

Bartoňková, Dagmar

Marcellinus Comes and Jordanes's Romana

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. E, Řada archeologicko-klasická. 1967, vol. 16, iss. E12, pp. [185]-194

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/109956>

Access Date: 27. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

DAGMAR BARTOŇKOVÁ

MARCELLINUS COMES AND JORDANES'S ROMANA

Eusebius's Chronicle of the World, based on the Christian view of life, and the Latin translation of the same, effected by Hieronymus and supplemented with reports of events up to 378 A. D. exercised a considerable influence on the historiographic interest of authors in the 5th and 6th cent. writing in Latin. Attempts to imitate this kind of literature were increasing in number; some of them likewise began human history with Adam (cf. e.g. Prosper's Chronicle, following things up to 455 A. D. and Cassiodorus's Chronicle, doing the same up to 519 A. D., or the History of the World by Orosius — *Historiarum adversus paganos libri VII* — ending with the year 417, or Jordanes's work *De summa temporum vel origine actibusque gentis Romanorum*, reporting up to 551), while other records simply started their narrative where the annals of some of their predecessors had stopped. Of the latter type of works compiled in Latin a special attention should be devoted particularly to those writings that are a direct continuation of Hieronymus's Chronicle and have for their starting point the year 379. Two Latin chronicles of this kind have been preserved from the 5th and 6th centuries: one was written by Hydatius (it goes down to 468) and the other is the work of Marcellinus Comes, bears the title *Chronicon*, and reports on events from 379 to 534, while the Supplement carries on to 548 A. D.

About Marcellinus we are best informed in Cassiodorus's work *Institutiones divinarum et humanarum* I, 17, in the chapter entitled *De historicis Christianis*. According to Cassiodorus Marcellinus came from Illyricum (... Marcellinus Illyricianus), before Justinian's ascension of the throne was the latter's "cancellarius",¹ and during Justinian's reign, "being better off", he wrote his historical work.² In the same chapter we learn that Marcellinus compiled also some sort of meteorologic-geographical work of four volumes,³ while chapter 25 informs us that Marcellinus described in detail — likewise in four volumes — Constantinople and Jerusalem.⁴ According to Holder-Egger⁵ these were two separate works, whereas Mommsen⁶ assumes the existence of one work only, entitled *De temporum qualitatibus et positionibus locorum*, and containing also the said detailed description of Jerusalem and Constantinople. Mommsen's view is shared also by Schanz.⁷

So much we learn from direct reports on Marcellinus. Besides, we can take for granted that the author wrote his Chronicle in Constantinople. This circumstance is noteworthy when we take into account the fact that the work was written in Latin. One may, however, accept the explanation of Holder-

Egger.⁸ pointing to two circumstances: the knowledge of Latin was widespread among the aristocracy of the "New Rome" and Marcellinus came from Illyricum. Besides, there exists the probability of Marcellinus becoming a priest after Justinian's ascension of the throne.⁹ It seems that he actually held some higher office at that time. It is implied in Cassiodorus's remark: "ut qui ante fuit in obsequio suscepto gratus, postea ipsius imperio copiose amantissimus appareret". Mommsen even allots to Marcellinus in the circus a seat reserved for senators, finding support for this view in a text referring to the year 528,¹⁰ but it does not mean that Marcellinus's formulation justifies Mommsen in drawing this conclusion. Neither is there sufficient evidence substantiating the supposition, expressed by Holder-Egger,¹¹ that Marcellinus the annalist was a relative of Marcellinus the patrician.

As we have already mentioned, Marcellinus's Chronicle is linked up directly with Hieronymus, which means that it starts with the year 379. Its first part describes events to 518 (the death of Anastasius), the second covers the short period from 518 to 534 (i.e. ends with the fall of the Vandal Empire in the reign of Justinian). Further continuation of the chronicle, the so-called *Additamentum*, comprising the period from 534 to 548, is obviously not the work of Marcellinus. Mommsen¹² has arrived at this conclusion partly because it is evident that Cassiodorus did not know this part of the chronicle, but mainly because no mention is made of it in Marcellinus's preface, in which the author alludes only to the first supplement, dealing with the years 518—534. Noteworthy is also Mommsen's observation that the author of the *Additamentum* often resorted to the present tense in his narrative, which was never done by Marcellinus. Mommsen believes in the probability of this second supplement originating likewise in the East.

As for the significance of Marcellinus's Chronicle as a source drawn upon by early medieval authors of Latin historiography, it is usually taken for granted that it was consulted by Jordanes when he was writing his *De summa temporum vel origine actibusque gentis Romanorum* about the middle of the 6th cent. and maybe also when he drew up his other work *De origine actibus Getarum*. Marcellinus's work must have served as a source of information also later. Its influence is evident on Bede (672—735) in his work *Chronica maiora* and partly also in his *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* and it can be likewise traced in Paulus Diaconus's work *Historia Romana*. As to other authors that may have drawn upon Marcellinus, consult the more detailed discussion of the question by Holder-Egger as well as Mommsen's preface to his edition of Marcellinus's Chronicle.¹³

And now we should like to discuss Jordanes's work *De summa temporum vel origine actibusque gentis Romanorum*, following Mommsen's example and denoting it simply "Romana". Marcellinus's Chronicle was looked upon without reserve as a source of the above Jordanes's work with respect to the period in question. Thus cf. e.g. O. Holder-Egger, *Neues Archiv* 2 (1877), p. 108, W. Wattenbach, *Deutschland Geschichtsquellen in Mittelalter I*, Berlin 1877, p. 67. It was, however, as early as in 1882 when Theodor Mommsen pointed out in the preface to his edition of Jordanes's *Romana* on p. XXIX that Jordanes's records are more extensive than those of Marcellinus, and offered two explanations: Either Jordanes drew upon Marcellinus while the

version of Marcellinus we know is in some way abridged, or else Jordanes did not consult Marcellinus's work at all, but drew upon some other chronicle, which did not survive to our times and which may have been abridged by Marcellinus. Yet, in 1894 — i.e. twelve years later — Mommsen himself rejected his own original standpoints in the foreword to his edition of Marcellinus's Chronicle, page 53 sq., expressing the following counter-arguments: a) There is but little probability of Marcellinus having been preserved in an abridged form, for the two only preserved archetype¹⁴ manuscripts — one from the 6th cent. and the other from the 10th or 11th cent. — are nearly identical. b) In Marcellinus's work itself we do not detect any traces of abridgement. Mommsen's ultimate view of the problem is as follows: Jordanes made use of Marcellinus's Chronicle and of some other chronicle, in addition to it. The latter was perhaps the source upon which Marcellinus himself could draw, and Jordanes may have derived his amplification of the narrative just from this text. As to the *Additamentum*, Jordanes did not draw upon Marcellinus's continuator, on the contrary, both authors drew here upon the same record of the Gothic War, independent of each other. The continuator did so in a greater measure than Jordanes, while both of them had at their disposal also *Gonsularia Constantinopolitana*.

The very development of Mommsen's views shows — this research-worker being in fact the only thorough investigator of the problem — that the question is not so simple as it may seem. In spite of it all, we perpetually find in literature alluding to Jordanes's sources Marcellinus's work mentioned as the only one that could supply Jordanes with information about events succeeding the ascension of Theodosius to the throne. (Cf. e.g. M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters I*, München 1911, p. 117, M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur IV*, 2, München 1920, p. 120, Wattenbach-Levison, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter I*, Weimar 1952, p. 77 sq., E. Č. Skržinskaja, *Jordan — O proischoždeniji i dějanijach Getov*, Moscow 1960, p. 27.) This means that Mommsen's final arguments were evidently not given deserved attention. Thus we think it necessary to deal once more with Mommsen's hypothesis and test it by attempting a detailed comparison of Marcellinus's Chronicle with Jordanes's *Romana*, and on the basis of this comparison we shall try to conclude whether it was Marcellinus Comes alone who acted as Jordanes's informer when the latter described events from Theodosius onward, and if this was not the case, and if there existed another source drawn upon by Jordanes, as Mommsen maintained, we shall try to find to what extent Jordanes depended on this unknown source in comparison with his dependance on Marcellinus.

Having this object in view we shall divide Marcellinus's Chronicle into three parts (1. years 379—414; 2. 415—534; 3. 535—548), and these periods we shall be comparing with corresponding periods in Jordanes's *Romana*.

I. It is generally admitted that as for the years 379—414 Marcellinus drew upon Orosius's work *Historiae adversus paganos*, quite often reproducing from it nearly word by word whole passages. Yet, to conform the text to the aim he himself followed he omitted various personal comments of Orosius. It has been demonstrated that even Jordanes drew upon Orosius (the comparable years to Marcellinus's period 379—414 are in Jordanes the years 315—326). The literal analogies in Marcellinus and Jordanes found for this period must

be ascribed to the use of a common source, namely Orosius (cf. Mommsen, l. c.). We are therefore not going to deal with this period in detail, as the aim of our study does not require it, and we shall devote more attention to the second period, i.e. to the years 415–534.

II. If we follow both these works in reference to the period 415–534 (i.e. up to *Additamentum affixum* to Marcellinus), we can see that in contrast to Jordanes Marcellinus includes in his record also some ecclesiastic news. This concerns chiefly his reports on some writers of the Church, such information being taken most frequently from Gennadius's work *De viris illustribus* and often reproduced word by word. But in addition to it he reports also on different buildings, and on various natural phenomena, such as the solar eclipse, earthquakes, severe frosts and so forth. These additional records of Marcellinus, which, for that part, may be found also in the first period in his *Chronicle*, can be explained by the writer's geographic-meteorological interests, about which we are informed in Cassiodorus's allusion to Marcellinus's further literary activity. In fact, such reports seem to have found their way into every narrative of Marcellinus (cf. e.g. the piece of news we refer to on page of this article). On the other hand, all similar material is evidently deliberately ignored by Jordanes. If we therefore put aside information of this sort and try to analyze in both authors records of other nature for the above-said second period, we are confronted with these possibilities:

A) The reports of both authors agree, both as to subject-matter and considerably also as to the form in the following places:

Marcellinus	Jordanes	Marcellinus	Jordanes
<i>anno</i> 422,2	§ 326	<i>anno</i> 476,2	§ 345
424,3	327	481	346
425,1	328	519,2	360
450,2/457	332	519,3/520	361
455	334	527	362
457,2/461,2	335	533	365
475,2	344		

For the sake of comparison let us quote at least the following parallels:

Marcellinus, 424,3
Iohannes regnum Occidentale Honorio defuncto invasit.

Marcellinus, 455

Valentinianus princeps dolo Maximi patricii, cuius etiam fraude Aetius perierat, in campo Martio per Optilam et Thraustilam Aetii satellites iam percusso Heraclio spadone truncatus est.

Idem Maximus invasit imperium tertioque tyrannidis suae mense membratim Romae a Romanis disceptus est. Gizericus rex Vandalorum, ab Eudoxia Valentiniani uxore epistulis invitatus ex Africa Romam ingressus est eaque urbe rebus omnibus spoliata eandem Eudoxia cum duabus filiabus secum rediens abduxit.

Marcellinus, 475,2

Jordanes 327
Iohannes vero Honorio defuncto regnum occidentale invasit.

Jordanes 334

Valentinianus autem occidentalis imperator dolo Maximi patricii, cuius etiam fraude Aetius perierat, in campo Martio, per Optilam et Thraustilam Aetii satellites iam percusso Eraclio spadone truncatus est. imperium quoque eius idem Maximus invasit tertioque tyrannidis suae mense membratim Romae a Romanis disceptus est. Gizericus tunc rex Vandalorum ab Eudoxia Valentiniani uxore invitatus ex Africa Roman ingressus est eaque urbem rebus omnibus expoliata eandem Eudoxiam cum duabus filiabus secum in Africa rediens duxit.

Jordanes, 344

Nepote Orestes protinus effugato Augustulum filium suum in imperium conlocavit.

Marcellinus 476,2

... Augustulum filium Orestis Odoacer in Lucullano Campaniae castello exilii poena damnavit. Hesperium Romanae gentis imperium, quod septingentesimo nono urbis conditae anno primus Augustorum Octavianus Augustus tenere coepit, cum hoc Augustulo periit, anno decessorum regni imperatorum quingentesimo vigesimo secundo, Gothorum dehinc regibus Romam tenentibus.

Nepotem imperatorem Orestes fugatum Augustulum suum filium in imperium conlocavit.

Jordanes, 345

(Odoacer) ... Augustulumque imperatorem de regno evulsum in Lucullano Campaniae castello exilii poema damnavit. sic quoque Hesperium regnum Romanique populi principatum, quod septingentesimo nono urbis conditae anno primus Augustorum Octavianus Augustus tenere coepit, cum hoc Augustulo periit anno decessorum regni imperatorum quingentesimo vicesimo secundo: Gothorum dehinc regibus Romam tenentibus.

B) The reports of both authors differ:

a) Jordanes describes events that are not mentioned in Marcellinus at all (these reports refer to Bonifatius, Attila, Basiliscus, Valamerus, Vidimerus, Odoacer, Zeno Illus, Vitalianus, and Belisarius, more detailed descriptions of the same military campaigns, and the like). The passages from Jordanes's text, to be quoted in this connection, are the following:

Marcellinus	Jordanes	Marcellinus	Jordanes
—	330	—	347
—	332 (the second part)	—	350
—	333	—	351
—	335 (the first part)	—	367
—	336	—	368
—	337		

b) Jordanes and Marcellinus describe upon the whole the same events, but Jordanes's descriptions are evidently richer and fuller:

Marcellinus	Jordanes	Marcellinus	Jordanes
425	328	484	349/352
447,2,4	331	488,1	352/353
475,1	341/342	491,1	354
476,1	342/343	519,1	360
476,2	345 (the first part)	529	363
483	348		

Let us quote at least some parallel extracts:

Marcellinus 447,2,4

Ingens bellum et priore maius per Attilam regem nostris inflictum paene totam Europam excisis invasisque civitatibus atque castellis contrasit.

Attila rex usque ad Thermopolim infestus advenit.

Marcellinus 529

Parthis bella moventibus arma Romanus paravit exercitus finesque suos rebellans tutatus est. haec expeditio nostrorum paene per quinquennium tenuit, digressaque Oriente Africam petiit, contra Vandalos feliciter dimicatura.

Jordanes 331

Hunorum rex Attila iunctis secum Gepidas cum Ardarico, Gothosque cum Valamir, diversasque alias nationes suis cum regibus, omnem Illyricum Traicianique et utramque Daciam, Mysiam et Scythiam populatus est.

Jordanes 363

Iustinianus imperator regnat iam iubante domino ann. XXVIII. qui ut scepris genio a suo avunculo mancipatus est, mox Parthos bella moventes destinato exercitu conspescuit et fines proprios tutans Parthorum saepe multos adflixit. postea vero facientibus peccatis in die sabbati sancti paschae inito certamine, exercitui et non ducis instinctu in fluvio Eufrate, fugiens Parthos, Romanus numerosus ruit exercitus.

c) In just a few instances Marcellinus's description gives more details; naturally, we do not have in mind here those various reports of religious or meteorological character, alluded to above, on page . An instance of this kind relates to the year 447 giving a precise denotation of a battlefield, but, to be sure, even this detail may be associated with his special interest in geography. When reporting on years 502—504 Marcellinus enlarges more upon the serious deterioration of relations between Anastasius I and Persia, while in connection with the year 530 he mentions the Roman Commander Mundus, although mixing up his name with that of the barbarian Mundo mentioned likewise by him sub 505.

d) As for records quoted sub b) and c), so far we every time had to deal with instances in which we could observe that in the course of describing the same event with essentially identical or similar wording one or the other author (more often Jordanes) amplified his description with additional details of information in the form of an extra sentence or a group of words. These instances, however, find a distinct contrast in a number of passages likewise describing essentially the same event, yet we could hardly include them in the above groups, for in these passages we find either of the two authors presenting as a rule the same topic with other expressions, besides supplying the reader with some additional information. Yet even here we may say that Jordanes's record is usually bulkier, nevertheless, we cannot include these passages in the group II B b) if we do not wish to be guilty of inaccuracy. In this connection we may compare the following quotations:

Marcellinus	Jordanes	Marcellinus	Jordanes
424,1,2	327	492	355
434	328	493, 499, 502, 503, 505	356
437	329	494	359
447,5	331	514	357
471/472,2	338	515,2	358
474,1	339, 340	530	363
489	349	532	364
484,2	351	534	366

Let us reproduce here at least the following passages:

Marcellinus 447,5

Arnegiselus magister militiae in ripense Dacia iuxta Utum amnem ab Attila rege viriliter pugnans plurimis hostium interemptis occisus est.

Marcellinus 514,1

Vitalianus Scythia, adsumpta Romanorum equitum peditumque, plus quam sexaginta milia armatorum in triduo congregatorum, in locum qui Septimus dicitur advenit ibique castra metatus est, dispositisque a mari in mare suorum ordinibus ipse ad usque portam, quae aurea dicitur, sine ullius accessit dispendio, scilicet pro orthodoxorum se fide proque Macedonio urbis episcopo incassum ab Anastasio principe exulato Constantinopolim accessisse asserens...

Marcellinus 515,2

Idem Vitalianus eidem Anastasio impera-

Jordanes 331

... contra quem (Attilam) Arnegiselus magister militum Mysiae egressus a Marcianopolim fortiter dimicavit, equoque sub se decidente praeventus est, et nec sic quiescens bellare, occisus est.

Jordanes 357

... sed et quod plus fuit dolendum, contra ultimum suum famulum Vitalianum de Scythiam per sex annos civile bellum extraxit. is si quidem Vitalianus cum LX milibus armatorum tertio pene non rei publicae sed regi infestus accedens multa suburbana regiae urbis praedis spoliosisque adtrivit.

Jordanes 358

... contra quem (Vitalianum) dum Hypa-

tori immanior factus est inimicus: praemissis quippe suorum equitibus armatisque naviculis sinistro sibi litore decurrentibus ipse peditem armis stipatus Systhenense praedium ingressus est totiusque loci palatium habuit mansionem. missi sunt ad Vitalianum a Caesare senatores, qui pacis cum eo leges componerent: nongenta pondo auri, exceptis regalibus muneribus, pro pretio tunc accepit Hypatii, iam mille centum auri libris cum Uranio captivo sibi a suis in Sozopoli oblati. magister militum Vitalianus per Thracias factus Hypatium, quem captivum catenatumque apud Acres castellum tenebat, reversus suo remisit avunculo.

Marcellinus 534

Provincia Africa, quae in divisione orbis terrarum a plerisque in parte tertia posita est, volente deo vindicata est. Carthago quoque civitas eius anno excidionis suae nonagesimo sexto pulsus devictisque Vandalis et Gelimere rege eorum capto et Constantinopolim misso, quarto Iustiniani principis consulatione, ipsius moderatione recepta est, sua cum patria firmius, quam dudum fuerat redintegrata.

III. And now let us direct our attention to the so-called *Additamentum*, in other words, to Marcellinus's continuator, dealing with the years 535—548. As we have already pointed out, Mommsen believes that Jordanes did not draw upon Marcellinus's continuator and expresses the opinion that both of them resorted to the same unknown record of the Gothic War.

If we compare the *Additamentum* directly with Jordanes's work *Romana*, we find that the reports contained in the *Additamentum* most resemble, as to character, the records of the second period, which we have just been discussing sub B d) that is to say, the same events are being often described with considerable variation, while Marcellinus's continuator, as Mommsen already stressed, evidently made ampler use of the assumed source about the Gothic War than Jordanes. In this connection we may compare the following quotations:

Additamentum	Jordanes	Additamentum	Jordanes
535	369, 370	541,1/546,4	377
536,4	372	540,3/541,2	378
536,7,8	373	542,2,3	379
537	374	547,5/545,3	380
539,4/540,3	375	547,3	381, 382
540,1	376		

(Cf. e.g. the following fragmentary extract:

Additamentum 542,2,3

Gothi Erario rege occiso Totilam in regnum manciparunt, qui malo Italiae mox Padum transit et ad Faventiam Aemiliae ci-

tius nepus Caesaris cum exercitu numero pugnaturus egreditur, ante ab Hunnis auxiliariibus capitur et Vitaliano mula insedens turpiter venditur, antequam aperto proelio parte adversa sese inimicum ostenderet. post quem item Rufinus Alathortique mag. mil. saepe superati, saepe inrasi ab eo et spreți sunt.

Jordanes 366

mox quoque soluto de Orientali parte exercitu eundem ductorem, quem dudum Orienti transmiserat, elegit Belisarium, cui numerosos fortissimosque milites deputatis ad australem plagam contra Vandalos mittit. quo favente deo qua venerat facilitate, ea celeritate Vandalos superavit, Lybiamque ad corpus totius rei publicae iungens, Gelimere regem opesque Chartagini in urbe regia principi spectante populo optulit, cuius notu remuneratus consulque ordinarius mox designatus, de manibus Vandalicis Belesarius triumphavit.

Jordanes 379

... Erarius qui et ipse vix anno expleto peremptus est et in regno. malo Italiae Bauduila iuvenis nepus asciscitur Heldebaldis.

vitatem Romanum exercitum superat, duces effugat, Caesenam et Urbinum, Montem feretris et Petrapertusa occupat, huc illucque discurrens devastat Italiam.

Rursus in annonaria Tuscia ad Mucellos per Ruderit et Liviarid Bledamque duces suos Romanum exercitum superat. quo proelio Bessa patricius vulnaretus evadit: ceteri vero fugientes per quaqua salvati sunt.

qui mox et sine mora Faventino in oppido Emiliae soli proelio commisso Romanum superavit exercitum: et nec diu post haec item per suos ad Mucellos annonariae Tusciae feliciter dimicans iudices fugat, exercitum partim donis, partim blanditiis sibi consociat totamque Italiam cum ipsa Roma pervadit omniumque urbium munimenta distruens...

Especially noteworthy are in the *Additamentum* the years 538, 543, 544, and 545, 1, 2, since its author informs the reader about events linked up with the names Vitigis and Totila more extensively than the author of *Romana*. It is only Marcellinus's continuator who brings a valuable piece of information about the death of Theodahadus (in 536) and thus amplifies the more concise reports of Prokopius (*Bellum Gothicum* I 11, 6—9), of Cassiodorus (*Variae* X, 31), from *Consularia Italica* (Mommsen, *Chron. min.* I, 333), and of Agnellus. 62 (MGH, *Scriptores rer. langobard. et Ital. saec. VI—IX*).¹⁵

Jordanes, in contrast to it, reports more extensively than *Additamentum* on Belisarius, as it is evident e.g. from paragraph 371.

Noteworthy is also the fact that in the *Additamentum* and in Jordanes's *Romana* we do not find any parallels that would mutually agree to such an extent as it was the case sub II A.

When comparing Marcellinus's *Chronicle* with Jordanes's *Romana* we came to the conclusion that after excluding the narrative concerning the years 379 to 414, in which both authors drew upon Orosius, and after doing the same with ecclesiastic and geographic-meteorological material in which only the former writer was keenly interested, the bulk of the records can be divided into several categories. Part of the information was accordant, while the rest of it, representing the major portion, was at variance. It is above all the greater extent of information in Jordanes that makes us take Mommsen's arguments presented in the introduction to his edition of Marcellinus's *Chronicle* duly in earnest. But besides, we also have to take into consideration the fact that in the two writings there are to be found a good number of reports on the same events that considerably differ both as to subject-matter and form, these passages having been included by us sub II B d). We are of the opinion that, in fact, we could hardly find a better explanation of this phenomenon than that offered by Mommsen, i.e. that both Marcellinus Comes and Jordanes had at their disposal another source, the contents of which each of them made use of according to his liking. One of them ascribed more importance to some details, while the other gave preference to other details. We therefore suggest that literature dealing with Jordanes in the future should, in accordance with Mommsen's convincing arguments, include among the sources drawn upon by Jordanes, reporting in his *Romana* on history from Theodosius onward, besides the *Chronicle* by Marcellinus Comes also some source, unknown to us so far, whose influence upon Jordanes was not inferior to that of Marcellinus.

As for the mutual relation of the *Additamentum* and Jordanes's work *Romana*, here the situation is less complicated, for the comparison of the two works clearly shows that their authors describe, to be sure, the same events, but evidently on the basis of some other source, as Mommsen has pointed out. The treatment of the single topics is drawn up, upon the whole, with a free

hand, but in favour of the assumed common source speak partly some identical expressions and partly also the fact that it is only Marcellinus's continuator and Jordanes who mentioned *Campi Barbarici* as the place where Vitigis seized power. No other preserved author conveyed this piece of information.¹⁶ In support of Mommsen's theory, however, another argument may be found, apart from text analysis: it is, in fact, an open question whether Jordanes was at all familiar with the *Additamentum* since Cassiodorus was ignorant of it and since the chronological interval between the works of the two writers is negligible.

NOTES

¹ ...qui adhuc patricii Iustiniani fertur egisse cancellos...

² ...sed meliore condicione devotus a tempore Theodosii principis usque ad fores imperii triumphalis Augusti Iustiniani opus suum domino iuvante perduxit; ut qui ante fuit in obsequio suscepto gratus, postea ipsius imperio copiose amantissimus appareret.

³ ...Marcellinus etiam quattuor libros de temporum qualitibus et positionibus locorum pulcherrima proprietate conficiens itineris sui tramitem laudabiliter percurrit, quem vobis pariter dereliqui...

⁴ ...Marcellinus quoque, de quo iam dixi, pari cura legendus est, qui Constantinopolitana civitatem et urbem Hierosolymorum quattuor libellis munitissima ratione descripsit.

⁵ *Holder-Egger*, *Neues Archiv* 50, Note 3.

⁶ *Theodor Mommsen*, *Chronica minor* II, 42.

⁷ *M. Schanz*, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* IV, 2, p. 112.

⁸ *Holder-Egger*, *Neues Archiv* 2, 54.

⁹ Cf. *Mommsen*, *Chr. min.* II, 42; *Schanz*, *Gesch. der röm. Lit.* IV, 2, p. 111 — *Schanz* sees confirmation of this view in the quoted Cassiodorus's formulation "meliore condicione devotus", while *Holder-Egger*, in contrast to it, evidently does not take this possibility into account.

¹⁰ Anno regiae urbis conditae centesimo nonagensino octavo regium vestibulum priscumque in eo solum ob aspicienda probandaque in circo certamina structum victor Iustinianus princeps eminentiorem clarioremque quam fuerat et utramque senatorum ex more spectantium porticum solita magnanimitate redintegrevit, bonis quidem agitatoribus praemium, ignavis autem in nobis severitatem innuens. (*Marcellini comitis Chronicon*, 528.)

¹¹ *Holder-Egger*, o. c. p. 49.

¹² *Mommsen*, *Chr. min.* II, 42.

¹³ The latest and the most thorough edition of Marcellinus's Chronicle is the work of *Th. Mommsen*, and it was published in *Monumenta Germaniae historica*, section *Auctorum antiquissimorum*, tomos XI — *Chronica minora saec. IV., V., VI., VII.*, vol. II, *Berolini*, Weidmann 1894.

¹⁴ All the manuscripts of Marcellinus's Chronicle are according to *Mommsen*, *Chr. min.* II, 47 sqq., derived from two archetypes, one of which is represented by the so-called *Codex Sanct-Omerensis* and the other by *Codex Tilianus*. *Codex Sanct-Omerensis* (according to the French town St. Omer) comes from the 10th or from the beginning of the 11th cent. and contains besides a few Latin works of other authors also Marcellinus's Chronicle up to the year 534, i.e. without the *Additamentum*. This manuscript forms the basis of two other, later manuscripts, as well as Marcellinus's editio princeps, edited by *Antonius Sconhovius* in Paris in 1546.

The most valuable manuscript of Marcellinus's Chronicle is, however, considered to be *Codex Tilianus* from the end of the 6th cent. As we see, it originated at a time which was not too far-off from Marcellinus's days. Contrary to *Codex Sanct-Omerensis* it has the year 548 for its terminus and comprises therefore also the *Additamentum*. It was named after Bishop du Tillet (*Tilius*), who was its possessor towards the close of the 16th cent. Now it is kept in Oxford. To this manuscript 13 later manuscripts must be traced down (as for the problematic existence of the last three see *Mommsen*, *Chr. min.* II, 52).

¹⁵ Cf. *Z. V. Udalcova*, *Italija i Vizantija v VI. veke*, Moscow 1959, p. 275.

¹⁶ *E. C. Skržinskaja* in her publication *Jordan O proischoždeniji i dějanijach Getov*, Moscow 1960, writes incorrectly on page 361, Note 815, that Jordan is the only one who

denotes the place where Vitigis seized power, using the designation "Campi barbarici", while she makes no mention at all about Marcellinus's continuator. In the *Additamentum*, however, we can read about the year 536 the following: *Gothorum exercitus Theodahadum regem habens suspectum Vitigis in regno asciscit: qui mox in campos Barbaricos regnum pervasit.* — Cf. Jordanes, *Romana* 49: *Vitiges Campania ingressus mox ad campos venisset Barbaricos, ilico exercitus favore, quod contra Theodahadum suspectum habebat, excepit...* and Jordanes, *Getica* 137 (*De origine actibusque Getarum*, ed. *Th. Mommsen*, Berolini 1882): *... et mox in campos Barbaricos Vitiges in regno levatus Romam ingreditur praemissisque Ravenna fidelissimis sibi viris Theodahadi necem mandat. qui venientes imperata sibi perficiunt et occiso Theodahado regem qui a rege missus adveniebat (et adhuc in campos Barbaricos erat Vitigis) populis nuntiat.*

Translated by S. Kostomlatský

MARCELLINUS KOMES A JORDANŮV SPIS ROMANA

Eusebiovo sepsání kroniky světa, založené na křesťanském světovém názoru, a Hieronymův překlad této kroniky do latiny, doplněný o události až do r. 378, ovlivnily do značné míry historiografický zájem latinsky píšících autorů 5. a 6. stol. n. l. Objevuje se stále více pokusů o napodobení takovéhoto prací, ať už jde o díla, která také počínají již Adamem, anebo o práce, jejichž autoři prosíe jen navazují na některé předchozí kronikáře tam, kde tito skončili. Z latinských děl naposled jmenovaného typu je třeba příkládat velkou pozornost zejména těm, která jsou přímým pokračováním kroniky Hieronymovy a která se tedy začínají rokem 379. A takové latinské kroniky se z 5. a 6. stol. zachovaly dvě. Jednu složil Hydatius, druhou Marcellinus komes, jehož *Chronicon* zahrnuje léta 379 až 534 a s Dodatky, které zřejmě již přímo od Marcellina nepocházejí, ještě pak i léta 534 až 548. Marcellinova kronika se pokládala bez nějakých výhrad za pramen pro Jordanův spis *De summa temporum vel origine actibusque gentis Romanorum* (podle Mommsena zkráceně nazývaný *Romana*), a to pro část počínající Theodosiem. V r. 1882 upozornil však Th. Mommsen ve své předmluvě k vydání Jordanova spisu *Romana* na to, že Jordanovo dílo je plnější než Marcellinova kronika a podal pro to dva výklady: buď Jordanes z Marcellina čerpal, ale Marcellinus se nám dochoval zkrácený, anebo Jordanes nepoužíval Marcellinova spisu, nýbrž nějak nám bližší neznámé kroniky, kterou Marcellinus zkrátil. Za dvanáct let poté, v r. 1894, v předmluvě k novému, doposud nejlepšímu vydání Marcellinovy kroniky však Mommsen polemizuje s těmito svými staršími názory a dochází k závěru, že Jordanes užíval Marcellinovy kroniky, ovšem vedle ní i nějaké jiné, snad té, na které je závislý sám Marcellinus. Toto prý platí ještě ve větší míře o *Additamentu*. Protože však odborná literatura i nadále uvádí při vypočítávání Jordanových pramenů pro dobu počínající se nástupem Theodosia jen Marcellina komita, považujeme za potřebné vrátit se znovu k Mommsenově hypotéze, navázat na jeho poznámky a prověřit ji tím, že se v tomto článku pokousíme o podrobné srovnání Marcellinovy kroniky a Jordanova spisu *Romana*.

Na základě našeho rozboru jsme dospěli k závěru, že po vyloučení zpráv z let 379 až 414, kdy oba autoři čerпали z Orosia, a po vyloučení zpráv náboženského a geografickometeorologického charakteru, kterým věnoval záměrně velkou pozornost Marcellinus komes, se nám informace rozpadly do několika hlavních skupin. Část zpráv se shodovala jak věcně, tak i do značné míry formálně, druhá část, a to větší, se však lišila. A byla to především větší bohatost zpráv u Jordana, která nás nutí přiklonit se na stranu Mommsenovu a dále také poměrně velká skupina zpráv (srov. sub II B d), ve kterých každý z autorů zpracovává zcela stejný námět odlišnějším způsobem, přičemž jednou ten, podruhé zase onen přináší navíc nějakou jinou, doplňující informaci — celkově však je i zde třeba konstatovat, že bohatější je Jordanes. Porovnávání jednotlivých míst z obou autorů nás také vede k přesvědčení, že vliv oné nám bližší neznámé práce na Jordana byl přinejmenším takový, jako vliv Marcellina komita samotného.

Pokud jde o vzájemný vztah mezi *Additamentem* a Jordanovým spisem *Romana*, tu srovnání zřetelně ukazuje, že autoři sice popisují stejné události, avšak na základě nějakého třetího pramene, neboť zpracování jednotlivých událostí je tu volné, na stejný pramen však ukazují některé vhodné výrazy a mimo jiné i to, že jedině u Marcellinova pokračovatele a u Jordana se setkáváme s označením místa, kde se zmocnil vlády Vitigis, jako „*Campi Barbarici*“.