker's Almanack* of the middle of the fourth century A. D. It is dedicated to a Christian of the name of Valentinus, who cannot be certainly identified, and the illuminated title-page was the work of Furius Dionysius Filocalus, the well-known artist who engraved for pope Damasus the splendid inscriptions which that versatile pontiff set up prodigally throughout the basilicas and catacombs of Rome. First comes a kalendar, divided into two parts, astronomical and civil; the *natales Caesarum* in the latter point to the joint reign of Constantius and Constans (340–350), though they have been altered to suit the sole reign of Constantius (350–361). Next come the *Fasti consulares*, a complete list of the consuls from the first days of the Republic down to A. D. 354 inclusive, i. e. between 800 and 900 years, with leap-years marked for every fourth year, and for every year the day of the week and the day of the moon's age on January 1. Thirdly, a list of Easter-days for the century from 312 to 411, according to the 84 years' cycle as modified by the local use of the Roman Church: down to 358 the table is accurately made out with the correct names of the consuls,

and doubtless preserves the record of the actual days on which Easter was celebrated at Rome, but the last half of the table, referring to a time which was future when it was incorporated in the collection, has fallen into a good deal of confusion, no doubt through the attempts of successive scribes to bring it up to date. Fourthly, a list of the Prefects of the City for the hundred years from 254 to 354, 'ex temporibus Gallieni quis quantum temporis praefecturam Urbis administraverit.' Fifthly, two brief lists constituting between them the primitive ecclesiastical kalendar of Rome, the 'depositio episcoporum' and the 'depositio martyrum': the former contains ten popes from Lucius († 354) to Silvester († 335) in the order of their obits in the calendar year, and two more at the end, Marcus († 336) and Julius († 352), in chronological order—obviously it was drawn up after Silvester's death under Marcus, and brought up to date after Julius's death under Liberius—the latter contains Christmas Day, the two African festivals of 'Perpetua and Felicitas' (March 7) and 'Cyprian' (September 14), the feast of St Peter's Chair (February 22), and some twenty-five commemorations of Roman martyrs, including SS. Peter and Paul, and the popes Fabian, Xystus II, and perhaps Callistus.

Next follows the list that is of special interest for us: 'Imperante Tiberio Caesare passus est Dominus noster Iesus Christus duobus Geminis coss.¹ VIII kal. Apr., et post ascensum eius beatissimus Petrus episcopatum suscepit; ex quo tempore per successionem dispositum, quis episcopus quot annis praefuit vel quo imperante.' The list runs from St Peter to Liberius, whose accession in 352 is mentioned but not his death: unfortunately it has suffered much in the course of transmission, but we can say with certainty that to the name of each bishop was attached a record of (1) the length in years, months, and days of his tenure, (2) the emperors in whose reign he held office, (3) the consulships of the beginning and end of his term. From Pontianus († 235) onwards the list becomes more circumstantial: historical notices are from time to time inserted, and the day of consecration and the day of death are recorded with gradually increasing regularity. From the same point also a corresponding change takes place in the treatment of the consulships: down to

¹ That is, A. D. 29.

Pontianus the last consulship of one pope is always distinct from the first consulship of his successor—as though each pope were assumed to have died at the end of December, and his successor to have entered on office at the beginning of January¹—but where the actual day of death or consecration was known, and that took place at any other time of year, it was obvious that the same consulship which saw the one pope out saw also the next one in, and after Pontianus the list recognizes this and proceeds accordingly. The whole compilation nevertheless is by a single editor: the consulships, whether before or after Pontianus, are taken from the *Fasti* which form the second document in the collection, the blunders of which are regularly reproduced. But if these consulships were first added by the compiler of 354, we must, in reconstructing the chronology of the Roman succession, leave them entirely aside. Even where they are correct (and the compiler not infrequently took the consuls of a wrong year), they add nothing to the credibility of the list: their only value is that they help towards the reconstruction of the compiler's text, and towards the elimination of the errors that in the course of transmission since his time have crept into it.

These six pieces are quite obviously all integral component parts of the same collection of A. D. 354: it is otherwise with the piece that next follows in the Vienna MS, namely a list of consuls from Julius Caesar down to 533,² with historical notes attached, notes which from the end of the fourth century onwards are so numerous that the document becomes rather *Annals* than *Fasti*. But the consuls' names deviate considerably from those of the collection proper, so that not even the nucleus of these *Annals* can be attributed to the chronographer of 354, and we need not linger over them. We come back, however, into the near neighbourhood of the Liberian chronographer with a brief *Chronicle of the World*, from the beginning of Genesis onwards, the chronological summary of which is brought down to the consulship of Paulinus and Optatus, A. D. 334.³ And even

¹ The consular year, like our own civil year, ran from January 1 to December 31.

² The years that correspond to A. D. 404-437 are lost.

³ This date alone shews that the title interpolated in one MS between the preface and the body of the document *Incipit chronica Horosii* must be the blundering conjecture of some scribe. Orosius lived nearly a century later, and his *Chronicle* is extant.

if a Chronicle of the World would not have been quite what we should expect in our Roman *Whitaker*, the two next following and final pieces carry the World Chronicle with them and justify its place—an *Origo Gentis Romanae* or Chronicle of the City of Rome, and a *Notitia Regionum* or description of the different quarters of the City. Both these documents are full of local and topographical knowledge: the former, arranged historically according to the reigns of the different emperors, comes down to the death of the emperor Licinius in 324, the latter, arranged geographically according to the Regions, includes buildings of Constantine the Great. Both are therefore contemporary with the World Chronicle of 334, and doubtless formed a single whole with it, incorporated *en masse* into the collection of 354.

But before we return to our papal list, there is something more to be said about this World Chronicle, which as it happens can be traced back exactly 100 years behind the recension in which our collection presents it. For if we compare it with an anonymous *Liber generationis* which serves as the first book of the chronological compilation of the so-called Fredegar, but is also preserved independently in a few early MSS, we shall find that the two forms are related to one another with so much closeness of matter and so little of language, that the necessary conclusion is that they are separate versions of a single Greek original. Now the other form contains, twice over, a chronological summary—omitted by our editor of A. D. 334—reckoning 5738 years from Adam to the thirteenth year of the emperor Alexander, i. e. A. D. 234, which was also the year of writing.¹ Moreover in the table of contents that heads this other version of the Chronicle, the nineteenth chapter is 'Imperatores Romanorum ab Augusto et quis quot annis imperavit', the twentieth and last 'Nomina episcoporum et quis quot annis praefuit', though unfortunately, while the imperial catalogue appears in its right place in the text of that version, the episcopal catalogue has dropped out. Both catalogues are absent from our chronographer's form of the Chronicle, no doubt for the simple reason that he possessed, elsewhere in his own collection, fuller lists whether of emperors

¹ 'Fiunt igitur omnes anni ab Adam usque ad XIII Alexandri imperatoris annum anni V̄DCCXXXVIII . . . fiunt igitur omnes anni ab Adam usque in hunc diem anni V̄DCCXXXVIII.'

or of popes : both were, however, quite certainly genuine parts of the Chronicle of A. D. 234. But what chronicler is there of that date, writing in the Greek language and—as the parallelism of the imperial and papal succession proves—in the West? There is only one Christian author who fulfils the conditions of subject-matter, place, and time : Hippolytus of Rome, who was living till 235, and the catalogue of whose writings includes a work called *Χρονικά*.¹

We have thus acquired the knowledge that the Chronicle of Hippolytus was in circulation at Rome in the fourth century in a Latin dress, and that it included a list of popes presumably carried down to the year 234 ; further, that our chronographer of 354 has for the purposes of his own collection suppressed that list, just as he has suppressed the parallel list of emperors, because he has elsewhere provided us with fuller lists brought up to date. But it still remains possible that the chronographer depended, directly or indirectly, on Hippolytus for the earlier part of his papal list ; and this is what we have now got to try and find out.

In itself it would have been not unlikely that our writer, if he had access to other and completer sources, should have left the Hippolytean papal list entirely out of account, just as he seems to have done with the list of emperors. Hippolytus's list of emperors, we learn from the other version of his Chronicle, extended from Augustus to Alexander Severus, and was confined to names and duration-numbers in years, months, and days : the chronographer's list runs from Julius Caesar to Licinius, and is enriched with numerous notices of Roman events exactly parallel in style to the notices, for the period after 234, of the papal list.² The two imperial lists appear to be entirely independent of one another : in other words, the imperial list of Hippolytus, if its

¹ The catalogue is inscribed on a contemporary statue of Hippolytus now in the Lateran Museum. Julius Africanus is excluded, not only because he wrote in the East, but because his Chronicle was composed some fifteen years earlier. See above, pp. 105-107.

² Compare, e. g. the notice for Diocletian and Maximian 'His imp. multae operae publicae fabricatae sunt' with those for the popes Fabian 'Multas fabricas per cimiteria fieri iussit' and Julius 'Hic multas fabricas fecit'. The Hippolytean list of emperors may be found in *Chronica Minora* i 137, 138 ; the chronographer's list *ibid.* 145 sqq., or *Ueber den Chronographen vom J. 354*, p. 645.

only chance of survival had been through the Liberian chronographer, would have gone under altogether. We cannot, it is true, apply the same criterion in the case of the two episcopal lists, since here the original catalogue of Hippolytus has, as it happens, dropped out also from the other version of his *Chronicle*: but if the matter had stood there, and we had nothing but the parallel of the imperial list to guide us, the probabilities would have pointed to the independence of the papal list of the chronographer *vis-à-vis* to the papal list of his predecessor. And it might seem a further argument on the same side that the Liberian chronographer's list is disfigured in its earlier part by grosser blunders than we should willingly attribute to Hippolytus.

Are there then any definite indications which counterbalance this presumption, and suggest that the chronographer acted differently in regard to the one list than he had done in regard to the other? Modern scholars have with some approach to unanimity answered this question in the affirmative,¹ because they detect a break in his work exactly at the point at which any one who had based himself so far on Hippolytean material must have passed to the employment of some other source. There is in fact no doubt that the Liberian list does divide itself into two more or less well-marked sections, and that the dividing line comes at the episcopate of Pontianus. It has already been noted (p. 125) that the dating of the popes by the consuls reveals just there a change from one method to another: no doubt the whole series of consular dates are all equally due to the Liberian editor himself, but the change suggests a change in the character of the material that lay before him, such as might correspond to the change, for instance, from a literary to a diplomatic source, from the *Chronicle* of Hippolytus to the archives of the Roman See. Again the *data*, stereotyped on a single model down to Urbanus, the immediate predecessor of Pontianus, become from thence onwards richer and more varied. Before Pontianus only one precise date is marked, the martyrdom of the two apostles on June 29, and only one historical note is superimposed on the chronological framework, namely the publication of the *Shepherd*

¹ Mommsen, *Ueber den Chronogr. vom J. 354*, p. 597; Lipsius, *Chronologie*, p. 41; Lightfoot, *S. Clement* i 261.

of Hermas under the episcopate of his brother Pius: from Pontianus to Liberius, on the other hand, historical notices are numerous, and precise datings by month and day become so regular that it is possible throughout the whole period (apart from the years of disorganization during the persecution of Diocletian) to fix the days of accession and of decease with some approximation to accuracy. Thus, by piecing the evidence together, we can assert without reserve that bishop Anteros was consecrated on Sunday, November 22, A.D. 235, and died on January 3, A.D. 236, after an episcopate of only six weeks, and that his successor Fabian was consecrated on Sunday, January 10 following, and died a martyr, on the outbreak of the Decian persecution, January 20, A.D. 250.¹

That is as far perhaps as we can profitably carry at this stage the enquiry into the sources that lie behind the Liberian catalogue of the popes. We turn now to the consideration of the last of the lists printed on p. 16, the list given us by St Optatus.

6. Optatus, bishop of Mileou² near Cirta, the capital of Numidia, was the author of a work in six or seven books against the Donatists, on which later Catholic writers, and in especial St Augustine, drew largely. Neither the name nor the date of Optatus's work can be established without difficulty. For name, it was probably devoid of one altogether—'Optati Milevitani libri numero VII'—a simple enough device so long as an author wrote no more than a single work: if it was known by any particular name, it will have been by that of the Donatist writer against whom it was directed, 'ad Parmenianum'. As to date, the Roman catalogue of which we are going to speak is brought down, on the consentient testimony of all the extant MSS, to

¹ See my paper, 'The papal chronology of the third century' in *J. T. S. July*, 1916 (vol. xvii pp. 338-353). The investigations of previous scholars in this matter, even Lightfoot's admirable pages *op. cit.* 286-299, have suffered, as I shewed in the paper referred to, by the neglect, down to the year 314, of the rule of Sunday ordination, which there is every reason to believe prevailed throughout the third century. By taking this rule into account, it becomes possible to carry the proof of the details of the chronology from 235 onwards to a much higher degree of certainty.

² We know the adjective familiarly, Optatus Milevitanus: but what was the name of the town which the adjective represents, or whether it was ever known in a Latin form at all, is not so easy to say. Abp. Benson *Cyprian* p. 584 gives Mileou in the text, Milev in a note. The official title of the place was 'colonia Sarnensis Milevitana'.

pope Siricius, therefore to at least A.D. 385. But there is good reason to suppose that the treatise underwent (whether at the hands of Optatus himself or no) a process of re-handling some ten or twenty years after the original publication. Thus the Donatist succession at Rome is given (ii 4) as Victor, Bonifatius, Encolpius, Macrobius, and quite clearly Victor is there reckoned as the first of the line and Macrobius as in possession at the time of writing: 'si Macrobio dicatur, ubi illic sedeat, numquid potest dicere "in cathedra Petri"?' Yet a few sentences later the list has swollen to six, and Macrobius has, in all our MSS save one, two successors, Lucian and Claudian. Add to this that Optatus himself puts the interval since the great persecution of A.D. 303-305 as 'sixty years and more' (i 13), and that Jerome in his *de viris*, written in A.D. 392, places the literary appearance of Optatus on the catholic side 'under the Emperors Valentinian and Valens', i.e. between A.D. 365 and 375, and it is not easy to resist the conclusion that the same hand which inserted the two extra bishops of the Donatist succession in Rome was responsible also for one bishop in the Petrine succession. With Lucian and Claudian, Siricius ought also to disappear: Optatus must have published under pope Damasus, say about A.D. 370-375.

The first book of Optatus's work has for its subject the historical origins of the schism: in the second he turns to the examination of the marks of the one true Church. Of these marks or endowments, *notes*, the first is (so Parmenian and Optatus are agreed) the *cathedra* or Chair, that is, the episcopal succession. Each party claimed no doubt to have, at Carthage or at Cirta, the true succession to the line of bishops whom they claimed in common down to the early years of the fourth century; and Optatus does not wait at this point to work out the local problem, for he has a stronger argument at hand from the conditions existing in the great church across the sea which was founded—here again Parmenian would have no quarrel with Optatus—by the prince of the apostles himself.¹ But if Peter was the first bishop of Rome, and Linus succeeded Peter, and the succession of names in the whole line is well known from

¹ It was probably believed by all Christians in Africa that the preaching of Christianity, and therewith the apostolic origin of the episcopal succession, had come to Carthage mediately or immediately from Rome.

Linus down to Damasus, the present holder of the see, then the question is forced on us, to which party in Africa the communion of Damasus, and with Damasus of the whole line of succession represented in him, is available. And the answer is plain: the Catholics of Africa are in full fellowship with the bishop in the succession from St Peter, while the Donatists are so far from having part or lot with him that they have at Rome their own line of succession and their own conventicle for worship. One Victor had been sent from Africa to supervise the Donatist congregation in Rome, and he had been followed by three other bishops one after another. There was thus a succession, it was true, but a succession which could only be traced back a few stages, and then came to an end in a bishop who had no predecessor, 'filius sine patre, tiro sine principe, discipulus sine magistro, sequens sine antecedente, inquilinus sine domo . . . episcopus sine populo'. In contrast with this mushroom and alien succession, Catholics had their fellowship with a prelate who was only the last in a long line of predecessors reaching back to the apostle who was 'head of all the apostles'.

The actual list of names as represented in the manuscripts of Optatus is not free from difficulty: but by good fortune it happens that we possess a second testimony to the list in the 53rd epistle of St Augustine. Augustine's purpose in citing the catalogue of Roman bishops is very much the same as we have described in the case of Optatus, and it is more than probable that the later writer borrowed the catalogue straight out of the work of his predecessor. At any rate some peculiarities of the catalogue, shared by both Optatus and Augustine, are so marked that it is clear that they are not independent of one another, and we may legitimately use the evidence of the manuscripts of both writers to reconstruct the common original, whether or no that original goes back behind Optatus.

That Clement and Anencletus are inverted, that Alexander is omitted in his proper place and substituted for Eleutherus where the latter name ought to occur, are the most important features in which this fourth-century African list diverges from all other forms of the tradition, and they are guaranteed by the consentient testimony of the manuscripts, whether of Optatus or of Augustine. That the third bishop after Peter was known to the

list in the form Anecletus or Anicletus, and the last of those who concern us as Favianus, is also almost certain : and even these small peculiarities in orthography all help to guarantee the common ancestry of the list. In the later part of the list, after pope Fabian, there are more serious divergences between the two African writers¹ : but even so, they are not of a character to lessen the probability of the conclusion that St Augustine was employing the same list as St Optatus.

Optatus, like Irenaeus, gives no chronological material : his list is concerned with names and order only, not with dates.

It will be noticed that this African list, besides its own peculiarities in regard to the order and orthography of the names, presents certain other features in common with the Liberian list, namely, the inversion of Clement and Anecletus, and the inversion of Anicetus and Pius. On the other hand, the duplication Cletus Ana(Anen)cletus, as we find it in the Liberian list, does not re-appear in the African list : and therefore the alternatives suggested by the evidence of the relation of the two lists are (1) that Optatus drew not on the Liberian list itself, but on its source, and that that source was still free from the reduplication of names Cletus Anecletus, or (2) that if Optatus had the Liberian list itself at his disposal, then he must have also known another, in some respects purer, form of the Roman list and must have combined the two as best he could.

7. Limitations of space made it undesirable to print in the tables on p. 118 the seventh and last early catalogue of the popes, and the text of it may therefore be subjoined here to the previous discussion. In an anonymous hexameter poem against Marcion, printed in the editions of Tertullian, occur the following lines (lib. iii 272-296, Oehler ii 792) :—

Quorum discipuli qui successere per orbem,
conflati virtute viri, nostrique magistri,

¹ The two successive popes, Eutychian and Gaius, towards the end of the third century, are omitted in all the MSS of Optatus, but they are present in all the MSS of Augustine : probably therefore the fault lies not with Optatus or his source, but only with the manuscript tradition of his work. Again, of the two successive popes (according to the ordinary lists) Marcellinus and Marcellus, the former only is given by the MSS of Optatus, the latter only by the MSS of Augustine. In this case I think that we may be fairly sure that the original form of this African list did give only one of the two names.

coniunctos operis nobis tribuere honores.
 ex quibus electum magnum plebique probatum
 hac cathedra, Petrus qua sederat ipse, locatum
 maxima Roma Linum primum considerare iussit.
 post quem Cletus et ipse gregem suscepit ovilis.
 huius Anacletus successor sorte locatus,
 quem sequitur Clemens : is apostolicis bene notus.
 Euaristus ab hoc rexit sine crimine legem.
 sextus Alexander Sixto commendat ovile,
 post expleta sui qui lustris tempora tradit
 Tele[s]phoro ; excellens hic erat martyrqve fidelis . . .
 constabat pietate vicens ecclesia Romae
 composita a Petro : cuius successor et ipse,
 iamque loco nono, cathedram suscepit Hyginus.
 post hunc deinde Pius, Hermas cui germine frater
 angelicus pastor quia tradita verba locutus,
 atque Pio suscepit Anicetus ordine sortem.

Of the author, time, or place of this poem nothing is really known. But it seems to me quite certain that he used St Irenaeus. The details about Clement and Telesphorus, as well as information which he also gives as to the dates of the arrival in Rome of Cerdo and Marcion, point definitely in that direction. What he adds to Irenaeus, in the duplication Cletus Anacletus and the statement about Hermas, is all found in the Liberian list : but as he avoids the Liberian writer's mistakes in the order of the popes Cletus (Anacletus) Clement, and Pius Anicetus, it looks as though he tapped not the Liberian list itself but its source. Did he use Hippolytus and combine him as best he could with Irenaeus?

C. H. TURNER.

NOTE. It should have been emphasized (p. 111, five lines from the end) that such a list of bishops, consisting simply of names, order, and years of office, is just what on the analogy of what we know of Hippolytus (pp. 106, 127) we should expect to find in Africanus. Eusebius was probably the first chronicler to break up the episcopal lists and to incorporate the names into the *cadres* of his universal chronology.