

Jan-Markus Kötter/Carlo Scardino (eds.): Chronik des Hydatius. Fortführung der spanischen Epitome. Ediert, übersetzt und kommentiert. Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh 2019 (Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike G 9–10). XLVI, 398 p. € 129.00/ \$ 147.00. ISBN: 978-3-506-78915-0.

I

In 2012, Bruno Bleckmann, from the Institut für Geschichtswissenschaften, and Markus Stein, from the Institut für Klassische Philologie, both part of the Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, launched the project *Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike – KFHist* (“Minor and Fragmentary Historians of Late Antiquity”), funded by the Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften und Künste and the Union der deutschen Akademien der Wissenschaften. The project aims to edit, translate into German and provide commentary on about ninety texts written by Greek and Latin historians between the third and sixth centuries. This huge project promotes a close collaboration between classical philologists (in charge of the critical edition and philological commentary) and historians (responsible for historical commentary).

The directors of the project planned nine “modules”/collections, in order to organize texts according to subgenre, language, and/or the period in which they were written:

Module A: “Historians of the Third-Century Crisis;”

Module B: “Imperial History and Biographies of the Fourth and Early Fifth Centuries;”

Module C: “Panegyric History of the Fourth and Early Fifth Centuries;”

Module D: “Profane Historiography of the Late Fourth Century;”

Module E: “Church Historians;”

Module F: “Greek Profane Historians from Theodosius II to Anastasius;”

Module G: “Chronicles and Chronicle Continuations of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries;”

Module H: “Latin Profane Historians of the Fifth/Sixth Centuries;”

Module I: “Greek Profane Historians of the Fifth/Sixth Centuries.”

Nine volumes have already been published, allowing us to assess the high quality of the results. A full project website is still expected to go live, making available materials that apparently are not to be published on paper.

This new volume is part of module G, and includes two texts: the *Chronica* by Hydatius of Chaves (CPL 2263; G 9; pp. 1–384) and the very short Iberian continuation of this same chronicle up to 568 (G 10; pp. 385–398). This is the first time that this ‘continuation’ has been edited as an autonomous entity.

This same collection has also edited other historiographic texts which were copied together in the oldest known Iberian manuscript transmitting Hydatius’ *Chronica*, the ms. Madrid, Complutense 134, copied ca. 1243 in Toledo: the *Chronica* by Prosper of Aquitaine (G 5; ed. Becker/Kötter; 2016), the *Laterculus regum Vandalorum et Alanorum* (G 6; ed. Becker/Kötter; 2016), the *Chronica Gallica a. 511* (G 8; ed. Kötter/Scardino; 2017) and the *Narratio de imperatoribus [domus Valentinianae et Theodosianae]* (B 7; ed. Bleckmann/Kötter/Nickbakht/Song/Stein; 2017). I hope we can still expect the edition of some short texts also copied in this extraordinary manuscript, namely the *Chronicon a. 562* (CPL 2265; fols. 41va–41vb), the *Adbreniatio ebdomadatum Danielis* (CPL 2265; fols. 41vb–42ra), the *Anni sacerdotum Hebreorum* (CPL 2265; fol. 42ra–b) or the *Epitome Carthaginensis* (CPL 2258; fols. 42rb–47vb).

The edition of this volume was undertaken by two researchers of the project team, who have already been responsible for other volumes, with commendable success: Jan-Markus Kötter (responsible for chapters I–III and V of the Introduction, the German translation, and the historical commentary) and Carlo Scardino (responsible for chapter IV of the introduction, the critical edition, and the philological commentary).

No historical-philological commentary had previously been produced for Hydatius’ full text in any language: Richard W. Burgess’ promised study, based on his 1988 Oxford PhD thesis, was never published; Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann’s *Philologische Studien zur Chronik des Hydatius von Chaves* (Stuttgart, 1994) deals mainly with linguistic issues; and although Hydatius’ text had received considerable attention, especially from Spanish, French, and anglophone scholars, a detailed commentary of the chronicle was still lacking. Similarly, there was no German translation. For all these reasons, this is a long-anticipated and very welcome edition.

Just all the other volumes earlier published as part of this project, this book is written in German. This will obviously hinder a broader reception, especially of the introduction and extensive and detailed commentary, or indeed of the translation, by historians who are less fluent in German. This volume should be read, known and widely used but I fear it will be so less than it deserves.

II

After the foreword (v), the general index (VII–VIII) and the list of abbreviations (IX–X), one finds the list of sources (XI–XXX) and the bibliography (XXXI–XLVI). Here I have some minor concerns: namely, I do not understand the systematic choice of outdated German editions over newer, more accessible, and far superior critical editions. I give just a few examples:

Theodor Mommsen's edition (Berlin, 1892) of the *Chronicorum Caesaraugustorum reliquiae* (CPL 2267) is referred to, despite the recent edition by Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann as *Consularia Caesaraugustana* (Turnhout, 2001); for Isidore of Seville's *Chronica* (CPL 1205), the editors used Mommsen's very problematic text (Berlin, 1894) instead of José Carlos Martín's far better edition (Turnhout, 2003); for Isidore's *Historiae* (CPL 1204), the editors preferred Mommsen's edition (Berlin, 1894) to Cristóbal Rodríguez Alonso's (León, 1975); they used Migne's edition (!) (Paris, 1862) of Isidore's *De uiris illustribus* (CPL 1206) rather than Carmen Codoñer Merino's (Salamanca, 1964); Marius of Avenches' *Chronica* (CPL 2268) was read in Mommsen's edition (Berlin, 1894) and not Justin Favrod's (Lausanne, 1993²); the *Origo gentis Langobardorum* (CPL 1178) is used in its edition by Ludwig Bethmann (Hannover, 1878), not that by Annalisa Bracciotti (Rome, 1998); Orosius' *Historiae* (CPL 571) is used in the old Karl Zangemeister edition (Wien, 1882) and not Marie-Pierre Arnaud Lindet's (Paris, 1990–1991). I also noticed the lack of reference to Fredegarius' *Chronica* (CPL 1314), which is referred to several times in the text (e.g. 26–48, 52–54, 57, 207).

III

The introduction to Hydatius' *Chronica* is very competent. It comprises six chapters, almost all divided into several parts.

In the first chapter, “Biographische Skizze” (“Biographical sketch”; 3–7), Kötter recovers Hydatius’ life from the few available sources (a letter from Turibius of Astorga and a letter from Leo I) and the scattered self-references found in the *Chronica*. I do not think one can go much further than Kötter does: Hydatius was born around 395 into the elite of his region. He travelled east possibly in 407, where he met Jerome. Kötter accepts that he became a cleric in 416 (see Hyd. 62b; all references to Hydatius’ *Chronica* are from the present edition) and bishop in 427, possibly of Aquae Flaviae (modern Chaves, in Portugal; see cc. 201, 207). Kötter refers to Hydatius’ activity against the Priscillianists and Manicheans, and confirms his ignorance of the great councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451); he also refers to Hydatius’ diplomatic activity, up to his brief arrest under the Suevic king Frumar in 460, probably motivated by some suspicion of disloyalty. After his release, Hydatius’ never again mentions himself.

The second chapter focuses on “Formale Aspekte” (“Formal aspects”; 7–29), and is divided into five sections:

In II.1, “Anlässe und Zeitpunkt” (“Context and dating”; 7–10), Kötter argues convincingly for a multistage (“mehrstufige”; 9) elaboration of the *Chronica*, with two drafting periods in 456 and 468, justifying the existence of two prefaces. Less convincingly, Kötter also suggests that the lack of written sources from 427 onwards indicates that Hydatius could have started writing his text in this year.

In II.2, “Chronologischer Rahmen” (“Chronological framework”; 10–18), Kötter discusses the theses of Christian Courtois,¹ Steven Muhlberger,² and Richard W. Burgess³ concerning the chronological structure of the chronicle as transmitted by ms. B (Berlin, Phillipps 1829), on which all the critical editions since Mommsen are based. The relevant chronological differences between this new edition and Burgess’ are also explained in detail (see below). Regardless of some minor shortcomings (see below), Kötter’s chapter is

1 Auteurs et scribes. Remarques sur la chronologie d’Hydace. In *Byzantion* 21, 1951, 23–54.

2 *The Fifth Century Chroniclers. Prosper, Hydatius, and the Gallic Chronicler of 452*. Leeds 1990 (Arca 27).

3 *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana. Two Contemporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire*. Oxford 1993 (Oxford Classical Monographs).

again very well thought out and is clearer than Burgess' chapter on this same issue.

II.3, "Die Chronik als Universalchronik?" ("The chronicle as a universal chronicle?"; 18–21), discusses issues of literary genre, notably Hydatius' lengthy narratives, which are not very typical of the 'chronistic' genre, and the obvious Iberian focus of his text. Kötter rightly considers the first discussion as ahistorical, taking into account Hydatius' indistinct use of the concept of 'chronica': he acknowledged different types of *chronica* when he distinguished his own text from the much longer *chronica alia quam haec*, comparing Sulpicius Severus' *Chronica* to his own (c. 37a; p. 21). Kötter rightly argues that the regionalist focus of the text is due more to difficulties of information flow than to any conceptual design.

II.4, "Quellengebrauch und Informationsgehalt" ("Use and content of the sources"; 22–25), lists Hydatius' known sources. Although Hydatius apparently knew some of the works of Augustine (c. 53), Jerome (c. 59), and Paulinus of Nola (c. 81), I think his references are too general to assert anything for sure. On the other hand, the lost *Consularia Caesaraugustana*, a type of *Consularia Gallica*, and several letters from Praylios of Jerusalem, Pauline of Beziers, Cyril of Alexandria, Leo I, and Euphronius of Autun seem to have been known to Hydatius. Kötter argues that Hydatius began to use these letters mainly after 427, when he was consecrated bishop and must have had access to some ecclesiastical correspondence that apparently was still circulating. This kind of documentation ends in 452, probably due to the political instability in north-western Iberia.

II.5, "Rezeption und historischer Wert" ("Reception and historical value"; 26–29), deals with the reception of Hydatius' text. I think that this subject still deserves a more detailed treatment in the future. Kötter recognizes Hydatius' relative unpopularity and relates it to his prolixity (26). In fact, from the very beginning, Hydatius' *Chronica* was epitomized and must have had several gaps, hindering its transmission: neither the *Chronica Gallica a. 511* nor Isidore of Seville nor Fredegarius in Gaul seem to have known the complete *Chronica*. Still, Kötter seems to me too harsh in his judgment of the historical value of Hydatius' text: "ist es doch, gegen Burgess, kaum angebracht, Hydatius als den besten Historiker seiner Zeit zu loben, wo er doch zunächst einmal nicht viel mehr als der einzige Historiker seiner Zeit – und Herkunft – ist. Vieles von dem, was er berichtet, ist jedenfalls unzusammenhängend und für sich genommen kaum verständlich. In Teilen ist das freilich

nicht seine Schuld, da uns eine Verständnis fördernde Parallelüberlieferung zu vielen Details seiner Darstellung fehlt.” (27–28).

The third chapter, “Inhaltliche Grundzüge” (“Main content”; 29–47), deals mainly with historical issues. Kötter refers to Gallaecia and the Roman Empire (III.1, “Gallaecia und das Römische Reich”; 29–34), the image of barbarians in the *Chronica* (III.2, “Das Barbarenbild der Chronik”; 34–39), threats to the Church (III.3, “Bedrohungen der Kirche”; 39–42), the approaching end of the world (III.4, “Das nahende Ende der Welt”; 42–45), and concludes with a summary: “The Chronicler and the Lost Order” (III.5, “Zusammenfassung: Chronist und verlorene Ordnung”; 45–47).

I highlight just a few elements of this very well-done synthesis: Kötter argues that Hydatius, a member of the local Roman elite, is reacting with hostility to the presence of barbarian peoples in Iberia whom he condemns as an obvious disruptive factor. His chronicle must be seen as a sign of the increasing regionalization of political conditions in fifth-century Iberia. Kötter also asserts that there is a growing normalization of the barbarian’s image throughout the text, which parallels the growing regional fragmentation (38). Also of note is the way Hydatius interprets the barbarians’ arrival as a threat to the Church, whose stability is linked to the stability of the empire. Kötter rightly notes the absence of any reference to the metropolitan bishop of Braga, who was surely Hydatius’ direct superior. He suggests that this bishop may have been a Priscillianist, and/or perhaps a collaborator of the Sueves. However, such a relationship is difficult to prove, as Kötter himself admits (41). Kötter also tempers Burgess’ thesis, which frames Hydatius’ *Chronica* in the context of the imminent Parousia: for Kötter, “die Chronik des Hydatius bietet damit ein Beispiel für einen verfehlten Konservatismus, der eine zum Selbstzweck geronnene Nostalgie kultiviert und sich lieber in die Vorstellung des nahenden Weltuntergangs ergibt als in die Akzeptanz notwendiger Veränderungen altbekannter Lebensumstände” (46).

Chapter IV deals with philological and textual transmission issues: “The Chronicle’s transmission” (“Zur Überlieferung der Chronik”; 47–70). Scardino acknowledges that this critical edition does not offer much novelty on the text or its transmission (see below). He simply summarizes what Mommson and Burgess have already argued: in IV.1, “The different versions of Hydatius’ Chronicle” (“Die verschiedenen Versionen von Hydatius’ Chronik”; 47–48), Scardino confirms the loss of the full text of the *Chronica*. The manuscript tradition depends today on a truncated archetype β , on

which depend on an Iberian branch (γ), whose oldest manuscript was copied in the mid-thirteenth century (Madrid, Complutense 134), and a Gallic branch (δ), represented by the ms. B referred to above, copied in Burgundy in the first half of the ninth century, and by the text adapted by Fredegarius and incorporated into his own *Chronica* in 613.

In IV.2, “The manuscripts” (“Die Handschriften”; 48–59), Scardino uses Burgess’ *stemma codicum* (49) and describes seven manuscripts, focussing especially on ms. B. Like Burgess, Scardino also considers ms. London, British Library, Harley 6251 the best example of Fredegarius’ *Chronica* (= F). Regarding the Iberian manuscripts, this edition offers no new information beyond what Burgess has already presented. Without further justification, Scardino only used two manuscripts of this version: mss. Madrid, Complutense 134 (= Hm) and Madrid, BN 1376 (= Hn).

In IV.3, “The modern prints and recent editions” (“Die neuzeitlichen Drucke und modernen Editionen”; 57–59), Scardino comments, with no special novelty, on all the critical editions from Luis de San Llorente’s (Rome, 1615) to Burgess’.

IV.4, “Principles for the critical edition” (“Grundsätze der Textkonstitution”; 59–62) acknowledges that “[d]ie vorliegende Edition folgt in vielerlei Hinsicht Burgess, ohne auf einige grundlegende Errungenschaften von Mommsens Ausgabe zu verzichten” (59). In fact, it follows the numbering of Mommsen’s chapters; it prefers classical orthography; it greatly simplifies the layout of the folio in ms. B, which Burgess had tried to recover; like Burgess, this edition uses mss. F, M, and H whenever they fill gaps in ms. B and the information fits the context and style of Hydatius; unlike Burgess, even when ms. B has no gap, if the additions from mss. F and H fit the context and are in Mommsen’s edition, they are also included in the present edition.

The reasons for returning to Mommsen’s paragraph numbers are not entirely clear to me. Mommsen had attributed a numbered paragraph to each regnal year, even if there were no events: for example, the twelfth, thirteenth, and fifteenth years of Theodosius’ reign have no events; these “blank” paragraphs were Mommsen’s paragraphs 20, 21, and 23 and are thus retained by Kötter and Scardino.

Burgess had rejected this option and renumbered the text, leaving out the blank paragraphs. Kötter and Scardino prefer Mommsen's numbering, because it is the most widely used, so they say, in the secondary literature (59). They are right, but this is so only because most of the secondary literature predates 1993. However, I do not think that after Burgess' edition it is justifiable to still use Mommsen's (or Tranoy's) edition, especially given the significant improvements in the text offered by Burgess. Besides, in addition to his own numbering, Burgess' translation includes Mommsen's numbering in parentheses. As such, it is quite easy to find and use both numbering systems.

IV.5, "Comments on orthography" ("Bemerkungen zur Orthographie"; 62–66), and IV.6, "Language and style" ("Sprache und Stil"; 66–70), deal mainly with linguistic questions. The chapter on language and style closely follows Carmen Cardelle's previous conclusions (see above).

Chapter V, "Structure and aim of the edition" ("Gestalt und Ziel der Ausgabe"; 70–71), presents again the main changes in relation to Burgess' edition. Kötter and Scardino assert that the commentary's primary task is to help penetrate deeper into the basic philological and historical characteristics of the chronicles: "Insofern versteht sich der vorliegende Band als Ausgangspunkt für intensive Detailuntersuchungen zu Hydatius, nicht aber als Endpunkt der Beschäftigung mit dessen Chronik per se." (71).

Chapter VI, "Concordances" ("Konkordanzen"; 72–78), presents the indispensable tables of correspondence of the paragraph numbering between Burgess and this edition (VI.1, "Kapitelzählung"; 72–74). It is the only place in this edition where one can see these correspondences. This chapter also offers a table of correspondence between the regnal years of each emperor, as they appear in Hydatius, and the years of the Christian era as they have been calculated by the various editors of the *Chronica* (VI.2, "Jahreszählung"; 74–78).

IV

The Latin text and the German translation are presented on parallel pages, as in similar bilingual editions. The text is organized into blocks corresponding to each imperial regnal year, with the corresponding year of the Christian era indicated in square brackets.

The text presents two apparatuses: an apparatus of manuscripts indicating the codices that transmit each paragraph of the text, and a critical apparatus which follows the line numbering of the page. This is a traditional approach but makes it more difficult to read. I prefer Burgess' option of presenting the critical apparatus divided according to the paragraphs of the text.

The commentary is very detailed and helpful: it is by far the most important part of the volume. The historical commentary refers to the German translation; the philological commentary to the Latin text. The historical commentary identifies characters and events and discusses the historical value of specific passages of Hydatius' text. The linguistic commentary is very traditional and particularly useful for clarifying syntax and semantic issues. I would have expected more detailed comment on the use of sources and manuscripts and on reception issues, but clearly these areas were not of great interest to the editors.

The continuation of Hydatius' *Chronica* (G 10) barely occupies half a printed page. I do not think the editors should have edited it as an autonomous text. Even though this continuation was not written by Hydatius, and appears only in the Iberian manuscripts, it is obviously not a text in its own right but a short update of Hydatius' *Chronica*. I agree with Kötter's and Scardino's argument that this continuation could not have been written much later than 568, the last date mentioned in the text, but I disagree when they assert that, due to its small circulation, it must have been produced in Iberia (see below).

This book lacks several final indexes. I also question the editors' choice to omit them throughout the collection: an *index verborum* and at least an index of persons and places is required in any lengthy books of this nature. Nor is there an index of sources or of at least medieval users of Hydatius' text. Since there are no sources or reception apparatuses, a final index is indispensable.

V

The "physical fact" of the text always requires some sort of visual apprehension and interpretation. Hence, the recovery of the layout of Eusebius/Jerome's *Chronica* was central to Rudolf Helm's edition, in order to understand the methods of Eusebius of Caesarea and, after him, Jerome, and how they had dealt with the complexity of columns and dating systems in the *Chronica*.

Burgess understood this when he decided to reproduce the layout of ms. B. In fact, this is the only manuscript in which Hydatius' *Chronica* is copied (fols. 154r–172v) immediately after Eusebius/Jerome's (fols. 1v–154r), keeping the same layout and the complexity of its dating system. Moreover, Burgess rightly argued that Hydatius' *Chronica* was always understood not as a discrete text in itself, but as an update of Eusebius/Jerome's *Chronica*. Hence, there is a very good chance that ms. B could be the best testimony of Hydatius' own codex. For this very reason, Burgess argued that the complexity of Hydatius' text as copied in ms. B should be retained in the critical edition, keeping its apparent incongruities, such as the Olympiads or the years of an emperor's reign sometimes marked in the middle of a paragraph (cc. 40, 47 = 39 Burgess; c. 58 = 50 Burgess; c. 86 = 77 Burgess); or keeping the references to the Jubilee years, to the Hispanic era, to the Abrahamic years, or the rubrics that indicate the popes, all of which represent a continuation of Eusebius/Jerome's text.

Kötter and Scardino have not maintained the layout of ms. B or its apparent confusion of dating systems. In this new edition, the Olympiads are regularly signalled every four years and the regnal year changes regularly at the end of a paragraph and never in the middle. Hydatius' marginal Hispanic eras are never marked in this edition, nor are the Jubilee and Abrahamic years or the sequence of the popes, which were in ms. B and thus are reproduced in Burgess' edition. The reader gains in clarity: the layout of this new edition is not as overloaded as Burgess', nor as confused by its multiple columns as Mommsen's. Reading Hydatius' text is now very easy and enjoyable.

However, even if we cannot be absolutely sure that ms. B reproduces exactly the original form of Hydatius' text, this is our best testimony, and it is coherent with Eusebius/Jerome's.

In Eusebius/Jerome's *Chronica* in ms. B there are seventeen references to the Hispanic era; in Hydatius' *Chronica*, there are two references inserted within the text itself (cc. 42, 214) and two more marginal references (aera 420 and aera 430 = AD 382 and 392). All other references to the Hispanic era are drawn from ms. M (Montpellier, Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire H151), which is usually considered close to B and where one finds six different marginal references to the Hispanic era, and from ms. Hm (Madrid, Complutense 134), which contains eight more marginal references to the Hispanic era. Burgess has included nine of these references in his edition, seek-

ing to reconstruct a systematic and complete use of the Hispanic era by Hydatius. Burgess' reconstruction is perhaps too uncertain: in fact, there are only two references to the Hispanic era common to all the manuscripts: 470 and 490. However, it is also evident that the use of the Hispanic era in the margin of non-Iberian manuscripts, such as B and M, betrays the Iberian origins of their model. Kötter and Scardino prefer to follow Mommsen here and do not mark the Hispanic eras. I would have appreciated a more detailed discussion of the problem.

Regarding the Jubilee years, ms. B is not systematic. In the *Chronica* of Eusebius/Jerome four Jubilees after the Ascension are signalled (the first and the sixth are missing); in Hydatius there is an explicit reference only to the seventh Jubilee after the Ascension (= AD 382; c. 7). The reference to the eighth Jubilee (= AD 432) is missing, but Burgess added it in his edition. It is true that these Jubilee years are absent in the earliest manuscripts of Eusebius/Jerome's *Chronica* (hence Burgess' suggestion that they were added by Hydatius himself). However, in ms. B, there is continuity of use between the two texts. If ms. B is the best testimony of Hydatius, I think Burgess is right to include them.

In addition, Burgess' eschatological interpretation of Hydatius' *Chronica* is based on the use of the Jubilee years throughout the manuscript and not only in this text: indeed, in ms. B, fol. 122v there is a marginal reference to an apocryphal text known as *Reuelatio Sancti Thomae* which announced the Parousia on the ninth Jubilee after the Ascension of Christ (= AD 482). To Burgess, this detail is fundamental: according to him, this reference goes back to Hydatius' manuscript itself, which would mean that Hydatius really thought that the end of the world was approaching. Kötter and Scardino have doubts about the real influence of the *Reuelatio* on Hydatius, and therefore his use of the Jubilee years (43–44). In any case, the commentary is again silent on these issues.

Finally, regarding the years *a natiuitate Abraham*, in ms. B these were systematically used by Eusebius/Jerome and by Hydatius. Mommsen (1894, 6) considered them a later addition, but Burgess (1993, 36) rightly argues that this dating system was used in fols. 156r, 157r, and 165r, written by the same hand that copied the text; he also argues, in my view quite rightly, that what Mommsen had considered additions are actually corrections. Although this dating system is mentioned by Kötter and Scardino (e.g. 14, 19 n. 3), it is not included in the text either.

VI

In the edition of Hydatius' *Chronica*, one of the most difficult problems to solve is that of chronology. It is not possible to reach a definitive conclusion on all the dating problems. For the most part, Kötter and Scardino follow Burgess. There are two cases, however, that deserve some comment.

Honorius XXVIII. The ms. B places the beginning of the 24th year of Honorius' reign in c. 64 (= c. 56 Burgess). However, Burgess preferred to place it before c. 67 (= c. 59 Burgess), where, according to him, in ms. B there are traces of crimson ink and abrasion. Kötter and Scardino do not do this: in the critical apparatus (106–107), they do not mention these signs before c. 67, but report them before c. 65 (and indeed they are there in the manuscript), where they locate the beginning of the 24th year of Honorius (106).

I also have difficulty in identifying the erasure to which Burgess refers before c. 67; I see the abrasion before c. 65 in ms. B. However, I am not sure that it relates to a deleted regnal year. In fact c. 65 refers to a Pope Eulalius, so the rubric erased here could have been one that signalled a new pope, examples of which are to be found in many other places in this manuscript, but not here (this rubric may have been erased because Eulalius was later considered an antipope). Therefore, I would not locate the beginning of Honorius' 24th year before c. 65 either. However, placing the beginning of *Honorius XXVIII* before c. 64, as Mommsen did, allows us to correctly date the eclipse referred to here to 418. So in this case I would rather follow Mommsen.

Valentinianus XXV–XXX. Burgess suggested that some of the regnal years noted in the text did not correspond to complete "calendar years". Thus, Valentinian III's 25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th and 30th years are identified by Burgess as AD 449-449-450-451-452/3-453/4; Kötter and Scardino propose instead AD 449-450-451-452-453-454 (16–17).

The problem here is as follows: ms. B locates the consulate of Asturius, which in reality occurred in AD 449, in Valentinian III's 26th year, and locates the death of Theodosius II, which in reality occurred in AD 450, in Valentinian III's 27th year. However, Valentinian's first year was 425: therefore, AD 449 would be Valentinian's 25th year and not his 26th. For this reason Burgess repeated the year 449, making it correspond in fact to Valentinian's both 25th and 26th years; and thus Valentinian's 27th year would be 450. However, according to Hydatius/ms. B, Valentinian died in his 31st regnal year,

which in fact corresponds to AD 455. This is indeed the right date. However, if Valentinian's 26th year corresponded to 449, his 31st year could not have been AD 455, but 454. Therefore, Burgess considers that Valentinian's 29th–30th years corresponded to AD 452/3 and 453/4. This solution is very unsatisfactory. If Burgess accepted that the consulate of Asturius and the death of Theodosius II are wrongly dated by Hydatius, then he would not need to duplicate the year 449. In my view, Kötter and Scardino are right: for some reason, Hydatius misdated the consulate of Asturius and the death of Theodosius II, putting them in Valentinian III's 26th–27th years.

VII

Cc. 214a and 217a also deserve some comment. Kötter and Scardino keep them in the positions they occupy in Mommsen's edition: after c. 214 (= 209 Burgess) and after c. 217 (= 212 Burgess), respectively. In Burgess, they correspond to cc. 213b and 213a, respectively, and are edited after c. 217 (= 212 Burgess). In ms. B these two paragraphs are missing; after c. 217 (fol. 170r) there are three and a half blank lines. The manuscripts of the Iberian epitome only transmit c. 214a, although in different positions: ms. Hm (fol. 41va) places it after c. 213, but does not transmit c. 214 or 217a (no Iberian manuscript does). Fredegarius transmits c. 217a after c. 217, but omits c. 214a. Given their thematic affinity and the fact that in the Iberian manuscripts c. 214a was not always copied in the same place, Burgess decided to merge c. 214a and c. 217a and to insert them after c. 217 to fill the 3.5-line gap in ms. B.

The problem is complicated. It was not clear to me why the editors maintain c. 214a where Mommsen included it, mainly because, as Scardino admits, the Iberian manuscripts do not give a sure indication of where this addition must be positioned (357). Burgess' option is questionable, but it is ingenious as it takes advantage of the blank lines in ms. B.

VIII

Burgess' *stemma* is simplified in this edition: for example, the relationship between the Iberian manuscripts is much clearer in Burgess' *stemma*. In addition, the *stemma* could have been reconsidered, based on more recent research. I give some examples:

a) Like Burgess, the editors consider ms. Hm as dependent on a lost manuscript from the Monastery of Alcobaça (Portugal). In fact, it was not: several authors have argued that Hm and the lost codex from Alcobaça depend on the same model⁴. Of course, this does not affect the text of Hydatius, but it does affect the transmission history of its text and its *stemma codicum*.

b) In this group of Iberian manuscripts, there are at least two codices that Burgess thought unrecoverable, and therefore Kötter and Scardino do not use them:

– ms. Segorbe, Archivo Catedralicio, arm. G, est. I (= ms. Hs Burgess), a manuscript copied by Juan Bautista Pérez Rupert (ca. 1534–1597). The manuscript was lost in 1938 during the Spanish Civil War, but photographs survive in Madrid (Madrid, Biblioteca Tomás Navarro Tomás, Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales, Fondos CCHS, Caja I/Segorbe, photos 74–84). It is therefore possible to retrieve its content and use it at least for the history of Hydatius' text.

– ms. København, Arnamagnæanske Institut, Københavns Universitet, AM 833 4º, fols. 145v–148r (= ms. Ha Burgess). It belonged to Juan Páez de Castro and was used by Juan Bautista Pérez and Jerónimo Zurita.

c) Bautista (“Juan Páez de Castro”, 27–35) offers convincing arguments that Páez de Castro's manuscript (= Ha) does not derive from a lost manuscript from Burgo de Osma (= O), as Burgess had thought. And Bautista is right: at the margin of ms. Hs, Pérez annotated several variants taken from O. These marginalia confirm that Ha did not depend on O.

Kötter and Scardino simplify the *stemma* to make mss. Ht (= Toledo, Archivo y Biblioteca Capitulares, 27-26) and Hn (Madrid, BN 1376), both also copied by Pérez, depend on O. However, as far as the text of Hydatius is concerned,

4 A. A. Nascimento: Em busca dos códices Alcobacenses perdidos. In: *Didaskalia* 9, 1979, 279–288; G. V. Sumner: El perdido códice Alcobaciense y la Crónica Mozárabe de 754. In: *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 177, 1980, 343–346; F. Bautista: Juan Páez de Castro, Juan Bautista Pérez, Jerónimo Zurita y dos misceláneas historiográficas de la España altomedieval. In: *Scriptorium* 70, 2016, 3–68, and R. Furtado: La ‘Crónica’ de Eusebio-Jerónimo en Madrid, BHMV, Complutense 134 (ff. 2va–14vb). In: J. F. Méza Sanz (ed.): *Latinidad Medieval Hispánica. Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de Latín Medieval Hispánico, La Nucía (Alicante)*, 20–23 de noviembre de 2013. Firenze 2017, 69–84.

although ms. O belongs to the family of Iberian manuscripts, it is not the model of any of the other Iberian copies we know.

- 37a alia O aliam Hm om. HaHsHtHn
 48 malo BO malum H
 49 se BO sue H
 56 milibus BO uno XX Hm uno et uiginti HaHsHtHn
 60 Gothum BOHmHa Gothorum HsHtHn
 68 Gallecia BH Gallia O
 81 merito BOHm marito HaHsHtHn
 90 ultio consequitur diuina H ultionem consequitur diuinam O
 92 per Aetium B^{corr.}O Abetio Hm a Aetio Ha Aetio Hs Actio Ht Acti Hn
 115 Carthaginem BO Carthago magna H
 XV OHm XXV HaHsHtHn
 127 presidet BO preside et H
 139 Hispali Censorinus BO spalicem surius H
 140 depredator BOHm populatur HaHsHtHn
 142 irruptam B irrupta O om. H
 145 de Eutychete Hebionita B Ebionem O Tebionem H

d) Bautista also argues that Ht and Hn do not depend on Ha.⁵ This is also confirmed now for the text of Hydatius: only ms. Hs, also copied by Pérez, depends on Ha.

- 43 agerentur BHmHaHs ageretur HtHn
 48 implentur BHmHaHs implentest Ht implent Hn
 49 ineundam BHmHaHs ineundem Hm iucundam HtHn
 90 haud B^{corr.}HaHs autem Hm aut HtHn
 flumine BHm fluuio HaHsHtHn
 145 ad Leonem ... Cyrilli episcopi om. HtHn
 depulso HmHaHs pulso HtHn
 147 regina BHmHaHs regia HtHn
 152 filius eius (eius filius HtHn) succedit in regno BHmHtHn om. HaHs
 168 Romanis B^{corr.}HaHs Romani HmHtHn
 211 om. HtHn
 212 om. HtHn
 235 appellatur BHmHaHs om. HtHn

5 Bautista (see note 4) 34.

IX

Finally, some reference should be made to the edition of the Iberian continuation of the *Chronica*. The manuscripts used were again only Hm and Hn. However, this continuation was also copied in Ha, Hs, and Ht.

In Hm, this epitome fits into a larger set of texts, organized in a coherent chronological sequence. I recently argued that this Iberian manuscript transmits a *liber chronicorum* (fols. 2va–42rb) whose last part (after fol. 25vb) is composed of a set of texts all prior to 568, and coming from outside Iberia.⁶ At the end (but still a part) of this collection, Hydatius' *Chronica* was also copied with this short continuation, whose main characteristic is precisely its non-Iberian theme. It is therefore necessary to consider why in Iberia an exclusively foreign-related continuation should have been added to Hydatius' *Chronica*, in the precise context of a non-Iberian set of texts. Contrary to what Kötter and Scardino assume, I propose that this version of the *Chronica*, or at least this very short update with information about the arrival of the Lombards in Italy, was not produced in Iberia.

One last note about the references to Alypius of Thagaste, Augustine of Hippo, and Possidius of Calama in this epitome. Since Kötter and Scardino only use ms. Hm, they think this information is a particularity of this copy (396). In fact, ms. Ha transmits these same names at the end of the epitome, just after the reference to Alboin (fol. 148r); and in ms. Hs, photo 85, these names, although scratched out, also appear at the end of the text. In fact, these references were certainly in the margins of the manuscript model of the entire Iberian tradition.

My remarks, of course, are not intended to diminish this huge work which is very commendable. I am not convinced that this critical edition will replace Burgess'. But the book deserves praise for its introduction and, above all, the excellent commentary, which is by far the best aspect of the volume.

6 R. Furtado: A Collection of Chronicles from Late Antique Spain: Madrid, Complutense 134, ff. 25vb–47vb. Content, Structure and Chronology. In D. Paniagua/M. A. Sanz (eds.): *Formas de acceso al saber en la antigüedad tardía y en la alta edad media. La transmisión del conocimiento dentro y fuera de la escuela*. Barcelona/Rome 2016 (Textes et études du Moyen-Âge 84), 227–258.

Rodrigo Furtado, Lisbon
rodrigo.furtado@campus.ul.pt

www.plekos.de

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Rodrigo Furtado: Rezension zu: Jan-Markus Kötter/Carlo Scardino (eds.): Chronik des Hydatius. Fortführung der spanischen Epitome. Ediert, übersetzt und kommentiert. Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh 2019 (Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike G 9–10). In: Plekos 22, 2020, 123–139 (URL: http://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2020/r-koetter_scardino.pdf).
