

**Twelfth-century studies in Trier's Roman past.  
(Chronological discussions in Ms British Library, Addit. 19967).<sup>1</sup>**

*Lars Boje Mortensen*

## 1 INTRODUCTION

History was not a subject in its own right for scholastic studies in the twelfth century.<sup>2</sup> If a classical historiographer like Sallust *was* studied in the schools, he enjoyed this attention as a source of Latin composition and of ethical doctrine rather than as a basis for historical interpretation.<sup>3</sup> Though their place in the curriculum was, at best, small, historical texts did play a part in the general upsurge of studies in western Europe. We have two strong indications of this: the flourishing of historical writing in the twelfth century – displaying a richness and variety not seen since antiquity – and the large number of manuscripts containing classical and earlier medieval historical texts. A tiny fraction of the latter evidence is my concern here.

It would be a natural assumption that the more frequent literary study of classical Roman authors was accompanied by a similar rise in interest in Roman history, at least as a chronological frame supporting the literary studies. This was – I believe – indeed the case, but no twelfth-century writer produced a survey of Roman history. Instead late antique and early medieval manuals were reproduced. Copies of these manuals – prominent among them Orosius and Paul the Deacon's *Historia Romana* – survive in great numbers, and many are from the twelfth century. How, and to what extent, they were actually studied cannot yet be properly assessed: in the preliminaries to an investigation addressing this problem I came across a ms that gives some interesting evidence of twelfth-century use of such texts which otherwise rarely seem to have elicited glosses or commentaries.

The text to be discussed below reveals a twelfth-century scholar from Trier engaged in a historical debate which is local in essence, but has important ramifications into ancient Roman history.

---

1 For criticism and suggestions I am grateful to my colleagues Sten Ebbesen, Karsten Friis-Jensen, Birger Munk Olsen, and John Ellis. I would also like to thank the British Library for kind permission to publish from their manuscripts.

2 Cf. Goetz (1985).

3 On the use of Sallust in the 12th century: Smalley (1969). Munk Olsen II: 307-363 lists no less than 172 9th-12th century mss of Sallust's works (including fragments and excerpts), many of which contain rich glosses.

2 DESCRIPTION OF MS LONDON, BL, *ADDIT.* 19967

As the ms in question has not been subjected to any scrutiny - the versions of the main texts being uninteresting to editors - I shall offer a more exhaustive description than the ones found in the catalogue and in Jacob (1954).<sup>1</sup>

Ms. London, British Library, *Addit.* 19967 is of parchment, folio-sized: 375 X 250 mm (original size ca 400 X 275). It was produced in Trier in the late eleventh or early twelfth century, probably at the rich Benedictine abbey of St. Maximin (see below). The present binding is dated 1749. Pagination runs from 1 through 268. Except for three leaves (1, 150, & 151) it is homogeneous in material and structure; it consists mainly of numbered quaternions, though with quite a few deviations. The Roman numeral signatures at the end of each gathering were probably added later in the 12th century, as some of them seem to have been written on top of erased ones. In the following signatures of gatherings are in Roman (as in the ms), leaves in Arabic numbers; "<>" indicate absent number:

I: 1-8 (f.1 has been replaced by a later copy (14th cent.) - probably reproducing the layout of the original first page). II: 9-16. III: 17-24. IIII: 25-30 (quinion wanting no.s 3,5,7,9). V: 31-39 (senion wanting no.s 1,4 & 8). VI: 40-47. VII: 48-55. VIII: 56-63. VIII: 64-71. X: 72-76 (ternion wanting no.6). XI: 77-84. <XII>: 85-92. XIII: 93-100. XIII: 101-108. XV: 109-115. XVI: 116-120 (ternion wanting no.6). XVII: 121-128. XVIII: 129-136 (quinion wanting no.s 3,10). XVIII: 137-144 (quinion wanting no.s 4,8). <XX>: 145-149 (ternion wanting no.5). ---: 150-151 (two added leaves, parchment of very different quality, same size). <XXV>: 152-159. XXVI: 160-167. XXVII: 168-174 (quaternion wanting no.8) + 175-176 (bifolium wanting no.1 + singleton). XXVIII: 177-184. XXVIII: 185-190 (ternion). XXX: 191-196 (ternion). XXXI: 197-201 (ternion wanting no.2). XXXII: 202-209. XXXIII: 210-217. XXXIII: 218-225. XXXV: 226-234 (quinion wanting no.9). XXXVI: 235-242 (senion wanting no.s 2,3,8,9). XXXVII: 243-250. XXXVIII: 251-258. <XXXVIII> (erased): 259-268 (quinion).

The ms contains two main texts: (1) Landolfus Sagax' *Historia Romana* (*HR*) in 26 books - composed around A.D. 1000, and in later tradition often called 'Historia miscella' - on ff.1v-148v; (2) *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* (*HET*) compiled in the late sixth century by Cassiodorus and Epiphanius on ff.152r-267v. Both texts are given in their full, unabridged versions, and with a division into books matching that of the modern editions. Landolfus' text begins with a short accessus - probably by Landolfus himself - that explains the circumstances of composition: "Incipit Historia Romana Eutropii gentilis usque ad obitum Ioviani imperatoris. Cui aliqua Paulus Aquilegensis diaconus addidit rogatu Adelberge Beneventane ductricis. Deinde idem Paulus ex diversis auctoribus colligens a Valentiniani imperio incipiens usque ad tempora Iustiniani. Cui est Landolfus Sagax secutus et ipse ex diversis auctoribus colligens in eadem historia addidit, et perduxit ea usque ad imperium Leonis. Quod

1 Catalogue (1875) 23-24; Jacob (1954) 34-35, no.77.

est annus dominice incarnationis nonagesimus sextus indictione VII." What 20th-century scholarship might want to add, is that Paul the Deacon as well as Landolfus not only added text to the previous work(s), but also inserted new passages. This is why one can tell with certainty that the present ms contains Landolfus' *Historia Romana* rather than Eutropius with Paul's and Landolfus' additions.

The only apparent deficiency concerns Landolfus' text: after the end of book 26 (f.148rb) follows a summary list of Roman emperors noting the duration of each reign. This ordering matches other parts of the Landolfus tradition. But here the final entry "Basilius et Constantinus" is missing, the explicit being "iste interfectus a Iohanne cognominato Simiski intus in ipsum citonam. Iohannes cum Basilio et Constantino annis VI".<sup>1</sup> Furthermore a short list of empresses is also wanting at this point. There is no more space on f.148, and if these final words of the *Historia Romana* were ever in the ms, they must have been on the cut leaf "following" f.148. They could not have been physically detached otherwise because the present f.149 is certainly part of the same ternion, and its text (in another hand) begins at the immediate top without any sign of (or reasons for) previous erasure.

This slight deficiency, then, has nothing to do with the mysteriously lacking gatherings 21-24: I have no ready explanation for this. The ms. has probably been rebound more than once since the twelfth century,<sup>2</sup> and it would be rash to conclude much from its present physical appearance. Evidence from medieval catalogues and from an existing copy of addit. 19967 - for which see below - indicates that *HR* and *HET* were the only texts in this collection right from the beginning, but the presence, at an early stage, of some text(s) covering these five lost quaternions can not be ruled out.

The lay-out of the book is as follows. Throughout it is written in a late Carolingian minuscule with rather light brown ink in two columns and has "book-titles" - i.e. "explicit liber etc." - and book initials in silver. There is no index for *HR*, whereas the *HET* has an elaborate and numbered list of capitula heading each book; these lists easily catch the eye as they have been penned with smaller letters. Theoretically, an index for *HR* may have been drawn up on the original f.1r. However I consider this unlikely because there is no systematic chapter- or booktitles or numbers

1 Cf. Landolfus *HR*, ed. Crivellucci, p.3.

2 Apart from 1749, we have a notice about Nicolaus Petreius rearranging the library of St. Maximinus in 1593, adding *ex libris* and a new numbering ("in dorso notatis"); perhaps this involved some restoration of books (Jacobs (1906) 197).

in the text matching such an index; you only find the silver explicits and incipits. In contrast, the *HET* is provided with numbering and chapter-titles in the text itself.

A contemporary bookhand and a later cursive hand (14th/15th century) have corrected the texts (the last one seems identical to the one that wrote the ex libris on 267v; cf. e.g. 19v, 26v, 31v); *HR* has apparently been proof-read more thoroughly than *HET* which displays very few corrections. A cursive hand has added stray marginal titles in *HR* of the type "Scipio Africanus" etc., and a later (gothic) bookhand has put a few more in ("De Hannibale", "De Nerone"). These divers marginal scribbles provide no information that is not already in the text, but do give some help to a reader searching for specific passages. Furthermore there are quite a lot of notabene marks, almost on every page in *HR*, but none in *HET*. A couple of them seem to confirm the Treverian origin of the reader who put them in: on f.35rb at the text "namque Ambiorix cum Eburonatribus et Atuaticis conspirans animatus Treverorum consilio ..." (*HR* 6,23), and on f.35vb at "Labienus sequenti proelio omnis Treverorum copias interfecit" (*HR* 6,24). There are no illustrations and no explanatory glosses.

As outlined above, the book was made to cover Roman history and early church history by means of two voluminous and authoritative works, (1) *HR* and (2) *HET*. Some minor texts have, however, crept into the ms. on left-over space at the end of gatherings, in the margins, and on the added folios 150-151. These are:

(3) at the end of gathering 20, ff.149ra-149va, in a Carolingian minuscule slightly different from the main hand, papal correspondance with Trier from 1133-1134. The four letters deal with charges of simony against Gerhard, abbot of St. Maximin. One is addressed from Innocens II to Gerhard himself, two from the pope to the Treverian archbishop Albero (1131-1152), and one from a cardinal Almeric to Gerhard. The letters are no.s 348-351 in Hontheim's Treverian diplomatarium.<sup>1</sup>

(4) f.149va-b, a letter by emperor Henry II on some possessions of the abbey of St. Maximin. Written by a hand with chancery traits, different from anything else in the ms. This is not found in Hontheim (1750), but the same subject is treated in a letter of 1023 by Henry.<sup>2</sup> Some text is missing at the bottom of the right column due to cropping.

<sup>1</sup> Hontheim (1750) I:523-525.

<sup>2</sup> No. 224, pp.358-361. The text in Addit. 19967 - which may be a later forgery - begins: "Privilegium domini Henrici secundi regis de resignacione VI milium DCLVI mansorum idem clipei regalis. In nomine sanctae et individuae trinitatis, Heinricus divina favente clementia Romanorum imperator augustus. Quamvis antiquos terminos..."

(5) the three notes described and edited below.

(6) the folios not original with the book, 150 & 151, contain liturgical texts (late 12th century hand).<sup>1</sup>

(7) at the end of gathering 39, on ff.267vb-268vb: "Sermo de uinculis S. petri Apostolorum principis".<sup>2</sup>

As to the origin and the history of the ms, Jacob (1954) gathered some basic information. By means of additional analysis and references the following story emerges:

On the palaeographic evidence the catalogue and Jacob date the book to the twelfth century, and this need not be disputed, though there are hardly any strong reasons for excluding a late eleventh-century date.

The script is a well disciplined, not very abbreviated Carolingian minuscule of which some individual traits are: for 'et', "et", the tironian note ("7") as well as the ampersand ("&") are used. Erect and uncial "d". Majuscule "S" at line- and word-end, not within a word. Frequent and correct use of "e" caudata, but "ae"-ligature also occurs. For "-que", "q," and "q;" are found. For "con-" only "con" and "c" with a stroke above are used, not inversed "c". "-ur" is always "--", whereas "-us" can be "9", "s" longa with a left-winding leg or simply "us" ("bus" is "b;"). There is usually no space between prepositions and their noun. Common ligatures are "ct" and majuscule "NT", the latter only at word-endings. Forking at high ascenders can hardly be discerned. There are no strokes on double "ii", no catchwords, and no hyphenation.

There is no way of proving that the ms was produced in the actual scriptorium of St. Maximin in Trier, but it is very likely. If it was not, its place of origin can certainly be narrowed down to the immediate surroundings of Trier, and we can also be sure that it entered the library of St. Maximin shortly after its production, and no doubt already in the early twelfth century. The evidence for its origin and early whereabouts is the following:

(1) The sloppy exlibris on f.267v (14th/15th cent.) saying "Codex monasterii sancti Maximini prope Treverorum".

(2) The medieval catalogue of the library, edited by Kraus (1869), Becker (1885) 178-181, and Keuffer (1899) 51-53, "Ecclesia S. Maximini Treverensis". Entry no.102 (Becker; Keuffer: 101) is "Historia Romana cum tripartita historia in uno volumine" - without reasonable doubt the book in question.<sup>3</sup> Kraus and Becker date the catalogue to "11/12 saec.",

1 Incipit: "Dominus vobiscum. salutatur sacerdos populum et orat ut dominus sit cum illo." Explicit: "et nos oramus ut omnipotens pater omnem victum spiritualem ac carnalem nobis largire dignetur omni tempore."

2 Incipit: "Sollemnem observatiam huius festive diei", explicit: "scilicet quo nimis contrarium esset Christianae religioni divinas."

3 As suggested by Jacob (1954) 35.

but Lauffner and Munk Olsen place it in the end of the eleventh century.<sup>1</sup> The dating of the catalogue ties up with the dating of the manuscript because this entry is original, not a later addition. Following the latter scholars this would of course put the writing of the ms as well as its entry into the library of St. Maximin in the late eleventh century.<sup>2</sup>

(3) The version of its text of *HET*. According to Jacob (1954) 105ff. a few sample readings clearly place the ms. in a family centered on Cologne, Mainz, and especially Trier, and traceable in this region back to the tenth century. In other words, the exemplar used for producing the *HET* was found in, or not far from Trier.

(4) The twelfth century notes edited below were written by a native of Trier with this very ms in hand (evidence for this, below).

(5) The entering of the papal correspondance and the privilege by Henry II also strongly point in the direction of the abbey of St. Maximin.

The ms stayed on in Trier through the middle ages and right up to the time of the French revolution. Another catalogue of the library of St. Maximin was drawn up in 1393; no. 94 in that list is "historia Romana in uno magno volumine".<sup>3</sup> Though *HR* only is mentioned, the description of the size makes me confident that we are here dealing with *Addit. 19967*. In 1519-1520 it was copied in its entirety in Trier by a scribe named Michael. For some reason he reversed the order of texts, opening with *HET* and putting *HR* behind. His book - a piece of good luck for my research - also found its way to the British Library: it is now *Harley 3242*. Jacob reported that its readings showed it to be a copy of *Addit. 19967*, and my findings certainly confirm this, as some of the marginalia described below went into Michael's text. From this copy it is clear that 470 years ago the contents of *Addit. 19967* were the same as now. No other major texts seem to have been present, and the slight deficiency in the text of *HR* is reflected in *Harley 3242*.<sup>4</sup>

The next trace of activity around *Addit. 19967* can be found in the voluminous history of Trier by Browerus & Masenius (1670). They refer

1 Laufner (1985) 37; Munk Olsen (1987) 261.

2 Laufner (1985) 20-21 is not aware of *addit. 19967*, and believes that the entry refers to a lost 9th century ms.

3 Catalogue edited by Keuffer (1899) 54-58.

4 The ms gives *HET* on ff.1-116 and *HR* on ff.117-247. It was written "per me fratrem Michaellem Treueris, anno domini millesimo quingentesimo nonodecimo ipsa die sancti Andree apostoli" (116vb), and "anno domini mill. quin. vicesimo ipsa die conversionis sancte apostoli" (247vb). Explicit of *HR* same as *addit. 19967*: "Johannes cum Basilio et Constantino annis VI" (f.247vb).

to a ms of *HET* in St. Maximin, and paraphrase as evidence for a historical point some marginalia bearing on early Treverian chronology, written by "an anonymous monk".<sup>1</sup> In 1724 two French Benedictines, Martène and Durand, published their results of a "voyage littéraire". On their trip they had obviously also been rummaging through the library of St. Maximin, and one of the items that impressed them was "une très-belle Histoire Romaine distribuée en vingt-six livres, avec cette inscription: Incipit historia Romana. Eutropii gentilis" etc.<sup>2</sup>

In 1794 a less peaceful French expedition - by the revolutionary army - went over the library, and emptied it.<sup>3</sup> Some valuables and almost all the manuscripts from the abbey had, however, already been removed in 1792, and this presumably included our historical collection.<sup>4</sup> The next thing we know is that it came into the possession of the collector Joseph Görres.<sup>5</sup>

Here it was consulted by the Monumenta Historiae Germanica team in the 1840s; Archiv (1843) mentions as no. 94 of Görres' library in Koblenz "Historia miscella et tripartita, mbr. s. XI. fol.", and in the 1848 edition of *Gesta Treverorum*, G. Waitz quotes text B edited below from "codice olim sancti Maximini nunc in bibliotheca Görresiana Confluentiae asservato (Nro.94.) manu saeculi XII."

Somehow the ms passed to the antiquarian Edwin Tross, from whom the British library bought it in 1854, as the fly-leaf has it. As far as I have been able to work out no one but Jacob has consulted the ms in this century; Crivellucci does list it in his authoritative edition of Landolfus, but he had no use for it.

### 3 EDITION OF THREE NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF TRIER

The three texts all discuss the early ecclesiastical history of Trier. Among the protagonists are four early bishops of Trier, of whom, in fact, next to nothing is known: Eucharius, Agritius, Maximinus, and Paulinus; the first is extremely shadowy - allegedly the apostle of Trier together with Valerius and Maternus (beginning of second century), Agritius is known to have taken part in the council of Arles 314, Maximinus is mentioned as a friend of Athanasius by Jerome in *Chronicon* 343; his successor

1 Browerus & Masenius (1670) I: 216; quotation below.

2 I quote from Keuffer (1899) 69 (who is not aware of the identity of the ms.)

3 Kuhn (1985).

4 Cf. Jacobs (1906); Kuhn (1985) 115-117.

5 Jacob (1954) 35; cf. Kuhn (1985) 118.

Paulinus was exiled to Phrygia by the Arian emperor Constantius II.<sup>1</sup> The two existing biographies of St. Maximin were composed in the 8th and 9th centuries,<sup>2</sup> and that of Agritius is an 11th-century fabrication.<sup>3</sup> The problems debated in the notes are mainly chronological, and some of the reasoning and historical learning involved is rather interesting.

All three texts were, I am sure, composed by the same author. They were entered by a trained scribe on the basis of a draft; whether the scribe was identical with the author cannot be established. Ink and script are the same throughout the notes. The hand is a Carolingian minuscule, more abbreviated and somewhat less disciplined than the main text hand.

It differs principally on these counts: use of strokes on double "ii" (not on single) and of hyphens. Very frequent use of ampersands, but uncrossed tironian notes also occur. For "con-" superstroked as well as inverted "c" are found. "e" caudata is used, but less frequently and not in a consistent manner; I have not seen "ae", only simple "e" as replacement for the "e" caudata. "que" is "q;", never "q.". Very slight forks can be discerned of some high ascenders. Common ligatures are "ct" and "st". For "us" only "9" is used. Majuscule "S" is put rarely and indiscriminately (within words as well). Question marks are also found.

As the hand of the notes show no traces of Gothic influence a twelfth century date is almost certain, and a pre-1180 is very probable. Furthermore no references occur to texts (or events) later than ca 1130; the *Historia Treverica* (= *Gesta Treverorum*) is often mentioned, and Waitz has shown that it must date from shortly after 1101.<sup>4</sup> One part of text B is entered at the margin of the copies of the papal correspondence of 1133/1134; a likely guess is that the scribe of the notes would have preferred the free space at the end of the gathering, rather than the margin - if possible. To put it more clearly: the papal letters were already there when the notes were written. This gives us a terminus post quem, and a reasonably secure dating of the notes to the decades between 1140 and 1180.

The first text (A) is found on the empty space left at gathering 5, from f.39ra to 39vb. Paragraph 3 is written to the right of §§ 1 & 2 in a smaller script, and § 27 is entered at the bottom margin of f.39v; it is really a

1 The little that is known about these figures (and especially the later traditions about them) is discussed in Winheller (1935), who supplies a rich bibliography.

2 The first, anonymous one is printed in AA.SS. May, tom. 7 (Paris and Rome 1866) 19-36; the later one is by Lupus of Ferrières - see bibl. below.

3 Waitz (1848) 114 argues for a date between 1050 and 1070, Sauerland gives the possible range of 1050-1095, and the probable one of 1070-1090, whereas Thomas (1968) 152 n.90 puts it around 1050.

4 Waitz (1848) 118; see below for further details.



post scriptum and the main text ending at § 26 seems to have been carefully calculated as to fill exactly the space available.

This piece discusses the date of St. Maximin, the third bishop of Trier and patron saint of the abbey where the ms was kept. More specifically it answers the question, whether he was a contemporary of St. Martin of Tours. In §§ 1-4 excerpts of source-texts regarding the chronology of some fourth century emperors and saints are set down. In the apparatus to these paragraphs I have adduced the full sources in order to make it clear how the author "harmonises" the information. Paragraphs 5-6 form a rather verbose introduction. §§ 7-10 present the arguments put forward by those who deny the contemporaneity of St. Maximin and St. Martin, whereas §§ 11-27 offer the arguments favouring their contemporaneity. The latter view is obviously shared by the author, who - on the grounds established in §§ 1-4 - leads a host of hagiographical and historiographical authorities into the field against the testimony of the biographer of St. Martin, Sulpicius Severus.

The second text (*B*) is written on the margins of f.148v and 149r, i.e. to the left of the list of emperors added to Landolfus' *HR* (§§ 1-4) and to the right of the papal correspondance (§§ 5-10). This piece was edited by Waitz in a footnote in his introduction to the *Gesta Treverorum* (pp.117-118). He must have used *Addit. 19967* (then in Görres' collection), but he does not name his source.

The problem addressed here is the number of years elapsed between the supposed Christian beginnings of Trier in the early second century under the "apostle" Maternus and the first known ecclesiastical figure after him, Agritius. By using his manuals of Roman history the author decides that the span was 200 years, thus proving wrong the *Gesta Treverorum*. He goes on to challenge the claim - found in the same *Gesta* that the Christian tradition was discontinued in those 200 years.

The third text (*C*) begins as a note (§ 1) written at the left margin of 176v at the end of the second book of *HET*, at: "de cetero autem per annos octo dicitur Antiocena ecclesia uacasse sedem". A "+"-sign is put after "annos" and repeated in the margin at the beginning of the note. The leaf has been cropped with the result that the first four letters or so of each line are missing. However, they are restitutable by means of *Harley 3242*, f.26vb, the scribe of which considered the marginal note a part of the text. He has - reasonably enough - moved it to after "sedem" - thus not destroying the syntax. The train of thought is taken up at further

length on the same folio in the second column itself which had been left free at the end of gathering 26 (f. 176vb) (§§ 2-5).

The issue here is Agritius' career before he came to Trier: was he patriarch of Antioch or not? Our author is adamant that he was, though he is obviously troubled by the fact that none of his manuals of Roman or ecclesiastical history mentions this. Only the privilege by pope Silvester - the very pope who received the Donation of Constantine! - to the city of Trier brings this piece of information. (This privilege was forged in the 11th century and it enjoyed 5 "editions", the final form being the one quoted in the *Gesta Treverorum*.)<sup>1</sup> His only real argument turns out to be that Silvester, being a saint, can not be regarded a liar. The motivation behind the argument seems to be connected with some celebrated relics of Trier, the authenticity of which is warranted by the same text.

Three features of these notes (in their codicological context) are, to my mind, remarkable: (1) the rather wide research in historical texts done by the author. (2) the character of reasoning, or, one might say "source-criticism" displayed. (3) the clear evidence provided by the ms of a "Roman history book" studied by a twelfth century scholar.

1. The author of the notes is no target for the commonplace criticism of ancient and medieval historians for not mentioning their sources. In fact he names quite a few and his text shows that he used most of them directly. To me it seems that he had studied (and discussed with others?) the early history of Trier as described in the *Gesta Treverorum*, and from there worked his way through some of its sources and other relevant texts. These can be put under two main headings: Lives of saints, and manuals of Roman or world history. Among the latter - my main interest here - are Jerome's *Chronicon*, Bede's *De temporibus* (perhaps also his *Chronicon*), Orosius, Regino of Prüm's *Chronicon*, Landolfus' *HR*, and *HET*. According to the early catalogue the library of St. Maximin was well provided with historical literature, and most of the above are listed.<sup>2</sup> A less industrious scholar would have been satisfied with Jerome and Bede and not worried about information from *HR* and Orosius; in those cases you actually have to do some reading to cull chronological knowledge (for details see the apparatus). The author e.g. shows a good

1 Sauerland (1889) 88-118.

2 Orosius (Becker 109; Keuffer 108); Bede "De temporibus tres" (79-81) - possibly covering *De temporibus*, *De temporum ratione*, and *Chronica*; *Chronica Ieronimi* (61); Regino could be no. 129 (Keuffer): "*Cronica ex diversis collecta*".

command of the genealogical turmoil surrounding the dynasty of Constantine.

2. Anno Domini datings are evidently used by our author, but his standard point of reference for fourth-century history is the reigns of emperors, no doubt because that is what his sources for Roman history offered him. As will be seen in the first piece (*A*), calculations based on these reigns help him undermine the opponents' claim.

In the same text *A* we find him excluding the testimony of one source as it conflicts with all others, but in *C* it is the other way round; as already pointed out this does render him uneasy, especially because - as he states himself - you would expect Agritius to be mentioned by e.g. Jerome who otherwise provides information on patriarchs of Antioch. In text *B* his sources have nothing to offer when he wants to fault the *Gesta Treverorum* for its claim that between Maternus and Agritius paganism had overruled Christianity in Trier. In this case he argues from probability. In the same context (*B* 9) we find an interesting observation which today would be termed "cultural relativism": judging the evidence, he states, do not forget that the custom of the times of St. Martin was to postpone baptism until late in life.

However in connection with text *A* and its discussion of the contemporaneity of St. Martin and St. Maximin I discovered that he commits a serious crime: conscious and clumsy tampering with the evidence. It does not emerge directly from the text, but his repetitive reference (§§ 13, 19, 25) to *HET* made me suspicious. If you turn to the passage as recommended - X,3 - in the ms itself, you find (f.250va) "Theoderitus II. Honorius itaque susci /250vb/ piens occidentis imperium ludum gladiatorum primo anno imperii sui qui Rome celebrabatur huius modi causa remouit. quidam Tilemachius conuersatione monachica pro hac causa ab oriente uenit ad Romam [...]. Socrates III. Pauco tempore transeunte tertio anno Nectarius Constantinopolitanus episcopus defunctus est consulatu Cesarii et Attici, septima et uicesima die Septembri mensis. Eodem anno eodemque consulatu obiit ille Turonensis Martinus. Sed mox (§§ [in the bottom margin] Constantinopolim studia generantur episcopatus, aliis alium ordinari cupientibus) nouissime uero placuit ut etc." This reads oddly, and in fact the underscored bits are inserted - on erasure - by a hand with a disquieting resemblance to the one that wrote the notes! What the author needed for his argument was a chronological link between the consulate of Cesarius and Atticus, mentioned as the date of Martin's death by Gregory of Tours, and the years of emperors' reign.

In excess he also entered the phrase of Martin's death. In a way the forgery succeeded because this wording is exactly reproduced by *Harley* 3242, f.101rb. He furthermore has the audacity to refer to Regino of Prüm - who also worked in Trier some 250 years earlier - as if he supported the case of contemporaneity of the two saints. In fact Regino implies the very opposite, having Maximin dead long before the flourishing of Martin (see apparatus below).

If any general conclusion can be made about this man's "methods" of historical research, it must be that your case rests much better if you have some old authorities on your side. If they do not support your claim they must be overruled by other similar authorities or, in the last resort, you must make them say what you want.<sup>1</sup>

At this point one might well ask what immediate interests prompted our author to this mixture of painstaking scholarship and obvious lies. He was clearly a patriot of Trier as much as the author(s) of *Gesta Treverorum*, but he might also have represented even more local interests, viz. those of the abbey of St. Maximin. The longest of the three texts (A) could be interpreted in this way: by demonstrating that Maximin and Martin were contemporaneous and that they went to Rome together, the importance of Maximin is enhanced by association with the much more renowned Martin.

The criticism of the *Gesta Treverorum* could also be seen in this light. According to Waitz three basic editions of the *Gesta* exist: the simple one reaching 1101, one with alterations and additions going down to 1132, and a further addition to 1152.<sup>2</sup> As each ms of the *Gesta*, however, must be regarded as a separate edition with its own notes, datings etc, this is only a helpful simplification, and on indirect evidence Waitz notes that even the "simple" text printed by him has been interpolated. In § 16, for example, a list is entered of bishops of Trier between Maternus and Agritius, i.e. the period of the history of the city otherwise stated to have been pagan. Our author clearly read a version of the *Gesta* without this interpolation. Now, the main text printed by Waitz was no doubt produced in the Benedictine abbey of St. Eucharius, and some of the interpolations may come from that of St. Martin.<sup>3</sup> In other words, each abbey

1 A similar procedure was followed by another scholar from Trier who wanted the ancients to talk about the mythical founder of the city, Trebeta, son of Ninus: in an Orosius ms. he inserted the words "privignum suum Trebetam regno expulit". This still fooled Brower in the 17th century (Thomas (1968) 191-192).

2 Waitz (1848) 118-123. Cf. Thomas (1968) 23-25.

3 Waitz (1848) 120. A great number of holy men are, according to the *Gesta*, buried at St. Eucharius. Cf. Thomas (1968) 27.

had rich opportunity to twist the Treverian past in their favour by working on their own copies of *Gesta Treverorum*. It is not far-fetched, I think, to assume that the author of the notes was engaged in a debate springing from such work, and that he may even have been in charge of producing a "Maximinian" copy of the text. The present essays thus reflect some of his preparatory work. This is of course only a loose suggestion, and I hope students of the *Gesta* will be able to correct or develop the idea.<sup>1</sup>

3. The author refers several times to the texts of the very ms, into which he enters his notes, *HR* and *HET*.<sup>2</sup> Most noticeable perhaps are his phrases "presenti Romana historia" (A 15 & 16) and "hec Romana historia" (A 18). It could be argued of course, though rather sophistically, that the notes were composed with another ms containing *HR* in hand, and only later entered into this one, where the references also happen to fit. The forgery committed on *HET* X,3, incidentally, provides the hard evidence against such speculation: the author of the notes really "worked" on this very book!

A part from a few illustrious instances (e.g. William of Malmesbury) we are in want of links between twelfth-century historical scholars and contemporary copies of texts concerned with Roman history. London *Addit.* 19967 provides a new example of such a connection. Unfortunately, in this case we do not know the scholar, but the relevance of ancient Roman history and texts as *HR* and *HET* in the twelfth century is certainly evidenced in his work.

\* \* \*

Principles of edition: I follow the spelling of the ms except for ignoring "e" caudata. Punctuation, paragraph-numbers and choice of lower/upper case are mine, but not without some support from the ms. It must be

1 One important clue to all this, the St. Maximin ms of the *Gesta* itself, so far eludes me: the old catalogue of the library does not list the *Gesta*, and indeed it could only have done so by addition if the late 11th-century date of the catalogue is correct. In the (incomplete) 1393 catalogue the *Gesta* may hide under item 109: "antiqua gesta in antiquo uolumine". Waitz does refer to *Gesta*-texts with St. Maximin origin, but only indirectly: Hontheim and Martène have seen them but now (1848) they have disappeared. Kuhn (1985) 121 states that the St. Maximin copy of the *Gesta* was sold from the Francofortian bibliophile J.G. Kloss' collection in London in 1835, and that it later found its way to Berlin. Unfortunately he does not provide more information.

2 *HR*: A 3, 11, 15, 16, 18, C 2; *HET*: A 13, 19, 25 bis, C 2, 3.

noted that the scribe has not always put ordinal numbers where he ought to.

<> indicate absence by scribal error and my paragraph numbers.

<<>> indicate loss by physical damage. Suppletions are from *Harley 3242*.

[] seclude excess material in the ms.

\ / include text written above the line.

++ include text unintelligible to me.

Apart from a few textual notes, the apparatus contains references to the sources used by the author.

## A

<1> Sumptum ex cathologo regum quod est secundum chronicam Ieronimi et secundum Orosium et Bedam de temporibus.

<2> Constantinus regnavit annis XXXI.<sup>1</sup> Constantius cum fratribus annis XXIII.<sup>2</sup> Iulianus annum I et menses UIII.<sup>3</sup> Ioui[ni]anus menses UIII.<sup>4</sup> Valentinianus cum fratre Ualente annis XIII.<sup>5</sup> Gratianus annis

- 
- 1 Hieron. Chron. 228,26-229,1: "regnavit Constantinus ann. XXX mens. X"; Orosius VII,26,1: "Anno ab urbe condita MLXI Constantinus tricensimus quartus gubernacula imperii a Constantio patre suscepit, quae uno et triginta annis felicissime tenuit."; Beda De temp. 291C: "Constantinus annis XXXI".
  - 2 Hieron. Chron. 234,12-13: "regnavit Constantinus, Constantius et Constans ann XXIII mens. V diebus XIII"; Orosius VII,29,1: "Anno ab urbe condita MXCII Constantius tricensimus quintus cum Constantino et Constante fratribus suis adeptus imperium viginti et quattuor annis tenuit." Beda De temp. 291C: "Constantius et Constans annis XXIV"; Beda Chron. 426: "Constantius cum Constantino et Constante fratribus, an. XXIII m. V d. XIII".
  - 3 Hier. Chron. 242,10-11: "regnavit Iulianus ann. I mens. VIII"; Orosius VII,30,1: "Anno ab urbe condita MXCVI Iulianus dudum, post autem tricesimus sextus ab augusto rerum potitus anno uno et mensibus octo imperii summam solus obtinuit." Beda De temp. 292A: "Julianus annis II".
  - 4 Hieron. Chron. 243,16-17: "regnavit Iovianus mens. VIII"; Orosius VII,31,1-3: "Anno ab urbe condita MCXVII Iovianus tricesimus septimus imperator [...] octavo demum mense quam imperare coeperat vitam finivit." Beda De temp. 292A: "Jovianus anno I".
  - 5 Hieron. Chron. 244, 7-8: "regnavit Valentinianus et Valens ann. XIII mens. V"; Orosius VII,32,1: "Anno ab urbe condita MCXVIII Valentinianus tricesimus octavus apud Nicaeam consensu militum imperator creatus est mansitque in eo annis undecim." & VII,33,1: "Anno ab urbe condita MCXXVIII Valens tricesimus nonus imperium quattuor annis Valentiniano mortuo tenuit." Beda De temp. 292A: "Valentinianus annis XIII [...] Valens annis III"; Beda Chron. 440: "Valentinianus cum fratre Valente an. XI".

UI.<sup>1</sup> Theodosius annis XI.<sup>2</sup> Archadius cum fratre Honorio annis XIII.<sup>3</sup> Honorius cum nepote Theodosio annis XU.<sup>4</sup> Theodosius post Honorium annis XXUI.<sup>5</sup>

<3> Romana historia: interiit Iulianus III<sup>o</sup> anno sui consulatus, III<sup>o</sup> imperii sui, UI<sup>o</sup> uero ex quo Cesar a Constantio fuit ordinatus; monarchia uno anno et UIII mensibus.<sup>6</sup>

<4> Seuerinus Coloniensis ut uita sua perhibet LUI annis uixit in episcopatu Coloniensi.<sup>7</sup> Ambrosius Mediolanensis ut uita sua perhibet obiit sub Archadio et Honorio UIII<sup>o</sup> anno eorum principatus.<sup>8</sup>

<5> /39rb/ + Quoniam diuersitas auctorum est peruersitas lectorum ita ut sepius hinc zizania pullulet<sup>9</sup> errorum, et in campo scripturarum alea amministretur pugnarum, dum hi defendunt quod appetunt, et illi reperiunt<sup>10</sup> quod probare non satagunt <h>is agentibus ne ueritas putetur falsitas, illis reclamantibus ne antiquorum infringatur auctoritas, dum ex uno eodemque sensu habeant auctoritates multimodas, tamen non recte iudicantibus succedit falsitas. +

<6> \Unde/ ad medium deducamus contemporalitem Martini et Maximini que multis dubitatur, et uideamus quamplures sapientes in hac hesitasse et sepius ex multis sententiis uite Martini in litem de hac contemporalitate uenisse, unde et adhuc sub iudice lis est; que tamen quia

- 1 Orosius VII,34,1: "Anno ab urbe condita MCXXXII Gratianus quadragesimus ab Augusto post mortem Valentis sex annis imperium tenuit." Beda De temp. 292A: "Gratianus annis VI"; Beda Chron. 451: "Gratianus cum fratre Valentiniano an. VI".
- 2 Orosius VII,35,1: "Anno ab urbe condita MCXXXVIII Theodosius quadragesimus primus interfecto per Maximum Gratiano imperium Romani orbis obtinuit mansitque in eo annis undecim, cum iam in Orientis partibus sex annis Gratiano uivente regnasset." Beda De temp. 292A: "Valentinianus cum Theodosio annis IX [...] Theodosius annis III cum Archadio et Honorio"; Beda Chron. 459: "Theodosius, qui Gratiano uivente VI annis iam Orientem regebat, post eius mortem regnat an. XI".
- 3 Orosius VII,36,1: "Anno ab urbe condita MCXLVIII Arcadius Augustus, cuius nunc filius Theodosius Orientem regit, et Honorius Augustus frater eius, cui nunc respublica innititur [...] uixitque Arcadius post patris excessum annis duodecim." Beda De temp. "Archadius annis XIII cum fratre Honorio"; Beda Chron. 463: "Arcadius filius Theodosii cum fratre Honorio an. XIII".
- 4 Beda De temp. 292A: "Honorius annis XV cum Theodosio minore"; Beda Chron. 468: "Honorius cum Theodosio minore, fratris sui filio, an. XV".
- 5 Beda De temp. 292A: "Theodosius minor annis XXVI."; Beda Chron. 477: "Theodosius minor Arcadii filius an. XXVI".
- 6 HR 11,43: "Iulianus ergo quarto consulato suo, quem ediderat cum Salustio VII Kal. Iul. interiit anno tertio imperii sui, septimo uero ex quo Cesar a Constantio fuerat ordinatus, uite anno tricesimo primo."
- 7 Hoc non inuenitur in Uita et translatio S. Seuerini (ed. Acta Sanctorum. Oct. Uol. X (23. Oct.) pp.56-64 (Parisius & Romae 1869). Notant tamen capituli 7 & 8 Seuerinum contemporalem Martini fuisse.
- 8 Ne hoc quidem de auctoritate, uidelicet Paulini Uita Ambrosii (PL 14:27-46), profluit.
- 9 z.p. in ras.
- 10 reperiunt: reperiebant Cod.

soluere facilis est, quid utreque partes de hac sentiant, proferamus et quid magis tunc eligendum sit uideamus.

<7> Sic tamen obponere solent qui negant ipsam contemporaneitatem. dicunt etenim: quomodo dicitur Martinus Turonensis contemporaneus Maximini esse, dum constet Martinum sub Constantio militasse sub quo Maximinus obiit, et Paulinus successor Maximini exilium subiit? ut ergo omnino noueritis eos contemporaneos non fuisse, uitam ipsius Martini inspiciamus ubi dicitur: "inter scolares alas primus sub Constantio dein sub Iuliano Cesare militauit."<sup>1</sup> Item de eodem: "cum exisset edictum a regibus ut ueteranorum filii ad militiam scriberentur. Martinus cum esset annorum XU sacramentis militaribus implicatus est; triennium fere ante baptismum in armis fuit. Sed cum esset annorum duo de XX ad baptismum conuolauit, et per biennium postea solo nomine militauit; sicque XX annorum apud Wangionem ubi Iulianum donatium militibus suis erogare cepit arma abdicauit."<sup>2</sup> Deinde sub Ualentiniano episcopatum conscendit quem XXUI annis rexit. Sicque Archadio et Honorio principibus obiit LXXX<sup>o</sup> I<sup>o</sup> etatis sue anno, Attico et Cesareo consulibus.

<8> Ecce defloratam habes totam uitam Martini, uitam dico quam non solum Sulpicius Tolose episcopus discipulus ipsius Martini, uerum etiam Gallus scolasticus et ipse discipulus eque Martini nec non Gregorius et ipse episcopus successor Martini, in unum compilauerunt; cum sane nullus eorum attestetur quod ipse contemporaneus Maximini fuerit et neque hoc per annos regum posse<t> stare, cum, ut iam diximus, Sulpicius eum primum sub Constantio, sub quo Maximinus obiit et Paulinus exilium subiit, affirmet, dein sub Iuliano Cesare, militasse, sub quo et XX annorum apud Wangionem arma abdicauit, et secundum Gallum episcopatum sub Ualentiniano ascendit,<sup>3</sup> et secundum Gregorium Archadio et Honorio principibus obiit LXXX<sup>o</sup> I<sup>o</sup> etatis sue anno XX<sup>o</sup> UI<sup>o</sup> autem

- 
- 1 Sulpicius: "ipse armatam militiam in adulescentia secutus inter scolares alas sub rege Constantio, deinde sub Iuliano caesare militauit." (2,2).
  - 2 Sulpicius: "sed cum edictum esset a regibus, ut ueteranorum filii ad militiam scriberentur, prodente patre, qui felicibus eius actibus inuidebat, cum annorum quindecim, captus et catenatus sacramentis militaribus implicatus est," (2,5). "trienium fere ante baptismum in armis fuit..." (2,6). "cum esset annorum duodeviginti, ad baptismum conuolauit [...] qua Martinus expectatione suspensus per biennium fere posteaquam est baptismum consecutus, solo licet nomine, militauit." (3,5). "interea inruentibus intra Gallias barbaris Iulianus caesar coacto in unum exercitu apud Wangionem civitatem donatium coepit erogare militibus, et, ut est consuetudinis, singuli citabantur..." (4,1) (Martinus abdicat arma in cap. 4,2-9). "exinde relicta militia..." (5,1).
  - 3 Gallus scilicet in dialogo Sulpicii referens (Dialogus (ed. Halm) II,5,5): "eo fere tempore, quo primum episcopus datus est, fuit ei necessitas adire comitatum. Valentinianus tum maior rerum potiebatur."



pontificatus sui Attico et Cesario consulibus,<sup>1</sup> ergo Martinus Turonensis contemporalis Maximini non fuit.

<9> Sed quidam Maguntiensis, cuius discipulus Lubentius extitit qui et sinodo Agripinensi cum Maximinus Eufuran Coloniensem hereticum gradu mouit interfuit et subscripsit, dicitur<sup>2</sup> Romam cum Maximino isse et redisse et Treueris cum Maximino habitasse et Paulinum consecrasse; sed et ibi quieuisse, et iuxta primos pastores collocatum esse; et in hoc uitam Maximini errasse, dum eum opinatissimum uocat cum opinatissimus fuerit ille Turonensis et non ille Maguntiensis. etenim si ille Turonensis Romam cum Maximino isset profecto et Agripinensi sinodo subscripsisset. Dum uix constet eum iuxta computationem Sulpicii tunc quando illa sinodus facta est, natum esse, ergo omnibus modis probabilibus argumentis approbatur quantum ex uita Martini scire datur, quod contemporales non fuerunt - maxime cum nec ipsa uita Maximini eum Turonensem uocet nisi opinatissimum.<sup>3</sup> Sic se defendunt qui hanc contemporaneitatem negant.

<10> Unde et nos qui eam approbare uolumus eisdem modis et ex uita ipsa Martini, dum omnino taceamus Maximini, eos inpetamus; et quomodo ipsi auctores uite Martini inter se discrepent primo omnium demonstramus.

<11> + Etsi is, qui sub Iuliano secundum Sulpicium XX annorum arma abdicauit, sub Ualentiniano secundum Gallum LU annorum episcopatum conscendit, /39ua/ alioquin non illum XXUI annis secundum Sulpicium rexit nec LXXX<sup>o</sup>I<sup>o</sup> anno etatis sue obiit quia LU et XXUI faciunt LXXXI, dum non amplius in catholo<go> regum inueniantur quam XUIII a primo anno ex quo Iulianus Cesar a Constantio secundum Romanam historiam ordinatus est<sup>4</sup> usque ad XI annum Ualentiniani qui est ultimus uite et principatus eius. +

<12> Multum ergo discordat Sulpicius et Gallus dum ille Martinum XX annorum sub Iuliano Cesare dicat arma apud Wangionem abdicasse, et iste affirmet eum sub Ualentiniano episcopatum ascendisse. Aut ergo secundum Sulpicium episcopatum sub Ualentiniano non ascendit aut iuxta Gallum XX annorum sub Iuliano Cesare arma non abdicauit, aut certe secundum Gregorium non sub Archadio et Honorio LXXX<sup>o</sup>I<sup>o</sup> anno etatis

1 Gregorii De uitutibus sancti Martini episcopi I,3: "In quo gloriosam et pene initabilem agens uitam per quinquennia quinque bis insuper geminis mensibus cum decim diebus, octogesimo primo aetatis suae anno, Caesareo et Attico consulibus, nocte media quieuit in pace..."

2 dicitur: in ras.

3 Vita Maximini Lupo auctore § 7 (MGH p.77,17-18): "cuius rei gratia cum Romam tenderet opinatissimum confessorem Martinum conuenit."

4 HR 6,43.

sue obiit, XXUI<sup>o</sup> autem pontificatus sui, Attico et Cesario consulibus. Igitur quia discrepantias Galli et Sulpicii habemus, nunc Sulpicii et Gregorii uideamus. Et quia Sulpicius sub Iuliano dicit Martinum XX annorum arma abdicasse et Gregorius affirmet eum LXXX<sup>o</sup>I<sup>o</sup> etatis sue anno Archadio et Honorio principibus Attico et Cesario consulibus obiisse, uideamus itaque si ipsi anni concordent.

<13> Sed quia ex tripartita historia in III<sup>o</sup> capitulo X libri luce clarius patet quod Archadii et Honorii annus III est Attici et Cesarii consulatus quo obiit Martinus;<sup>1</sup> et sic per omnia euidentis est Sulpicium<sup>2</sup> sicut cum Gallo sic eque cum Gregorio discordare, + cum non LXXXI unus<sup>3</sup> annus a Iuliano usque ad III annum Archadii et Honorii qui est consulatus Attici et Cesarii et obitus Martini inueniantur, sed uix LUIII. +

<14> Ergo discordat Sulpicius a ceteris auctoribus quia secundum eum, si sub Iuliano XX annorum Martinus arma abdicauit et secundum Gregorium LXXXI annum uixit, tunc plane non sub Ualentiniano sed X<sup>o</sup> anno maioris Theodos[o]ii episcopatum conscendit; quod omnino secundum Gallum falsum est qui eum affirmat sub Ualentiniano conscendisse, nec III<sup>o</sup> anno Archadii et Honorii sed XIII<sup>o</sup> Honorii et Theodosii iunioris, nec Attico et Cesario obiit consulibus sed Honorio VII<sup>es</sup> et Theodosio secundo. Quod iterum omnia iuxta Gregorium falsum est, qui eum asserit Archadio et Honorio principibus obiisse Attico et Cesario consulibus.

<15> Et ne mireris Sulpicium istum a solis istis auctoribus uidelicet Gallo et Gregorio discrepare, cum etiam a chronica Ieronimi et ab Orosio magis autem a presenti Romana historia fere in omnibus discrepet ubi dicit: "cum exisset edictum a regibus ut ueteranorum filii ad militiam scriberentur, Martinus cum esset annorum XU sacramentis militaribus implicatus est", + cum neque hoc edictum usquam alibi legatur nisi in hoc solo Sulpicio, sed et reges qui fuerint, a quibus hoc edictum exierit ubi Martinus XU annorum fuerit, possimus inuenire. +

<16> Sic omnibus fere auctoribus clamantibus quod post mortem Constantis iunioris fratris Constantii quem pater Constantinus in tricennalibus suis inperare cum fratribus constituit et tyrannis quibusdam qui tyrannidem commouerant deletis, sic tandem cum presenti Romana historia predicti auctores clamant.<sup>4</sup>

1 cf. supra.

2 est Sulpicius: Sulpicium est Cod.

3 unus: aut "imus" legendum?

4 HR 11,17-18.

<17> Solus itaque eo tempore Romano imperio Constantius prefuit princeps et augustus quousque Iulianum ordinasset Cesarem. Ergo si solus, ubi tunc, queso, sunt illi reges de quibus hoc edictum exiit, cum non fuerint plures nisi solus Constantius maxime cum sub alio nullo Martinus XU annorum fuerit nisi sub eo solo alioquin non sub Iuliano XX annorum arma abdicauit, sed XXUI annorum.

<18> Quod si dicas Iulianum esse et Constantium hos reges de quibus hoc edictum exiit, illud statim repugnat ubi dicit Martinum "inter scolares alas primum sub Constantio dein sub Iuliano militasse",<sup>1</sup> quia si primus sub Constantio, ergo ante Iulianum militauit. Repugnat etiam idem Sulpicius eisdem auctoribus, ubi dicit Iulianum sine pugna barbaros apud Wangionem, quando Martinus XX annorum arma abdicauit, in deditionem recepisse, cum Ieronimus, Orosius, Beda de temporibus, maxime autem hec Romana historia, dicat eum pugnasse ubi et regem Badomarium cepit.<sup>2</sup>

<19> His itaque repugnantibus cum suo auctore Sulpicio sepositis, quomodo Gregorius cum Gallo et ceteris auctoribus concordet uideamus. Ait enim /39ub/ LXXX<sup>o</sup>I<sup>o</sup> etatis sue anno obiit Martinus XX<sup>o</sup>UI<sup>o</sup> pontificatus sui, Archadio et Honorio imperatoribus Attico et Cesareo consulibus. Sed, ut ex tripartita historia in III<sup>o</sup> capitulo X libri habemus, III annus horum imperatorum est illorum consulum et eodem obisse Martinum <constat>.<sup>3</sup>

<20> Unde sursum computabis a III<sup>o</sup> anno Archadii et Honorii usque ad XI annum Constantini et inuenies LXXXI annum et ibi determinabis natiuitatem Martini et sic habes eum UIII<sup>o</sup> anno Valentiniani episcopatum conscendisse, quia a III<sup>o</sup> anno Archadii et Honorii usque ad UIII annum Valentiniani sunt XXUI anni.

<21> Item ab UIII<sup>o</sup> anno Valentiniani usque ad XI annum Constantini sunt plane LU anni et sic per omnia concordat Gregorius Gallo, dum non negat per suam computationem quin Martinus bene sub Valentiniano episcopatum conscenderit; igitur XI anno Constantini secundum hanc computationem Gregorii natus est Martinus. Quod et Regeno Prumiensis affirmat.<sup>4</sup>

<22> Nunc ergo uideamus si contemporalis Maximini secundum Gregorium fuerit. Quod plane per omnia constat. Nam Maximinus UI<sup>o</sup> anno Constantii Eufuran Coloniensem gradu mouit, et Seuerinus qui

1 Sulpicius 2,2, citatus supra.

2 HR 11,27: "...potentissimum eorum regem Badomarium cepit."

3 Cf. supra.

4 Re uera nihil de Martini ortu Regino narrat; cf. supra.

uoces in celo psallentes in transitu Martini audiuit ei substituit. propter quod et Ieronimus in chronica eundem annum diligenter annotauit, ubi et Martinus XXUI annorum fuit, quia ab XI<sup>o</sup> anno Constantini usque ad UI Constantii sunt XXUI anni; qui tamen annus est III pontificatus Maximini et UI<sup>o</sup> anno episcopatus Athanasium hospicio recepit, ut Ieronimus perhibet, et secum detinuit, quousque iterum ad Constantis litteras regressus est Alexandriam, sicque Maximinus UIII anno pontificatus sui Romam ire perrexit ubi et opinatissimum Martinum XXX<sup>a</sup> iam annorum conuenit.

<23> Quod si dicis uitam Martini hoc non habere, quod cum Maximino Romam ierit, nos dicimus ipsis auctoribus uite Martini attestantibus, quod omnia de eo non dixerint, sed etiam aliis dicenda dimiserint, et quia hoc iter et miracula que ibi gesta sunt magis ad Maximinum spectant quam ad Martinum; propterea uita Maximini hoc dicere debuit, non uita Martini.

<24> Attamen contemporaneitatem istam multis modis approbamus, sicut est per Seuerinum Coloniensem: si enim UI<sup>o</sup> anno Constantii Maximinus Eufrate Seuerinum substituit et hic in transitu Martini uoces psallentes audiuit et, ut uita sua perhibet, LUI annis in episcopatu uixit, constat eum magis concordare cum Gregorio quam Sulpicio quia a UI<sup>o</sup> anno Constantii usque ad III Archadii et Honorii sunt LIII anni et ita habebis Martinum biennio ante Seuerinum obiisse; si uero Sulpicium inspicias, tunc profecto Seuerinus ante Martinum obiit. Quod plane falsum est.

<25> Similiter et de Ambrosio hoc idem dicimus, quia iuxta Gregorium Martinus ante Ambrosium obiit,<sup>1</sup> unde et uisionem in altari in transitu eius uidit. Secundum uero Sulpicium Ambrosius, qui UIII<sup>o</sup> anno Archadii et Honorii, ut uita eius perhibet, obiit, ante Martinum transiit. Quod omnino iterum falsum est. Iuxta Gregorium enim Martinus III<sup>o</sup> anno Archadii et Honorii Attico et Cesario consulibus obiit, quod et tripartita historia in III<sup>o</sup> capitulo X libri euidenter asserit. Secundum uero Sulpicium XIII<sup>o</sup> anno Honorii et Theodosii iunioris transiit, ipso Honorio UI<sup>es</sup> consul et Thedosio bis; quod XI<sup>o</sup> anno Constantini fuerit natus Martinus, adiuuat Gregorio Regeno. Quod uero III<sup>o</sup> Archadii et Honorii anno consulatu Attici et Cesarii obierit, testatur tripartita historia, cum in his omnibus nullus assistat Sulpicio sed magis omnes repugnent ei.

<26> Confirmat etiam hanc contemporaneitatem uita beatissimi Mansueti primi Tullensis episcopi, ubi apertissime dicitur: "cum Maximinus Treuerensis et Martinus Turonensis simul Roma redirent, per Tullum

---

1 Cf. Gregorii uerba in cap. I,5: "Eo namque tempore beatus Ambrosius [...] Mediolanensis ciuitate praeerat episcopus."

transierunt. et ecce dum orationis gratia basilicam beati Mansueti intrassent subito cum stupore omnium audita est uox cuiusdam defuncte de tumulo dicens "o serui dei excelsi!" et cetera, que legentibus euidentissime patent quo modo ipsa defuncta statim ab infernalibus penis liberata est.<sup>1</sup> Quod miraculum Maximino magis quam Martino attribuitur.

## B

<1> Ieronimus in chronica: colliguntur omnes anni a XU Tiberii anno, hoc est a predicatione domini usque ad XIII annum Ualentis CCCLI,<sup>2</sup> quibus si addas illos XXX, hoc est a XL<sup>o</sup>II<sup>o</sup> Cesaris Augusti qui est annus natiuitatis domini usque ad XU annum Tiberii qui est primus annus predicationis Domini, erunt anni CCCLXXXI ab incarnatione domini usque ad XIII annum Ualentis quo interiit.

<2> Sed retrorsum computatis annis a XIII<sup>o</sup> anno Ualentis usque ad XXIII annum Constantini patris Augusti, qui est annus aduentus beati Agricii, remanent plane anni CCCXXXIII. Ergo CCC<sup>o</sup>XXX<sup>o</sup>III<sup>o</sup> anno incarnationis domini Agricius ab Helena missus est Treueris presul effectus et usque ad secundum annum Constantii filii Constantini perdurauit;<sup>3</sup> cui Maximinus successit anno dominice incarnationis CCCXL<sup>o</sup>II<sup>o</sup>, sicque anno pontificatus sui III<sup>o</sup>, imperii uero Constantii UI<sup>o</sup>, dominice autem incarnationis CCCXLUI<sup>o</sup> generalem sinodum Agripine Colonie in depositionem Euftrate Arriani III<sup>o</sup> idus Maias indictione IIIa post consulatum Amanti et Albinus sub Iulio papa celebravit; propter quod et Ieronimus eundem annum diligentissime in chronica quasi in persona Maximini annotauit, dum Maximinum hoc anno clariorem reddidit, et eundem annum memorabilem ob memoriam Maximini indidit.<sup>4</sup>

1 Haec non inveniuntur verbatim in Adonis Dervensis Vita Mansueti, sed eodem tenore narrantur in lib. I, cap. XIV (PL 137:632B-C = AA.SS. September, Tom. I:644D-E (Parisius & Romae 1868)).

2 250,1-5: "Colliguntur omnes anni usque in consulatum Valentis VI et Valentiniani iunioris iterum Augusti. A XV Tiberii anno et praedicatione Domini nostri Iesus Christi anni CCCLI."

3 Cf. Browerus & Masenius (1670) I: 216: "Quia Helenae augustae, a qua missum consentiunt omnes, brevis inde vita superfuit. Quare mediam hic viam insistere, securius; quam a maioribus tritam munitamque testatur S. Maximini coenobita ad oram marginis manuscriptae tripartitae; Agricius Treverim venisse dicens, anno Constantini XXIII ac inter Materni occasum et ortum Agricii, duo ferme interfluxisse saecula."

4 236,1-4: "Maximinus Treverorum episcopus clarus habetur. A quo Athanasius Alexandriae episcopus, cum a Constantio quaereretur ad poenam, honorifice susceptus est."

<3> Itaque absque ulla contradictione computabis inter Maternum et Agricium plenariter CC annos quod et probabilibus argumentis approbamus. Si enim LIII<sup>o</sup> dominice incarnationis anno beatus Eucharis pontificatum Treuerice urbis accepit et XXIII annis rexit, et Ualerius in XU successit, sicque Maternus in XL determinauit. Constat profecto eundem Maternum anno domini C<sup>o</sup>XXX<sup>o</sup>II<sup>o</sup> obiisse, hoc est X<sup>o</sup>III<sup>o</sup> anno inperii Adriani et II<sup>o</sup> papatus Telesphori,<sup>1</sup> et sic absque ulla contradictione computabis CC annos inter Maternum et Agricium, quia LIII et XXIII, deinde XU, tunc XL faciunt CXXX<sup>o</sup>II<sup>o</sup>, non CXXVIII ut Treuerica historia habet,<sup>2</sup> et in hoc arguitur mendacio.

<4> Ecce habes deprehensam Treuericam historiam; adhuc nota eius secundum mendacium. Dicit enim, "anno domini CCC<sup>o</sup>LXU<sup>o</sup>III<sup>o</sup> Agricius presul efficitur",<sup>3</sup> quod apertum mendacium est, quia ut superius ex Ieronimo monstrauius, cum a natiuitate domini usque ad XIII<sup>o</sup> annum Ualentis, quo interiit, sint anni CCCLXXXI. sed retrorsum computatis ab eodem XIII<sup>o</sup> anno Ualentis usque ad XXIII<sup>o</sup> annum Constantini qui est annus aduentus beati Agricii, remanent plane anni CCCXXXIII non CCCLXVIII. Et ita comprobabis eam bis per omnia mentitam, unde ex \his/ duobus mendaciis plura potes ex eadem Treuerica historia ad plenum colligere.

<5> Quoniam CC annos inter Maternum et Agricium fuisse ex chronica Ieronimi comprobauimus, restat ut uideamus si ciuitas ista, ut quidam uolunt, maxime Treuerica historia,<sup>4</sup> his CC annis in paganismum redierit, an in christianitate perdurauerit.

<6> Quod nobis omnino non uidetur - uidelicet eam in paganismum redisse; cum enim constet usque ad passionem Tirsi et Palmacii et totius Treuerici populi que facta est a Rictiouaro sub Diocletiano et Maximiano anno domini CCC<sup>o</sup>UI<sup>o</sup>, hoc est XVIII<sup>o</sup> anno inperii Diocletiani, quando in Martio mense in diebus pasce ecclesie per totum orbem Romanum iussu Maximiani et Diocletiani subuerse sunt I<sup>o</sup> anno persecutionis, quia ut Ieronimus in Chronica testatur II<sup>o</sup> anno persecutionis Diocletianus in

1 199,21-24: "[XII] Imperator Hadrianus pater patriae appellatur et uxor eius Augusta. Romanae ecclesiae episcopatum suscipit VII Telesphorus ann. XI."

2 cf. Gesta 148,1-2 (§ 16): "igitur sanctus Maternus apud Coloniam obiit senex anno dominicae incarnationis 128."

3 Gesta 152,22-25 (§ 19): "Anno Dominicae incarnationis 368 sanctus Agricius Trebirorum praesul efficitur."

4 Gesta § 16 (149,15-18): "Postquam denique inseparabilis tres euangelii sui operarios per petim remunerandos, scilicet Eucharium Valerium et Maternum, vocavit ad superos, Treberi rectae fidei credulitatem amiserunt et ad pristinum paganismi vomitum ex maxima parte redierunt."

Nicomedia, Maximianus Mediolani purpuram deposuerunt<sup>1</sup> - cum, inquam, usque hoc tempus tota ciuitas a tempore beati Eucharri christiana extiterit et episcopi Methodio teste Paretensi<sup>2</sup> ecclesie episcopo et martire per totum tempus inter Maternum et Agricium non defuerint, ita ut XXUI episcopi enu<me>rentur, absurdum uidetur ut in tam paruo tempore, sicut est a passione predictorum martirum usque ad aduentum beati Agricii, tota hec ciuitas in paganismum redierit.

<7> Cum, inquam, non plus quam XXIII anni extiterint, quia a primo persecutionis anno usque ad XXIII annum inperii Constantini fuere non plus quam XXUI anni, quoniam IIII<sup>o</sup> persecutionis anno regnare orsus est. Ergo XXIII anni sunt inter passionem Tirsi et Palmatii et aduentum beati Agricii.

<8> Quod si dicas his diebus ciuitatem in paganismum redisse et exinde Tetradium usque ad tempora Martini paganum perdurasse, nobis omnino stare \non/ uidetur. Quo modo homo tanti nominis ut Tetradius in tam preclara et regia ciuitate paganus durare tot tempora potuisset, maxime tot sanctis sacerdotibus hic uigentibus, ut Agricius, Maximinus et Paulinus? Quo modo homo paganus contemporalis Maximini esset in una eademque ciuitate, cum constet eum tot ac tantis miraculis claruisse? Qua fronte Eufratam Agripinensem uir deo plenus gradu mouit utpote hereticum, et non in ciuitate sua conuertit<sup>3</sup> paganum? Quo modo in ulteriorem Frigiam Paulinus pro Christo exulauit et ibi usque ad sanguinem pagani predicauit, dum hic in sua diocesi paganos reliquit? Inconueniens plane fuit.

<9> Sed quia Tetradius a Martino baptizatus est dicimus eius baptismum usque illuc sicut mos illius temporis erat distulisse quod et Augustinum et Ambrosium et ipsum Martinum inuenimus fecisse. Nec tamen totam ciuitatem paganam \ideo/ extitisse.

<10> Quod si dicis Tetradium omnino gentilem fuisse, nec ideo Martinum in eius domum descendisse, dicimus eum hoc ideo egisse, quia uiderit eum non obstinata mente paganum, sed sibi reseruatum esse, quia si idem obstinata mente incredulus fuisset nequaquam pro filia ad Martinum accessisset, sed potius ad idola sua declinasset.

---

1 228,6-14: "XVIII. Diocletiani anno mense Martio in diebus paschae ecclesiae subuersae sunt. Quarto autem persucutionis anno Constantinus regnare orsus. Secundo anno persecutionis Diocletianus Nicomediae, Maximianus Mediolanii purpuram deposuerunt."

2 Hunc auctorem inuenire non potui.

3 conuertit Waitz: conuertt.. Cod.

## C

<1> <<His>> UIII annis dicitur Agricius <<Anti>>ochie prefuisse, hoc est inter <<Eusta>>chium et Eufonium. Quamquam <<quidam>> affirmant eum ante Eusta<<chium>> presedis, hoc est inter Philo<<goni>>um et Eustachium; qui Philo<<ni>>us t>>emporibus Licinii obiit. Et hic <<Eust>>achius in Niceno concilio ei suc<<cessit>>. Fuerunt ergo inter Philogonium <<et Eu>>stachium item fere UIII anni, <<quibus dicit>>ur Agricius presedis. Sed utrum ante <<Eusta>>chium an post eum pontificauerit <<iudic>>io legentium relinquimus. Tum <<tant>>um constet eum ibi patriarcham extitisse.<sup>1</sup>

<2> Contra eos qui menciuntur Agricium Antioenum patriarcham non extisse. Quoniam sunt nonnulli qui Agricium Antioenum patriarcham negant fuisse, quia neque Ieronimus neque Romana aut tripartita historia seu aliquis scriptorum eum in catalogo Antioenorum episcoporum inserit, maxime cum Ieronimus in chronica omnes Antioenos episcopos a tempore Petri qui primus Antioenam fundauit ecclesiam usque ad tempora sua ita per ordinem nominatim digessit, ut qui sub quibus principibus claruerint apertissime docuerit, nusquam de Agricio mentionem faciat; cum et discreta nomina ipsorum episcoporum et certa principum sub quibus uixerunt tempora describens, nullam de hoc Agricio faciat questionem; accedit etiam ad hoc quod ille Paretensis ecclesie episcopus et martyr Methodius cum et ipse describeret magnificos presules illarum ecclesiarum que ab ipsis apostolis fundate sunt, uidelicet Romanorum, Ierosolimitanorum, Antioenorum, Alexandrinorum, descripsit etiam Treuirorum. Qui ueniens ad tempora Constantini sic ait: his diebus Romane prefuit ecclesie Silvester, Ierosolime Macharius, Antioche Eustachius, Treueris Agricius.

<3> Igitur quia in hoc concordant auctores, Ieronimus uidelicet et ille Paretensis Methodius nec non et tripartita historia, postremo et omnes illi qui de Antioenis episcopis aliquid scripserunt, quod Agricius iste nec in numero nec in catalogo eorum inuenitur, sufficiat nobis quod solum Treuerensis episcopus dicitur; ne si incipiamus affirmare Antioenum eum patriarcham fuisse uideamur Ieronimo et ceteris auctoribus contra ire. Sic nobis opponere solent qui eum Antioenum patriarcham negant.

1 Cf. Browerus & Masenius (1670) I: 216: "Alius paulo vetustior in M.S. tripartita historia bibliothecae Sanmaximinianae, ubi, Eustathio calumniis et fraude inimicorum Nicaenae fidei deturbato, octenii notatur sedis Antiochenae vacatio. His octo, inquit, annis, hoc est, inter Eustathium et Euphronium, dicitur Agricius Antiochia praefuisse."



<4> Ad quod dicimus quod et eis sufficiat e conuerso, quia eundem Agricius, nec Ieronimo inferior nec tripartite historie minor Siluester apostolicus non solum eum Antioenum episcopum sed et patriarcham denominat in priuilegio nostre urbi per eum transmissio.<sup>1</sup>

<5> Nisi forte dicas et Siluestrum mentitum et eius priuilegium falsum. Quod si falsum est, falsum est et Mathiam et tunicam domini cum clauo et cultello et ceteris sanctorum reliquiis eum transtulisse. Nonne igitur uides ad quantum inconueniens deduceres? aut ergo Agricius Antiochie patriarcha extitit, aut certe secundum te Siluester de eo falsum protulit. Sed quis, queso, es, qui etiam sanctos de falsitate arguas? igitur quia absurdum est credi beatum Siluestrum falsum dixisse, ita profecto constat Agricius absque dubio Antioenum patriarcham extitisse.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY (sources and secondary works)

- Armara Treuirense. Beiträge zur trierer Bibliotheksgeschichte. (Bibliotheca Treuirense 1). Ed. G. Franz. Wiesbaden 1985.
- Becker, G., *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui*. Bonn 1885.
- Beda, *De temporibus* (PL 90: 277-292)
- Beda, *Chronica* (MGH, AA XIII (Chronica minora III)), ed. Th. Mommsen, pp.223-333.
- Brower, P.Ch. & Masenius, P.J., *Antiquitatum et annalium Treuirenseum libri XXV*, II tom. Leodii 1670.
- Catalogue of additions to the manuscripts in the British Museum in the years 1854-1860. Addit. 19,720-24,026. London 1875.
- Gesta Treuerorum, see Waitz.
- Goetz, H.-W., 'Die "Geschichte" im Wissenschaftssystem des Mittelalters', Chapter XII in: F.-J. Schmale, *Funktion und Formen Mittelalterlicher Geschichtsschreibung. Eine Einführung*. Darmstadt 1985.
- Gregory of Tours, *De virtutibus sancti Martini episcopi*. Ed. B. Krusch, MGH SRM I:584-661.
- Hieronymus, *Chronicon*. Ed. R. Helm, *Eusebius Werke 7* (Die Griechischen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte), Berlin 1956.

1 Hoc privilegium in Gestis § 18 sic citatum est (152,7-21): "Magna ergo doctoris inquisitione habita, omnium fidelium consilio sanctus Agricius Antiochenae praesul civitatis evocatur, et ad Treberim cum preciosissimis reliquiis, quas inferius nominabimus, a papa et regina destinatur, cum privilegio quod isdem papa Silvester ad honorem treberensis ecclesiae hoc modo noscitur scripsisse: "Sicut in gentilitate propria virtute, sortire et nunc Trebir primas super Gallos et Germanos prioratum, quem tibi prae omnibus harum gentium episcopis in primitivis christianae religionis doctoribus, scilicet Eucharion Valerio et Materno, ac per baculum caput ecclesiae Petrus signavit habendum, suam quodammodo minuens dignitatem, ut te participem faceret. Quem ego Silvester eius servus successionem indignus per patriarcham Antiochenum Agricius renovans, confirmo ad honorem patriae dominae Helenae Augustae, metropolis eiusdem indigenae, quam ipsa felix per apostolum Matthiam Iudea translata cum tunica et clavo Domini et dente sancti Petri et scandalis sanctae Andreae apostoli, et capite Cornelii papae ceterisque reliquiis magnifice ditavit specialiterque provexit. Huius privilegii conscii nocivi aemuli communionem dirimantur, quoniam anathemate maculantur."

- Hontheim, J.N., *Historia Treverensis diplomatica et pragmatica*. 3 tom. Augustae Vindelicorum & Herbipoli 1750.
- Jacob, W., *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der sogenannten Historia tripartita des Epiphanius-Cassiodor. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur* 59 (V. Reihe, 4), ed. R. Hanslik. Berlin 1954.
- Jacobs, E., 'Die handschriftensammlung Joseph Görres'. Ihre Entstehung und ihr Verbleib', *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 23 (1906) 189-204.
- Keuffer, M., 'Bücherei und Bücherwesen von St. Maximin im Mittelalter', *Jahresbericht der Gesellschaft für nützliche Forschungen zu Trier von 1894 bis 1899* (48-94). Trier 1899.
- Kraus, F.X., 'Die Bibliothek von St. Maximin bei Trier im XI./XII. Jahrhundert', *Intelligenz-Blatt zum Serapeum*, Jg.30, no.15 (1869) 113-116.
- Kuhn, H.W., 'Anmerkungen zu Auflösung der Stifts- und Klosterbibliotheken in und um Trier. Zum Beispiel die Abtei St. Maximin', 115-126 in: *Armara Treverensia*.
- Landolfus Sagax, *Historia Romana*, ed. A. Crivellucci. Istituto storico italiano, fonti per la storia d'Italia. Roma 1912-13.
- Laufner, R., 'Vom Bereich der trierer Klosterbibliothek St. Maximin im Hochmittelalter', 15-43 in: *Armara Treverensia*.
- Lupus of Ferrières, *Vita Maximini episcopi Treverensis*. Ed. B. Krusch MGH RMS III:71-82 (1896).
- Olsen, B.M., *L'Étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Vol. I, II, III, Paris 1982, 1985, 1987.
- Orosius, *Historiae adversum paganos*. Ed. W. Zangemeister, CSEL 5, Wien 1882.
- Regino of Prüm, *Chronicon*. Ed. Pertz MGH SS I:537-612 (1826).
- Sauerland, H.V., *Trierer Geschichtsquellen des XI. Jahrhunderts* Trier 1889.
- Smalley, B., 'Sallust in the Middle Ages', 165-175 in: *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D.* Ed. R.D. Bolgar. Cambridge 1969.
- Sulpicius Severus, *Vita sancti Martini*. Ed. C. Halm, CSEL 1, Wien 1886, pp.107-137.
- Thomas, H., *Studien zur trierer Geschichtsschreibung des 11. Jahrhunderts, insbesondere zu den Gesta Treverorum*. *Rheinisches Archiv* 68. Bonn 1968.
- Vita et translatio S. Severini*, ed. in *Acta Sanctorum*, October, vol. 10 (23. Oct.) pp.56-64. Paris & Rom 1869.
- Waitz, G., *Gesta Treverorum*, ed. G. Waitz, MGH SS 8, pp.111-200. Hannover 1848.
- Winheller, E., *Die Lebensbeschreibungen der vorkarolingischen Bischöfe von Trier (Rheinisches Archiv 27)*. Bonn 1935.