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Preface

Aims and scope of the thesis

The purpose of this thesis is to contribute to a better understanding of the literary phenomenon of Byzantine compilation literature and, in particular, collections of historical excerpts, besides bringing hitherto unstudied material to the attention of scholars. A working definition of a collection of historical excerpts would be the following: a text consisting of passages extracted from a single or different historical texts of the same or different authors and put together under a principle, that is, thematically.

For a long time, such collections only received attention as sources for the works they rely on and not as works of literature in their own right. Studies of historical works produced through processes of compilation, on the other hand, have always been in dialogue with the concept of *encyclopaedism*. This concept was presented by the French philologist Paul Lemerle in his famous book on Byzantine written culture entitled *Le premier humanisme byzantin* published in 1971. More than half the book was devoted to the cultural revival of the 9th-10th centuries and the book closed with a chapter on what Lemerle called *encyclopaedism* in the 10th century.\(^1\) Lemerle introduced the concept of *encyclopaedism* to demarcate the resurgence in literary production under the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus\(^2\) and used the term *encyclopaedia* to refer to works produced under the auspices of this emperor by processes of compilation.\(^3\) According to Lemerle,

---

2. Constantine was only 8 years old when his father, the emperor Leo VI, died and a number of regents were appointed in his place. From 919-944 Constantine shared the throne with Romanus I Lecapenus, a Byzantine naval commander of Armenian descent. Constantine’s sole reign began in 945 and lasted until his death. On Constantine Porphyrogenitus see Lemerle (1971), 266-300; Toynbee (1973), esp. 1-25 and 575-605; Tartaglia (1982), 197-206; Wilson (1983), 140-145; Ševčenko (1992a), 167-195; Karpozilos (2002), 281-296; Nemeth (2010).
3. Lemerle was not the first to speak of Byzantine *encyclopaedism*. Alphonse Dain had already supported in 1953 that until, and mainly in the 9th century, the interest in the classical past was expressed through the transliteration of ancient texts into minuscule script and that the habit of selecting and re-ordering of various
the phenomenon of encyclopaedism covers the compilation of works like the Theophanes Continuatus, the De Cerimonii (Περὶ Βασιλείου τάξεως), the De Thematibus (Περὶ Θεμάτων) and the De Administrando Imperio (Πρὸς τὸν Ἱδίον νῦν Ῥωμανόν) as well as the Excerpta Constantiniana (Ἐκλογαι) and an anonymous veterinary work, the Hippiatrica (᾿Ιππιατρικὸν βιβλίον). As regards the Geoponica (Γεωπονικά), the authorship and dating of which is still debated, Lemerle argued that the function of the work was to transmit knowledge, but he simply characterises it as a sylloge, that is a collection of passages, related to the court of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

Lemerle’s concept has since dominated scholars’ approaches to the Byzantine literary culture during the Macedonian dynasty and the term encyclopaedism continues to be employed by Byzantinists. For instance, A. P. Kazhdan, C. Hannick, J. Shephard and M. McCormick also consider the 10th century the age of encyclopaedism. Lemerle’s view was challenged by Paolo Odorico, first in an article published in 1990, in which he introduced the concept of the culture of sylloge. The term characterises the phenomenon of selecting, passages of various works in the manner of sylloge appears only in the 10th century. A phenomenon, which Dain integrated in the encyclopaedism of the 10th century; Dain (1953), 64-81.

The Greek title is: Χρονογραφία συγραφείσα ἐκ προστάξεως Κωνσταντῖνου τοῦ φιλοχρίστου καὶ πορφυρογενίτου δεσπότου ἠμῶν, ὑιοῦ Λέοντος τοῦ οσφωτάτου δεσπότου καὶ ᾠδίδου ἡμῶν βασιλέως, ἀρχομένη ἐνθεν κατέληξεν ὁ κατά γένος προσήκων τῷ βασιλείᾳ μακαρίτης Θεοφάνης ὁ τῆς Σιγιρινῆς, ἤγουν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας Λέοντος τοῦ ἐξ ἀρμενίας ἠς τάς τε καθ’ ἐκατὰ ὑποθέσεις ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς Κωνσταντῖνος φιλοπόνως συνέλεξε καὶ εὐσυνόπτως ἐξέθετο, πρὸς εὐκρινὴ τοῖς μετέπειτα δηλώσαν; cf. Featherstone – Signes Codoñer (ed.) (2015). On the so-called Vita Basili, the fifth book of the Theophanes Continuatus, see Ševčenko (ed.) (2011). Book VI was probably a later addition to the original corpus of the five books of Theophanes Continuatus by Basil the Notthos; cf. Featherstone (2014), 353-372. J. Signes Codoñer and I. Ševčenko showed that the first five books were composed by a team of writers working under the supervision of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; Signes Codoñer (1989), 17-28; Ševčenko (1992), 184-187; Signes Codoñer (2017), 17-21. W. Treadgold attributed the Vita Basili to Theodore Daphnopates; Treadgold (2013), 166-180. W. Treadgold’s hypothesis had already been examined and refuted in Markopoulos (1985), 171-182.

Reiske (ed.) (1829); Vogt (ed.) (1967); Moffatt – Tall (transl.) (2012).


de Boor (ed.) (1903-1910).

The Recensio B in the textual transmission of the text appears to be related with the scriptorium of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; cf. McCabe (2007), 269-275. The title Τππατρικὸν βιβλίον is transmitted in the Suda 4739 and Suda 267, as well as in the codex Cambridge, Emmanuel College 251; cf. McCabe (2007), 1.


Lemerle (1971), 266-300.


Odorico (1990), 1-21. On Lemerle’s view see n. 1.
re-copying, synthesising and presenting older textual material.\textsuperscript{14} P. Odorico in a series of surveys on the subject, convincingly showed that encyclopaedism is an inaccurate and misleading term to expound what were in fact collections or syllogai.\textsuperscript{15} In fact, encyclopaedia is a modern term pointing to artefacts with literary functions different from Byzantine collections. Moreover, P. Odorico showed that there was nothing innovative about the collections executed on imperial commission in the 10\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{16} They excerpt older texts employing a method similar to that applied by florilegia, gnomologia, military and historical compositions that were compiled centuries earlier than the 10\textsuperscript{th} century. Nevertheless, Lemerle’s term of encyclopaedism continued to make its way into scholarship. In June 2007 a conference on Encyclopaedism before the Enlightenment was held at St Andrews, the proceedings of which were edited by Jason König and Greg Woolf in 2013 under the title Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance. The title of the volume as well as the papers presented in it showed that the term Byzantine encyclopaedism continued to be elaborated among Byzantinists and that a number of scholars was disposed to recognize the uniqueness of collections executed during the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus in terms of methods and goals.\textsuperscript{17}

In May 2009 a conference was held in Leuven on works consisting of excerpts and on the validity of Lemerle’s concept of encyclopaedism. The proceeds of the conference are collected in a volume entitled Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium?, edited by Peter Van Deun and Caroline Macé and published in 2011. Though many of the participants kept repeating the term encyclopaedism, it was during this congress that P. Odorico established his own concept of the culture of sylloge tackling Lemerle’s term.\textsuperscript{18} In the same volume, though, Paul Magdalino’s article acknowledges the distinctiveness of the 10\textsuperscript{th}-century collections. Magdalino sees the fact that these collections were designed or commissioned by emperors as a key feature that differentiates them from earlier or later collections.\textsuperscript{19} It should be noted that, in line with Magdalino, in 2010 Andreas Nemeth devoted a large part of his dissertation on the Excerpta Constantiniana to arguing that collections during

\textsuperscript{14}Odorico (1990).


\textsuperscript{16}Odorico (2013); Odorico (2014); Odorico (2017).

\textsuperscript{17}Nemeth (2013), 232-258.

\textsuperscript{18}Odorico (2011a).

\textsuperscript{19}Moreover, P. Magdalino associates the designation of the imperial collections of the 10\textsuperscript{th} century with the Triumph of Orthodoxy over Iconoclasm. The Orthodox concept of law and good order (εὐταξία) dominates collections produced under the reigns of Leo VI and Constantine Porphyrogenitus. In terms of ideology, order seemed to have denoted the return to Orthodoxy after the disastrous period of Iconoclasm and the restoration of education after its decline during the previous two ages; cf. Magdalino (2011), 143-160.
the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus were executed in an innovative manner, different from that of earlier collections.\textsuperscript{20}

In February 2012 a workshop on textual transmissions of Byzantine texts took place in Madrid. The papers delivered at the workshop were edited by Juan Signes Codoñer and Inmaculada Pérez Martín in the volume \textit{Textual transmission in Byzantium: between textual criticism and Quellenforschung}, published in 2014. This time the spotlight was set on the terminology covering all sorts of compositions. A number of papers in the volume dealt with the rewriting processes of collections of selections and compilation literature. Nevertheless, in my view, the different case studies presented in the volume reveal that practices of excerpting have wrongly been restricted to the cultural context of the 10\textsuperscript{th} century: the practice of gathering and excerpting starts much earlier than the 10\textsuperscript{th} century.

Recently, scholars have tended to take collections of historical excerpts seriously as a literary phenomenon and study them as autonomous pieces of literature.\textsuperscript{21} One collection of excerpts, the so-called \textit{Excerpta Constantiniana}, has received much attention in particular:\textsuperscript{22} the manuscript transmission of the \textit{EC} was rigorously studied by J. Irigoin and K. Schreiner,\textsuperscript{23} the numbers and names of the Constantinian collections have been treated by P. Lemerle, K. Schreiner, B. Flusin and A. Nemeth,\textsuperscript{24} and the methodological and structural principles of the \textit{EC} have been investigated by U. Roberto, A. Nemeth and D. Rafiyenko.\textsuperscript{25} But whereas the \textit{EC} have thus received quite some scholarly attention, other excerpt collections are still awaiting detailed study. In this thesis, I therefore focus on a series of minor collections that have received little or no attention at all, namely the so-called \textit{Epitome} of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century, the \textit{Excerpta Anonymi} (10\textsuperscript{th} c.), the \textit{Excerpta Salmasiana} (8\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} c.) and the \textit{Excerpta Planudea} (13\textsuperscript{th} c.). I treat these collections of excerpts in their entirety, that is, as \textit{cultural forms in their own right}\textsuperscript{26} and as original attempts to transmit history. More particularly, I embark on a close analysis of three aspects of the aforementioned texts: a) their method of redaction, b) their literary structure, and c) their cultural and political function.

\textbf{a. Working method:} This thesis aims at specifying the working method applied in the excerpt collections and argues in favour of viewing these texts as the product of the

\textsuperscript{20}Nemeth (2010).

\textsuperscript{21}In addition to the papers presented at the conferences mentioned above, see also the dissertation by A. Nemeth (2010) and the special issue of \textit{Byzantinoslavica} 75 (2017) edited by P. Odorico.

\textsuperscript{22}The extant parts of the \textit{EC} were published in de Boor (1903), de Boor (1905), Büttner-Wobst (1906), Bosissevaivin (1906) and Roos (1910).


\textsuperscript{25}Roberto (2009), 71-84; Nemeth (2010), 179-245; Rafiyenko (2017).

\textsuperscript{26}The expression is borrowed from P. Van Nuffelen (2015), 15.
A culture of sylloge, an approach to older texts that was common in the time when the collections studied in this thesis were made. I shall study not only the kind of sources used, but also how excerptors integrated the excerpts from older collections into their own work so as to form entirely new texts pursuing their own aims within their own context. In particular, a) I identify three steps in the process of redacting a sylloge of historical excerpts: reading, selection, and composition, and b) I show that the texts examined in the thesis share compositional principles: their compilers retained the language and style of the original text, respected the original sequence of excerpts and aimed at brevity and accuracy. The Epitome, the Excerpta Anonymi, the Excerpta Salmasiana and the Excerpta Planudea are syllogai just like those produced in Byzantium from Late Antiquity onwards. They are rooted in a common approach as regards the transmission of knowledge to succeeding ages by embedding the classical texts into the new social, political or theological context.

b. Literary structure: In a second step, I start out from linguistic data to study how the excerpted texts are transformed in the process of excerpting: changes in vocabulary, grammatical structures and overall organisation provide the basis for understanding how the original text was adapted to a new audience. I treat the collections not as mere witnesses to the texts they excerpt, but as literary creations in their own right. By studying the overall message and structure of these new literary works, I identify possible authors and their target readers. In addition, this thesis seeks to consider how the pervasive use of excerpt collections impacted on the writing of history: I argue for a modified understanding of the history of Byzantine historiography by highlighting that excerpt collections reflected a common way of dealing with historical texts of the past.

c. Cultural and political function: A further goal of this thesis is to explore the political dimension of the works produced through processes of compilation. That is, I focus on how the past was re-ordered and reconstructed in collections of historical excerpts. We shall see that omissions and alterations in the course of the redaction of the excerpt collections point to political attitudes and the perception of the world current in the period they were compiled. Their compilers appear to serve the dominant imperial policy of the time. Therefore, placing each collection within its political and cultural framework will allow us to get a better insight into the changes selected pieces of texts underwent before their inclusion into the collection. The thesis attempts to show that political circumstances and cultural contexts had a strong bearing on the authors’ system of selection.

To achieve the aforementioned goals, I build on a close analysis of the reciprocal relationship between methods of transmission and contexts. Combining codicological, literary and political analyses, my thesis endeavours to contribute to a better understanding of the intertwining of knowledge and power. Some of the collections have not been edited before, and for those that have been edited, recourse to the manuscripts is necessary. Such a codicological study is meant to provide further building blocks for
future editions. I provide partial editions of unedited texts. All uncredited translations are my own.

**Structure of the thesis**

Chapter 1 serves to introduce the reader to the concept of *culture of sylloge*. The term refers to a specific technique or method applied by Byzantine writers in a variety of disciplinary fields. The chapter explores the origins of the *culture of sylloge* and surveys the types of texts in which the *culture of sylloge* is practiced. The last part of the chapter elucidates the three steps of redaction of an excerpt collection.

Chapter 2 embarks upon a close analysis of the date, content and structure of the 10th-century *Excerpta Anonymi*. The study of the historical excerpts in the *sylloge* sheds new light on the methodological principles of the *Excerpta Anonymi*: it shows that the *Excerpta Anonymi* employed a method similar to the one applied in the *EC*. Similarities in content and method between the two works suggest that the compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* possibly had access to material gathered in the first place for the *EC*. Furthermore, chapter 2 focuses on the historical and political context of the *Excerpta Anonymi*: omissions and alterations on the part of the compiler of the *sylloge* point to the concept of *limited ecumenism*, the foreign policy that characterised the Macedonian dynasty.

Chapter 3 looks at the so-called *Excerpta Salmasiana*. The historical excerpts transmitted in this text are often discussed in studies on the original text from which they were taken, and which is usually attributed to John of Antioch. Chapter 3 argues that the *Excerpta Salmasiana* comprise three distinct *syllogai* of excerpts and aims at identifying possible collections of excerpts behind the compilation of the *sylloge*. The study of the working method applied to the various parts of the *Excerpta Salmasiana* reveals the three steps of redacting an excerpt collection as seen already in the *EC* and the *Excerpta Anonymi*. Furthermore, the study of the material selection from Agathias’ text permits us to understand how the compiler of the *sylloge* imbued it with a new meaning. The passages reflect on a period in which the Empire had territorially shrunk and its civilizing influence had been restricted.

Chapter 4 is devoted to the so-called *Epitome of the 7th Century*. The text is an anonymous collection of historical excerpts transmitted in four manuscripts dated from the 10th to the 14th centuries. The *sylloge* was originally compiled in the 7th century, though. Chapter 4 aims to challenge the traditional view that the *Epitome* is a summary of a collection

---

2752 excerpts from Agathias’ *Historiae* preserved in the codex Vaticanus gr. 142 and 113 excerpts from Eusebius’ *HE* transmitted in three of the total four manuscripts of the so-called *Epitome* are edited in the appendix of the thesis for the first time.
consisting of the complete texts of a number of ecclesiastical histories. The study of the content and structure of the *Epitome* shows that the initial heading of the work, as preserved in the manuscript tradition, must be the original title of the work. Accordingly, what is conventionally called *Epitome* is a collection of historical excerpts taken from a variety of sources. The selection of excerpts from Eusebius’ *EH* in the *Epitome* is edited for the first time in the appendix of this thesis.

Chapter 5 is concerned with the Συναγωγή, a collection of excerpts compiled by Maximus Planudes at the end of the 13th century. The focus of the chapter lies in a series of excerpts on Roman history transmitted as part of the Συναγωγή. The section on Roman history in the Συναγωγή contains excerpts from John of Antioch, Paenius, Xiphilinus and a lost chronicle, traces of which can be encountered in Manasses and other Byzantine texts from the middle Byzantine period. The study of the excerpts reveals that this part of the Συναγωγή derives from an earlier collection of historical excerpts compiled by Maximus Planudes himself. Chapter 5 examines the arrangement of excerpts in the Συναγωγή as well as the strategies by which Planudes redacted his *sylloge*. It shall become manifest that Planudes was aware of the issue of flawed contextualization caused by the excerpting method and that he resorted to the same strategies as earlier compilers of excerpt collections. Planudes’ rhetorical training becomes evident in the selective use of excerpts from his sources as well as in the political use of his collection: Planudes aimed to counsel the emperor Andronicus II to pursue a military offensive policy towards the enemies of the Empire in the East and the Balkans.

The concluding chapter reflects on the implications of reading collections of historical excerpts as proper works of history. In particular, this chapter intends to show that collections of historical excerpts share a series of literary features which identify them as a specific group within historiography. Specifically, a) collections of historical excerpts exhibit linguistic and stylistic homogeneity. They tend to simplify their source text, b) compilers of excerpts collections often drew on earlier *syllogai*. Textual borrowings among historical collections link them as a distinct genre and suggest that the compilers were aware of the fact that they belonged to a common tradition of historical writing, and c) collections of historical excerpts represented history according to themes. The analysis of the format and function of all four excerpt collections points out that the selective use of passages and their thematic arrangement were shaped by cultural concerns, contemporary ideology as well as personal intentions. The result to be drawn is that collections of historical excerpts merit to be seen as a third way, along with histories and universal chronicles, of writing history, for they were intended to serve the role of history, that is, to preserve memory, supply posterity with moral examples and shape political and cultural thinking.
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Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum, b1
(ed. Denis 1970)
Chapter 1
Introduction

This thesis endeavours to show that along with the two traditional historical genres, e.g., history and chronicle, collections of historical excerpts constitute an other approach to history in Byzantium. Considering collections of historical excerpts as discrete works of history throughout the Byzantine millennium, I shall first reflect on the technical terms by which Byzantines used to refer to these texts. I also present contemporary definitions of terms used in this thesis, and, in some cases, give my own definition. After discussing Byzantine and modern terminology, I shall consider the origins of the so-called culture of sylloge and show how collections of historical excerpts relate to it. This will enable us to set historical excerpt-collections within the historiographical tradition. In the last part of this chapter, I shall examine the methodological principles underlying the compilation of a Byzantine collection of historical excerpts.

1.1 Terminology

1.1.1 Byzantine terminology

Byzantine writers refer to historiographical writing in a variety of ways, without making strict distinctions between different historiographical genres. Indeed, terms such as historia, syngraphe, chronikon, chronographia, ekthesis, diegesis, biblos were often used indistinctively by Byzantine writers. At times, these general terms were often accompanied by other terms, such as syntomos, epitome, synopsis, paradosis to indicate a process of summarising (ἐπιτομή, σύνοψις, παράδοσις).\(^1\) Summarising, then, was recognized as a distinct manner of rewriting a text, and a number of historical works were written in

this manner. The Σύνοψις Ἱστοριῶν by Skylitzes, the Ἐπιτομὴ Ἱστοριῶν by Zonaras and the Σύνοψις Χρονική by Manasses are prime examples of earlier texts shortened and represented in a new form. The titles transmitted along with those texts are indicative enough of the technique applied by their authors. Yet, summarising is undeniably involved in another category of rewriting, as well; namely, the aggregation of different excerpts into a single, new text. As will be shown below (section 1.2.2), such a new text could be a chronicle (e.g. the χρονικὸν σύντομον ἐκ διαφόρων χρονογραφῶν by George the Monk, Theophanes’ chronicle), a collection of selected excerpts (ἐκλογή, συλλογή, συναγωγή) or an anthology (ἀνθολόγιον, ἀνθολογία).

I would like to draw attention to a prefatory remark to the chronicle of George the Monk. In the prologue to his work, George sets out his working method:

ἐκ πολλῶν ὀλίγων συντείνοντα ποιῶς μετὰ πόνου συλλέξαντες καὶ συνθέντες (...), ἀναγκαία δὲ πάνυ καὶ γροσίμα λιαν οἵμαι δι’ ἐπιτομῆς καὶ σαφηνείας ἐναργεστάτης ύψηνομένον ὅτι μάλιστα. κρείσσον γάρ μετὰ ἀληθείας ψελλίζειν ἢ μετὰ ψεύδους πλατωνίζειν. οὐχ ὅταν γάρ ὁ λόγος ρεῖ καὶ ἔξω τῶν ὀρών φέρεται διαφορατός ἄστιν, ἀλλ’ ὅταν βραχὺς μὲν ἢ τῷ μῆκε, πολύς δὲ τοῖς ἐνθυμήμαι καὶ ἐν τῷ συντόμῳ τὸ ἀπαράλειπτον καὶ ἀτρεκές ἔχων τῶν ἀναγκαίων (...).

George the Monk collected, selected, abridged and represented a number of passages in a new whole. The terms ἐπιτομὴ and ἐν τῷ συντόμῳ are used by George to identify the extent to which he intervened in the original texts, after their selection and before their arrangement in the chronicle. As we shall see in section 1.2.2, his working method is similar to that applied to other works belonging to the culture of sylloge. Yet amongst these works, there are big differences. If we look at, say, the Bibliotheca of Photius and the EC, we find a very different literary format of a collection of passages: whereas Photius provides summaries of the ancient works he had read, the excerptors working on the EC under the auspices of Constantine Porphyrogenitus preserve the original wording of the texts. The intended audience and the literary structure adopted by the author were the key factors determining such a choice.

As regards the extent to which the excerptors used to intervene in the original text, the prooemium to the EC provides us with important information:

---

2 Signes Codoñer (2016), esp. 69-72.
5 George the Monk, Chronicon 2,4-13.
The statement implies that Constantine Porphyrogenitus made a choice between two existing manners of creating excerpt collections: not summarising (συνάψεως) but appropriating (οἰκείωσις).

P. Odorico pointed out that compilers of these type of texts often inserted statements in the prefaces to their works that outline their working method. He drew attention to the fact that the vocabulary in the prefaces is quite frequently identical; terms such as ἐκλογή, συλλέγω, συλλογή, συλλέξασθαι, συνάξω, συναγωγή, συντίθημι, are all used to denote the technique by which collections of passages were compiled. It should also be noted that, in the Byzantine period, the term ἐκλογή was used to identify both a single selected excerpt and an entire compilation of passages. The term also occurs in the plural, ἐκλογαί, as in the title ἐκλογαί ἀπὸ διαφόρων λόγων, a collection of citations extracted from John Chrysostom or in the title of the sophist Sopater’s work as transmitted by Photius: ἐκλογαί διὰφοροὶ ἐν βιβλίοις ὑβ. The ἐκλογαί, on both occasions, means the collections of selections. Recently, K. Demoen showed that a number of epigrams preserved in manuscripts transmitting collections of excerpts on a particular subject use the same vocabulary detected by P. Odorico in the introductions to various syllogai.

With the exception of the EC, the texts under discussion in this thesis survive without any preface. The preface to the EC calls the subject categories according to which the excerpts were classified ὑποθέσεις. The Excerpta Anonymi survives without a preface or any heading. The same holds true for the Excerpta Salmasiana. The manuscript tradition of the so-called Epitome of the 7th Century transmits the heading Συναγωγή. The same term is found in two of the manuscripts transmitting the Excerpta Planudea. As will be shown in chapter 4, the Byzantines reserved the terms epitome and synopsis for the working method applied by those attempting to write history, either in the form of a chronicle or history or collection of historical excerpts. The term synagoge, by contrast, embraces both the technique by which the excerpts were selected and the composition of a text from the selected pieces.

A further term reflecting the activity of those compiling an excerpt-collection is ἐρανίζω. In the early 3rd century, the term occurs in the Refutatio omnium haeresium, a
Christian polemical work attributed to Hippolytus of Rome: ἐκ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἀντιπάθειας ἐρανισάμενοι, ξένην βιβλίον ἐσκευάσαντο. In the 5th century, Procopius of Gaza uses the term in the prooemium to his commentary on Genesis: τὰς καταβεβλημένας ἐκ τῶν Πατέρων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἰς τὴν Ὀκτάτευχον ἔξωθεσις συνελεξάμεθα, ἐξ ὑπομνημάτων καὶ διαφόρων λόγων ταύτας ἑρανισάμενοι. The codex Bruxellensis 11301-16 preserving the EL1 possibly transmits the name of a member of the team working under the supervision of Constantine Porphyrogenitus: ὁ ἑρανισάς τὸ παρὸν Θεοδόσιος ἐστίν ὁ μικρός. The phrase was copied in the margin of f. 2r in a different hand from that of the rest of the codex and it is not certain that the sentence was also found in the archetype of the EL1. Even if we accept that Theodosius the Younger was on the team of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the sort of task assigned to the ἑρανισάς is not clear. He could be either the person who collected and excerpted the texts of the EL1 or the person who put a series of selected passages in order. It is equally possible that Theodosius was responsible for both the selection and the arrangement of the excerpts. The same term ἑρανιζόμενος also appears in another work of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the DC. When the emperor describes his method in compiling this work, he adds: δεῖν ὑήθημεν, ὥσα τε παρὰ τῶν παλαιότερῶν ἐφευρέθη καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἐφευρέσεως διηγήθη καὶ παρὰ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἐθεάθη καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνηργήθη, ταύτα φιλοπόνῳ μελέτη ἐκ πολλῶν ἑρανισάσαι καὶ πρὸς εὐσύνησιν καταληψιν τῶν παρόντων ἐκθέσθαι φιλοτεχνῆματι, καὶ πατρίων ἔθων παρεωραμένων παράδοσιν τοῖς μεθ᾽ ἡμᾶς ἐνυπηρμήνασθαι. In this case, the term seems to point to the selection of the passages to be included in the DC.

1.1.2 Terminology in the thesis

Before we proceed to discussing the origins of the culture of sylloge, I briefly give my own definitions of a number of terms used in this thesis. I consider this essential because scholars have not yet arrived at a consensus about a number of terms concerning compilation literature. As a result, terms such as compilation, collection, selection, anthology,
corpus, miscellany, collectanea, anthology, and florilegium are frequently used to refer to the same category of texts, without any distinction whatsoever – a fact that prevents us from understanding the structure, the function, and the working methods of certain type of texts.

To begin with, in this thesis the term compilation is used as an umbrella term covering works produced by assembling material collected from earlier sources. All the terms that follow, then, are subspecies of compilation. A first subspecies is an excerpt collection, for which I have already given a working definition: a whole comprising passages excerpted from single or different historical texts of the same or different authors and put together under a principle, that is, thematically. Such excerpt collections were intended for specific audiences: they could be used for teaching at schools, to expose moral examples as well as to narrate historical or theological events. The Greek term for collection is συλλογή (sylloge). Accordingly, in what follows, an excerpt collection on a particular subject shall also be mentioned as a sylloge of excerpts. It is worth citing here that florilegia are syllogai of citations drawn from the Scriptures and the writings of the Church Fathers.\(^{19}\) In this thesis collections consisting of complete texts are designated as anthologies. It follows that such receptacles could house small-format genres, such as epigrams, poems and letters. The Anthologia Palatina,\(^ {20}\) for instance, is an anthology of epigrams, which has come down to us through a manuscript dated to the second half of the 10\(^{th}\) century.\(^ {21}\) The same codex preserves also an anthology of Anacreontic poems.\(^ {22}\) Anthologies comprising letters of fictitious authors appear in the ninth and tenth centuries, as well.\(^ {23}\) In fact, since these anthologies consist of selected complete texts, they are not syllogai of excerpts. Where anthologies consist of a series of complete texts by one and the same author, I use the term corpus.\(^ {24}\)

There is a significant number of Byzantine codices in which the inserted passages are not related to each other as they were not copied under a principle, that is, thematically or alphabetically. These manuscripts are called miscellanies. Miscellanies are thus


\(^{21}\)The Palatinus gr. 23 is now deposited at Heidelberg. Part of the Palatinus is kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France at Paris, labelled as Parisinus suppl. gr. 384; Beckby (1957-1958); Cameron (1993).

\(^{22}\)West (1993); Cameron (1993).

\(^{23}\)Nemeth (2010), 21.

\(^{24}\)Nyström (2009), 45 calls corpus an authors’ total production.
receptacles containing pieces of texts of various genres and on assorted subject matters written by a single or different authors. This thesis does not study *miscellanies*, for they are not, in the absence of an ordering principle, *syllai* of excerpts.²⁵

As far as the content of a *sylloge* is concerned, I use the terms *excerpt* or *extract* to describe a piece of text extracted from an earlier work. In a *collection/sylloge* such excerpts are likely to vary in length but not in subject matter: their arrangement creates a new unity. On the other hand, by *collectanea* I mean the passages extracted from heterogeneous sources and on a variety of subjects. These extracted pieces of texts put together constitute a *miscellany*. I use the term *source text* to describe an earlier work from which excerpts or extracts and collectanea were drawn. The term *excerptor* is used to denote the person who excerpts or collects excerpts or collectanea. I call *compiler* the Byzantine scholar who reworks and synthesises the selected excerpts in a new entity. It is important to note that the excerptor and the compiler could or could not be, but often were, the same person. Finally, in this thesis, terms such as *epitome* (*epitomise*) and *synopsis* (*synopsise*) are reserved for the summary process, that is, a category of rewriting a text rather than an accumulation and a representation of different texts into a single entity.

### 1.2 The culture of sylloge

The concept of the so-called *culture of sylloge* has been introduced to describe the working method by which a series of works, from late Antiquity onward, was executed: the deconstruction of carefully selected older texts and their reconstruction in a new receptacle, that is, in a different format and context.²⁶ It should be noted that every age of Greek literature cared about preserving texts considered essential to be preserved at the time. The Hellenistic scholars conceived it as their duty to be the critics, the co-ordinators, and the epitomizers of classical Greek literature.²⁷ Thus, the Alexandrians determined the classical canon producing editions by engaging in copying and pasting. During the Hellenistic period, the Alexandrians gave us also the commentaries.²⁸ Such treatises flourished in the Roman world. In later centuries, this practice and phenomenon found its expression through compilations of excerpts, which meant intervention in the original narrative sequence of a work, omission of what they did not consider essential to

---

²⁶This is the definition given of the *culture of sylloge* by P. Odorico; Odorico (2017).
²⁷Jenkins (1963), 97.
the narrative structure, and production of excerpts from previous entire works. There is an assortment of works compiled in late Antiquity employing this method: a series of passages are thematically extracted from earlier texts and put together into a single receptacle. *Florilegia*, for instance, produced as a result of the theological controversies from the 5th century onwards, are entirely based on the aforementioned working method. In fact, the origins of such practices can be traced through profane collections of texts, which were compiled much earlier than the first *florilegia*. In the early Byzantine period, when Christians began to create their own collections, they relied on anthologies of the Hellenistic age in terms of method and content. Thus, a new form of engagement with the preserving of knowledge emerged. The *culture of sylloge* is both the heir to those earlier traditions, but also espouses a new vision as regards the transmission of knowledge to succeeding ages. This came about as a result of the new social, political and theological context in which compilation literature was produced.

This thesis argues that what should concern us is not the sort of sources the excerpt collections are made up from. Attention should instead be drawn to the structure and the function of the collections. For instance, collections of historical excerpts as well as certain Byzantine chronicles were constructed on the basis of the same technique. The format through which the excerpts were transmitted in these two sorts of texts is different, though. The collections have never, so far, been seen as independent pieces of literature and as attempts to transmit history. On the one hand the anonymity under which such collections have been handed down to us and, on the other hand, the fact that scholars long considered them lack originality have obscured their significance as texts in their own right. It is this dismissive view of excerpt collections that this thesis aims at tackling. In what follows, I put forward the types of works in which the *culture of sylloge* is to be found: *Florilegia*, *Gnomologia*, *Quaestiones et responsiones*, *Menologia* (1.2.1), *Chronicles* (1.2.2), and *Condensed “libraries”* (1.2.3).

---

29 Some scholars are disposed to emphasise the influence of *florilegia* on the production of excerpt collections: P. Magdalino considers what P. Odorico names *culture of sylloge* as a literary phenomenon rooted in the florilegic tradition and translates the concept as the *florilegic habit*; cf. Magdalino (2011), 143-156. About the significant role of doctrinal controversies in compiling florilegia see Richard (1951), 721-748. For the *florilegia* concerning Church Councils see Alexakis (1996), 6-42 and 116-132.

30 Miscellaneous collections of the second and third centuries such as the *De natura animalium* (Περὶ Ζῴων ἰδιότητος) by Aelian, the *Stromata* (Στρωματεῖς) by Clement of Alexandria, the *Cesti* (Κεστοί) by Julius Africanus and the *Noctes Atticae* in Latin by Aulus Gellius also bear a striking resemblance with regard to the concept of compilation literature to later excerpt-collections. The miscellaneous collections exhibit a lack of rigid structure, though. On Aelian see Hercher (ed.) (1864-1866). On the cultural and literary function of Aelian’s work see Kindstrand (1998), 2962-2996. On Clement see Méhat (1966). On Julius Africanus’ *Cesti* see Wallraff – Scardino – Mecella – Guignard (edd.) (2012). On Aulus Gellius see M. Hertz (ed.) (1853).

31 For an excellent review of the ancient anthologies and their impact on the florilegia of the early Byzantine period see Chadwick (2006), 1-10.
1.2.1 Florilegia, Gnomologia, Quaestiones et responsiones, Menologia

In the 6th and 7th centuries, we see a large part of the literary activity to be focused on authenticity when seeking the true gnosis according to Orthodox teaching. The polemical literature of that period, including catenae, homilies and collections of Patristic citations, was created in response to the historical circumstances and formed as efforts towards systematizing knowledge. In this framework, gnomologia such as the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, John Stobaeus’ *Anthologium*, Ps.-Dionysius the Aeropagite’s works, the catenae by Procopius of Gaza, Antiochus’ *Pandecta scripturae sacrae* and Ps.-John of Damascus’ *Sacra parallela* as well as the question-and-answer collections of Ps.-Caesarius and Maximus the Confessor make up fine examples of the gnosis as it was understood during these centuries. All of them created collections from selected passages of Patristic texts, sayings from the Gospels and the New Testament and texts from Biblical or Jewish

---

32 The topic has been elucidated by A. Cameron; cf. Cameron (1991), 298-299; Cameron (1996a), 250-276. On the dogmatical controversies of the period see Hovorun (2008), esp. 14-15, 59, 71 and 88-89. In particular, the religious rivalries and dogmatical disputes of the 7th century were depicted in the arguments of the Councils of 681 and 690 AD., the canons of the Councils of 691-692 (which are not florilegia but illustrate theological controversies of the age (cf. Nedungatt – Featherstone (1995), 45-185), the letters concerning the Monothelite controversy, the homilies written by three 7th-century Palestinian intellectuals, namely by John Moschus, Sophronius of Jerusalem, and Maximus the Confessor, Sophronius’ Christmas Sermon of 634 and his Greek anacreontics and the writings of John of Damascus (see n. 57). On the three Palestinian intellectuals and their role in the contemporary theological disputes see Booth (2013). On Sophronius’ sermons and anacreontics see (Usener (ed.) (1886), 500-516; Gigante (ed.) (1957).

33 The *Apophthegmata Patrum*, a collection of sayings of the Desert Fathers, was arranged alphabetically but also according to twenty one themes; see Guy (1962), 119.


36 In the 6th century, Eustathius, the abbot of the monastery of Attaline, after the Persian attack on Ankyra which compelled the monks of the monastery to flee, asked his friend Antiochus to compile a patristic anthology, the so-called the *Pandecta scripturae sacrae*; cf. PG 89, coll. 1421. The anthology was later used by John of Damascus, who organised its material in alphabetical order in his work entitled the *Sacra parallela*. The collection was used widely in the 10th century; cf. Richard (1962), 475-510.


38 Riedinger (1969); Riedinger, (ed.) (1989); for this work as a sample of the culture of sylloge see Papadogiannakis (2011), 29-41. On this type of literature in general see Rey (2004), 165-180.

39 On Maximus the Confessor see Louth (1996), 3-77; Booth (2013).
Wisdom literature, classified by subject matter or arranged in alphabetical order. These collections continued to be adapted and used in subsequent years as rhetorical tools.\textsuperscript{41} This sort of activity continued during the 8\textsuperscript{th} and 9\textsuperscript{th} centuries. The 8\textsuperscript{th}-century \textit{Doctrina Patrum} represents citations from 93 ecclesiastical writers organised under thematic headings.\textsuperscript{42} The \textit{Questiones et responsiones} by Anastasius of Sinai is made up of a series of citations extracted from their original context and reorganised in chapters in a new text, the so-called \textit{Soterios}.\textsuperscript{43} The outbreak of Iconoclasm at about 726 and the need to defend icons, support the Orthodox dogma, and refute Iconoclasm reinforced the search for works of the \textit{Fathers} and the creation of collections of citations. The efforts were initially made under the auspices of the iconophile Patriarch Tarasius which set the basis for a trend that was to dominate the next centuries, namely, that of collecting related texts and creating collections of excerpts. The following Councils of 754, 787 and 815 and the second phase of Iconoclasm, which broke out in 815 and lasted until 842, intensified the production of \textit{florilegia}.\textsuperscript{44} To give but one example, the \textit{florilegium} of the Iconoclast Council of 815 was compiled by employing a method similar to that of gnomologia and collections of theological questions of the fifth, sixth and seven centuries presented above.\textsuperscript{45} The function of such \textit{florilegia} coincided with that of collections of \textit{questions-and-answers}; namely, to accumulate and preserve various aspects of the \textit{true dogma} as well as vindicate and authenticate doctrines and council decisions. In addition, the approach to older texts is the same, albeit the structure in which citations are represented was different.

In the 10\textsuperscript{th} century, a number of works that were similarly religious in scope, share compositional methodologies and have much in common with earlier collections in terms of content: \textsuperscript{46} the \textit{Vita sancti Andreae Salii}, \textsuperscript{47} the \textit{Synaxarion Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae}.\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{42}F. Diekamp ascribes the work to the period between the years 685 and 726; cf. Diekamp (1907), lxxix-lxxx and xlv-lxvi.
\textsuperscript{44}On \textit{florilegia} used in Church Councils see above n. 29. On the period see Mango (1977), 105-177. The \textit{Amphilochia} by Photius, a collection of questions and answers based to a large extent on patristic texts, can be seen in the context of the aftermath of the Iconoclastic debate after the Restoration of the Icons in 843; cf. Westerink (1986-1998); see also below in the same chapter.
\textsuperscript{45}Alexander (1953), 35-66.
\textsuperscript{46}Upon the prominent role of Christianity in the Byzantine society around those years see Dragon (2003); Magdalino – Nelson (2010), 1-38.
\textsuperscript{47}Rydén (1995).
\textsuperscript{48}The author of the \textit{Synaxarion} was the deacon and bibliothecarius Evaristus; cf. Sauget (1969), 32. On the relation with the imperial court see Flusin (2001), 41-47. A. Papadopulos-Kerameus was the first to associate the \textit{Synaxarion} with the court of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; cf. Ševčenko (1992), 188. On the other hand, H. Delehaye attributes the patronage of the \textit{Synaxarion} to Leo VI; cf. Delehaye, (ed.) (1902), LVI. On the \textit{Synaxarion} see also Rapp (1995), 31-44; Mango (1999), 79-87.
Theodorus Daphnophates’ and Symeon Metaphrastes’ collections of speeches as well as Symeon’s Menologion. All of them are composed on the basis of selections. What differentiates one from another is their format and their function. Daphnophates’ and Symeon Metaphrastes’ speeches are formed by a series of interconnected citations extracted from John Chrysostom and Basil of Caesarea, respectively. The collections aimed, primarily, at preserving and defending the true gnosis. On the other hand, Symeon Metaphrastes’ Menologion consists of complete texts, which underwent much change in terms of style and language in the course of their transmission. The very last fact led P. Odorico to be sceptical as to whether Symeon’s Menologium is to be viewed in the context of the culture of sylloge. As shown below, however, the rewriting of the text is involved in all formats through which gatherings of selected texts are given. The extent of adaptation of selected excerpts varied among syllogai even of the same sort of texts. The different degrees of changes in terms of language and style as well as the distinct extent of insertions or omissions were contingent on or determined by the educational level of the compiler, his aims and his target audience. As far as the practical function of the Menologium is concerned, it was intended to serve liturgical needs of everyday worship in monasteries and churches. The entire assemblage is, however, formulated according to the compositional pattern which is perceptible in earlier gnomologies or questions-and-answers: a series of selections taken from their original contexts and assembled in a single container, according to a particular ordering principle. The same holds true for the coeval Synaxarion. The texts which were gathered and put together in the Synaxarion have been subject to similar linguistic and stylistic alterations. And the practical function of the Synaxarion differs from that of the menologia. Nevertheless, its author’s working method is similar to that of the aforementioned collections of speeches as well as of Symeon’s Menologion.

49PG 63, coll. 56; cf. Odorico (2011a), 100.
50PG 32, coll. 1115-1382; PG 34, coll. 821-968.
51Symeon was not without precedent. The first menologia can be traced back to the late 8th and early 9th century when Theodore the Studite compiled a collection of panegyrics on feasts of saints and the future Patriarch Methodius who had compiled an hagiographical collection; cf. Rapp (1995), 32-34. It is likely that Basil the Nothos stands behind the production of the Menologion by Symeon Metaphrastes; cf. Høgel (2002), esp. 70. Moreover, the Menologion by Symeon Metaphrastes provided the basis for subsequent collections of the Lives of saints, the so-called Menologia. Concerning the process of redacting of these collections see Hegel (2002), 88-110.
53Odorico (2017).
54See n. 48.
1.2.2  Chronicles

A number of chronicles are constructed likewise on the basis of the same technique as Florilegia, Gnomologia, Quaestiones et responsiones, Menologia: passages from different works were singled out and put together to produce a homogeneous text. Thus, certain chronicles were actually syllogai formulated and articulated in a form other than that of florilegia and collections of theological questions. Recently, P. Odorico showed that the text found in the codex Parisinus gr. 1336, conventionally called the Commentary on the Hexaemeron, is a universal chronicle designed as a typical product of the culture of sylloge: a series of citations taken from different works and put together to form a new text. The method of the anonymous compiler of the chronicle is similar to that of George the Monk. During the second period of Iconoclasm, George the Monk compiled his own history, which is, to a considerable extent, a collection of excerpts mainly taken from patristic texts and put together to form a homogeneous text. The reworking of the excerpts before their insertion into the chronicle is not consistent throughout the whole. The chronicle was intended to provide knowledge for Orthodox readers. This purpose outweighs the chronological goals of George the Monk’s historical narrative. His extracting method is the same as the one applied by florilegia, question-and-answer works, and collections of speeches. Thus, in George’s chronicle nothing was written by George himself. Theophanes, at the beginning of the 9th century, pursues a similar method in compiling his own chronicle. In the prooemium to his work, Theophanes makes clear his methodological approach to his sources; his chronicle is actually a compilation of selected pieces and nothing is written by the compiler himself.

In addition, Symeon Logethetes’ chronicle as well as the so-called chronicle of Ps.-Symeon appear to include antiquarian material in a similar manner. The title transmitted along with Symeon’s chronicle is representative of the technique followed

55The text is mistakenly attributed to Eustathius of Antioch; cf. Odorico (2013), esp. 377-382: according to P. Odorico the chronicle includes extracts from Eusebius’ Chronicon, Homiliae in hexaemeron of Basil of Caesarea, Athanasius of Alexandria, the Physiologus, Achilles Tatius, Origen and Flavius Josephus.
56As regards the dating of George the Monk’s chronicle see Afinogenov (1999), 437-447; Afinogenov (2004), 237-246.
58οὐδὲν ἀφ’ ἑαυτῶν συντάξαντες, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἱστοριογράφων τε καὶ λογογράφων ἀναλεξάμενοι ἐν τοῖς ἴδιοις τόποις τετάχαμεν ἐκάστου χρόνου τὰς πράξεις, ἀσυγχύτως κατατάττοντες; cf. Theophanes, Chronographia 4,13-15). P. Odorico interpreted also another passage of Theophanes’ prooemium as belonging to the culture of sylloge: τὴν τε βίβλον ἣν συνέταξε καταλέλοιπε καὶ ἀφορμὰς παρέσχε τὰ ἐλλείποντα ἀναπληρῶσαι; cf. Theophanes, Chronographia 4,1-2; Odorico (2010), 209-216.
59On Symeon Logethetes see Markopoulos (1978); Kazhdan (2006), 167-168; Wahlgren (2006), esp. 3*-8*, 27*-117*, 118*-120*. See also below n. 182 and n. 183 in chapter 2.
by the historian: a series of passages selected and extracted from different chronicles were arranged in a way to form a new chronicle.

Theophanes and Ps.-Symeon’s texts were extensively excerpted by George Cedrenus in the 11th century. Cedrenus, like Theophanes and Skylitzes, in the preface to his chronicle outlines the method in using his sources. It turns out that the steps he follows in composing his chronicle correspond to those recorded in the prooemium to the EC: Cedrenus assembled a series of diverse works (chronicles and theological writings), he read them carefully and made a selection of the passages he had interest in. Then, he put the selected pieces in chronological order and augmented them with oral sources. The preface also reveals the aim of the arrangement of the excerpts: to facilitate the accessibility to older texts and to refresh the memory of the reader. Strikingly, as P. Odorico pointed out, the same practical functions are explicitly highlighted in Stobaeus’ Anthologium, the Doctrina Patrum and the EC.

The examples mentioned above reflect syllogai of excerpts presented in the form of a chronicle. Beside the different format of the receptacle, its excerpting and compiling method is the one already seen in the theological writings from the 5th century onwards. Undeniably, the function of a chronicle diverges from that of a florilegium, gnomologium or menologium. Nevertheless, the vocabulary that occurs in the proemia to these chronicles is congruous with that encountered in the prefaces to religious-in-scope works. The common use of terms in the prefaces points to the same working method behind the composition of these works.

60 χρονικὸν ἐφεξῆς συλλεγέν. ἐκ διαφόρων χρονικῶν τε καὶ ἱστορικῶν ἀρχόμενον ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ; cf. Symeon Logothetes, Chronicon, 5.
61 Bekker (ed.) (1838-1839).
63 Throughout Cedrenus’s work we encounter a considerable number of entries irrelevant to the general narrative having been inserted with the word ὅτι; cf. Bekker (ed.) I, 12, 15-17, 20-23, 26-28, 321-323, 325-327, 330-333, 563-567; cf. Tartaglia (2007), 239-255; Magdalino (2011), 158-159. It is interesting that in contemporary compilations as well in the EC a century later and other works attributed to Constantine Porphyrogenitus or other excerpt collections of the same age, such as, the Excerpta Anonymi we detect a similar introductory ὅτι for entries.
64 τοὺς μεταγενεστέρους καταλελοίπαμεν τροφὴν ἁπαλὴν καὶ ἀληλεσμένην, ἵνᾳ μὲν τὰς τῶν ἂνθρετῶν ἱστορικῶν βιβλίων ἐπελθόντες ἔχουσιν ὑπομνήματα (οἶδε γὰρ ἡ ἀνάγνωσις ἐμποιεῖν, ἡ δ’ ἀνάγνωσις τρέφειν καὶ μεγαλύνειν τὴν μνήμην, ὅσπερ τοῦναντίον ἢ ἄμελεια καὶ βαστώνη ἐπιφέρειν ἀμνηστίαν, ἥ τινι πάντως ἐπεται λήθη, ἀμαυροῦσα καὶ συγχέουσα τὴν μνήμην τῶν πεπραγμένων), αἱ δὲ μήπω ἐντευχηκότες ταῖς ἱστορικαῖς ὁδηγοῦ ἔχουσι τὴν ἐπιτομήν; cf. Cedrenus, Compendium historiarum, 6.
65 Odorico (2013), 375-376.
1.2.3  Condensed “libraries”

There is a category of works in which it is impossible to identify all the sources used and, accordingly, the extent to which the sources were re-edited and adapted. Moreover, they are not syllogai of excerpts in the strict sense of the term: a series of citations or longer excerpts put together to form a new entity. P. Odorico considers these texts collectively as bibliothèques miniatures.66 These works either represent a series of complete works, frequently reworked stylistically or linguistically, or they consist of a sequence of summaries of earlier texts. The intervention on the part of the compiler is either more extended or difficult to evaluate. Condensed libraries cannot be deemed encyclopaedias. Moreover, their practical and political functions run counter to the aim which encyclopaedias serve, namely, the circulation of knowledge. Yet, the arrangement of the selected sources in condensed libraries differ from the way seen in florilegia, collections of theological questions and certain chronicles. Despite their deviations, we should not prevent ourselves from categorizing them within the culture of sylloge.67 For the mentality, by contrast, that shaped their formation is the same as apparent in other products of the culture of sylloge: the accumulation of a selection of texts, their deconstruction and representation in a new format. Their formation is rooted in the culture of sylloge.

The kind of texts the condensed libraries preserve varies. In the early 6th century, during a period of religious and dogmatic turmoil, we know that the bishop of Gangra encouraged Theodorus Anagnosta to compile a compilation consisting of the three histories of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret.68 A conspicuous number of military and legal compilations were executed under the reigns of Basil I (867-886) and Leo VI (886-912). These compilations, undeniably, influenced the imperial compilation literature during the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.69 The legal compilation known as Procheiros Nomos was accomplished during the reign of Basil I.70 The Procheiros Nomos consists of 40 titles and was largely depended on the Justinianic Code as well as on the Ekloge, the selection of laws made under Leo III, the Isaurian.71 Leo VI’s the Tactica,72 a

---

66Odorico (2017).
67See also P. Odorico’s skepticism on the nature of these compilations in Odorico (2017).
68Taking into consideration that this was the age in which florilegia flourished, we perceive the essential role of florilegia in the establishment of the culture of sylloge. On the history by Theodorus Anagnosta see Hansen (ed.) (1995).
69On the link between the legal activity of Leo VI and the historiographical projects of Constantine Porphyrogenitus in terms of the ideology of order, law and dogma see Pieler (1989), 79-86; Magdalino (1997), 169-182.
72Dennis (ed.) (2010); PG 107, coll. 669-1116; Dain – Foucault (1967), 353-363.
treatise on the tactics of war, as well as his two legal compilations, the *Basilica*⁷³ and the *Book of the Prefect*⁷⁴ should be seen in the context of the *culture of sylloge*, as well. They are all compiled of passages taken from earlier works on military matters and imperial law, respectively.

Lexica and anthologies of the middle Byzantine period should be seen in the framework of the *condensed libraries*, as well. I have already referred to the *Palatine Anthologia* and the *anthologia* of Anacreontic poems preserved in the Palatinus gr. 23.⁷⁵ As far as *lexica* are concerned, the *Haimodein Lexicon* basically is a collection of entries on rare words.⁷⁶ Passages of the entries were extracted from late antique historians (Procopius, Agathias, Menander and Theophylact Symocatt). The method of the *culture of sylloge* is evident. The compiler of the lexicon retained the basic structure of the selected pieces. The originality of the new entity lies in the sequencing of the passages assumed in the *Haimodein Lexicon*. The so-called Suda is a lexicographical treatise of the end of the 10th century.⁷⁷ The *Suda* consists of entries on rare words or terms, on geographical and ethnographical notices as well as on names of important figures. The entries, arranged in alphabetical order, appear to have been extensively drawn from the *EC*,⁷⁸ from late antique historians,⁷⁹ from the *Onomatologos* by Hesychius of Miletus, and from various philosophical and grammatical treatises.⁸⁰ Entries in the *Bibliotheca*⁸¹ and the *Amphilochia*⁸² by Photius (810-891) summarise to a large extent the collected texts. This is why scholars are not disposed to treat Photius’ works as wholes made up of collections of selections.⁸³ As shown above, the method of summarising can be well implicated in the creation of collections of selections. Photius’

---

⁷⁵See n. 21 and n. 22.
⁷⁸On the textual relation between the *Suda* and the *EC* see de Boor (1914-1919), Adler (1932), esp. 701-706; Schreiner (1987), 1-30; Prandi (1999), 9-28; Roberto (2005b), Ixxxix-ci. A. Nemeth conjectures the existence of lists of words made during the preparation of the *EC*, which lexica such as the *Suda* and the *Haimodein Lexicon* drew on; cf. Nemeth (2010), 36-38 and 217ff.
⁷⁹Zecchini (1999), 75-88.
⁸⁰On this see Adler (1928), xxi-xxii.
works such as his *Lexicon*, the *Bibliotheca* and the *Amphilochia* reflect the same approach to older texts: the method of collecting, selecting, extracting and representing of textual pieces. In the *Bibliotheca* the treatment of the original texts is not consistent throughout the entire work: the *Bibliotheca* consists of 280 codices, that is, entries of books that Photius had read and studied; some codices transmit excerpts of the books, while some others contain condensations or summaries of ancient and late antique authors. In a similar manner the reworking of the selected pieces is unsteady throughout the *Amphilochia*. Photius excerpted long passages from a variety of writers; excerpts from John Chrysostom, Polychronius, Germanus of Constantinople, John of Damascus and Theodoret have passed with minor changes, whereas excerpts from Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Gregory of Nazianzus, Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, Maximus the Confessor have been subject to greater changes. It should be noted that Photius’ aims of compiling his *Bibliotheca* coincide with those of Stobaeus and Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ when executing the *Anthologium* and the *CE*, respectively; Photius, like Stobaeus, aimed to help his brother get acquainted with a variety of works, and, like Constantine Porphyrogenitus, intended to accumulate a large number of texts and facilitate those willing to read through them.

Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ *DAI* and *DT* are manuals on the internal and external policies of the Empire. His *DC* is a compilation on imperial ceremonies, ordinations and festivities. They are all constructed on the basis of passages extracted from earlier works. As far as the function of these compilations is concerned, it is determined by the political ideology of the Macedonian dynasty. It is noteworthy, that these compilations are all conveyors of Constantine’s geographical outlook on the Empire and serve to propagate the emperor’s political aims.

---


85 Unlike codices 1-233, the part including codices 234-280 contains more extracted passages than summaries. This led Treadgold to argue that the second part was a later addition to the work; cf. Treadgold (1980), 12-13 and 37-51.

86 On the possible textual relation between the *CE* and other works compiled on Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ commission see Ševčenko (1992a), 191; Pratsch (1994), esp. 60-71; Nemeth (2010), 51-64.

87 On the manuscript tradition of the *DC* see Featherstone (2004), 113-121. On Basil the Nothos, the bastard son of Romanus I Lecapenus, as the final redactor of the *DC* see Featherstone (2011), 109-116; Featherstone (2013), 353-372.

88 On the working method see Sode (2011), 161-176 and Pratsch (1994), 13-136. The *DAI* includes material taken from archival documents as well excerpts from Theophanes’ *Chronographia* and Stephen of Byzantium’s *Ethnica* and the *DC* comprises excerpts from the archives and Peter the Patrician’s history; cf. Treadgold (2013), 156. On the proposition that part of the *DAI* had been compiled under Leo VI see Howard-Johnston (2001), 304-329.

89 See especially Magdalino (2013b) and Magdalino (2013c).
1.2.4 Conclusion

As we have seen, barriers in defining what is meant by compilation literature are removed when studying the phenomenon of excerpting, synthesising and re-editing older material as part of Byzantine written culture, in particular, that of the *culture of sylloge*. Such a reading would presuppose for scholars to focus primarily on the compositional and organizational structure of collections and on their function within the Byzantine literary, social and political framework, since the key feature of compilation literature is the variety of forms and literary genres within which it can be encountered.\(^90\) The works mentioned above expressed and at the same time determined a fashion in terms of literary production during the whole Byzantine period; the chief concern of a writer was to collect writings corresponding to a particular subject matter and to extract information perceived as essential to be preserved. Compilation literature gained a significant importance in the 10\(^{th}\) century and especially during Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ reign. In fact, what is discernible throughout Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ literary efforts is his prominent desire to direct and authorise the historiographical writings as well as the compilation literature of his age.\(^91\) The aims of such an endeavour on the part of the emperor can be traced in the imperial ideology of the entire Macedonian dynasty, adopted by Constantine Porphyrogenitus and his predecessors to legitimise their rulership.\(^92\) On the other hand, Constantine Porphyrogenitus considered the revival of knowledge, arts and sciences as vital to the growth of Byzantium and also as part and parcel of his imperial duties to strengthen the administration of the state.\(^93\)

\(^90\)See also Holmes (2010), 55-80.
\(^91\)The theme has been treated by P. Magdalino, who compares the three historical writings undertaken under the emperor’s auspices. P. Magdalino, however, maintains that these works have unique and distinctive features setting them apart from other compilations; cf. Magdalino (2013c), esp. 201-205. C. Holmes sees the military compilations produced under Constantine’s reign as an effort on the part of the emperor to gain political legitimacy and enhance his political authority; cf. Holmes (2010), 55-80; see also Nemeth (2010), esp. 38-65. On the ideology of the Macedonian dynasty see also Markopoulos (1992), 159-166 and Markopoulos (2006), 286-292.
\(^92\)Basil I, the founder of the Macedonian dynasty was of Armenian descent and a peasant by his birth. He usurped the throne after murdering first Bardas, the emperor’s Caesar and soon afterwards the emperor himself, Michael III. For the political history of the age see Treadgold (1997), esp. 453-455.
\(^93\)Τὴν δὲ τοῦ πορφυρογεννήτου Κωνσταντίνου φιλοκαλίαν καὶ καλλιεργίαν καὶ τὴν πρὸς πάντα διόρθωσιν καὶ βελτίωσιν μέλλων διηγεῖσθαι, καὶ ὅπως εὐθεῖᾳ καὶ δικαικῶς τὸ ὑπήκοον περιέσωσεν (…) Ὀὕτως πάντα ἐφευρὼν εἰς ἀρχαιότητα καὶ ἀμέλειαν, καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν χυδαιωθέντων καὶ καταφρονηθέντων, ὡς φιλόθεος καὶ φιλόκαλος προέκρινεν τῶν δειλῶν καὶ ἀνάνδρων τοὺς εὐτόλμους καὶ ἀνδρείους, καὶ τούτους τῷ μαγίστρῳ καὶ δομεστίκῳ τῶν σχολῶν Βάρδᾳ τῷ Φωκᾷ παραδοὺς νίκην τῇ Ῥωμαϊκῇ ἀρχῇ προεξένησεν. πολλῶν δὲ ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ ἡμῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀξιεπαινέτων γνώσεις καὶ λογικαὶ τέχναι καὶ ἐπιστήμαι, τούτων οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅπως ἀμεληθέντων καὶ παροραθέντων τί σοφίζεται ὁ φιλοσοφώτατος ἐκεῖνος νοῦς; ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἤπιστατο πράξειν καὶ θεωρέιν πρὸς θεόν ἡμᾶς ὄικειοῦντα, καὶ τὴν μὲν πράξειν πολιτικοὶ προσαρμόζουσαν πράγμασιν, (…) καὶ οὐ
In the next section, I shall set out the steps according to which the original texts were employed by the compilers before they were embedded into the collections.

1.3 The working method of excerptors of historical texts

This section scrutinises the methodological principles underlying the compilation process of a *sylloge* of historical excerpts. In the following pages, I examine how an excerpt collection was redacted.

In studying the working process followed in collections of historical excerpts I shall rely a) on the *prooemium* of the EC, and b) on external sources providing information on the creation of similar Byzantine literary works. We shall see later on that it is confirmed by the collections that are studied in the main body of this thesis.

To begin with, the *prooemium* of the EC reveals to a considerable extent the method and criteria used for this enterprise. The other excerpt-collections studied in this thesis, by contrast, are not accompanied by any such *prooemium*. Nevertheless, their compilers, occasionally, break the concatenation of excerpts by inserting in the collection material of their own. The new insertions are bridging passages introduced in order to enhance the narrative sequence of the excerpts. Upon careful examination, the augmented texts shed light on the excerpting method and selection criteria of the excerpt-collections. In what follows, I examine the extent to which information furnished by the *prooemium* of the EC could help us get a better understanding of the structure and method of the four collections of excerpts examined in this thesis.

Secondly, external information derived from contemporary works shall help us to determine the various steps of the working process and to explore whether or not this working method corresponds to a pattern of compilation of excerpts before, during or after the reign of the Macedonian dynasty. It is worth comparing the *prooemium* of the EC to the *enkomion* on Symeon Metaphrastes written by Michael Psellos and referred to the

---

πολὺς χρόνος διελθὼν, τὰς μεγάλας ἐπιστήμας καὶ τέχνας τῇ θυσείᾳ καὶ συνέσει τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος κατωρθώσαντο, καὶ κριτὰς καὶ ἀντιγραφεῖς καὶ μητροπολίτας ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐκλεξάμενος τετίμηκεν, καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν Ῥωμαίων τῇ σοφίᾳ κατεκόσμησεν καὶ κατεπλούτισεν; cf. Theophanes Continuatus, 445-446.

*The* *prooemium* preceded each volume of the EC. On the *prooemium* see Lemerle (1971), 281-282; Flusin (2002), 538-549; Odorico (2017). For a French translation of the *prooemium* see Lemerle (1965), 605; Odorico (2017). For an English translation of the *prooemium* see Nemeth (2010), 184-186. A. Nemeth provides also an edition of an iambic poem dedicated to Constantine Porphyrogenitus that comes immediately after the *prooemium* in the codex Tours C 980 transmitting the *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiiis*; cf. Nemeth (2010), 190. On the codex see below n. 89 in chapter 2.
working method of Symeon, probably concerning a theological work of Symeon commissioned by an emperor, presumably by Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Finally, Photius’ judgment on John Stobaeus’ *Anthologium* written some centuries earlier and the preface to John Damascenus’ *Sacra parallela* provide significant information on the creation of excerpt collections. The external sources chosen represent compositions each of which relies on texts of different literary genres. This study advances the hypothesis that such *syllogai* were the product of a common approach to older texts in Byzantium. They are all rooted in a late antique approach as regards the transmission of knowledge to succeeding ages by embedding the classical texts into the new social, political or theological context.

Three steps and procedures may be identified in the process of redacting a *sylloge* of historical excerpts: (1) The text in question was read through to the end before being chosen for the collection. Long or brief passages were selected from a certain text and then copied word by word. (2) The passage was then rephrased, amended and shortened. These altered versions of the passages were then copied and assembled in a new codex. (3) A new narrative was composed.

### 1.3.1 Selection

Certain passages were selected and extracted from their original environment. The selected passages were drawn from their original context and copied word by word before being edited and adopted into the collection. The procedure also emerges from the *prooemium* of the *EC* and Psellos’ *encomium* of Symeon Metaphrastes. Both texts yield significant information on the working method of the excerptors and reveal aspects of a seemingly common pattern of compilation of excerpts during the Macedonian dynasty. After presenting the motives and purposes of the collection, the *prooemium* goes on discussing the working process:

(...) καὶ ὀλιγώρως ἔχειν πρὸς τὰ καλὰ καὶ ῥαθυμότερον διακείσθαι πρὸς τὴν τῶν φθασάντων γενέσθαι κατάληψιν, κατόπιν γινομένης τῆς ἄληθος ἐπιτεῦξεως, ὡς ἐντεύθεν ἄδηλα συνειξόσθαι τὴν τῆς ἱστορίας ἐφεύρεσιν, πὴ μὲν σπάνει βιβλὼν ἐπωφελῶν, πὴ δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἐκτάδην πολυλογίαν δειμανόντων καὶ κατορρωδούντων, ὁ τῆς πορφύρας ἀπόγονος Κωνσταντίνος ὁ ὀρθῳδόκος καὶ χριστιανικότατος τῶν πῶποτε βεβασιλευκότων, ὁ ὅσιοπέτερον πρὸς τὴν καλῶν κατανόησιν διακείμενος καὶ δραστήριον ἐσχηκῶς νοῦν ἔκρινε βέλτιστον εἶναι καὶ κοινοφελές τῷ τε βιω ὁνησιφόρον. πρότερον μὲν ζητητικὴ διεγέρσει

96Bibliotheca, cod. 167.
97The collection was used widely in the 10th century; cf. Richard (1962) col. 475-510. On the *Sacra parallela* see Ehrhard (1901), 394-415; Odorico (1990), 9-12.
Throughout the prooemium we detect the importance of the selection (ἐκλογή) described above as the basic procedure in the redaction. The selection was determined by the aims of the collection. Accordingly, compilation literature is to be found in a variety of disciplinary fields and there have been historiographical and military collections, florilegia, collections of patristic quotations, philosophical collections and the so-called chreiai and gnōmai that were collections of anecdotes. The identification of the different authorities assembled into a single text appear to be significant for the compilers. The end of the prooemium to the EC is revealing: ἐμφαίνει δὲ τούτῳ τὸ προοίμιον, τίνας οἱ λόγοι πατέρας κέκτηνται, καὶ θέν ἀποκυίσκονται, ὡς ἄν μὴ ὅσοι ἀἱ κεφαλαίωδες ὑποθέσεις ἀκατονόμαστοι καὶ μὴ γνήσιοι, ἀλλὰ νόθοι τε καὶ ψευδώνυμοι, εἰσὶ δὲ ἐκ τῶν ὑποτεταγμένων χρονικῶν.

---


99It is noteworthy that florilegia and catenae identify the author of the excerpted passages too. To give but one example see Procopius of Gaza’ Catena in Canticum canticum. The same occurs in the earliest recension of the Hippiatrica; cf. McCabe (2007), esp. 262–269.

100See section 2.2.2.

101See section 3.2.

102See section 4.2.
book the same sentence is repeated to describe the working method of the compiler, e.g. Ἐκ τοῦ τρίτου λόγου. The selection of the texts that were appropriate for the purposes of a collection was also guided by the need for brevity (τὴν ἐκτάδην πολυλογίαν δειμαινόντων καὶ κατορρωδούντων).

The term selection is repeated two times in the prooemium (συλλέξασθαι, ἐκλογής). The excerptors of the EC were first commissioned to select historical texts concerning the 53 subjects of the collection, before proceeding to create excerpts from them. Each excerptor was requested to split up the entire work of an author into short excerpts according to certain subject matters. The division of the original text required the careful selection of relevant passages. That procedure was followed by the distribution (καταμερίσαι) of each excerpted section into the diverse subjects (εἰς ὑποθέσεις διαφόρους).

Each excerpt was copied in separate manuscripts divided thematically. According to A. Nemeth, the excerptors of the EC have first created copies of the complete works of the historians to be excerpted. It should be noted that the fragmented nature of the EC prevents us from drawing definite conclusions on the matter. I am leaning to argue in favor of P. Odorico’s argument, who supports that it was only the selected passages on a certain topic that were copied verbatim. In the following chapters we shall see that the structure itself of the selected pieces in the syllogai examined in this thesis verifies that the compiler read and employed selected texts having first copied them word by word. The compiler would read the relevant passage through to the end annotating it thoroughly. This procedure permitted him to combine disparate details and go on to the next step later, which was to edit the original text. That allowed him also to rearrange the material when he thought that the meaning was not clear enough or when he wanted to give a new meaning to a certain text passage.

The other external source providing information on the working methods of Byzantine text composition is the encomium of Symeon Metaphrastes written by Michael Psellos. In the end of his encomium, Psellos discusses the composition of Symeon’s Menologion:

Καὶ ἂν αὐτῷ ἐξ ἐτοίμου κύκλος τε ὧν βραχὺς τῶν τε πρώτως ἐνσημανομένων τὴν λέξιν καὶ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα τιθέντων· καὶ ἄλλος ἐπ’ άλλω, ὥς ταῦτα ποιῶν, ὅ δέ τὰ δεύτερα· καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις οἱ τὰ συγγεγραμένα ἐξακριβεύομενοι. ἢν, ὡς τού τούς ὑπογραφέας λάθοι, πρὸς τὴν ὑποκειμένην διορθώσωνται ἔννοιαν. οὐ γὰρ ἐνήν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸ πλήθος τῶν συγγραμάτων πολλάκις τὰ αὐτὰ ἀνακυκλεῖν τε καὶ ἔφοράν

---

103See Appendix I: table V.
104Nemeth (2010), 242-245.
105Odorico (2017).
And he (Symeon Metaphrastes) had a preparation at hand and not too small group (of assistants); those who first selected the passage and those who, after this, wrote it (the passage) down. One man after the other, one doing the first task, the other the second one; and in addition to these people, (there were) others that revised the passages written down, so as to make corrections of mistakes that had escaped the notice of the amanuenses, according to their intended meaning.  

In Psellos’ encomium, selection (ἐνσημαινομένων τὴν λέξιν) represents again the second step in the redaction. Psellos refers to a group of redactors worked together under supervision. Some members of this group selected the passages to be extracted and some others, the copyists, wrote them down (ταῦτα τιθέντων). In the end, other members of the group verified or revised the work of the amanuenses (τὰ συγγεγραμμένα ἐξακριβούμενοι).

C. Høgel in discussing the same passage in his book on Symeon Metaphrastes translates the phrase ἐνσημαινομένων τὴν λέξιν as taking the words in shorthand. In his view, Psellos states at this point that the original text was taken down in shorthand before being copied into normal script. This preposition leads him to surmise that the original text was rephrased and reformulated orally before being dictated by Symeon or someone else to the copyists. First, I would like to notice that the present participle ἐνσημαινομένων comes from the verb ἐνσημαίνω, which means report, signal, give sign of, intimate or impress. Therefore, the meaning of the term alludes to the activity of selection rather than to that of forming shorthand. C. Høgel is likely to have translated it differently because of the word τὴν λέξιν that follows the participle. The term λέξις means a single word or phrase and C. Høgel translated that way. However, λέξις can also mean the text of an author and the phrase ἐνσημαινομένων τὴν λέξιν in Psellos’ text corresponds to the selection of the passages to be extracted. Nevertheless, C. Høgel’s assertion of the oral reformulation as the most important part in the working process of the Menologion is not baseless, especially when we turn our attention to the kind of differences detected between Symeon’s version of saint’s lives and their old ones. Psellos, however, does not
verify C. Høgel’s assumption at this point and I shall return to this below when discussing the second step of the redaction.

1.3.2 Editing

During the second step of redaction, the text was employed, rephrased, amended and shortened for the purpose of copying. The procedure relied on the annotations made during the previous step. A shortened version of each of the selected passages was created and copied. The editing of the material was based on certain general criteria as well as on individual ones.

Concerning the issues of similarities in the sequencing and the transferal of details, we detect that collections of historical excerpts remain faithful to the original texts and at several points they copy the source texts word by word. Such an approach is in line with a statement found in the prooemium of the EC:

οὐδὲν τὸ παράπαν ἀφαιρουμένης τῆς τοῦ λόγου ἀκολουθίας τῇ διαφέρει τῶν ἐννοιῶν.\(^{114}\)

The prooemium of the EC enables us to identify the principles which a compiler adheres to when editing a certain text:

καταμερίσαι τοῦτο εἰς λεπτομέρειαν (...) καταμερίσαι εἰς ὑποθέσεις διαφόρους (...) κοῦκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν τῶν ἐγκειμένων, δ’ διαφεύγει τὴν τοιαύτην τῶν ὑποθέσεων ἀπαρίθμησιν, οὐδὲν τὸ παράπαν ἀφαιρουμένης τῆς τοῦ λόγου ἀκολουθίας τῇ διαφέρει τῶν ἐννοιῶν, ἀλλὰ σύσσωμον σωζόσχης καὶ ἐκάστη ὑποθέσει προσαρμοζομένης τηλικαύτης σὺ συνάψεως, ἀληθέστερον δ’ εἶπεν, ὀἰκείωσεις.\(^{115}\)

The text supplies us with a fuller picture about the requirements which compilers insisted on. The prooemium repeats the necessity of precision and narrative sequence (τῆς τοῦ λόγου ἀκολουθίας, σύσσωμον) and stresses the importance of the compositional and organizational structure of a collection as the term καταμερίσαι is frequently used throughout the prooemium.

In a passage from the Excerpta Anonymi, the compiler himself reveals significant information about his own criteria synthesizing his material. The passage is entitled Περὶ πυρόεντος κεραυνοῦ, which had been excerpted from John Lydus’ De Ostentis. The compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi intervenes three times adding personal comments: he inserts a personal statement at the beginning of the excerpt, a linking phrase in the middle of the

\(^{114}\) Excerpta de legationibus, 2.

\(^{115}\) Excerpta de legationibus, 2.
excerpt and a second personal statement at the end of it. All of them were integrated into the original passage in order to justify the compiler’s decision to insert a certain excerpt precisely at a specific point into the collection. The three statements are the following:

Προέφθημεν εἰς τὸ στοιχεῖον εἰπόντες περὶ σκηπτῶν καὶ ἐλλιπῶς αὐτὸ εἰρηκότες, νῦν τελεώτερον καὶ ἀκριβέστερον δεῖν φύλημεν ἐμφηναί, καὶ μάλιστα περὶ πυρόεντος.¹¹⁶ (...) Εἴπωμεν δὲ πάλιν καὶ περὶ τῶν φυλασσομένων ἀπὸ κεραυνῶν.¹¹⁷ (...) Ὡς δὲν δὲ μὴ ἁτελῆς ἢ ἢ περὶ κεραυνῶν διδασκαλία, δεῖ καὶ περὶ καιρῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τόπων διαλαβεῖν.¹¹⁸

We anticipated the eighteenth letter by speaking of thunderbolts and as we have spoken of them elliptically, we considered it necessary for them (the thunderbolts) to be presented entirely and more precisely, and above all (to speak of) the fiery ones. (...) We spoke in turn of what avoids thunderbolts (...) So that the elucidation of thunderbolts will not be incomplete, the seasons and the places (concerning thunderbolts) need to be treated.

It is noticeable that the chapter begins with the author’s statement that the previous chapter, entitled Περὶ σκηπτῶν, had opened a new section in the collection called the στοιχεῖον, which means the letter Σ, that is, the eighteenth letter of the Greek alphabet. The statement makes clear that from the β στοιχεῖον up to that point there had also been another fifteen στοιχεῖα. From this, it can be inferred that the compiler had first divided the collection thematically and then decided to synthesise and present the material by arranging it in alphabetical order; a methodological approach which corresponds to the one evident throughout the prooemium of the EC. The excerptors working under Constantine’s supervision had to divide the selected material into themes (καταμερίσαι εἰς ὑπόθεσεις διαφόρους) based on their content (τῇ διαιρέσι τῶν ἐννοιῶν).

The compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi professes that in order to make things clearer, despite his narrative having reached the eighteenth section – which the letter σ implies – he needed to include a chapter, even if this did not follow the intended alphabetical order. The compiler’s statement, at this point, also contains a phrase which reveals his strive for accuracy: τελεώτερον καὶ ἀκριβέστερον. The wording alludes to the EC as well as to Symeon Metaphrastes’ claims in the prefaces to the Vita Sancti Symeonis Stylitae and the Vita Sancti Sampsonis Xenodochi:

---

¹¹⁶ Excerpta Anonymi, 46,25-27.
¹¹⁷ Excerpta Anonymi, 47,11-12.
οὐδεὶς οὐδέπω κατὰ μέρος τὰ κατ᾿ αὐτὸν διεξήλθεν, οὐδεὶς ἀπαντᾷ καθήκεν ἑαυτὸν, οὐδὲ ἀκριβῶς ὅπως ἔκαστα εἶχεν ἀνέγγαφε.119

ἐγὼ δὲ βίον λέγω, κατὰ μέρος συντεταγμένον, καὶ τὰ ἐκείνου διαλαμβάνοντα πρὸς ἀκριβείαν, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τῶν θαυμάσιων μνήμην ἄρκοντως ποιούμενον.120

The function of the second statement exactly in the middle of the chapter Περὶ πυρὸντος κεραυνοῦ, is to enhance the narrative sequence. The choice of a lexical verb, ἔποιμεν, turns the compiler into an author and the first person plural, instead of the third person singular one, gives a sense of immediacy to the text.

In the last paragraph of the same chapter, the compiler stresses, once again, the importance of clarifying what he is writing down (ὅς ἃν δὲ μὴ ἀτελῆς ἡ ἢ περὶ κεραυνῶν διδασκαλία). The word διδασκαλία ascertains his aim of creating a collection for practical as well as didactical purposes. It is worth noting that when the prooemium of the EC explains the motives of the project, it refers to practical and didactical aims:

(...) ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐκ τῆς τῶν τοσοῦτων ἔτων περιδρομῆς ἀπλετόν τι χρήμα καὶ πραγμάτων ἐγήγεντο καὶ λόγων ἐπλέκετο, ἐπ᾿ ἀπειρόν τε καὶ ἀμήγκαν ἢ τῆς ἱστορίας ἡμίρυνε συμπλοκή, ἔδει δ᾿ ἐπαρρεπέστερον πρὸς τὰ χείρω τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων προαίρεσιν μετατίθεσθαι χρόνως ὑστερον καὶ ὀλγώρως ἔχειν πρὸς τὰ καλὰ καὶ ῥαθυμότερον διακείσθαι πρὸς τὴν τῶν φθασάντων γενέσθαι κατάληψιν, κατόπιν γινομένης τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἐπιτεύξεως, ὡς ἐντεύθεν ἀδηλία συσκιάζεσθαι τὴν τῆς ἱστορίας ἐφεύρεσιν, πη μὲν σπάνει βιβλιῶν ἐπωφελῶν, πη δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἐκτάδην πολυλογίαν δειμαινόντων καὶ κατορρωδοῦντων (...) καὶ ἐνδελεχότερον κατεντυγχάνειν εἰς τοὺς τροφίμους τῶν λόγων καὶ μονιμώτερον ἐντυποῦσθαι τούτως τὴν τῶν λόγων εὑρόδειαν.121

According to the prooemium people at that time were prone to make the wrong choices (πρὸς τὰ χείρω) because they were unable to learn the lessons of the past (τῆς ἱστορίας ἡμίρυνε συμπλοκή). The reason inferred was the scarcity of useful books (σπάνει βιβλιῶν) and the complexity (τὴν ἐκτάδην πολυλογίαν) of the existing ones. Consequently, the creation of a collection of the most important historiographical works could alleviate the problem of the lack of books and would facilitate reader’s access to them. The content of the collection could also provide the readers with historical exempla and help them to cope with similar cases in the future.122 The last sentence of the aforementioned passage

119PG 114, coll. 336.
120PG 115, coll. 280.
121Excerpta de legationibus, 1-2.
122It has to be pointed out that in the De administrando imperio, Constantine VII addressing his son, emphasises a similar aim for this work: for it is worth while, my dearest son, that a record of these things also should not escape you, in
recalls Photius’ comment on the didactical usefulness of Stobaeus’ *Anthologium in his Bibliotheca*.121

A similar attitude can be also detected in another chapter in the *Excerpta Anonymi* indicated only by the letter γ:

Καὶ εἶπον ἂν καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ καθ’ ἐξῆς τοῦ χρόνου μέχρι σχεδὸν τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς. ἄλλ’ ἵνα μὴ δόξω θηρώμενος δόξαν κενὴν ταῦτα γράφειν, ἄλλως τε καὶ τῶν πλείστων πᾶσι γινωσκομένων. Κύρου μνησθήσομαι καὶ Ῥωμύλου σὺν τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ· τὰ γὰρ περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Πριὰμον καὶ Οἰδίποδος τί καὶ γράφομι ὡς μηδενὸς τὰ κατ’ αὐτοὺς ἁγνοοῦντος.124

I could say even more of such things, one after another, up to our time, but in order not to be considered that I write about these things seeking vainglorious reputation, and because most of these things are known to all, I will mention Cyrus as well as Romulus and his brother. However, wherefore to write about Alexander, the son of Priam and about Oedipus, since everyone is acquainted with their stories.

The entire paragraph constitutes an addition by the compiler himself. He states that he could say even more about the subject matter he deals with (occult science and astrologers predicting the future) but he will not do so as he does not want to be deemed arrogant and all knowing (θηρώμενος δόξαν κενῆν). Besides that, most of the incidents concerning predictions of death and occult science are well known (πᾶσι γινωσκομένων). Next he informs his reader of his intention to narrate a story related to Cyrus and a story concerning Romulus and Remus while leaving out excerpts on Alexander the son of Priam and on Oedipus. The reason he gives for his choice is that all people were acquainted with the last two (ὡς μηδενὸς τὰ κατ’ αὐτοὺς ἁγνοοῦντος) but probably not with the stories of Cyrus and Romulus and Remus. Consequently, the passage highlights yet again the practical requirements in excerpting and the *Excerpta Anonymi* compiler here stresses the practical and didactic aims of his collection. What emerges here is the usefulness of a text in facilitating the accumulation of knowledge. Similar preoccupations are explicitly claimed in other works produced by processes of compilation.125 In Byzantine

order that, should the same things come about on similar occasions, you may by foreknowledge find a ready remedy; cf. DAI, 46.166–9.

121 Ἡ δὲ συναγωγὴ αὐτῷ ἐκ τε ποιητῶν καὶ ῥητόρων καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς πολιτείας λαμπρῶς βεβιωκότων ἐγένετο, ὡς καὶ αὐτός φησι τῶν μὲν τὰς ἐκλογὰς τῶν δὲ τὰ ἀποφθέγματα καὶ τινῶν ὑποθήκας συλλεξάμενος, ἐπὶ τῷ ρυθμίσαι καὶ βελτιώσαι τῷ παιδὶ τὴν φύσιν ἀμαυρότερον πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀναγνωσμάτων μνήμην, στείλειεν; cf. Bibliotheca, cod. 167. On the passage see Odorico (1990), 14-16.

122 *Excerpta Anonymi*, 32,28–33.

123 The matter has repeatedly been treated by P. Odorico in several articles. Similar didactical claims are to be found in Oribasius’ *Ἱατρικαὶ Συναγωγαί*, Stobaeus’ *Anthologium*, John of Damascus’ *Sacra Parallela*, and Doctrina
compilations, what matters is the selection of relevant passages to be represented and in particular in the case of the *Excerpta Anonymi*, it is the arrangement of material in alphabetical order which facilitates the reader interested in geography and occult science.\(^{126}\)

As P. Lemerle first noticed, the *prooemium* of the *Geoponica*,\(^ {127}\) a twenty-volume collection of agricultural lore compiled during the 10th century on commission of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, bears a resemblance to the *EC* when referring to the practical use of the collection:\(^ {128}\)

\[(...) καὶ ὅπως, καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα, μεγέθει φύσεως καὶ βάθει φρένων εἰς ἐν συλλεξάμενος κοινωφελὲς ἔργον τοῖς πάσι προτέθεικας.\(^ {129}\)]

The term ὑφέλεια is also encountered in the preface to the *Taktica* of Leo VI written some decades earlier.

\[(...) κοινὴν δὲ τοῖς ὑπηκόοις χαρίσασθαι τὴν ὑφέλειαν.\(^ {130}\)

In the preface to *Sacra parallela*, a sylloge of patristic quotations, John of Damascus refers to the motives of his work:

\[(...) καὶ τὰ περὶ τούτων σποράδην κεῖμενα ἀποφθέγματα ἡνθολόγηται, καὶ ἰδίοις τίτλοις παρατέθεινται.\(^ {131}\) (...) οὕτως καὶ η κατασκευὴ ὅλου τοῦ συγγράμματος, σύμμικτος ὀνόμα ἀπὸ τῆς θείας Γραφῆς, καὶ τῶν ὁσίων καὶ θεοφόρων ἀνδρῶν, πολλὴν ἔχει, τοῖς μὲν βουλομένους ἀναγνώσκειν ψυχαγωγίαν, τοῖς δὲ φιλοπονοῦσιν, εἰς τὸ διὰ μνήμης ἀναλαβεῖν εὐμάρειαν πάσι δὲ τοῖς ἑντυγχάνουσιν, ὑφέλειαν.\(^ {132}\)

The word σποράδην alludes to the scarcity of books described in the *prooemium* of the *EC*. According to John of Damascus, the *Sacra parallela* is a collection of texts, which was

---


\(^{127}\)Beckh (ed.) (1895).

\(^{128}\)Lemerle (1971), 289.

\(^{129}\)Geoponica, 2.

\(^{130}\)Dennis (ed.) (2010), 6.

\(^{131}\)Lequien (ed.) 1712, 279; PG 95, coll. 1041.

\(^{132}\)Lequien (ed.) 1712, 279; PG 95, coll. 1044.
meant to facilitate (εὐμάρειαν) the study of the Fathers of the Church (τοῖς δὲ φιλοπονούσιν) for those who desire to do so. He also adds two more purposes for his enterprise: pleasure (ψυχαγωγίαν) and teaching through memory (διὰ μνήμης ἀναλαβεῖν).

The passage above also bears a striking resemblance to a remark made by Photius in the Bibliotheca about John Stobaeus’ Anthologium. There Photius’ judgement yields significant information as to the requirements John Stobaeus intended to meet by creating this Anthologium:133

Ἡ δὲ συναγωγὴ αὐτῷ ἔκ τε ποιητῶν καὶ ῥητόρων καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς πολιτείας λαμπρῶς βεβιωκότων ἔγένετο, ὃν (ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς φησὶ) τῶν μὲν τὰς ἐκλογάς τῶν δὲ τὰ ἀποφθέγματα καὶ τινῶν ὑποθήκας συλλεξάμενος, ἐπὶ τῷ ῥυθμίσαι καὶ βελτιώσαι τῷ παιδί την φύσιν ἀμαυρότερην ἔχουσαν πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀναγνωσμάτων μνήμην, στείλειν. (...) Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν κεφαλάia, οἷς τῶν παλαιότερων ῥήσεως ἥρμοσεν Ἰωάννης ὁ Στοβαῖος, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ἀνδρῶν φιλοσόφων τε καὶ ποιητῶν ῥητόρων τε καὶ βασιλέων καὶ στρατηγῶν, ταύτας συνήθροισε, τοσαῦτα καὶ ἐκ τοσούτων. Χρήσιμον δὲ τὸ βιβλίον τοῖς μὲν ἀνεγνωκόσιν αὐτὰ τὰ συντάγματα τῶν ἀνδρῶν πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν, τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ὧν ἀνδρῶν φιλοσόφων τε καὶ ρητόρων, ταύτας συνήθροισε, τοσαῦτα καὶ ἐκ τοσούτων. Χρήσιμον δὲ τὸ βιβλίον τοῖς μὲν ἀνεγνωκόσιν αὐτὰ τὰ συντάγματα τῶν ἀνδρῶν πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν, τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ὧν ἀνδρῶν φιλοσόφων τε καὶ ρητόρων, ταύτας συνήθροισε, τοσαῦτα καὶ ἐκ τοσούτων. Χρήσιμον δὲ τὸ βιβλίον τοῖς μὲν ἀνεγνωκόσιν αὐτὰ τὰ συντάγματα τῶν ἀνδρῶν πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν, τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ὧν ἀνδρῶν φιλοσόφων τε καὶ ρητόρων, ταύτας συνήθροισε, τοσαῦτα καὶ ἐκ τοσούτων. Χρήσιμον δὲ τὸ βιβλίον τοῖς μὲν ἀνεγνωκόσιν αὐτὰ τὰ συντάγματα τῶν ἀνδρῶν πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν, τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ὧν ἀνδρῶν φιλοσόφων τε καὶ ρητόρων, ταύτας συνήθροισε, τοσαῦτα καὶ ἐκ τοσούτων. Χρήσιμον δὲ τὸ βιβλίον τοῖς μὲν ἀνεγνωκόσιν αὐτὰ τὰ συντάγματα τῶν ἀνδρῶν πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν, τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ὧν ἀνδρῶν φιλοσόφων τε καὶ ρητόρων, ταύτας συνήθροισε, τοσαῦτα καὶ ἐκ τοσούτων.

It is noteworthy that Photius in commenting on the usefulness of the anthology uses expressions like πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν, μνήμην, ἀταλαίπωρος καὶ σύντομος εὕρεσις, which are terms very close in meaning to those that occurred in the Sacra parallela. According to Photius, John Stobaeus’ Anthologium is well worth consulting (χρήσιμον δὲ τὸ βιβλίον) because its structure allows the reader (as in the case of the EC and the Sacra parallela) to go through the content easily and quickly (ἀταλαίπωρος καὶ σύντομος εὕρεσις). Intentions and desires to simplify complex material and make it more acceptable and pleasant are also found in the preface to the manual of siege craft Parangelmata poliorcetica.135

Ὅσα μὲν τῶν πολιορκητικῶν μηχανημάτων δυσχερῆ καὶ δυσέφικτα πέφυκεν, εἰτε διὰ τὸ ποικίλον καὶ δυσδιάγνωστον τῆς τούτων καταγραφῆς, εἰτε διὰ τὸ τῶν νοημάτων δύσληπτον ή

133Photius when giving a summary of the 4th-century collection of historical writings by Sopater, characterises the work as ἐκολογαὶ διάφοροι ἐν βιβλίοις ἰβ’ (=various extracts in twelve books); cf. Bibliotheca, cod. 161.

134Bibliotheca, cod. 167.

135The work is preserved along with another compilation, namely the Geodesia, in the 11th c. codex Vaticanus graecus 1605. Both works are derivatives of a 10th-century compilation on the subject matter of sieges. On the two manuals see Sullivan (2000), esp. 1-24. The Parangelmata poliorcetica and the Geodesia are edited in Sullivan (2000), 26-113 and 114-151, respectively.
The preface stresses the need for clarity (σαφὲς, εὔληπτον, εὔγνωστα καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν εὐκατάληπτα) as well as the didactical and practical importance of the present manual. Accuracy in terminology, common diction (ἰδιωτείᾳ λέξεων) and simplicity (ἁπλότητι λόγου, σαφέστερον) can easily teach anyone (τῶν τυχόντων) how to carpenter and construct siege engines (εὐκόλως καὶ τεκτονεύεσθαι καὶ κατασκευάζεσθαι).

Similar objectives are set in the introduction to the Taktika of Leo VI137 and in the prefaces to the De cerimoniis138 and the De administrando imperio of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.139

It should be pointed out that excerpt collections such as the EC, the military treatises, the codex Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a, the Geoponica and the Hippiatrica140 were all based on late antique texts. Their practical purposes could be disputed by the fact that their sources were very old and out of date.141 In addition, these collections relied on texts very often

---

138Ως ἂν δὲ σαφῆ καὶ εὐδιάγνωστα εἶναι τὰ γεγραμμένα, καὶ καθωμιλημένῳ λόγῳ καὶ ἁπλοῖκῳ πρὸς τὴν τῶν προκειμένων ἐχρησάμην δήλωσιν, μηδὲν θαυμάσῃς, ὡς ἂν ἐπιδεῖξην καλλιγραφίας οἰκῆς ἀπόκρισην καὶ τὸ διηρμένον διογκούσης καὶ ὑψηλὸν ποιῆσαι ἐσπούδασα; cf. DAI, 1.8-12.
139A tenth century veterinary collection. The principal manuscript of the recensio B of the textual transmission of Hippiatrica shows striking affinities with manuscripts produced in the scriptorium of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; McCabe (2006), 269-275.
140There are cases in which compilers themselves doubt the contemporary relevance of the material they include in their collections. Nicephoros Ouranos in his Tactica and the author of the De velitatione are two prime examples of compilers expressing doubts on the practical usefulness of the knowledge they transmit; cf. Holmes,
quite blurred and difficult in linguistic terms. In the preface to the Geodesia, the compiler claims that:

τὸ μὲν περὶ τὰς λέξεις ἁσαφὲς καὶ διάφραστον τῶν πάλαι ἑπιστημῶν εἰκρινήσαι καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἱδωτικῶτερον μεταβαλεῖν.\textsuperscript{142}

Compilers, in some cases endeavor to update their classical and late antique material by adding explanations or simplifying vocabulary. One should wonder, however, whether compilations like the Hippiatrica and Geoponica could really practically be used by horse-doctors or agriculturists of the 10\textsuperscript{th} century as both works lack innovations in horse medicine and agriculture respectively, which had taken place after Late Antiquity. Nevertheless, collections, even if antiquarian in terms of content, were still considered useful mainly for teaching at schools.\textsuperscript{143}

\subsubsection{1.3.3 Composition}

In the foregoing, I have shown how the excerpts were employed, rephrased and shortened following certain criteria. Accordingly, the compiler of an excerpt collection would aim at accuracy, brevity, retaining the narrative sequence and fulfilling practical and didactical purposes. It is however apparent that such goals set restrictions for the compilers to rephrase the text to any large extent. I am going to discuss this matter beginning from what is evidenced in the prooemium of the EC. As regards the extent to which the excerptors used to intervene in the original text, the prooemium provides us with important information:

(…) κοικ ἄλησιν οὐδὲν τῶν συγκειμένων, ὃ διαφεύγεται τὴν τοιαύτην τῶν ὑποθέσεων ἀπαρίθμησιν, οὐδὲν τὸ παράπαυν ἀφαιρομένης τῆς τῶν λόγων ἀκολουθίας τῇ διαφέρει τῶν ἐγγονῶν, ἀλλὰ σύσωμον σωζόντος καὶ ἐκάστη ὑποθέσει προσαρμοζομένης τηλικαύτης ὡς συνόψεως, ἀληθέστερον δ’ εἰπεῖν, οἰκειώσεως.\textsuperscript{144}

The statement means that the excerptors do not summarise but retain the exact structural form of the original text. It also implies that Constantine Porphyrogenitus

\textsuperscript{142}Sullivan (2000), 116.
\textsuperscript{143}See on that McCabe (2006), 299-301.
\textsuperscript{144}Excerpta de legationibus, 2.
made a choice between two existing manners of creating excerpt collections; summarising (σύνοψις) or appropriating (οἰκείωσις).

Attention must be drawn to the term οἰκείωσις. A. Nemeth appears to interpret the term οἰκείωσις as the exact copy of the entire historical work that is to be excerpted at a later stage of the redacting procedure. P. Odorico, by contrast, assigns to the συγκειμένων preceding the term οἰκείωσις, the meaning of selected pieces of text, arguing thus that it is only selected passages that were incorporated, without any textual intervention, into draft manuscripts before the official copies of the 53 subject categories are executed. P. Odorico’s argument seems to be more tenable based on the content and format of the extant collections of the EC as well as other Byzantine collections. As I have already argued, the integration of the original extracted passages initially into the collection is made manifest in Psellos’ comments as well as in the way Symeon composes his Menologion and the Excerpta Anonymi. The term οἰκείωσις represents a category of rewriting a text rather than a conflation of different texts into a single entity; the excerptors working under the auspices of Constantine Porphyrogenitus preserve the original structure of the extracted pieces. Accordingly, σύνοψις should be reserved for the summary process, another category of rewriting, too. Interestingly, the author of the prooemium as opposed to the term σύνοψις did not insert there the term ἀντιγραφή, which would make the difference clearer. Instead he inserts a word that derives from the verb οἰκεῖω- ω that means adapt, make something to fit, make something suitable for. The term οἰκείωσις does not strictly exclude any intervention in the text whatsoever, it ensures however the original narrative sequence. The term οἰκείωσις, on the one hand, allows the excerptors to correct the original material according to the specific circumstances and preoccupations under which these were originally composed and on the other to adapt them, through the process of editing, to the socio-political context of the 10th century. In the EC the term οἰκείωσις permits the distribution of the excerpts according to precise themes without any major modifications in the content and such an approach allows for the omission of passages but does not permit to summarise what an excerptor may regard as irrelevant for each thematic section.

146Nemeth (2010), 186 and 228-234.
147Odorico (2017).
148The excerptors when wanting to mark the division of excerpts, add the conjunction ὅτι at the beginning of each text. They also add names and chronological data or short statements in order to rationalise the narrative; Roberto (2009), 79. C. de Boor accentuates an occasion where an excerptor had added three words at the beginning of an excerpted passage of Procopius’, which intended to connect this passage with the previous one; cf. de Boor (1912), 388.
149The excerptors in general do not abridge the original text. However, there are exceptions. For instance excerpts from John of Antioch and John Malalas that have been epitomised; Roberto (2009), 81-82. For Malalas
Psello aptly describes Symeon’s approach to the original texts at another point in his encomium:

Τά τε γάρ προοίμια τῶν λόγων αὐτώ ἀπτόμενα εὐθὺς τοῦ ὑποκειμένου καὶ βραχὺ τι προίὼν τὸν τὸν συγγράμματος ἀναφαίνει σκοπὸν καὶ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐνίοις τῶν λόγων ὑπόθεσιν κεφαλαιωσάμενος εὐθὺς κατὰ μέρος τέμνει πρὸ ταῖς πρόσωπα καὶ τῶς καιρῶς μεθαρμόζεται καὶ τὸ μὲν χρώμα τοῦ λόγου τὸ αὐτὸ πάσι καὶ ἡ ποιότης μία τῆς φράσεως, ἢ δὲ τοῦ ἡδοὺς μεταβολὴ ποικίλη καὶ, ὡς ἄν εἴποι τις, τεχνικῆ, οὐ διὰ τὴν τέχνην τὰ πρᾶξεν τα μεταβάλλουσα, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκάστῳ τῶν παραπιπτόντων πραγμάτων τε καὶ προσώπων οἰκεῖον διερμηνεύεται.

He relates the beginning of the passages directly to the subject and, moving on slowly, discloses the aim of the composition, and by shortening the entire subject of some passages, he, concurrently, divides (the passages) into sections and adapts them to the persons and to the circumstances. The colour of language remains the same throughout the passages, and the quality of style is one and the same. The diction, instead, changes in various ways - as one might say - skillfully, the events do not undergo any change through the method, but each feature is interpreted so as to be adaptable to each of the events and to each of the persons in question.

Psello states that Symeon shortens the old text (κεφαλαιωσάμενος) by dividing the original material into small parts (κατὰ μέρος τέμνει) and by making changes in the text (μεθαρμόζεται) relevant to the character of each saint and related to the circumstances of the saints’ time. Nevertheless, Symeon does not distort the original narrative sequence (οὐ μεταβάλλουσα). The term οἰκεῖον at the end of the passage recalls the prooemium of the EC. Psello explains that Symeon’s interventions and modifications in the text stem from the necessity to make the new composition fit the personal traits of each saint and the incidents related to him. We shall see in the following chapters that a similar approach to older texts is detectable throughout the Excerpta Anonymi, the Excerpta Salmasiana, and the Excerpta Planuadea: the authors of the collections intervene in the original text but they do not epitomise it. They relied methodologically on already determined principles by following the procedures described above.

---

see Thurn (ed.) 2000; Flusin (2002), 539-546. Av. Cameron has also noticed a case in which the excerptors have summarised an epigram found, both, in Diodorus of Sicily and George the Monk; Cameron (1993), 293-297.

1.4 Conclusion

This chapter put forward that the four syllogai of excerpts scrutinised in separate chapters in the thesis were products of a common approach to older texts and of traditional excerpting techniques. I argued that the four collections under discussion excerpt historical texts employing a method that is congruent with the one applied to the EC. Omissions or insertions of passages and re-arrangement of sentences within a single excerpt reflect the same pattern of reworking earlier texts and disclose ideological tendencies and priorities. For the main feature of a sylloge is the accumulation of selected knowledge. The selection of material as well as omissions and additions are determined by the scope and the goal of each of them and by the extent to which they aim to excercise censorship.

Accordingly, no distinction should be made between collections commissioned by emperors and syllogai compiled by scholars or literate men working independently and not under imperial patronage. The former are linked to the re-organisation of the imperial library, when all sorts of books were accumulated in Constantinople under the reign of Leo V (813-820) and their texts were transliterated into minuscule script. The latter is mirrored through the activities of creating florilegia, syllogae, anthologiae, as well as anonymous manuscripts of text fragments selected to some extent according to a steady principle. Nevertheless, these scholars were writing under the pressure of the dominating imperial policy, even if they have not been commissioned directly to serve it. An author belonging to the contemporary bureaucratic or intellectual milieu is likely to have absorbed what the dominant ideology expressed at that time. From this perspective,

---

151 This argument runs counter to A. Nemeth’s proposition that the excerpting method of the EC was innovative compared to previous excerpting techniques; cf. Nemeth (2010), 17-63.
152 See also Odorico (2017).
153 Constantine Porphyrogenitus removed the library to the Μεσόπατον; cf. Theophanes Continuatus, 145.
154 Monks from monasteries in Constantinople and around the capital had begun copying manuscripts systematically shortly after the Empress Irene took power in 780 and the iconophile Tarasius was appointed Patriarch of Constantinople; cf. Treadgold (1984), 80-81. The Byzantine cultural Renaissances of 9th and 10th centuries were in close connection with the increasing concentration of education and schooling and of the accumulation of books in one hand. The former emerged as part of the necessity of well-educated men to enter the imperial bureaucracy. The latter stems from the central interest in ancient and late antique literature at that period, which, in turn, derives from two chief reasons: the intensive desire to unite pagan and Christian culture and the efforts made by the first emperors of the Macedonian dynasty to legitimise its authority on the basis of affinities with the glorious classical past. On the classical influences in the literature of the tenth century see Jenkins (1954), esp. 21. On the union of the pagan and Christian culture, which was marked by St Basil’s celebrated Advice to young Christians on what use to make of the Classics see Jenkins (1963), 40; cf. PG 31, coll. 564-589. The topic of the efforts made by the first emperors of the Macedonian dynasty to legitimise their authority has been treated by Markopoulos (1994), 159-170; Holmes (2010), esp. 62-80; Magdalino (2013c), 187-209.
his work was a product of certain social, political and religious circumstances.\textsuperscript{155} Formation of opinion and strengthening of identity may have been among the scopes of collections of historical excerpts.\textsuperscript{156} On the other hand, such collections were likely to express the preoccupations of individual scholars, especially through periods of anxiety and apprehension.\textsuperscript{157} From this perspective it is no coincidence that a common desire among well-educated Byzantine writers was to preserve material of the past, material that was perceived as part of a common inheritance.

\textsuperscript{155}This seems to hold true for historical narratives throughout the Byzantine ages. Histories written in the 9\textsuperscript{th} century, namely those of George the Monk and the Ecclesiastical History of Niketas David Paphlagon, had not been commissioned by any imperial authority, whereas other historical narratives, namely the Regum libri quattuor of Genesius, the first part of Theophanes Continuatus, and the Vita Basilii were composed under the auspices of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, an emperor whose intention was to direct the composition of historical works in order to impose his imperial authority. Niketas' history is now lost, see Paschalides (2004), 161-173; Karpozilos (2002), 213-249. On the history of Genesius see Lesmüller-Werner – Thurn (edd.) (1978); Kaldellis (1998); Karpozilos (2002), 315-330; Markopoulos (1986), 103-108; Markopoulos (2009), 137-150. On knowledge and authority under Constantine Porphyrogenitus see Holmes (2010); Magdalino (2013c).

\textsuperscript{156}On the role of historiography in the context of identity formation, see Debié (2009), 93-114 and Wood (2010). Both scholars are concerned with Syriac texts, though. The matter merits further investigation.

\textsuperscript{157}The Empire passed many of such periods from the 6\textsuperscript{th} century on. I only refer to the overthrow of the tyrant Phocas at the beginning of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century, the Sassanian invasion under Chosroes II, the devastation of cities in the Near East, including Jerusalem, the siege of Constantinople by the Avars and the Persians in 626 AD. See in general Treadgold (1997).
Chapter 2
Excerpta Anonymi

The Excerpta Anonymi are an anonymous sylloge of excerpts dated to the second half of the 10th century. The sylloge comprises excerpts from anonymous patriographic texts, a considerable number of passages taken from late antique historians and passages on geometry. The excerpts are arranged in alphabetical order. Thematically, the excerpted passages deal with prophecies and oracular powers hidden in statues and dreams as well as with geography and ethnography.

This chapter 1) dates the unique codex of the Excerpta Anonymi to the mid-10th century, 2) considers the contents, sources and the structure of the Excerpta Anonymi, 3) studies the compositional method of the collection, 4) examines the relationship between the Excerpta Anonymi and the CE, and 5) studies the historical and cultural context within which the Excerpta Anonymi were compiled. Specifically, contrary to previous scholarly views that the selection of material in the Excerpta Anonymi either was made at random1 or represents the genre of lexica,2 I shall show that 1) the anonymous compiler of the sylloge made a conscious selection of passages, 2) the working method in the Excerpta Anonymi is identical to the one applied to the CE as well as to earlier collections of historical excerpts, and 3) that the selection of material was motivated by contemporary ideology. The dating to the mid-10th century of the unique codex of the Excerpta Anonymi enables us to contextualise the collection and to identify its political dimension. I argue in particular, that the selection of texts in the Excerpta Anonymi served the so-called restricted ecumenism that characterised the foreign policy of the Macedonian dynasty.

1Cameron – Herrin (1984), 5.
2Nemeth (2010), 33.
2.1 Dating of the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a

The *Excerpta Anonymi* were published from the unique codex *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a* by M. Treu in 1880.3 The *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a* consists of 84 + 2 folia measuring 190 X 128 mm. Folia 85 and 86 were left blank. The text occupies an area of 125 X 66 mm and there are 20 lines of text per page. The ruling pattern is Leroy 20D1. The codex is made of ten and a half quaternions and the folios are numbered 1 through 84 by a later hand.

Scholars have held different opinions regarding the date of the *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a*. P. Goukowsky and P. Odorico place the codex to the mid-10th century.4 A. Nemeth, by contrast, dates the *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a* in the late 9th or early 10th centuries.5 I have doubts about the validity of his proposition, since there seems to be no compelling argument for it. On the contrary, codicological and palaeographic features of the manuscript suggest a dating to the second half of the 10th century. Primarily, the shape of breathings, the manner of writing on ruled lines and the frequent use of uncial letters speak of a date in the second half of the 10th century.6 In addition, the *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a* shares a significant number of palaeographic characteristics with a group of manuscripts written in a minuscule script already well-established in the second half of the 10th century, namely the Vaticanus gr. 1613,7 the Athos Dionysiou 70,8 and the Vaticanus Urb. gr. 20.9

The script of the original text can be characterised as *bouletée*10 with features of the later *pearlscript*.11 In fact, the codex represents an early stage of the *pearlscript*. The letters stand vertical on the ruled lines and they are shaped with clarity and regularity. Although the handwriting approaches the *pearlscript*, some elements essential to the *canon*, as determined by Hunger, are still missing.12 The roundness of the *omicron* (ο) and *alpha* (α)

---

3Treu (ed.) (1880). On the *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a* see also Omont (1888b), 283; Agati (1992), 299-300. On the *Excerpta Anonymi* see also Preger (1901), X; Preger (1907), XXI-XXIV; Cameron – Herrin (1984), 4-8; Goukowsky (1995), 63-70; Amerio (1999), 35-42; Odorico (2014), 755-784.
5Nemeth (2010), 33.
6My special thanks go to prof. Panagiotis Sotiroudis (Thessaloniki) for his palaeographical assistance. In his opinion the codex was written at the end of the 10th century.
7The codex dates to the reign of Basil II. It was written between the years 979 and 989; cf. Follieri (1969), 33-35 and fig. 20.
8K. Lake-S.Lake (1934-1939, 154-155, fig. 28a.
9The codex dates to the year 992; cf. Follieri (1969), 36-37 and fig. 22.
10About *bouletée* see Irigoin (1977), 191-199; Agati (1992), esp. 9-26 and 307-331.
11*Pearlscript* was the writing style derived from the minuscule *bouletée*, the writing style of the first half and middle of the 10th century. The *Pearlscript* was succeeded by the *liturgical minuscule* emerging in the 11th century. On *pearlscript* see Hunger (1954), 22-32.
12Hunger (1954).
is not unitary throughout the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a. When it occurs at the end of the line, the \textit{alpha} (\(\alpha\)) loses its roundness and it is executed in a narrow shape.

Among the main features of the so-called \textit{pearlscript} observed in the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a are the following: a) the uncial form of \(\upsilon\) in the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a is a standard feature of the late \textit{pearlscript} of the very late 10th and the early 11th centuries; b) in the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a the ligature \textit{epsilon-iota} is common, whereas in the earlier \textit{bouletée} and the later \textit{liturgical minuscule} the ligature is often replaced by the two letters written separately; c) the uncial form of the letters \textit{beta} and \textit{epsilon} in the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a is a feature of the \textit{pearlscript} in general; d) there is no also open form of \textit{omega} (\(\omega\)). The letter \(\omega\) as it occurs in the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a is common in \textit{pearlscript}; e) the presence of uncial \(\upsilon\); f) the \textit{iota} is the same size as the rest of the letters g) there are more connections between the letters (in comparison, for instance, to the \textit{liturgical minuscule} script of the 11\textsuperscript{th} century); d) there is no ligature \textit{tau-omicron} with \textit{omicron} formed in a loop from the right part of the horizontal stroke of the \textit{tau} (this ligature is common in the minuscule script of the 11\textsuperscript{th} century).

As noted, the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a also exhibits palaeographic features that occurred in manuscripts written in \textit{bouletée}. Accordingly, the letter \textit{lambda} (\(\lambda\)) is not the same height as the rest of the letters and the letter \(\eta\) is identical to the ones in a number of manuscripts in \textit{bouletée}. For instance, the \textit{lambda} exceeds the average height in Athens B. N. 2641\textsuperscript{15} dated in 913/914, Oxford Bodl. Baroci 134\textsuperscript{16} dated in 947/948 and in Oxford Bodl. Auct. E. 2.12,\textsuperscript{17} which dates in the year 953, the time when \textit{bouletée} reaches its culmination. The letter \(\eta\) is identical in Hierosol. S. Crucis 55\textsuperscript{18} dated in 927 and in Paris gr. 139.\textsuperscript{19}

The Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a bears some characteristics of later script as well. Such features are the frequent use of uncials and the form of the letter \textit{rho} (\(\rho\)). The \textit{rho} (\(\rho\)) is not

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item In the \textit{liturgical minuscule} the letters epsilon, zeta, theta, kappa, lambda, phi and omega are also enlarged.
\item Liturgical minuscule is more static and almost upright, there are not many connections between letters, many letters are enlarged and the strokes of the letters are reduced.
\item Irigoin (1977), 196.
\item Barbour (1981), 6, fig. 19.
\item Irigoin (1977), 197; Barbour (1981), 6 and fig. 21.
\item Irigoin (1977), 197.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
connected to the following *alpha* (α) or *omicron* (ο). The letter *rho* occurs in that form in a number of manuscripts in bouletée, as well as in liturgical minuscule.\textsuperscript{20}

The handwriting of the author of the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a is quite even and controlled, betraying a professional scribe. The medium is the usual dark brown Byzantine ink. Headings and initials are in uncial but in the same ink. It is impossible to identify a specific scriptorium but an external source helps us determine the origin of the manuscript, namely Constantinople. We know that the *Patria* II of the *Patria of Constantinople* possibly used the *Excerpta Anonymi* itself and certainly a common source.\textsuperscript{21} This suggests that the Parisinus gr. 607a originated in the same place as the *Patria*.\textsuperscript{22}

### 2.2 Content, structure and sources of the *Excerpta Anonymi*

#### 2.2.1 Content

The content of the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a can thematically be divided as follows: 1) Patriographic passages. Fol. 1v–2r: Περὶ Αὐγουστείου; fol. 2r–2v: Περὶ ἀτραβατικῶν; fol. 2v–10r: Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων; fol. 10v–29v: Περὶ στηλῶν. 2) Geographical/ethnographical passages. Fol. 1r–1v: Περὶ Ἀδιαβηνῆς; fol. 9v–10r: Περὶ ἄνδρειας; fol. 10r: Ἀλλὸ περὶ Γετῶν; 29v–37r, 40v–42r, 57r–58v, 67r–68r; extracts from Herodotus, Cassius Dio, Procopius, and John Lydus; fol. 62v–67r: Περὶ Ἰστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ; fol. 72v–74r: Ἐκ τῶν περιηγητικῶν τὰ χρειώδεστα καὶ σαφηνέστα τοῦ Διονυσίου. 3) Omina/curious natural celestial phenomena/divination. Fol. 8v–9r, 31r–62v: extracts from scholia on Homer, Cassius Dio, Procopius, Appianus, and John Lydus. 4) Astronomic/geometric passages. fol. 75v–83r: excerpts from Leon the Mechanic’s *Πῶς δεῖ ιστᾶν σφαῖραν καὶ Διαίρεσις τῆς σφαίρας*; fol. 83r–84v: Theon of Alexandria’s Scholia.

As can be seen in Table 1, in spite of the fourfold content of the *Excerpta Anonymi*, the structure of the collection is alphabetical. As shall be shown in the following section, the

\textsuperscript{20}For instance in the codex Arch. S. Petri B 58; cf. Canart (1966), pl. II; and in the codex Dumbarton Oaks MS 1, 3, 4; cf. Kavrus-Hoffmann (1966), 289-312.

\textsuperscript{21}The *Patria of Constantinople* is a corpus of texts relating to the antiquities of Constantinople, dated to 995. That the *Excerpta Anonymi* were composed earlier than the *Patria of Constantinople* can also be supported by the fact that the *Suda*, the lexicon of the late 10th century, also drew on the *Excerpta Anonymi*; cf. Preger (1901), X. On the *Patria II* see Preger (1907), 151-209. For the manuscript tradition of the *Patria* see Preger (1907), III-XXV; Berger (1988), 50-86. See also Berger (2013), ix-xi, xiii-xiv.

\textsuperscript{22}It seems likely that the *Patria II* of the *Patria of Constantinople* were made in two stages drawing on the codex (codices) that the *Excerpta Anonymi* also drew on. The possibility that the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a was also in the possession of the compiler of the *Patria II* can by no means be excluded. On the complex manuscript transmission of the *Patria II* and their textual relationship with the *Excerpta Anonymi* see below section 2.5.1.2.
alphabetical order often breaks, though. Brief connecting passages were inserted by the compiler to explain his decision to include passages that do not follow the alphabetical arrangement.

Table 1: the contents of the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a</th>
<th>Alphabetical (στοιχεῖον)</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fol. 1r-1v: Περὶ Ἀδιαβηνής</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>geography/superstition</td>
<td>CD 68, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 1v-2r: Περὶ Λύγουστείου</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>statuary</td>
<td>John Lydus, <em>De Mensibus</em> 163,3 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 2r-2v: Περὶ ἀτραβατικῶν</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Roman ritual</td>
<td>John Lydus, <em>De Magistratibus</em> 21,18 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 2v-8r: Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>statuary/mythology/hidden powers</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 7r-7v: Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἐχόντος ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ κέρατα</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>statuary/mythology</td>
<td>Appian, <em>Syriaca</em>, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 8v-9r: Περὶ Λύγουστου εὐτυχίας</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>prophecy</td>
<td>Appian, <em>Bellum civile</em>, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 9r-v: Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἐν πέτρᾳ τῆς Ἀραβίας</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>statuary</td>
<td>Appian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 9r-10r: Περὶ ἀνδρείας</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>ethnography/mythology</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.10r: Ἀλλὸ περὶ Γετών</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>ethnography</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 10v-29v: Περὶ στηλῶν</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>statuary/hidden powers/prophesy/omina</td>
<td>Parastaseis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 29v-31r: Περὶ Βρεττανίας</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>geography/ethnography</td>
<td>CD 76,12 and 13,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 31r-32r: Περὶ Βεσβίου ὄρους Προκόπιος</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>geography/superstition</td>
<td>Procopius, <em>De bellis</em> 6,4,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 32r-36r: Περὶ Βριττίας νῆσου</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>geography/ethnography/superstition</td>
<td>Procopius, <em>De bellis</em> 8,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 36r-37r: Περὶ οἰλονοσοπίας τῶν Οὐάρνων</td>
<td></td>
<td>ethnography/omina</td>
<td>Procopius, <em>De bellis</em> 8,20,11-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 37r-40r: Περὶ Κάλχαντος τοῦ παρ’ Ὀμήρῳ</td>
<td></td>
<td>omnia</td>
<td><em>Scholia in Iliadem</em> 2,299-329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 40r-40v: Περὶ σημείου καὶ τέρατος</td>
<td></td>
<td>omnia</td>
<td><em>Scholia on Homer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 40v-41v: Περὶ χοίρων</td>
<td></td>
<td>ethnography/omina</td>
<td>Procopius, <em>De bellis</em> 5,9,1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41v-42r</td>
<td>Τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου perὶ παρατηρήσεως εἰκόνος</td>
<td>ethnography/omnia</td>
<td>Procopius, De bellis 5,9,22-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42v</td>
<td>Περὶ Γαίου Ἰουλίου Καίσαρος</td>
<td>omina/prophetic dream</td>
<td>CD 44,18,2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42v-44r</td>
<td>Περὶ τῆς γαμητῆς αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>omina/prophetic dream</td>
<td>CD 44,17,1, CD 37,52,2, CD 45,1,3, CD 45,1,3-5, CD 45,2,1, CD 45,2,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44r-44v</td>
<td>Περὶ Γαίου Ἰουλίου Καίσαρος</td>
<td>omina</td>
<td>CD 47,48,4-49,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v</td>
<td>Περὶ Θρασύλλου διδασκάλου Τιβερείου τοῦ Λύγούστου</td>
<td>omina</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v-45r</td>
<td>Αὔλλος</td>
<td>omina</td>
<td>Pet.Patr. (ES 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v</td>
<td>Περὶ Νέρωνος</td>
<td>omina</td>
<td>Pet.Patr. (ES 89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46r-46v</td>
<td>untitled</td>
<td>omina</td>
<td>CD 67,16,2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46v-47r</td>
<td>Β</td>
<td>omina</td>
<td>CD 67,16,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47r-47v</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>omina</td>
<td>CD 67,18,1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47v-53r</td>
<td>Περὶ Κύρου</td>
<td>omina/prophetic dream</td>
<td>Herodotus, Historiae 1,96-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53r-55v</td>
<td>Περὶ Ῥώμου καὶ Ῥωμύλου</td>
<td>mythology</td>
<td>Appian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55v-57r</td>
<td>Περὶ Ἀράβων μαντείας</td>
<td>omina</td>
<td>Appian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57r-58v</td>
<td>Περὶ βρουμαλίων</td>
<td>B ethnography/Roman ritual</td>
<td>John Lydus, De Mensibus 173,18-174 W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58v-61r</td>
<td>Περὶ βισέξτου</td>
<td>B Roman ritual</td>
<td>John Lydus, De Mensibus 43,17-49,24 W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61r-62r</td>
<td>Περὶ γενέσεως ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὅθεν τρίτα ἔνατα καὶ τεσσαρακοστὰ ἐπιτελοῦνται τοῖς τεθνεῶσιν</td>
<td>Γ superstition</td>
<td>John Lydus, De Mensibus 84,21-86,11 W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62r-62v</td>
<td>Περὶ ποσότητος τῶν τεκτομένων</td>
<td>superstition</td>
<td>John Lydus, De Mensibus 136,23-137 W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62v-67r</td>
<td>Περὶ Ἰστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ</td>
<td>geography</td>
<td>An earlier excerpt collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folios</td>
<td>Greek Text</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67r-67v</td>
<td>Περὶ πιπέρεως</td>
<td>geography/ethnography</td>
<td>John Lydus, <em>De Mensibus</em> 77,9-78,4 W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67v-68r</td>
<td>Περὶ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης</td>
<td>geography/astronomy</td>
<td>John Lydus, <em>De Mensibus</em> 53,6-55,4 W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68r-69v</td>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>meteorological phenomena/divination</td>
<td>John Lydus, <em>De Ostentis</em> 107,7-110,10 W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69r-70v</td>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>meteorological phenomena/divination</td>
<td>John Lydus, <em>De Ostentis</em> 181 W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70v-72v</td>
<td>Περὶ πυρόεντος κεραυνοῦ</td>
<td>meteorological phenomena/divination</td>
<td>John Lydus, <em>De Ostentis</em> 97-100,4 W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72v-75v</td>
<td>Εἰκ τῶν περιηγητικῶν τὰ χρειωδέστερα καὶ σαφηνέστερα τοῦ Δονυσίου</td>
<td>geography</td>
<td>Dionisius periegetam (GGM, II, 457b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75v-82v</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν οὐρανίων</td>
<td>geometry/astronomy</td>
<td>Leon the mechanic, <em>Pióς δει ιστάν σφαῖραν</em>, 264-265 Buchle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82v</td>
<td>Πόσοι γενικοὶ ἄνεμοι</td>
<td>meteorological phenomena/mythology</td>
<td>Leon the mechanic, <em>Πως δει ιστάν σφαῖραν</em>, 266 Buchle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83r</td>
<td>Πόσοι πόλοι</td>
<td>geometry/astronomy</td>
<td>Leon the mechanic, <em>Πως δει ιστάν σφαῖραν</em>, 264 Buchle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83v</td>
<td>Ἄνδρες</td>
<td>etymology</td>
<td>Scholia in Aratum, 44,5-7 Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83r</td>
<td>Ὅτι διαφέρει ἀστήρ ἀστεροῦ</td>
<td>astronomy</td>
<td>Arati Solensis phaenomena, 32 Buchle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84r</td>
<td>Περὶ δίκτου</td>
<td>magical herb</td>
<td>Arati Solensis phaenomena, 20 Buchle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84r</td>
<td>Ὄτι τριώνυμος ἐστιν ὁ Ἀρκτοφύλαξ</td>
<td>astronomy</td>
<td>Arati Solensis phaenomena, 32 Buchle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84r-84v</td>
<td>Πρώτοι δὲ βοῶν ἐπάσαντ’ ἀρτήρων</td>
<td>mythology/superstition</td>
<td>Arati Solensis phaenomena, 39 Buchle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84v</td>
<td>Κεδαιομένους</td>
<td>etymology</td>
<td>Arati Solensis phaenomena, 46 Buchle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 The structure of the Excerpta Anonymi

As suggested by the title of the first and single edition, the Excerpta Anonymi should be seen in the context of the culture of sylloge. The selection of material according to certain themes, its alphabetical arrangement and the homogeneity of the narrative structure throughout the Excerpta Anonymi indicate that their author intended to produce a coherent collection of excerpts. Let us look how this plays out in the various parts of the Excerpta Anonymi.

The compiler’s tendency to present his material in alphabetical order beginning with the letter (στοιχεῖον) A should be noted. This is apparent from the very beginning of the collection as it has been handed down to us. Accordingly, the compiler organizes his material under individual headings. The first three chapters are entitled as follows: Περὶ Ἀδιαβῆνης (fol. 1r-1v), Περὶ Ἀὐγουστείου (fol. 1v-2r) and Περὶ ἀτραβατικῶν (fol. 2r-2v). Then follows the first long section in the collection, which is entitled Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων (fol. 2v-29v). It incorporates a large part of the Parastaseis, which is marked by the indication Περὶ στηλῶν. It is noteworthy, however, that the words ἀγαλμα and στήλη have the same meaning so that the section Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων does not lose its thematic homogeneousness and thus, the author does not break the alphabetical order of the collection. The first part of the Excerpta Anonymi ends with the indication Τέλος τῶν στηλῶν written in enlarged minuscule letters on fol. 29v and followed by a line of five crosses the same size as the letters. In terms of content, the focus in the first part is on prophecies, omens and hidden powers.

The next group of passages bears the heading Ἀρχὴ τοῦ β’ στοιχείου (f. 29v). Indeed, it starts with passages concerning items beginning with that letter, but soon enters into a long digression on omens and prophecies, which breaks the alphabetical order. At the end, the author does return to the alphabetical order, and even starts with a new letter, Γ. This part is actually revelatory with regard to the working methods of the compiler and hints at the tension between the desire to respect the alphabetical order and the wish to have some form of thematic coherence. Let us look at this part in more detail.

The first passage is titled Περὶ Βρεττανίας (fol. 29v-31r) and has been extracted from Cassius Dio. Then follow three passages extracted from Procopius with the ensuing chapter entitled: Περὶ Βεσβίου ὄρους Προκόπιος (fol. 31r-32r), Περὶ Βριττίας νῆσου (fol. 32r-36r) and Περὶ οἰωνοσκοπίας τῶν Οὐάρνων (fol. 36r-37r). These excerpts are concerned with geography and ethnography. The passage from Cassius Dio and the last two, taken from Procopius, deal with the Island of Brititia and, therefore, have a thematic correspondence. The passages also comply with the author’s intention to have an alphabetical arrangement. The exception is the chapter Περὶ οἰωνοσκοπίας τῶν Οὐάρνων. At its beginning, the compiler adds the statement Μνησθήσομαι δὲ καὶ περὶ οἰωνοσκοπίας: it suggests that he felt compelled to justify his choice to include a title at this point, because the excerpt interrupts the alphabetical arrangement. We can understand, however, why
he wished to include this excerpt at this very point in his collection: it provides additional information concerning the Island of Brittaia. Moreover, the interest in the omens and prophecies of the Varni harks back to the first part of the compilation.

In the first part of the collection the compiler does not mention his sources. However, from the second part onward, he names the sources he draws on. In the first chapter, taken from Cassius Dio, the author’s name is mentioned in the second line of the chapter. In the case of the second chapter, Procopius is mentioned in the title Peri Βεσβίου ὄρους Προκόπιος. Procopius is also the source used for the next two chapters, Peri Βριττίας νῆσου and Peri οἰωνοσκοπίας τῶν Οὐάρνων, but his name is not repeated, as these two chapters derive from the same author. This system of identification is followed throughout the entire second part of the Excerpta Anonymi. Indeed, after the chapter on the Varni, the following title, Peri Κάλχαντος τοῦ παρ’ Ὄμηρῳ (fol. 37r-40r), indicates the source of the chapter, namely Homer. The ensuing chapter, Peri σημείου καὶ τέρατος (fol. 40r-40v), belongs to the same tradition, namely that of scholia on Homer and when the compiler returns to Procopius in the next chapter, Peri χοίρων (fol. 40v-41v), he again mentions his source. At this point, he once again, links the passage to the previous one with the word Μνησθήσομαι at the beginning of the new chapter. Indeed, the chapter Peri χοίρων is connected thematically with the ones derived from Homer as well as with the chapter on the Varni, as it deals with a Jewish oracle. The chapter Τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου περὶ παρατηρήσεως εἰκόνος (fol. 41v-42r) briefly presents another oracle, which is linked to the Goths.

It should be clear by now that after the initial alphabetical order with excerpts on Brittain and Brittainia, the compiler has added excerpts on oracles and prophecies without respecting the alphabetical order. Brief connecting phrases serve the purpose of maintaining coherence and narrative sequence. The chapter following that of the Gothic oracles is labelled Peri Γαίου Ιουλίου Καίσαρος (fol. 42v) and begins with the words Ὡμοιον καὶ.

The interest in dreams, oracles and omens continues in the following chapters (see above Table 1). Shortly before returning to the alphabetical order, the compiler introduces an auctorial remark in the chapter simply labelled as γ. He reveals the practical and didactical aims of his enterprise. He says that he could write more on the subject, but he does not want to be considered as θηρώμενος δόξαν κενὴν ταύτα γράφειν, viz. as one who writes about these things seeking vain reputation, and he adds that most of the facts he presents are known to all.

The chapter Peri βρουμαλίων (fol. 57r-58v) marks the compiler’s return to the letter Β and subsequently to the alphabetical order. It is an excerpt from the De Mensibus by John Lydus, as is the subsequent chapter Peri βισέξτου (fol. 58v-61r). The Parisinus compiler has considerably simplified and shortened the original text.

With the chapter Peri γενέσεως ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἄδεν τρίτα ἔνατα καὶ τεσσαρακοστά ἐπιτελοῦνται τοῖς τεθνεώσιν (fol. 61r-62r) the compiler moves on to the letter Γ. The alphabetical arrangement of the material, however, is discontinued with the very next
chapter, which bears the heading Περὶ ποσότητος τῶν τικτομένων (fol. 62r-62v). The compiler inserts a brief introduction of two sentences at the beginning of the new passage, explaining his decision to interrupt the alphabetical order again and link the new chapter to the previous one: Ἐπειδὴ περὶ γενέσεως εἴσομεν, οὐ πόρω τοῦ πρέποντος οὖμαι φάναι καὶ περὶ ποσότητος τῶν τικτομένων (Since we talk about births, I believe it would be appropriate to say something about the number of newborns). This time our author does not add the usual expression μνησθήσομαι but a stronger one: he professes that he felt the necessity to deliver more information on the particular subject he is concerned with at this point of the collection.

The following chapters Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ (fol. 62v-67r), Περὶ πιπέρεως (fol. 67r-67v) and Περὶ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης (fol. 67v-68r) do not follow the promised alphabetical order either. They are all, however, concerned with geography. Furthermore, the chapters Περὶ σεισμῶν (fol. 68r-69v) and Περὶ σκηπτῶν (fol. 69v-70v) bring us abruptly to the στοιχεῖον Σ (i.d. the eighteenth letter of the Greek alphabet). The heading of the following chapter Περὶ πυρόεντος κεραυνοῦ (fol. 70v-72v) does not correspond to the letter Σ but the passage has been included at this point in order to supplement the two preceding chapters of the στοιχεῖον. If the disorder at the end of part 2 suggests anything, it is that the chapters, Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ, Περὶ πιπέρεως and Περὶ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης may have been parts of a στοιχεῖον other than Μ, presumably whichever up to the Σ. If this is the case, it can be argued that the Excerpta Anonymi is incomplete and the missing passages must be parts of the στοιχεῖα Δ to Π.

The last part of the codex Parisinus suppl. gr. 607 a is entitled Περὶ τῶν οὐρανίων (fol. 75v-84v). Our compiler has relied on commentaries by Theon of Alexandria and Leon the Mechanic upon the poem of Aratus Phaenomena, written probably in the middle of the 3rd century BC.

To conclude, the material selection was made according to certain precise themes, that of statues inhabited by demonic powers, portents, miracles and curious dreams, curious nations and regions and curious natural celestial phenomena. The abridged form of numerous passages copied from the Parastaseis Anonymoi Chronikai, several chronographers, historians, and scholia on Aratus’ poem and the compositional and organizational format of the collection implies the compiler’s endeavour to structure and

---

23In the last paragraph of the same chapter, the compiler repeats, once again, that he considers it important to clarify what he is writing down: ὡς ἄν δὲ μὴ ἀτελὴς ᾖ ἡ περὶ κεραυνῶν διδασκαλία (f. 72r). The word διδασκαλία justifies the assumption that he aimed at creating a collection of such fragments for practical and didactical purposes.

24The series of excerpts was first published by E. Maass under the title Isagora bis excerpta; cf. Maass (1898), 317-322. J. Martin included the excerpts in his edition of scholia on Aratus; cf. Martin (1974), 23-31.

25The scholia have been generally attributed to Theon of Alexandria.

26Buchle (ed.) (1793).

27On Aratus’ life see Kidd (1997), 3-5.
provide knowledge upon certain themes. The selection criteria were determined by the collection’s practical and educational aims. In section 2.5 it shall be shown that the political and social context must have influenced the rationale of the selection of excerpts from various works. The omission of certain phrases, passages or whole paragraphs reflect the compiler’s intent to serve politico-cultural aims as well as practical and didactical ones, as shall be shown.

As shown, the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a is an incomplete codex dated to the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Yet, the possibility that the Parisinus is a copy of an earlier, probably damaged, manuscript cannot be excluded. This thesis argues that beside the codex unicus of the Excerpta Anonymi, the collection itself also is from the mid-10th century. Such a dating is based on the following arguments: a) internal evidence in the Excerpta Anonymi points to a specific contemporary ideology, namely that of restricted ecumenism advocated by the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus (see section 2.5.2.2); b) as shall be shown below, the Excerpta Anonymi must have drawn on material gathered in the first place for the EC (see section 2.4). The EC, a collection of historical excerpts on Constantine’s commission, began to be compiled before Constantine’s sole rulership (945-959) and were completed decades after the death of the emperor; c) the Excerpta Anonymi is a collection of quotations on subject matters evident in other contemporary works, namely an emphasis on the prophetic meaning, dangers and hidden powers of pagan statues as well as geographical and ethnographical interest (see sections 2.4.2-2.4.6); and d) scholarship has suggested that the Excerpta Salmasiana were compiled between the 8th and the 11th centuries. This thesis proposes that there is evidence supporting the dating of the Excerpta Salmasiana to the 10th century (see section 3.1). More specifically, the second part of the Exc.Salm.II is concerned with personal traits, life and deeds of certain emperors. Historical writing where the narration was focused on a certain emperor’s life became fashionable from the 10th century onwards (see section 3.3.2). Yet, a dating to the mid-10th century explains textual omissions and adaptations detected in the part transmitting the Agathias-excerpts (see section 3.4). Moreover, the Exc.Salm.II exhibit significant similarities with the Excerpta Anonymi with regard to the selective use of passages in the section of Roman history. The common selective use of passages testifies to the use of a common source, that is an except collection of passages from Cassius Dio and Peter the Patrician (see section 3.3.2.4). It is, therefore, likely that the compilers of the Excerpta Anonymi and the Excerpta Salmasiana, respectively, belonged to a contemporary intellectual milieu and made use of a common source.
2.2.3 **Sources of the Excerpta Anonymi**

I shall now discuss the sources the anonymous compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* drew from.

2.2.3.1 **Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai**

The text conventionally known as *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* was used extensively by the *Excerpta Anonymi* in the section corresponding to letter A. The *Parastaseis* belong to the class of texts labelled as *Patria*, works concerned with buildings and monuments of Constantinople.\(^{28}\) The *Parastaseis* are preserved only in one 11\(^{th}\)-century manuscript, the codex Parisinus gr. 1336. Th. Preger published the text from this manuscript in 1898.\(^{29}\) This edition was later incorporated (with a number of corrections) in his edition of *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum*.\(^{30}\) Preger’s edition was republished together with a translation in English and a commentary on the content of the *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* by A. Cameron and J. Herrin.\(^{31}\) Excerpts from the text are preserved in the *Suda*, in the *Excerpta Anonymi* and in the *Patria II*.\(^{32}\) Contrary to the traditional view, Odorico proposes that the *Parastaseis* are composed of two or more separate texts put together in a codex only in the late ninth or early 10\(^{th}\) century.\(^{33}\) According to him, the first part (ch. 1-26) bears the title *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai*, but its original structure and dating is uncertain.\(^{34}\) The second part (ch. 27-89) is a *sylloge* comprising excerpts from other collections on statuary, one of which was a collection of passages taken from a certain Theodore the Lector.\(^{35}\) They were both parts of a *dossier* that was a collection of other works or historical notes gathered for serving a future historical composition. The text in the Parisinus gr. 1336, an exact copy of the *dossier* in P. Odorico’s view, covers the ff. 111-134.\(^{36}\) If P. Odorico is right, the *Excerpta Anonymi* may have used one of the constitutive parts of the text modern scholars call *Parastaseis* and not the compilation as we have it today.

---

\(^{28}\)G. Dagron viewed the *Parastaseis* as a genuine production of the patriographic genre. See Dagron (1984), 31; the same in Berger (1988), 40.

\(^{29}\)Preger (1898).

\(^{30}\)Preger (1901, 1907). The *Παραστάσεις σύντομοι χρονικαί* are found in vol. I, (1901), 19-73.


\(^{34}\)It is also likely that the title *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* has never been the original title of the chapters 1-26. The term *parastaseis* (only found in the Parisinus gr. 1336) could refer to the exposition of material rather than to the presentation of monuments; cf. Odorico (2011c), 33-47.

\(^{35}\)On the *sylloge* see Odorico (2014), 762-773 (Henceforth Sylloge).

\(^{36}\)On the content of the manuscript see Omont (1888), 16; Odorico (2014), 778-781.
The *Excerpta Anonymi* have used and copied the *Parastaseis* and the *Sylloge* as a single and unitary text without taking into consideration the obvious separation between the two aforementioned works in the Parisinus gr. 1336.\(^{37}\) For sake of convenience, in this thesis, I treat the *Parastaseis* and the *Sylloge* that comes next in the Parisinus gr. 1336 as a single but incomplete text and under the heading *Parastaseis*.\(^ {38}\)

### 2.2.3.2 Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων

In the *Excerpta Anonymi* under the title *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* a series of excerpts on the description and allegorical interpretation of ancient Greek and Roman sculptures is transmitted. The series constitutes the first long section in the *Excerpta Anonymi* and it comes immediately after the first three chapters corresponding to the letter Α (Περὶ Ἀδιαβηνῆς, Περὶ Αὐγουστείου, Περὶ ἄτραβατικῶν). The section *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* takes up folia 2v-8r in the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a. The same series of sculptures was also copied in the *Patria II*. The *Patria II* either copied the *Excerpta Anonymi* directly or from a codex which the *Excerpta Anonymi* also come from.\(^ {39}\) In addition to the *Patria II*, the excerpts on sculptures have been handed down through the codex *Vaticanus gr. 468 (V)*, dated to the 14th century.\(^ {40}\) Folio 80v of *V* transmits a passage on a number of statues of gods. The description of each sculpture in *V* is preceded by a title which, with one exception, corresponds to the one recorded in the *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *Patria II*. The ultimate part of the passage in the *V* deviates in terms of subject matter: it provides us with a brief definition of four words: τέρας, σημεῖον, σύμβολον and τεκμήριον. This part in the series of sculptures is absent from the *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *Patria II*. Interestingly, the *Excerpta Anonymi* 28,4-9 excerpts a chapter under the title *Περὶ σημείου καὶ τέρατος*. Nevertheless, the passage, which also renders an explanation for the two terms of the title, differs thoroughly with that in *V*. Accordingly, the following hypotheses have been put forward: 1) M. L. Amerio holds the view that both, the *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *V*, drew on lexica containing such definitions of terms;\(^ {41}\) 2) A. Berger maintained that the series of excerpts under the heading *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* in the *Excerpta Anonymi* derived from an archetype X.

---

\(^{37}\) See Appendix II: table I.

\(^{38}\) The chapter numbering is that of the *Parastaseis* by A. Cameron and J. Herrin, with the footnote that chapters 1-26 and chapters 27-89 constitute parts of two different works.

\(^{39}\) The series of sculptures is found in the *Patria II*, chapters 2-14. On the textual relationship between the *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *Patria II* see the section 5.1.2.

\(^{40}\) See Appendix II: table II. The *V* transmits 9 out of the 15 excerpts in the *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *Patria II*. On the codicological characteristics and contents of the codex *Vaticanus* see Turyn (1952), 152-164; Christodoulou (1977), 37-38; Mioni (1985), 255-257. Christodoulou dates the codex to the 13th century. A date at the end of the 13th century was also suggested by A. Colonna; see Colonna (1991), 205.

\(^{41}\) See Appendix II: table II.

\(^{42}\) Amerio (2007), 13.
from which John Lydus’ passages on sculptures also come. A. Berger’s view seems to be more tenable, given the textual similarities between the Excerpta Anonymi and John Lydus’ De mensibus (see Appendix II: table II).

2.2.3.3 Herodotus

The chapter bearing the title Περὶ Κύρου in the Excerpta Anonymi transmits the Herodotean story of Cyrus’s early life. The excerpt is thematically connected with the Appian passages in the Excerpta Anonymi. As shall be shown in section 4.3, evidence on the margins of the codex Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a may suggest that the Herodotean story as well as the Appian excerpts had initially been copied together in an earlier excerpt collection, from which they were in turn excerpted by the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi.

2.2.3.4 Appian

Five passages in the Excerpta Anonymi can safely be attributed to Appian: a. Περὶ Αὐγούστου εὐτυχίας, b. Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἔχοντος ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ κέρατα, c. Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἐν πέτρᾳ τῆς Ἀραβίας, d. Περὶ Ῥώμου καὶ Ῥωμύλου, and e. Περὶ Ἀράβων μαντείας.

The compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi assigns the Περὶ Ἀράβων μαντείας to the end of Book 24 of Appian’s Historia Romana: Ἀππιανός φησι τῷ τέλει τοῦ κδ’ βιβλίου. Photius, who lists the books of the Historia Romana, calls the twenty-fourth book Arabica: καὶ ὁ εἰκοστὸς τέταρτος Ἀράβιος. In the Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἐν πέτρᾳ τῆς Ἀραβίας, the word πέτρᾳ refers to the city of Petra. Appian refers to the city of Petra again in the excerpt Περὶ Ἀράβων μαντείας, a fact that led P. Goukowsky to attributing the excerpt Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἐν πέτρᾳ τῆς Ἀραβίας also to Appian.

The first three Appian excerpts (a, b, c) are found in the first part of the Excerpta Anonymi, that is, the patriographic one. The last two (d, e) are transmitted separately in the collection, after a series of excerpts from Cassius Dio and Procopius. M. L. Amerio was

---

43Berger (1988), 68.
46Parisinus gr. 607a, ff. 9r-v: Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἐν πέτρᾳ τῆς Ἀραβίας (8,20-27 Treu) = Patria II, 84.
47Parisinus gr. 607a, ff. 53r-55v: Περὶ Ῥώμου καὶ Ῥωμύλου (36,10-37,29 Treu) = Appian, De regibus, 16, b, 4-17, a, 8 Bekker = Book 1 = Appian, Historia Romana fr. 1a e 1 (edd. Viereck - Roos).
49Bibliotheca, cod. 57.
the first to detect a different source for these two Appian excerpts.\textsuperscript{51} To M. L. Amerio it seems obvious that the passages Περὶ Ῥώμου καὶ Ῥωμύλου and Περὶ Ἀράβων μαντείας had ended up in the *Excerpta Anonymi* possibly via an excerpt collection. Nevertheless, she associates the inclusion of the Appian passages in the *Excerpta Anonymi* with the revived interest in Appian in the age of Photius, that is, in the mid-9\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{52} As shown in sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3, it is equally possible that the excerpts Περὶ Ῥώμου καὶ Ῥωμύλου and Περὶ Ἀράβων μαντείας have been excerpted by the compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* through a draft copy produced during the redaction of the *EC*.

2.2.3.5 **Cassius Dio**

A considerable number of excerpts in the *Excerpta Anonymi* are from the Cassius Dio tradition. Some of the passages are nominally ascribed to Cassius Dio by the compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* itself. Passages from the Cassius Dio tradition were included in the *Excerpta Anonymi* through an earlier collection of excerpts, now lost.\textsuperscript{53} Dio’s excerpts in the *Excerpta Anonymi* are entitled as follows: a. Περὶ Ἀδιαφηνής, b. Περὶ Βρεττανίας, c. Περὶ Γαίου Ἰουλίου Καίσαρος, d. Περὶ τῆς γαμετῆς αὐτοῦ, e. Εἶπωμεν δὲ καὶ ὡς ἡδυσμά τι ἐτερον τοῦ Δίωνος, f. an untitled passage on the emperor Domitian, g. β, and h. γ.

2.2.3.6 **Procopius**

Procopius’ *De bellis* has been excerpted by the *Excerpta Anonymi* under the headings: a. Περὶ Βεσβίου ὀροῦς Προκόπιος, b. Περὶ Βριττίας νῆσου, c. Περὶ οἰωνοσκοπίας τῶν ᪄αρνων, d. Περὶ χοίρων, and e. Τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου περὶ παρατηρήσεως εἰκόνος.

2.2.3.7 **John Lydus**

The *Excerpta Anonymi* contain passages from the three antiquarian treatises by John Lydus, namely the *De Mensibus* (On the months), the *De Magistratibus Rei Publicae Romanorum* (On the Magistracies of the Roman State) and the *De Ostentis* (On signs in the heavens): specifically, 1. the *De Mensibus* is the source for the passages: a. Περὶ Αὔγουστείου, b. Περὶ Βρομαλίων, c. Περὶ Βιαζίου, d. Περὶ γενέσεως ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἄδειν τρίτα ἐνατα καὶ τεσσαρακοστά ἐπιπλοῦνται τοῖς τεθνεχοῖς, e. Περὶ ποσότητος τῶν τικτομένων, f. Περὶ πιπέρεως g. Περὶ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης, and h. Περὶ σκηπτῶν. 2. The *De Ostentis* is used in: a. Περὶ σεισμόν, and b. Περὶ πυρόεντος κεραυνοῦ. 3. The *De Magistratibus* is the source used for the passages: a. Περὶ ἀτραβατικῶν.

\textsuperscript{51}Amerio (1999), 40.
\textsuperscript{52}Amerio (1999), 40–41.
\textsuperscript{53}On the use of Cassius Dio in the *Excerpta Anonymi* see section 2.4.4.
2.2.3.8 Peter the Patrician

Excerpts from Peter the Patrician’s Historia were embedded in the Excerpta Anonymi through the same collection of excerpts as the passages from Cassius Dio. Peter the Patrician’s text has been transmitted under the following titles in the Excerpta Anonymi: a. Ἀλλο Β, and b. Περὶ Νέρωνος.

2.2.3.9 Scholia on Homer

Two chapters in the Excerpta Anonymi go back to the tradition of scholia on Homer. The complex issue of the authorship and the transmission of such scholia prevents us from drawing any conclusion as to the exact source used by the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi. The first of the two passages is nominally assigned to a scholion on Homer by the Excerpta Anonymi itself. The title of the excerpt in the Excerpta Anonymi is: Περὶ Κάλχαντος τοῦ παρ᾽ Ὀμήρῳ. The chapter entitled Περὶ σημείου καὶ τέρατος ensues. This excerpt stands unidentified in the edition by M. Treu. Both chapters show the acquaintance of the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi with the ancient tradition of scholia on Homer. In fact, the passage Περὶ σημείου καὶ τέρατος exhibit significant similarities with a passage in the 12th-century collection of scholia on Homer by Eustathius of Thessaloniki. The Greek title of Eustathius’ work is: Παρεκβολαὶ εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάδα καὶ Ὀδύσσειαν. The work consists of Eustathius’ commentary on passages of the Homeric poems as well as extracts from earlier commentators. Eustathius’ sources are difficult to identify since most of the works he used are now lost.

2.2.3.10 Scholia in Dionysium Periegetam

Passages on geography and the derivation of place names have been extracted from the Scholia in Dionysium Periegetam. The whole series of passages taken from the Scholia is preceded by the title: Ἐκ τῶν περιηγητικῶν τὰ χρειωδέστερα καὶ σαφηνέστερα τοῦ Διονυσίου.

2.2.3.11 Leon the Mechanic’s Πῶς δεῖ ἱστᾶν σφαῖραν

On fol. 75v a line made up of five crosses the size of letters marks the beginning of the last part of the Excerpta Anonymi. The concatenation of excerpts on astronomy and geometry is preceded by the title Περὶ τῶν οὐρανίων. The compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi relied on Leon the Mechanic’s and Theon of Alexandria’s commentaries on
Aratus Solensis’ poem called *Phaenomena*. Leon the Mechanic was a mathematician and philosopher of the 6th century. The *Excerpta Anonymi* used his works entitled *Πῶς δεῖ ἱστάν σφαῖραν* and *Διαίρεσις τῆς σφαῖρας*. Both Leon’s treatises are based extensively on Aratus Solensis’ poem and on the commentary on it by Theon of Alexandria. Theon of Alexandria is likely to have been the editor of a text, which became the standard edition in subsequent Antiquity. The last part of the *Excerpta Anonymi* excerpts scholia by Theon of Alexandria on separate verses of Aratus’ *Phaenomena*. In particular, the scholia concern verses 27, 33, 91, 132, 159 of the *Phaenomena*. The compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* excerpts Leon’s and Theon’s texts in brief chapters and simplifies the selected passages. Each short passage bears a brief heading. One could say that this part was created in order to be used for didactic purposes in schooling.

### 2.2.3.12 Conclusion

The author of the *Excerpta Anonymi* reveals his admiration for the Roman past, which he primarily interprets as pagan. The diversity of the sources (patriographic texts, geographical texts, historical and geometrical works) implies an erudite man who was acquainted with the works mentioned above and knew precisely where to look for passages apposite to the subject matter of the collection. It is noteworthy that there are no texts passing unaltered into the *Excerpta Anonymi*. Inaccuracies and obscurity of expression in some source texts but also political motives and ideology led the compiler to intervene and reedit the excerpted passages.

When studying the Appian excerpts in the *Excerpta Anonymi*, P. Goukowsky arrived at the conclusion that the anonymous compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* (a) was a monk who wrote in a monastic environment where b) he had at hand the complete text of Appian as well as the entire works of Herodotus, Dio Cassius, Procopius and John Lydus. P. Goukowsky’s first argument is not tenable. On the contrary, his proposition is not in accordance with the selection of material on the part of the *Excerpta Anonymi* compiler, who excised almost every religious reference in the original texts and who expressed covert admiration for pagan elements of the past. Regarding the second argument made by P. Goukowsky, the analysis of certain passages shows that it is highly likely that, in addition to any other historical sources – possibly complete historical works – the compiler also relied on pre-existing excerpt-collections. As it will be shown below...

---

50 Aratus’s writings are dated in the mid-3rd century. On Aratus’ life see Kidd (1997), 3-5.
51 Buhle (ed.) (1793), 257-264.
52 Buhle (ed.) (1793), 266.
53 Kidd (1997), 49.
55 On the elimination of religious references in the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a and its compiler’s literary interests see analytically below section 2.5.1.
(sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3), for the chapter On the river Istros, the compiler drew on a collection of geographical material, whereas for the chapters On Cyrus and On Remus and Romulus he drew on a collection of occult science. Similarly, passages on Roman history in the Excerpta Anonymi derive from a collection on dreams and occult science comprising excerpts from Cassius Dio and Peter the Patrician.

2.3 The working method in the Excerpta Anonymi

The detailed analysis of single excerpts included in the Excerpta Anonymi can yield interesting results with regard to the working method of its author. The comparison of the original texts as preserved in earlier manuscripts and the Excerpta Anonymi, and the analysis of the resulting differences, omissions and additions shall help us to understand how the sources have been employed as well as the procedure they have undergone. In particular, the content and arrangement of excerpts in the Excerpta Anonymi point to the three procedures of redacting an excerpt collection discussed in chapter 1: a. reading of the whole source text and selection of passages, b. rewriting of the source text, and c. composition of a new unity.

a) selection

As noted in chapter 1, the first procedure consisted in reading the source text and selecting passages according to certain themes. Interestingly, the author of the Excerpta Anonymi seems to rely on a considerable number of texts. The sources of the Excerpta Anonymi were discussed in the previous section. The anonymous text conventionally known as Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai takes up the two thirds of the part of the codex Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a corresponding to letter A. The rest are excerpts from Cassius Dio and John Lydus. What follows under the part of the Parisinus corresponding to letter B are excerpts from Herodotus, Cassius Dio, Appian, Procopius and John Lydus. As shown in section 2.4, the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi did not necessarily draw on the entire works of the aforementioned late antique historians. Passages excerpted from Herodotus, Cassius Dio and John Lydus appear to have been taken from pre-existing excerpt-collections. The last part of the Excerpta Anonymi relies on passages on geometry and astronomy.

b) rewriting

---

66Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ; cf. Excerpta Anonymi 42,5-44,21.
67Περὶ Κύρου; cf. Excerpta Anonymi 33,1-36,9.
68Περὶ Ῥώμου καὶ Ῥωμύλου; cf. Excerpta Anonymi 36,10-37,29.
69The chapters are thoroughly studied below.
70On the Parastaseis see section 2.2.3.1.
As shown in chapter 1, the integration of the original text initially into the collection is made manifest in Psellus’ comments, in the way Symeon composes his Menologion and throughout the EC. It is also corroborated by the contents of the Excerpta Anonymi. The chapter Περί τῶν ἐπτὰ φιλοσοφῶν in the Excerpta Anonymi shows that the second step, which was the editing and rephrasing of the excerpts, presupposed a step in which each selected text was copied in its entirety.21 In the chapter seven philosophers encounter the emperor Theodosius II (405-450) at the Hippodrome:

Table 2: the chapter Περί τῶν ἐπτὰ φιλοσοφῶν in the Excerpta Anonymi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parastaseis, chapter 64</th>
<th>Excerpta Anonymi 17,31-18,24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Εὐδοκίας Ἀθηναίας κατὰ μοῖραν διακαθεσθεὶς κατὰ χάριν ἡράτῳ τύχην, καθ’ ἣν οἱ αὐτάδελφοι, τὸ ἔξον τῆς συγγόνου ἀκηκοότες εὐτύχημα, ἀνελθεῖν συνεπειρόντο φιλοσόφους καὶ τῇ τύχῃ εξ ἀτυχίας εἰδήθηναι ἱλασθήναι. Θεοδόσιος δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸ Ἰππικόν ἠλατό, τοῖς φιλοσόφοις ἄρεάς καὶ τὰς αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐνείλησεν; Ἡσαν δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ Κράνος, Κάρος, Πέλοψ, Ἀπελλῆς, Νερούας, Σιλβανός, Κύρκος. Ὁ οὖν συνήκαν εἰς τὸ Ἰππικόν τῷ βασιλεί τις θαυμασίας ὑμηκτίου. Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Θεοδόσιος ὅρων τοὺς φιλοσόφους θαυμάζοντας φησὶν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἢ ὁ φιλόσοφοι, εἰ θαυμάζετε, κατεφιλοσοφήσητε,’ ὡς παρατύπα ἀποκριθήκην ἐνα ἐξ αὐτῶν, Ἀπελλῆν ὁνόματι, καὶ εἰπεῖν· ἃς ἡ ταυμάζειν οὐκ ἦν τούτου τῆς ἐπιβάτης, εἰδὸς ἀκρίβως ὅτι ἦπει θαυμώπως ἐπιβάται γενόνται, ἀλλασσομένων τῶν Ὀλυμπιῶν, καὶ τὸ θαυμάζον άμβλουπισάει. Ἁρόσας δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο· ‘κακὸν τῇ βασιλίδιοι στοιχεῖον· ὥς τὸ στοιχεῖον τοῖς στοιχεῖοις συντρέχουντα. Καὶ ὁ Σιλβανός ἤθικαν τὸ πρὸς μεσημβριανός βίωσιν, ἐξ ἕν τὸ ἄνω τὸ χόρω ἐκείνης τεκμήριον, φησὶν· ‘καλὸς ὁ στοιχειοσώμενος καρποὶ γὰρ ἔπει τοῦτον ἐγόνατος ἐσονται. Ὁ δὲ Κύρδος ἐν τῷ δήμῳ ὁρῶν εἰπεῖν· ‘ὁ δήμος δὲ, ἂν ὁ δήμος περισσεύσουσιν. Ὅς τῷ Κράνος ἥθικεν τὸν βασιλέα περιτιμῆσαι. Πέλοψ δὲ τοὺς ὀφεῖς τῶν ὑδῶν ἐπείπε· ‘τίνος τὸ πρόβλημα; ἂν δὲ σθενάζετο ἢ Κωνσταντῖνου, εἰπεῖν ἢ Κωνσταντῖνος ἂνθρωπος ὁ φιλόσοφος ἄκορος ἡ βασιλέως οὐκ ἀληθῆς. Ἐσωρα γάρ τι ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ νοοῦσα στοιχεῖον τῶν Ὁλυμπιῶν ἢ ἡ ἀνθρώπος ἠκούσα τὸ πρὸβλημα; τοῦ τῇ θεοδόσιοι εἰπόντος Κωνσταντῖνος. ἐκεῖνον φαναι· ἡ φιλοσοφοῦς ἂνθρωπος ἡ βασιλεῖς ἡ ἀληθῆς. Ἐφερά γάρ τι ὁ φιλόσοφος ὁ θηλυκοῖς ζώδιον τεταμερείς ζώδιακος γράμματα γεγραμμένον καὶ εἰπεῖν· ὁ

21Excerpta Anonymi, 17,31-18,24.
The chapter represents the story of Eudokia and the encounter of her husband, the emperor Theodosius II, with the seven brothers of Eudokia and the ensuing confrontation between them regarding the meaning of the statues. In the Parastaseis, Kranos is the one who takes on the central role, as he is the leader of the Athenian philosophers (λογιστής τῆς Ἀθηνῶν φιλοσοφίας).

To begin with, the text transmitted in the Parastaseis seems to have been corrupted and, therefore, poses difficulties in interpretation. In some cases, we can only just assume the meaning of a word or a sentence. Such difficulties might have led the Excerpta Anonymi compiler not only to rearrange (as we shall see) the information from the Parastaseis but tetrapérate, ἐξ ὦν Κωνσταντίνος καὶ ἀπέρατοι ἔσονται. Κάρος δὲ προταπεῖς εἰπεν· δυστυχή μοι τὰ πάντα φαίνεται, ὅτι εἰ ταῦτα τὰ στοιχεῖα, ὡς πειρώνται, ἀληθεύουσιν, ἵνα τὶ ἡ τόλμης συνέστηκην:

...
also to make textual additions to the original text. Therefore, structural differentiation in the Excerpta Anonymi text can justifiably be attributed to the compiler’s efforts to simplify the original passage.  

Further, it is interesting to note how some details and separate information on Eudokia and her seven brothers have been brought together in the very first phrase in the Excerpta Anonymi. The first sentence in the Excerpta Anonymi stressing the name of Kranos and his own encounter with Theodosius at the Hippodrome, is an addition by the compiler himself based on the specific interest of Kranos in the Parastaseis, which emerged later on in the text however. I would like to draw attention to the underlined passages. The Excerpta Anonymi text begins with a reference to Kranos, which was produced by compiling material found at the end of the original text. A similar reference to Kranos is made again during the description of the question-and-answer confrontation between the philosophers and the emperor Theodosius:

ο δὲ Κράνος ἰδὼν ἀνδρείκελον γυμνόν, περικεφαλαίαν τῇ κεφαλῇ περιφέρον καὶ τὸν ὅνον ἐμπροσθεν, ἔφη, ὡς ποτε ὅνος ἀνθρώπος ἔσται καὶ ὃ τῆς συμφορᾶς, ὃτι ἀνθρώπος ὄνῳ ἄκολουθεί. 

The seven philosophers speak in turn and the second reference has been removed from the end and inserted at the point between the interpretations given by Kyrvos and Pelops respectively. Thus, the Parisinus compiler decided to end his text with the philosophers’ predictions as to the fate of Constantinople. The reason for this could be the fact that the Parisinus compiler intended to shift the focus from the confrontation surrounding the relevant passage in the Parastaseis, by deleting the heated exchange between Kranos and Theodosius. In the Parastaseis when Theodosius meets the philosophers at the Hippodrome, it says: ὦ φιλόσοφοι, εἰ θαυμάζετε, κατεφιλοσοφήθητε, which is a comment indicative enough of the confrontation that was taken place there and leads to the exchange between Theodosius and Kranos later on. Interestingly, the Parisinus excises the word κατεφιλοσοφήθητε and replaces it by the question: τί θαυμάζετε. In this way, he can also delete the emperor’s exchange with Kranos and at the same time maintain the narrative kernel and as well as conceal, for reasons beyond our purpose here, the conflict between a Christian emperor and a pagan philosopher.

The structure itself of the Περὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ φιλόσοφων verifies that the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi read and employed selected texts having first copied them word by word. The compiler would read the relevant passage through to the end annotating it thoroughly. This procedure permitted him to combine disparate details and edit the

---

72The difficult original text as well as the compiler’s tendency towards clarity and accuracy and his preference for brevity seem to stand behind such a choice.

73Excerpta Anonymi 18,13-16.
original text. That allowed him also to rearrange the material when he thought that the meaning was not clear enough or when he wanted to give a new meaning to a certain text passage.

c) composition

As shown in chapter 1, the proemium of the EC as well as Psellos’ encomium of Symeon Metaphrastes reveals that, when editing extracted passages, the compiler of a collection relied on certain criteria, such as accuracy and brevity. We notice that the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi relied methodologically on the same principles by following the procedures detected in the EC and Psellos’ encomium. The compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi intervenes in the original text but he does not epitomize it. Two samples from the Excerpta Anonymi may suffice to reveal this. The first one is a passage drawn from the Parastaseis and placed in the first part of the collection. The second passage has been extracted fromProcopius’ De bellis and is placed in the second part of the Excerpta Anonymi.

Table 3: the chapter Περὶ τῶν β σταυρῶν τῶν ληστῶν in the Excerpta Anonymi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parastaseis, chapter 23</th>
<th>Excerpta Anonymi 11.8-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ἐν τῷ Φόρῳ κάτωθεν τῆς μεγάλης στήλης ὑπάρχουσι σταυροί εἰς πλῆθος, τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ μεγάλου φέροντες ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ τόπῳ κεχωσμένοι εἰόν ἐς χρόνος τῆς σήμερον· ἀλλὰ καὶ βίοι τῶν συσταύρωσιν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ τόπῳ κεχωσμένοι εἰόν ἐς χρόνος τῆς σήμερον· ἀλλὰ καὶ βίοι τῶν συσταύρωσιν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ τόπῳ κεχωσμένοι εἰόν ἐς χρόνος τῆς σήμερον· ἀλλὰ καὶ βίοι τῶν συσταύρωσιν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ τόπῳ κεχωσμένοι εἰόν ἐς χρόνος τῆς σήμερον· ἀλλὰ καὶ βίοι τῶν συσταύρωσιν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ τόπῳ κεχωσμένοι εἰόν ἐς χρόνος τῆς σήμερον· ἀλλὰ καὶ βίοι τῶν συσταύρωσιν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ τόπῳ κεχωσμένοι εἰόν ἐς χρό

The passage in the Excerpta Anonymi is entitled Περὶ τῶν β σταυρῶν τῶν ληστῶν and it is a prime example of the extent to which the compiler abridges older texts. Interestingly the new text is formed once we unify the underlined passages of the Parastaseis’ text. It is also apparent that parts from the Parastaseis were copied word by word. One word, the one that is in bold, κεχωσμένοι,74 was removed from the middle of the Parastaseis to the

---

74The word reflects the attitude of Byzantines towards statues and monuments in Constantinople. Most of the monuments described in the Parastaseis do not even exist when the respective passages are written. But these monuments still exist below the surface of the city attesting to the esoteric dimension of it; cf. Odorico (2011b), 38-41.
beginning of the *Excerpta Anonymi*. Once more it becomes clear that the compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* had first copied the whole passage and read it through to the end before annotating, making alterations and finally copying it. In that way, he was able to rearrange words, to add an extra word in the text when this was necessary or to delete some others. Accordingly, the word *teθέντα* was added in the *Excerpta Anonymi* to make the meaning of the last part of the passage clearer. The *Excerpta Anonymi* compiler also omits words and entire phrases without changing the meaning of the passage.

The second passage was excerpted from the fifth book of *Procopius’ De bellis* under the title *Τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου περὶ παρατηρήσεως εἰκόνος.*

---

**Table 4: the chapter Τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου περὶ παρατηρήσεως εἰκόνος in the Excerpta Anonymi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procopius, De bellis 5.24.22-26</th>
<th>Excerpta Anonymi 29.1-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ξυνινέχθη ἐν Νεαπόλει τοιόνδε γενέσθαι. Θευδερίχου τοῦ Γότθων ἄρχοντος εἰκόνων ἐν τῇ ἁγορᾷ ἐτύγχανεν οὖσα, ἐκ ψηφιδων τινῶν ξυγκειμένη, μικρῶν μὲν ἐς ἄγαν, χροιαί δὲ βεβαιμμένων σχεδὸν τι ἀπάσας, ταύτης τῆς εἰκόνος ποτὲ τὴν κεφαλὴν διαφραγμαί ζωντος Θευδερίχου ξυμβεβήκη, τῆς τῶν ψηφιδῶν ἐπιβολῆς ἐκ τοῦ αὐτομάτου ξυνταραξθείσης, καὶ Θευδερίχῳ ξυνινέχθη τελευτήσα τὸν βιὸν αὐτίκα δὴ μάλα. ἔνιαυτοῖς δὲ ὅκτω ύστερον αἱ τὴν τῆς εἰκόνος γαστέρα ποιοῦσαι ψηφιδές διερρήσαν ἔξαιπναις, καὶ Αταλάριχος ὁ Θευδερίχου ψυχατρίδος εὐθὺς ἐπελεύστα. χρόνου τε τριβέντος ὅλιγον πίπτουσα μὲν ἐς γην ἀἱ περὶ τὰ αἴδοια ψηφιδές, Ἀμαλασοῦνθα δὲ ὁ Θευδερίχου παῖς ἐς ἄνθρωπον ἡράντιο, ταῦτα μὲν οὖν τῇ ἐξώρισι. Γότθων δὲ Ὁρώμης ἐς τὴν πολιορκίαν καθισταμένον τὰ ἐκ τῶν τῆς εἰκόνος μηρῶν ἄχρι ἡ ἄκρους πόδας διεφθάρθαι τετύχηκε.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ὅ καὶ αὐτὸ εἶδός ἐστι μαντείας παρὰ τοῖς πεπλανημένοις καὶ παρατηρουμένοις τα πάντα. Θευδερίχου τοῦ Γότθων ἄρχοντος εἰκόνων ἐν τῇ ἁγορᾷ ἐτύγχανεν οὖσα, ἐκ ψηφιδων τινῶν συγκειμένη, ταύτης τῆς εἰκόνος ποτὲ τὴν κεφαλὴν διαφραγμαί ζωντος Θευδερίχου ξυμβεβήκη, τῆς τῶν ψηφιδῶν ἐπιβολῆς ἐκ τοῦ αὐτομάτου ξυνταραξθείσης, καὶ Θευδερίχῳ συνινέχθη τελευτήσα τὸν βιὸν εὔθεως, ἔνιαυτοῖς μετὰ δὲ ἐτῆ ὅκτω καὶ ἡ γαστήρ διερρήσα ἐξαίρθης καὶ Ἀταλάριχος ὁ ψυχατρίδος τοιοῦτον ἐτελεύτησαν. ὅλιγον δὲ παρελθόντος χρόνου πίπτουσα αἱ περὶ τὰ αἴδοια ψηφιδές καὶ Ἀμαλασοῦνθα ἡ ψυχατρίδος τοιοῦτον ἐξ ἄνθρωπον ἡράντιο. εἶτα καὶ τῶν ποδῶν ὑπέρτων ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ διεφθάρῃ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *Excerpta Anonymi* author follows the source text closely and he remains faithful to the selected passages of the source text as regards events and narrative sequence. Particular attention should be given to the fact that most words of Procopius’ text are reused by the *Excerpta Anonymi* in the same grammatical form. The passage was first copied word by word and it was read through to the end before being edited. Likewise in

---

the chapter Περὶ τῶν β σταυρῶν τῶν ληστῶν, our compiler abridges, to some extent, his source by omitting less necessary material. He does not summarize and he does not wish to deviate from the meaning of the original text. The original text was supplemented with information by the compiler himself: it is the introductory statement in bold at the beginning of the Excerpta Anonymi passage. The importance of the frequent use of such brief introductions by the Excerpta Anonymi compiler has already been pointed out. In that way, our compiler makes the narrative sequence of the collection more coherent, comments on or justifies his own criteria of selection of certain texts and attempts to make his enterprise consistent and comprehensible. The excerptors working under the auspices of Constantine Porphyrogenitus also, often, add a short introduction to selected source texts by combining words found elsewhere in the original text. To give but one example, when excerpting Polybius IV.29-30, the excerptors augmented the story with a few phrases taken from the end of the original text.\footnote{Excerpta de legationibus, 29.} In the following chapters, we shall see that the strategy was also used in the Excerpta Salmasiana, Epitome of the 7th century and Excerpta Planudea. It turns out that their compilers were conscious of the flawed contextualization arisen when excerpting a passage from its original context.

It can be inferred that in Byzantine collections of excerpts on precise themes there have been three steps followed by a compiler: a) selection, b) editing, and c) composition. The selection of excerpts was based on general criteria such as accuracy, clarity, brevity and respect of the original narration. The examination of the three steps of redacting the collection showed that the excerptor a) respected the vocabulary and structure of the original text, and b) followed certain strategies in order to cope with the lack of context that arose when a passage was extracted from a whole unit. I categorised these strategies as follows: a) additions or omissions of text, b) re-arrangement of words, and c) repetition of words or phrases. As shown, the Excerpta Anonymi make up a unity of thematically connected excerpts extracted from a number of different works and acts as a new and autonomous piece of literature. The new entity can be read by itself and gets its own transmission. Its originality is reflected on the concatenation of the excerpts, that is, in the changed content and in the selected format through which a selected branch of knowledge is represented.\footnote{See also Odorico (2011a), 100.}
2.4 The EC and the Excerpta Anonymi

It has become clear by now that the *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *Excerpta Constantiniana* (EC) were the products of a common approach to older texts in Byzantium. They are a typical product of the *culture of sylloge*.

Their compilers construct a new narrative on the basis of a series of excerpts and the new whole warrants the transmission of knowledge through a new form, namely that of an excerpt collection. In what follows, I focus on the possibility of a textual relation between the 10th-century *Excerpta Anonymi* and the EC. The hypothesis is advanced that the anonymous compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* relied on earlier collections of excerpts and must have drawn on draft copies produced during the redaction of the Constantinian collections. A. Nemeth has proved in his dissertation that draft copies were, indeed, written before the final copies of the EC.

The existence of drafts for the EC raises the possibility that scholars, not necessarily involved in the EC project, could have access to these copies.

One should ask whether texts of these drafts could have been used in works other than those of the 53 subject-volumes of the EC. The latter could lead us to the intriguing hypothesis that the *Excerpta Anonymi* relied on material also used in the Constantinian project.

Interestingly, there is a group of works that could support the use of the EC, directly or indirectly, in the first as well in the second half of the 10th century: a collection of excerpts on sieges (codex Parisinus suppl. gr. 607), the *Excerpta Anonymi* and the historical work by Leo the Deacon.

Significantly, Leo the Deacon’s passage on the source of the river Istros bears a striking resemblance to a passage in the *Excerpta Anonymi*, labeled as *Περὶ Ἰστροῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ*. The question to be raised is whether Leo the Deacon and the anonymous compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* have used a common source and if they do
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78The section originates in my article “The Excerpta Anonymi and the Constantinian Excerpts” published in Byzantinoslavica 75 (2017), 250-264. The volume is edited by P. Odorico and includes contributions dedicated to the Excerpta Constantiniana.

79Odorico (1990), 1-21; (2011a), 89-107; see also n. 15 in the Preface.

80The examination of the excerpting method in the EC corroborates the existence of intermediary steps, that is draft copies, before the final copies of the EC are executed cf. Nemeth (2010), 93–177. See also Featherstone (2013), 353-372.

81The idea that other imperial treatises also used material, gathered in the first place for the EC was first advanced by I. Ševčenko, who argued for the direct use of the *Excerpta de legationibus* from the DT, DAI and Theophanes Continuatus in the case of the story of Soldan’s capture by Louis II and his escape; cf. Ševčenko (1992), 191. See now Signes Codoñer (2017), esp. 26-38. J. Signes Codoñer advances the hypothesis that the author of the *Theophanes Continuatus* was also involved in the project of the EC; cf. Signes Codoñer (2017), 39.

82The excerpts on sieges seem to have been copied in the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607 earlier than the extant copies of the EC are executed. Similarities in content and excerpting method point to the use of Constantinian collections at an early stage of their reduction; cf. Nemeth (2010), 147-172.

so, what this source was. Could this common text be one or more excerpts drawn from one of the Constantinian collections?

2.4.1 The EC

The EC is a collection of historical excerpts accomplished under the auspices of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The project started before the sole reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (945-959), lasted with certainty for decades, but we are not able to know when precisely it was completed. The analysis of the content in the EC betrays attempts made by the emperor to impose imperial authority on the selection of knowledge of the past. As mentioned already, the format of the EC and their manner of systematising historical works show affinities with other collections of historical excerpts.

The EC as they have survived transmit excerpts from twenty-six historiographers from the 5th century BC to the 9th century AD. The excerpts have been singled out and grouped in fifty-three collections which, in the preface to the work, are called ὑποθέσεις. Each of the five ὑποθέσεις that have come down to us corresponds thematically to a subject. Two collections have fully survived and the rest have been transmitted partially: the Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis have survived in a 10th century parchment codex, the Codex Peirescianus (Tours C 980). The Excerpta de sententiis have been handed down in a palimpsest manuscript, namely the codex Vaticanus graecus 73. The two ὑποθέσεις Excerpta de legationibus have been partially transmitted through different manuscripts. Both
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84 In Theophanes Continuatus is attested to that Constantine established a library in the Kamilas palace accumulating books from all over the known world in order to accomplish the major project of the so-called EC; cf. Theophanes Continuatus, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn 1838) 144-5. Constantine shared the throne with Romanos Lekapenus from 920 until 945.
85 According to A. Nemeth, the project was completed in the early years of Basil II (958-1025); Nemeth (2010), 1. Treadgold (2013), 157 believes that the EC “were completed not long before 959”.
87 See n. 82.
88 For a complete list of the authors see Lemerle (1971), 285-287; Flusin (2002), 546-550 and 558. Th. Büttner-Wobst suggested that the excerpted authors were twenty-eight. He includes Marcellinus, the author of a Life of Thucydides, whose excerpts are found in the Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis and the anonymous continuator of Cassius Dio, whose excerpts are found in the Excerpta de sententiis; cf. Büttner-Wobst (1906), 88-120, esp. 96. See also the discussion about the authors included in Photius’ Bibliotheca but not in the EC in Treadgold (2013), 160-162. On Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ selection of authors to be excerpted in the EC see Nemeth (2010), 38-50; Kaldellis (2012), 71-85.
89 On this manuscript see EV 1, viii-xlii. A. Nemeth, based on parallels in decoration between the Tours C 980 and later manuscripts, suggested that the codex was made after Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ death; cf. Nemeth (2010), 97. P. Sotiroudis dates the codex Peirescianus to the 11th century; cf. Sotiroudis (1989), 165-171.
90 On the codex Vaticanus graecus 73 see Mercati - De Cavalieri (1923), 67-78; Nemeth (2010), 127-134.
collections were contained in a codex, the Scorialensis B.I.4, deposited in the Escorial Library, which, unfortunately, was destroyed in a fire in 1671. Finally, the ὑπόθεσις Excerpta de insidiis is partially preserved in two different manuscripts of the 16th century, namely the codices Parisinus gr. 1666 and Scorialensis Ω.Ι.11.

Relying on the notes in the margins of the five surviving collections, scholars have suggested titles for the missing ὑπόθεσεις of the EC. In the prooemium to the EC the first ὑπόθεσις is called περὶ βασιλέων ἀναγορέυσεως (On the inauguration of emperors). Throughout the EC and other works attributed to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, we detect a particular interest in matters concerning the imperial court. Concerns about imperial hierarchy and the succession of emperors are also manifest in a number of titles transmitted in the EC as well as in the De cerimoniis. Suggested titles such as περὶ διαδοχῆς βασιλέων (On the succession of sovereigns), περὶ γάμων (On marriages), περὶ κασάρων (On the Caesars), περὶ ἐπιβουλῶν κατὰ βασιλέων γεγονυιὼν (On conspiracies against rulers) and περὶ πολιτικῶν διοικήσεων (On political affairs) are linked to Constantine’s interest in the imperial court as well as in politics. A. Nemeth suggested that such titles reflect Constantine’s insecurity about his legitimacy. K. Scheiner augments the list conjecturing the existence of

---

91 All copies from the lost codex we possess were made by Andreas Darmarios and his collaborators; Graux (1880), 93-97; de Boor (1902), 146-150. On the distinction between the two collections of Excerpta de legationibus see Flusin (2002) and Carolla (2008), 129-170.


93 In this respect, the codex Vaticanus gr. 977 containing Theophylact Simocatta’s Historiae and its continuation by the patriarch Nicephorus is of particular importance: the codex was used and marked by Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ collaborators; cf. Schreiner (1987), 1-30. On numbers and names of the collections see Wäschke (1882), 270-283; Büttner-Wobst (1906b), 105-119; Lemlerle (1971), 327-328; Schreiner (1987), 13-23; Flusin (2002), 553-555; Nemeth (2010), 65-92.

94 The table of contents of the De cerimoniis records the existence of a chapter on imperial succession. It is the chapter 42, which in the index of book II is entitled: Ὑπόμνημα ἐν συντόμῳ τῶν βασιλέων ἐν τῇ δε τῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ εὔπροσδότῃ Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ ἁγίου Κωνσταντίνου. This chapter has been lost in the manuscript tradition of the De cerimoniis. As, however, C. Mango and I. Ševčenko have argued the chapter is preserved in a palimpsest codex in Istanbul, the codex Chalcensis S. Trinitatis (125) 133; cf. Mango – Ševčenko (1962), 61-63.

95 Boissevain (1906), 289.

96 Büttner-Wobst (1906b), 116-117.

97 Büttner-Wobst (1906b), 117.

98 Nemeth (2010), 81.

99 Nemeth (2017), 257. Holmes (2010), 55-80 shows that Constantine Porphyrogenitus exploited military compilation literature in order to gain political legitimacy and enhance his political authority. The Patriarch Nicholas I Mysticus (901-907 and 912-925) denied to recognize Constantine Porphyrogenitus as a legitimate heir to the throne because he was the son of the emperor Leo VI and his fourth wife, Zoe Karbonopsina. See also n. 2.
collections on festivals and the deaths of the emperors. The volume entitled περὶ κυνηγίας (On hunting) can also be included in Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ interests. Constantine’s interest in military affairs, specifically in war and diplomacy, is mirrored through the ύποθέσεις bearing the proposed titles περὶ στρατηγημάτων (On the command of the army), περὶ νίκης (On victory), περὶ ἤττης (On defeat), περὶ ἀνακλήσεως ἤττης (On the transformation of defeat into victory), περὶ συμβολῆς πολέμων (On battles), (On reasons for war), περὶ δημηγορίας πολέμων (On battles), (On sieges) (On sieges), περὶ νίκης (On victory), περὶ πρέσβεων (On embassies by the Romans to the Barbarians and On embassies by the Barbarians to the Romans). Constantine’s interest in wartime virtues becomes manifest in the volume On virtue and vice. Constantine Porphyrogenitus was also interested in geography and ethnography. Apart from the ethnographical digressions embedded in two other works attributed to him, the DAI and the DT, he appears to have included collections entitled as περὶ ἐθνῶν (On customs), περὶ ἔθνων (On nations) and περὶ οἰκισμῶν (On the settlements). Scholars have also suggested titles for collections consisting of ekphraseis of monuments or vestments (περὶ ἐκφράσεως), epigrams (ἐν τοῖς ἐπιγράμμασι), letters (περὶ ἐπιστολῶν) gnomic statements (περὶ γνωμῶν) and mythology (περὶ Ἑλληνικῆς ἱστορίας) all excerpted from the historical texts that the excerptors of the EC had at their disposal. The titles of two other volumes reconstructed on the basis of the marginalia are περὶ ἀνδραγαθημάτων (On courageous deeds) and περὶ τοῦ τίς τι ἔξευρε (On inventors and their

100Schreiner (1987), 21-23.
101de Boor (1903), 275; Nemeth (2010), 83.
102de Boor (1903), 14 and 379; de Boor (1905), 33 and 222; Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 335; Roos (1910), 116 and 123; Boissevain (1906), 412.
103de Boor (1903), 390.
104Boissevain (1906), 210.
105Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 9.
106de Boor (1905), 390; Büttner-Wobst (1906b), 99.
109de Boor (1903), 484; Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 63; Roos (1910), 153; Boissevain (1906), 412.
110de Boor (1903), 435-441 and 513-568.
111de Boor (1903), 26.
112Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 84.
113Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 36.
114Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 123,23-4; Büttner-Wobst (1906b), 111; Nemeth (2010), 91.
115Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 207; Nemeth (2010), 86-90.
116de Boor (1903), 451.
117Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 212.
118Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 353.
119de Boor (1905) 33; Büttner-Wobst (1906a) 338 and 354.
inventions). The former probably contained excerpts on peculiar events and the latter on various innovative ideas and their inventors.

Constantine’s interest in theology is reflected in the hypothetical titles περὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν (On ecclesiastical affairs) and περὶ παραδόξων (On miraculous events) of the EC. It is noteworthy that the Excerpta de Legationibus gentium ad Romanos transmit four excerpts drawn from the Historia ecclesiastica by Socrates. The possibility that other ecclesiastical historians were excerpted in the EC cannot be ruled out. Constantine’s interest in theology and hagiography is also expressed through works published on his initiative or under his reign: homilies on the translations of the relics of St John Chrysostom, Gregory Referendarios’ homily on the translation of the Mandylion, Theodore Daphnopates’ oration on the translation of the arm of St Peter, the Translation of the relics of the Image of Edessa, a panegyric on the translation of the relics of St Gregory of Nazianzos and the Synaxarion Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae.
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120 Boissevain (1906) 222.
121 Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 145.
122 Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 40-41; Roos (1910), 172.
123 de Boor (1903), 387-390.
125 Warburg (1906) 222.
126 Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 40-41; Roos (1910), 172.
127 de Boor (1903), 387-390.
129 Boissevain (1906) 222.
130 Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 145.
131 Büttner-Wobst (1906a), 40-41; Roos (1910), 172.
In the following, I suggest that, for the chapter On the river Istros, the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi drew on a collection of geographical material, whereas for the chapters On Cyrus and On Remus and Romulus, he drew on a Constantinian collection of occult science. Similarly, passages on Roman history in the Excerpta Anonymi derive from a collection on dreams and occult science. In what follows, I shall undertake a close analysis of the source texts of the Excerpta Anonymi chapters Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ (On the Istros river), Περὶ Κύρου (On Cyrus) and Περὶ Ρώμου καὶ Ρωμύλου (On Remus and Romulus).

2.4.2 The chapter Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ

Richard Wünsch indicated as sources of the chapter Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ of the Excerpta Anonymi passages from the De Mensibus and the De magistratibus populi romani libri tres, both composed by John Lydus. Yet John Lydus was not the source for the excerptor. With only very few exceptions, the passages of the De Mensibus and the De Magistratibus do not bear any textual similarities with the Excerpta Anonymi chapter Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ. This conflicts with the fact that the Excerpta Anonymi normally remain faithful to the original text and, in many cases, copy their sources word by word. In fact, more than half the passage Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ is drawn from Herodotus. For the rest of the chapter the source used by the compiler needs further investigation.

Specifically, the chapter Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ can be divided thematically into four consecutive parts, which refer to the four rivers of Paradise: Istros (42,5-43,14), Nile (43,14-26), Tigris and Euphrates (43,27-44,9) and again Nile (44,10-21). Let us attempt to pin down the source text for each one of the four parts. The part on the river Istros (42,5-43,14) is composed from three separate texts: Herodotus’ History, John Lydus’ De magistratibus and Ps.-Caesarius’ Quaestiones et responsiones. In particular, Herodotus appears to be the source text for the Excerpta Anonymi 42,5-43,2, the De magistratibus is the source for the Excerpta Anonymi 43,3-11 and Ps.-Caesarius for the Excerpta Anonymi 43,11-14. The material on the rivers Tigris and Euphrates (43,27-44,9) has been taken from the
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132Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ; cf. Excerpta Anonymi 42,5-44,21.
133Περὶ Κύρου; cf. Excerpta Anonymi 33,1-36,9.
134Περὶ Ρώμου καὶ Ρωμύλου; cf. Excerpta Anonymi 36,10-37,29.
135On the river Istros.
137M. Treu indicates Herodotus along with a passage from John Lydus’ De Mensibus as the only sources of the chapter On the Istros river; cf. Treu (ed.) (1880), 58.
138Herodotus, 4, 48-50.
139De magistratibus populi Romani, 3,32.
140Quaestiones et responsiones, chapters 67 and 163.
Paraphrases in Dionysium Periegetam.\textsuperscript{141} Finally, the two passages on the Nile (Excerpta Anonymi 43,14-26 and 44, 10-21) are taken from Diodorus Sicily’s Bibliotheca historica\textsuperscript{142} and John Lydus’ De Mensibus, respectively.\textsuperscript{143}

Table 5: the sources of the passage On the Istrros river, 42,5-44,21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Istros 42,5-43,2</td>
<td>Herodotus, History 4, 48–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istros 43,3-11</td>
<td>John Lydus, De magistratibus populi Romani, 3,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istros 43,11-14</td>
<td>Ps.-Caesarius, Quaestiones et responsiones, ch. 67 and 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile 43,14-26</td>
<td>Diodorus of Sicily, Bibliotheca historica 1,37,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigris and Euphrates 43,27-44,9</td>
<td>Paraphrases in Dionysium Periegetam 977-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile 44,10-21</td>
<td>John Lydus, De Mensibus, 4, 107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of this table, it is apparent that the chapter Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ of the Excerpta Anonymi is a mixture of different works, all concerned with the four aforementioned rivers, though. Impressively, the works combined in the chapter are of different literary genres; the text is made up of excerpts from two historical works (Herodotus, Diodorus of Sicily), a geographical treatise (Dionysius Periegetes), two antiquarian texts (John Lydus) and an ecclesiastical work (Ps.-Caesarius).

Interestingly, such an approach towards source texts on the part of the Excerpta Anonymi is unique: in all the other chapters of the Excerpta Anonymi, the texts excerpted are clearly distinguished from each other and occasionally identified by the compiler himself. The exceptional situation in the chapter on the River Istrros therefore makes it unlikely that the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi was the compiler of the passage handed down to us under the title Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ. This hypothesis is corroborated when examining the collection in its entirety. The Excerpta Anonymi is a sylloge of excerpts just like those produced in Byzantium from the 5\textsuperscript{th} century onwards. Excerpt collections appear to conform to a number of structural principles: the compiler of a sylloge excerpts pre-existent texts and edits them while respecting their general structure. Furthermore, the selection of excerpts in the Excerpta Anonymi was based on general criteria such as accuracy, clarity, brevity and yet faithfulness to the original narration which, in turn, was determined by the collection’s practical and educational aims. The Excerpta Anonymi compiler creates a new narrative on the basis of excerpts. The chapter Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ, by contrast, presents itself as a single excerpt but is in fact a brief compilation within a collection of excerpts. Throughout the Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a, with the exception

\textsuperscript{141}Paraphrases in Dionysium Periegetam, 977-1000.
\textsuperscript{142}Bibliotheca historica 1,37,9.
\textsuperscript{143}De Mensibus, 4, 107.
of the chapter Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ, there is no evidence that our compiler merges separate source texts to create a single excerpt. The conclusion must be that the Excerpta Anonymi compiler has excerpted the passage on the four rivers of Paradise as a single entity from another manuscript. What was, however, the nature of that manuscript? Was it a different excerpt-collection, miscellaneous writings, a depository of notes intended for the private use of the compiler or a manuscript representing an intermediate stage to a final work? The composite nature of the passage, a conflation of different works on the same subject, could favour the latter argument. The hypothesis is further strengthened by the existence of another work containing a text very close to the chapter Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ of the Excerpta Anonymi: Leo the Deacon’s Historia transmits a passage similar to that of our collection; the only divergence is that Leo the Deacon records that the Istros resurfaces in the Celtic Mountains, whereas in the Excerpta Anonymi the river reemerges in the Apennine Mountains.

Leo the Deacon was born ca 950 in western Anatolia and came to Constantinople in his youth to receive his secondary education. He was ordained a deacon around 970 and joined the palace clergy in 976 during the reign of Basil II. Several passages in his Historia manifest his classical education. As a member of the palace clergy he is likely to have had access to the imperial scriptorium and to the draft copies of the EC.145

In his Historia, Leo the Deacon draws on a significant number of earlier historians, such as Herodotus, Thucydides, Diodorus of Sicily, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Procopius and Agathias.146 It is noteworthy that all of these historians had also been excerpted and used in the EC. In addition, Leo the Deacon’s Historia contains a considerable number of speeches and digressions reflecting topics of the 53 Constantinian hypotheses: the origin of the Mysians, the customs of the Rus and the accounts on the Hole Tile and on the source of the river Istros.147 As mentioned above, Leo’s passage on the source of the river Istros bears a striking resemblance to the passage in the Excerpta Anonymi, labelled as Περὶ Ἴστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ. The question to be raised is whether Leo the Deacon and the anonymous compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi used a common source and if they did so what was this source. Could this source be one or more excerpts drawn from one of the Constantinian collections?

144 Talbot – Sullivan (2005), 9-10.
145 The same has also been supported by A. Nemeth; cf. Nemeth (2010), 99.
147 Talbot – Sullivan (2005), 16.
2.4.3 *Περὶ Κύρου and Περὶ Ῥώμου καὶ Ῥωμύλου*\(^{148}\)

The other two chapters, under discussion, are *On Cyrus* and *On Remus and Romulus*. In the *Excerpta Anonymi* 32,28-33, the anonymous compiler interrupts the sequence of excerpts to insert a statement of his own. Apparently, he intends to inform the reader about the content of the forthcoming chapters:

*Καὶ εἴποι ἄν καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ καθ’ ἑξίς τοῦ χρόνου μέχρι σχεδὸν τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς, ἀλλ’ ἵνα μὴ δόξω θηρώμενος δόξαν κενὴν ταῦτα γράφειν, ἄλλως τε καὶ τῶν πλείστων πάσι γινωσκόμενων Κύρου μνησθήσομαι καὶ Ῥωμύλου σὺν τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτῶν· τὰ γὰρ περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Πριάμου καὶ Οιδίποδος τί καὶ γράφομι ός μηδενὸς τὰ κατ’ αὐτοὺς ἀγνοοῦντος*\(^{149}\)

If we take the statement at face value, we could say that the compiler had all four stories at hand, but that he selected only two, because they were less well known to the public. Moreover, the *Excerpta Anonymi* compiler names four characters, who all share a number of characteristics: first, they are stories about a son of a king, exposed to death but miraculously spared to accomplish great achievements later on, and second, dreams play a crucial role in all four narratives. The compiler prefers to recount only two of them, namely the story of Cyrus and the story of Remus and Romulus. At least two of these stories were known to the compilers of the *EC*: unlike the stories of Cyrus and Remus and Romulus, the story of Oedipus and of Alexander are included in the *EC*. The former is found in a short excerpt in the *EI* under the name of Nicolaus of Damascus.\(^{150}\) The story of Alexander is presented briefly in the *EV 1* where the excerptors used John of Antioch.\(^{151}\) This renders it likely that the four stories had been excerpted and put together by the Constantinian excerptors in a now lost collection about dreams.

We can note in passing that it is likely that the *EC* also knew the two other stories. In the *EV 1*, the excerptors included two passages concerning Remus and Romulus, under the name of Nicolaus of Damascus.\(^{152}\) The excerpts were inserted immediately after excerpts narrating Cyrus’ conquest of Lydia.\(^{153}\) The coincidence in content and sequence with the *Excerpta Anonymi* is striking. The *Excerpta Anonymi* chapter *Περὶ Κύρου* records the Herodotean story of Cyrus’s early life. Herodotus was also excerpted in the *EV 2*.\(^{154}\) One of

---

\(^{148}\)*On Cyrus and On Remus and Romulus.*

\(^{149}\)*I could say even more of such things, one after another, up to our time, but in order not to be considered that I write about these things seeking vainglorious reputation, and because most of these things are known to all, I will mention Cyrus as well as Romulus and his brother. However, wherefore to write about Alexander, the son of Priam and about Oedipus, since everyone is acquainted with their stories?*

\(^{150}\)*EI 7.*

\(^{151}\)*EV 1, 166-67.*

\(^{152}\)*EV 1, 349-353.*

\(^{153}\)*Though the excerpts were extracted from Dionysius of Halicarnasus, they were mistakenly inserted into text passages of Nicolaus of Damascus.*

\(^{154}\)*EV 2, 1-30.*
the excerpts juxtaposed in the EV 2 was extracted from the story of Cyrus’ early life, which is also included in the Excerpta Anonymi. In particular, in the EV 2, we encounter the story of Harpagus, whom Astyages tricked into eating his own son. After the meal, Astyages’ servants brought Harpagus the head, the arms and the legs so that he would realize that he had eaten his own son. The previous part of the story is missing. It might or might not have been excerpted in one of the other 53 hypotheses.

The chapter Περὶ Ῥώμου καὶ Ῥωμύλου was inserted into the Excerpta Anonymi after the material on Cyrus and precedes a passage excerpted from Appian, namely the Περὶ Ἀράβων μαντείας. In fact, the story of Cyrus is followed by two Appian excerpts, which are also thematically connected: they both narrate oracles that save someone’s life, the life of Ῥώμου and Ῥωμύλου and the life of the author himself, respectively. With regard to the correlation between the Περὶ Κύρου and the two Appian excerpts, I have two points to make. First, in the left margin on f. 47v in the codex Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a there is a number precisely in front of the title Περὶ Κύρου, which reads: ις (which equals 16). In the left margin on f. 53r, in front of the title Περὶ Ῥώμου καὶ Ῥωμύλου, the number ιζ (e.d. 17) occurs and finally, in the left margin on f. 55v, before the title of the last Appian excerpt, we encounter the number η (e.d. 18). The numeration implies an order. However, what does this order refer to? an order according to what? I suggest that the numeration at this point in the Excerpta Anonymi reflects the order by which the three excerpts had been copied in the manuscript which our compiler relied on. Given the fact that the three excerpts are thematically connected, this manuscript most probably was a dossier comprising material on omens and dreams, perhaps a depository of texts for later use. The fact that in the EV 2 two different passages, on Cyrus and Remus and Romulus respectively, had been copied in a sequence similar to that in the Excerpta Anonymi may be a coincidence. If we bear in mind, however, the way the Constantinian excerptors employed the complete narratives they had at hand, it seems probable that there was at least a draft manuscript containing, in sequence, material taken from the Herodotean version of Cyrus’ early life and the Appian version of the founders of Rome.

155Excerpta Anonymi 33,1-36,9.
156Excerpta Anonymi 37,30-38,21.
157 Τhe Excerpta Anonymi contain three further excerpts from Appian in the first part of the collection, that is, the patriographic one. The first passage is labelled as Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἐχοντος ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ κέρατα and was taken from Appian’s book on the Syrian war (Syrian War, 11,57,293-294). The second passage is entitled Περὶ Ἀγονοστου εὐτυχίας and corresponds to Appian’s book on Civil Wars (Civil Wars 2.57,236). Finally, the last passage bears the title Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἐν πέτρᾳ τῆς Ἀραβίας. The text has been copied also in the Patria II (Patria II, 84). The word πέτρᾳ refers to the city of Petra. Appian refers to the city of Petra again in the excerpt Περὶ Ἀράβων μαντείας, a fact that led P. Goukowsky to attributing the excerpt Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἐν πέτρᾳ τῆς Ἀραβίας also to Appian; cf. Goukowsky (1995), 63-70.
2.4.4 The passages on Roman history

The *Excerpta Anonymi* 29,14-32,27 transmit a series of excerpts derived from the Cassius Dio tradition; some excerpts show similarities with Dio’s direct tradition and some others exhibit textual congruence with Xiphilinus’ epitome of Dio.\(^{159}\) Interestingly, the concatenation of Dio excerpts in the *Excerpta Anonymi* is interrupted by four consecutive passages, which M. Treu either mistakenly assigns also to Cassius Dio or leaves unidentified.\(^{160}\) Two of the passages, namely the Ἀλλὸς \(A\) and the Περὶ Νέρωνος,\(^{162}\) respectively, derive from Peter the Patrician’s *Historia* preserved in the *ES* of the *EC*.\(^{163}\)

| CD 58,23 (Xiph. 154,7–8)\(^{164}\) | ES 14, 243,11–13\(^{165}\) | Excerpta 31,14–17\(^{166}\) | Anonymi | \[\]
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ἤγνωε μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν οὖν δὲ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Γαίον, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἶπεν ποτὲ αὐτῷ διαφερομένῳ πρὸς τὸν Τιβέριον ὅτι “σὺ τοῦτον ἀποκτενεῖς καὶ σὲ ἄλλοι”. | Ὅτι διαπληκτιζομένου ποτὲ Γαίον καὶ Τιβερίου τοῦ ἐκγόνου ἐφη πρὸς τὸν Γαίον ὁ πάππος Τιβέριος “Τιβέριος ἐφη πρὸς Γαίον ὁ Τιβέριος “τί σπουδάζεις καὶ σὺ τοῦτον φονεύσεις καὶ ἄλλοι σέ”. | διαπληκτιζομένων ποτὲ Γαίον τοῦ νυνί Γερμανικοῦ καὶ Τιβερείου τοῦ νυνί Τιβερείου ἐφη πρὸς Γαίον ὁ Τιβέριος καὶ σὺ τοῦτον φονεύσεις καὶ ἄλλοι σέ”. |[\[\] Table 6: passages on Roman history excerpted in the *Excerpta Anonymi* |\[\]

---

\(^{159}\)My thanks go to Dr. Dariya Rafiyenko for much helpful discussion on the matter: much attention is needed in dealing with U. P. Boissevain’s edition of Cassius Dio. For U. P. Boissevain relied on Dio’s direct tradition only when this is possible. In many cases, he combines Dio’s sources in order to form a Dio text as much reliable as possible. See, for instance, CD 59,25,5b–7 and 63,7,2.

\(^{160}\)Treu does not mention any source for the chapters Περὶ Τιβερείου, Ἀλλὸς \(A\) and Ἀλλὸς \(Γ\) and erroneously ascribes the chapter Περὶ Νέρωνος to Cassius Dio; cf. Treu (ed.) (1880), 58.

\(^{161}\)*Excerpta Anonymi* 31,14–17.


\(^{163}\)*ES*, 243,11–13 and ES, 253,23–27.

\(^{164}\)*Transl.* Banchich (2015), 31: Once when Gaius, the son of Germanicus, and Tiberius, the son of Tiberius were sparring, Tiberius said to Gaius, “Why hurry? You will kill him and another you”.

\(^{165}\)*Transl.* Banchich (2015), 31: Once when Gaius and Tiberius, his [Tiberius] descendant, were sparring, Tiberius the grandfather said to Gaius, “Why hurry? You will slay him and others you”.

\(^{166}\)*Transl.* Banchich (2015), 31: For he was ignorant of nothing that had to do with Gaius, but even said to him once, as he was quarreling with Tiberius, “You will kill him and others you”. 
The “Ἀλλ’ ὁ ἄλλο (Excerpta Anonymi 31,14-17) is decidedly close to ES 14 of the EC. Stress should be laid on the fact that the Excerpta Anonymi as well as the ES put τί σπουδάζεις at the beginning of Tiberius’ statement. Dio’s ἀποκτενεῖς was substituted by the synonymous φονεύσεις in both, the Excerpta Anonymi and the ES.

In addition, the Excerpta Anonymi exhibit significant similarities with an other excerpt collection, namely, the Exc.Salm.II\(^{171}\) with regard to the selective use of passages in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD 65,1,4 (Xiph.193,23-30)(^{67})</th>
<th>ES 89, 253,23–27(^{68})</th>
<th>Excerpta Anonymi 31,24–30(^{69})</th>
<th>Exc.Salm.II 54(^{70})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Οὐίτιλλος δε ἐπεὶ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐγένετο, τὰλλα τε διώκει ὡς ποι καὶ ἕδοκει αὐτῷ, καὶ πρόγραμμα ἑθετο δι’ οὗ τοὺς ἀστρολόγους ἐξήλασε, προειπὼν σφισιν ἐντὸς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἣτην τινα τάξας, εἰς ἅπασης τῆς Ἱταλίας χωρήσας. καὶ αὐτῷ ἐκεῖνος νυκτὸς ἀντιπροθέντες γράμματα ἀντιπαράγγειλαν ἀπαλλαγήσεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ βίου ἑντὸς τῆς ἡμέρας ἐν ἕτελεύτητι. καὶ οἱ μὲν ὀστὸς ἀκριβῶς τὸ γενησόμενον προέγνωσαν.</td>
<td>὜τι βιτελλίδας ἐξέβαλε τοὺς γόπας καὶ τοὺς ἀστρολόγους δι’ ἑπόησε πρόγραμμα καὶ ἀνατεθείκεν αὐτῷ ἐντός ἡμέρας ἐκχωρήσασθαι τῆς Ἱταλίας καὶ αὐτῷ νυκτὸς πρόγραμμα ἀνατεθείκασθαι ἀπαλλαγήσεσθαι αὐτὸν τοῦ βίου ἐν ἕτελεύταν ἐμέλλεν: οὕτως ἀκριβῶς τὸ γενησόμενον προέγνωσαν.</td>
<td>὜τι καὶ ἐθήκη πρόγραμμα τοὺς γόπας καὶ ἀστρολόγους ἐντός ἡμέρας ἐκχωρήσασθαι τῆς Ἱταλίας καὶ αὐτῷ νυκτὸς ἀνατεθείκασθαι πρόγραμμα παραγγέλλοντες ἀπαλλαγήσεσθαι αὐτὸν τοῦ βίου ἐν ἕτελεύταν ἐμέλλεν.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{67}\) Transl. Banchich (2015), 72: When Vitellius was in Rome, he was, I suppose, managing other matters as seemed right to him, and he issued an edict through which he expelled the astrologers, having told them to leave from all Italy within this day, having posted the specified one. And they, when they had issued a counter notice at night, in turn ordered him to depart from life on the day in which he died. And thus, on the one hand, they accurately prognosticated what was going to occur.

\(^{68}\) Transl. Banchich (2015), 72: Vitellius expelled the sorcerers and the astrologers through the edict, having told them to depart all of Italy on the specified day. And they, during the night, set up a counter edict stating that he was going to depart from life on the day in which he died. And thus, they accurately prognosticated what was going to occur.

\(^{69}\) At the end of his rule, irritated by the sorcerers and the astrologers, he edicted on what specified day they were to leave from all Italy. They, on the other hand, during the night, countered by announcing that he was going to depart from life on the very day he died.

\(^{70}\) Vitellius issued an edict to send the astrologers and the sorcerers away from Italy on a specified day. And they, during the night, countered by announcing that he was going to depart from life on the very day he died.

\(^{71}\) The Excerpta Salmasiana are a sylloge of historical excerpts named after the French humanist Claude Saumaise, who copied them around the year 1606 from a mid-12th century codex in Heidelberg. The compiler of the sylloge...
section on Roman history. Both excerptors have chosen to excerpt and include the same passages from the Cassius Dio tradition.\textsuperscript{172} The wording is virtually identical. Accordingly, the excerptors appear to share an interest in occult science as well as in dreams predicting the future. They both incorporate texts dealing with emperors who mistakenly underrated the abilities of astrologers to foresee the future. The common selective use of passages testifies to the use of a common source, that is, an excerpt collection comprising certain excerpts from the Cassius Dio tradition.\textsuperscript{173} The collection must have been on dreams and occult science.

I would like to draw attention to \textit{Exc.Salm.II} 54. As the table shows, the excerpt is impressively identical to a passage from Peter the Patrician’s \textit{Historia}, preserved in the \textit{ES} 89 of the \textit{EC}. The respective passage in the \textit{Excerpta Anonymi} is, likewise, derived from the \textit{ES}; the addition τοῦ γόητας in Peter the Patrician has been transmitted in both, the \textit{Exc.Salm.II} and the \textit{Excerpta Anonymi}. The same holds true for the sentence καὶ αὐτοί νυκτὸς πρόγραμμα, which is copied verbatim in the \textit{Exc.Salm.II} 54 and the \textit{Excerpta Anonymi} 31,24-30. Cassius Dio, by contrast, says καὶ ἐκεῖνοι instead of καὶ αὐτοί. Moreover, the imperfect indicative ἐμελλεν at the end of the \textit{Exc.Salm.II} 54 is only found in Peter the Patrician’s text. Furthermore, that Dio’s text was first abridged and used by Peter becomes manifest in the inclusion of the sentence οὕτως ἀκριβῶς τὸ γενησόμεν προέγνωσαν at the end of the \textit{ES} 89. Neither the \textit{Exc.Salm.II} 54, nor the \textit{Excerpta Anonymi} 31,24-30 excerpt the phrase.

Strikingly, excerpt 54 is not the only passage in the \textit{Excerpta Salmasiana} to derive from Peter the Patrician. \textit{Exc.Salm.II} 59 is blatantly identical to \textit{ES} 112 of the \textit{EC}. The \textit{Exc.Salm.II} 59 preserves Peter’s order (τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν δορυφόρων and καὶ ἐν ἀγρῷ ἔτη ζ) as well as the number of years that Similis lived (ἔτη ν). Cassius Dio, on the other hand, records only that Similis had a life of many years (ἔτη τόσα), without giving the exact number.

Finally, \textit{Exc.Salm.II} 53 corresponds to \textit{ES} 59 of the \textit{EC}. The passage transmits an oracle foretelling that the last of Aeneas’ sons would kill his mother and govern.\textsuperscript{174}


\textsuperscript{173}It is noteworthy that \textit{Exc.Salm.II} 53, 54 and 59 correspond to Peter the Patrician, \textit{ES} 59, 89 and 112, respectively.

\textsuperscript{174}The oracle is also found in the \textit{Anthologia Graeca}; cf. \textit{Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatinæ}, 512. The oracle has also been transmitted as a later scribal addition to Symeon Logothetes’ \textit{Chronicon}; cf. Symeon Logothetes, \textit{Chronicon}, 85.
Table 7: Peter the Patrician’s *Historia* in the *Excerpta Salmasiana*

|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| ἐπειδὴ τε ὁ Νέρων παραμυθούμενος αὐτοῦς οὐδαμοὶ ταῦτα τὰ ἔτη εὑρασθαί ἔλεγε, μεταβαλόντες ἔτερων λόγιον ὡς καὶ Σιβύλλειον ὄντως ὃν ἢδον· ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο „ἔσχατος Αἰνεαδῶν μητροκτόνος βασιλεύει“. | Ὄτι ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ περιβοηθοῦ ἐμπροσθός τῆς Ῥώμης ἐλέξθη τοιούτο τὶ λόγιον, ἔσχατος Αἰνεαδῶν μητροκτόνος βασιλεύει. | Ὅτε δὲ ἔτεχθη εἴπον οἱ ἀστρολόγοι, ὅτι καὶ βασιλεύει καὶ τὴν μητέρα φονεύσα· ἦν δὲ καὶ λόγιος ἔσχατος Αἰνεαδῶν μητροκτόνος ἠγεμονεύει.

|----------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| καὶ τὴν τῶν δορυφόρων ἀρχήν ἰκὼν τε ἔλαβε καὶ λαβὼν ἐξιστατο, μόλις τε ἄφεθεν εἰς ἄγρῳ ἱουνοῦ ἐπὶ ἔτη τὰ λοιπὰ τοῦ βίου διήγαγε, καὶ ἐπὶ γέ τοῦ μνήμα αὐτοῦ τοῦτο ἐπέγραφεν ὃτι „Σίμιλος ἐνταύθα κεῖται βιοῦ μὲν ἔτη τὸσα, ζήσας δὲ ἔτη ἔπτα. | Ὅτι ὁ αὐτὸς Σίμιλις ἐπειδή βίας τὴν ἀρχήν τῶν δορυφόρων παραλαβεν. ἐξιστή τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐν ἄγρῳ ἐτὰ ἐπτά διήγαγεν καὶ τελευτήσαντος ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ αὐτοῦ ἐπέγραψεν ὅτι Σίμιλις ἐνταύθα κατάκειται βιοῦ μὲν ἔτη πεντῆκοντα, ζήσας δὲ ἔτη ἔπτα. | Ἄδριανὸς Σίμιλον τιν, ἀνδρὰ φρονήσει καὶ ἐπιεικεία κεκοσμημένον, ἢνάγκασε τὴν ἀρχήν τῶν δορυφόρων παραλαβεν καὶ μόλις μὲν, ἐπεισε δ' οὖν. ὅλον δὲ ἐπισχὼν καὶ δεθεῖς, ἐξετη τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐν ἄγρῳ ἔτη ζ διαγαγόν τελευτὰ, ἐπιγραφήναι προστάζας τελευτήσαντος ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ αὐτοῦ. Σίμιλος ἐνταύθα κεῖται, βιοῦ μὲν ἔτη ν, ζήσας δὲ ἔτη ζ.

If I am right in postulating a common source between the *Exc.Salm.II* and the *Excerpta Anonymi*, this source could be:

1) a collection of excerpts on dreams and occult science; the excerpts are taken from Cassius Dio and Peter the Patrician’s works.

2) Peter the Patrician’s *Historia*.

The latter possibility is tempting, if very difficult to prove given the paucity of evidence for Peter’s texts. The *ES* and *EL* of the *EC* are the unique sources for the sixth-century author from Thessaloniki. The extant fragments from his history show a strong adherence to Dio’s text. This seems to be the only piece of evidence we possess with respect to his literary preference. The unidentified passages in the *Excerpta Anonymi* are congruent with the historical interests of Peter’s and could easily plug gaps in his narrative as it was handed down in the *EC*. Nevertheless, both arguments are not

---

175 The grammatical treatise *Ἅριον Συντάξεως* transmits two brief quotations from Peter’s *Historia*; cf. Bekker (ed.) (1814), 130 and 149.

sufficient to positively ascribe the whole section on Roman history in the *Excerpta Anonymi* to Peter the Patrician.

### 2.4.5 The EC as a depository of knowledge

As noted, I. Ševčenko was the first to argue that other treatises compiled in the palace also used material gathered in the first place for the *EC*.\(^{177}\) In fact, geographical interest dominates the *DT* and the *DAI*. The *DT* made use of historians excerpted also in the *EC*.\(^{178}\) The same holds true for the *DAI*. In addition, the codex *Laurentianus Plut. 55,4*, which was a product of the imperial scriptorium, contains geographical information, too.\(^{179}\)

Interestingly, there is also a group of histories that were certainly produced under the direction of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (944-959) and Basil the Nothos (that is under Nicephorus Phocas’ reign, 963-969) through processes of compilation. This bunch of texts comprises Genesius’ *Regum Libri Quattuor*,\(^ {180}\) the *Theophanes Continuatus*,\(^ {181}\) Ps.-Symeon’s *Chronographia*\(^ {182}\) and the two versions of Symeon Logothetes’ *Chronicon*.\(^ {183}\) These works, produced in imperial circles, show affinities in methodology, content and sources. Accordingly, they quite often correlate with each other in terms of common references.

---

\(^{177}\)See n. 82.

\(^{178}\)See, for instance, passages taken from Nicolaus of Damascus and Polybius.

\(^{179}\)Dain – Foucault (1967), 362.

\(^{180}\)The history by Genesius covers more briefly the same period as the first part of the *Theophanes Continuatus* (813-867) and similarly to *Theophanes Continuatus* is addressed to Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The narrative contains geographical notices and quotations from Homer (like the *Excerpta Anonymi*); cf. Lesmüller-Werner – Thurn (edd.) (1978); Kaldellis (ed.) (1998).

\(^{181}\)See n. 4 in the Preface. The text has been handed down to us in a single manuscript, the codex Vat. gr. 167 and comprises six books or three distinct parts: part 1 (four books on the reigns of Leo V, Michael II, Theophilus and Michael III respectively), part 2 (a book entitled *Vita Basilii*) and part 3 (a book on the reigns of Leo VI, Alexander, Constantine VII, Romanos I, Constantine VII and Romanos II). The third part may consist of two separate parts given the distinct political orientation of each of them. On the title of the *Vita Basilii* see Ševčenko (2011), 3-55.

\(^{182}\)The text is transmitted in the codex Parisinus gr. 1712, ff. 18v-272r and remains unedited except for the folios 235r-272r edited first by F. Combeifs, in Combeifs (ed.) (1685), 401-498. This edition was reprinted by I. Bekker in Bekker (1838), 603-760. Beside Bekker’s edition, a few passages (ff. 83r-88v) were published in Halkin (1959-1960), 7-27 and some others (ff. 200v-235r) in Browning (1965), 406-410. On the Parisinus gr. 1712 see Markopoulos (1978), 30-37 and Wahlgren (2006), 46 and 87-89.

\(^{183}\)The first version of Symeon’s chronicle was edited by S. Wahlgren; cf. Wahlgren (ed.) (2006). The second version remains poorly edited. Passages of parts of manuscripts preserved the second editions were published in Bekker (1838), 353-481; Istrin (1922), 3-65; Markopoulos (1979), 91-100; Featherstone (1998), 420-433. On the manuscript tradition of the first and second version of the chronicle see Wahlgren (2006), 27-49. On the dating of the two versions see also Markopoulos (1979), 83-119 and Treadgold (2013), 203-217. The identification of the Symeon Logothetes with Symeon Metaphrastes was disputed in Høgel (2002), 61-88 and Wahlgren (2006), 3-8.
to the past, mythological figures, exaggerated accounts and geographical allusions. The phenomenon implies the existence of a shared written tradition as well as a common repository of relevant references, that is a collection of historical-geographical material. J. Signes Codoñer holds the same view when arguing that a common source should be considered to be an anonymous collection of historical excerpts. When exploring the sources of the historical-geographical digressions encountered in the official histories throughout the 10th century, we arrive at two significant conclusions: 1) these original texts were also excerpted in the EC and 2) the sources were used in works which were compiled decades after Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ death. The latter point may suggest that material employed in the Constantinian imperial scriptorium continued to be used and elaborated for years inside and out of it.

Specifically, the aforementioned histories transmit geographical allusions that originally occurred in Homer, Strabo, Stephanus Byzantius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ Antiquitates Romanae, Nonnus’ Dionysiaca, Scholia on Apollonius Rhodius, Scholia on Dionysius Periegetes, Arian’s Bithyniaca, John Malalas’ Chronographia and Hesychius’ Patria. As far as the Excerpta Anonymi are concerned, the excerpt collection contains geographical references that occur likewise in some of the histories, namely the Excerpta Anonymi 49,1-4 on Tarsus occur in Genesius and the Excerpta Anonymi 49,17-18 on the origins of the name of the Medes bears significant resemblance to a passage in Ps.-Symeon.

---

184 A. Markopoulos seems to be certain that Genesius’ history and Theophanes Continuatus used common sources; cf. Markopoulos (2009), 137–150. Treadgold (2013), 180-181, Featherstone – Signes Codoñer (2015), 10-13 and Signes Codoñer (2017), 19 share A. Markopoulos’ view. W. Treadgold sees the lost Secret History of Nicetas the Paphlagonian as the common source shared by Genesius and Theophanes Continuatus; cf. Treadgold, 180-196. Treadgold’s view does not seem to be tenable though; see Ljubarskij (1987), 12-27 and below n. 368. I. Ševčenko argued that the author the Regum Libri Quattuor was member of the literary circle of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; cf. Ševčenko (1990), 171.

185 A. Diller first observed that the idea of historical embellishment is parallel to the revival of antique pagan themes in contemporary Byzantine plastic arts; cf. Diller (1950), 245, esp. n. 11.


187 For a detailed analysis of the common use of these allusions in the four official histories of the 10th century see Diller (1950), 246-252.

188 Genesius, Regum Libri Quattuor 47,6-10. The geographic notice on Tarsus is originally derived from Stephanus Byzantius; cf. Meineke (ed.) (1849), 605.6-13.

189 The passage, originally found in Stephanus Byzantius, has passed similarly changed in terms of structure to both, the Excerpta Anonymi and e; cf. Theophanes Continuatus, 706.16. The Excerpta Anonymi claim that the Medes’ name comes directly from Medea. Ps.-Symeon, instead, gives Medos as eponymous ancestor of the Medes. Herodotus claims that the name came directly from Medea herself, when she came to their land after leaving Athens; cf. Herodotus, Historiae 7.62.1. There are various traditions on the parentage of Medos: he was a son of
I would also like to draw attention to two chapters embedded into the first part of the *Excerpta Anonymi*. The first part is mainly made up of passages on Constantinopolitan statuary. The thematic sequence is contaminated by two apparently irrelevant ethnographic digressions of two peoples, namely the Norici and the Getae. The first chapter is a mythical account of how the Norici adopted their ethnic name: a divinely-sent boar was ravaging the land, until a man managed to catch it. Then the Norici shouted ‘one man’, which in their own language means *berounous* and that way the city was named Berounion. The account, not found elsewhere in Greek literature, bears marked resemblance to a similar digression about the naming of Italy in Genesius: some people, when crossing Italy, met a cow and shouted ‘Italian, Italian’, which in their dialect meant cow. The account is also unique in Greek literature. Both accounts seem to derive from a common tradition. (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae* 1.35 and Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca* 1.8.2–3).

### Conclusion

To conclude, the EC appear to have been used in treatises produced within court circles as well as in non-imperial works. The latter were written by persons associated with the palace or the imperial library. The anonymous compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* must have drawn on draft copies produced during the redaction of the Constantinian collections.

As the analysis of the chapter *On the river Istros* has shown, the passage must have been excerpted from an earlier dossier, presumably a collection of notes on geography. The chapters *On Cyrus* and *On Remus and Romulus* reflect the selection and arrangement of similar material in the EC. The passages on Roman history in the *Excerpta Anonymi* derive from a collection of excerpts on dreams, which could have been produced during the redaction of the Constantinian collections. This strongly suggests that among now lost Constantinian collections of excerpts, there probably existed collections of geography, dreams and portents. In the surviving Constantinian collections we detect excisions of passages on geography that can be explained by Constantine’s intention to include them in another thematic collection. To cite but one example: when excerpting Procopius for

---

Medea either by Aigeus (Ps.-Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca* 1.9.28), an Asian king (Diodorus, *Bibliotheca historica* 4.55.7), or Jason (Strabo, *Geographica* 11.13.10).


191 *Excerpta Anonymi* 9,10-13.

192 The only parallel is an entry in the *Suda*, which draws on the *Excerpta Anonymi*; cf. s.v. Βηρούνιον [158 T 1]).

the Excerpta de Legationibus, the excerptors leave out the description of Beroea. The omissions in the EC cover a subject usually mentioned with the phrase ζήτει ἐν τῷ περὶ (Look for it in the) plus the name of the collection, which appears in the surviving manuscripts when a passage in the main narrative is missing. Concerning geographical materials, the cross-references reveal the existence of three relevant, but now lost, collections: περὶ ἐθῶν (On customs), περὶ ἐθνῶν (On peoples) and περὶ οἰκίσμων (On settlements). The possibility of yet more collections on the subject cannot be excluded.

2.5 Historical and cultural context

In this section, I explore the extent to which ideology, contemporary attitudes and preoccupations influence the transmission of knowledge to the succeeding ages. Accordingly, what follows is an attempt to contextualize the Excerpta Anonymi. Certain preoccupations in the Excerpta Anonymi confirm that they belong in the context of the 10th century post-imperial ideology. As I shall argue, the composition of the Excerpta Anonymi belongs at a time when the transformative power and civilising influence of the Empire have been restricted. The implications of the new circumstances are reflected in the selection of excerpts as well as omissions and distortions of passages on the part of the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi. It should also be stressed that the Excerpta Anonymi share concerns evident in other contemporary works, namely an emphasis on the prophetic meaning, dangers and hidden powers of pagan statues as well as geographical and ethnographical interest. I shall begin by examining the attitude of the Excerpta Anonymi towards Roman emperors through a comparison with the Parastaseis and the Patria II. Then I elucidate the compiler’s attitude towards ethnographic material of earlier centuries.

2.5.1 Portrayals of emperors in the Excerpta Anonymi

The section argues that we can detect the impact of the propaganda of the Macedonian dynasty in the portrayals of emperors in the Excerpta Anonymi. It shall be shown how the Excerpta Anonymi use material from an earlier collection of excerpts, the conventionally

194EL 6 (2.7.2).
195Section 2.5.1 originates in my article “History through an excerpt collection. The case of the Excerpta Anonymi and the Patria of Constantinople” that was submitted for the volume edited by E. Amato, P. De Cicco, B. Lançon and T. Moreau, Les historiens fragmentaires de langue grecque à l’époque impériale et tardive to be published by Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
called *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai*, and how this compares to the use the *Patria of Constantinople* made of the same work. I shall show in particular that the compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* holds a negative attitude towards Justinian I and that he does not include theological judgments or comments. I shall start by comparing the *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *Parastaseis* regarding emperors. As I showed above, they relied on a shared source or the *Excerpta Anonymi* used the *Parastaseis*.

### 2.5.1.1 Comparison of the *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *Parastaseis*

#### a) Julian

In the *Parastaseis*, contemporary worries about idolatry are discernible throughout references to the emperor Julian the Apostate (361-363), the persecutor of Christians. The *Parastaseis* call Julian «θεοστυγής», which means hated by God, an epithet with theological weight that has been omitted by the compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi*.197

«(...) Κάμινος δὲ παμμεγέθης μεγάλη ἐως ἡμῶν διασωθείσα, ἐνθα Ἰουλιανὸς ὁ θεοστυγής προφάσει τῶν καταδίκων πολλοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ Χριστιανούς κατέκαυσε.»

«Κάμινος ἦν ἐκεῖ ἐκτισμένη παμμεγέθη ἐβοῦς ἡχούσα κεφαλήν ἐνθα οἱ κακούργοι έτιμώροντο ὅθεν καὶ Ἰουλιανὸς προφάσει τῶν καταδίκων πολλοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ Χριστιανούς κατέκαυσεν.»

(...) And there is an enormous great furnace, preserved until the present day, where Julian, hated by God, burned many Christians on the pretext of their being criminals.

*Parastaseis*, chapter 42

There was an enormous furnace there, which had the head of an ox, where the criminals were punished, and where, consequently, Julian burned many Christians on the pretext of them being criminals.

*Excerpta Anonymi* 15,22-29

*Parastaseis* chapters 46-49, which again refer unfavourably to Julian, have also been omitted in the *Excerpta Anonymi*; in chapter 46 Theodosius the Great, full of anger, breaks a statue of Julian’s and forbids coins with his image.198 In chapter 47 Julian is accused of

---

196 *Parastaseis*, chapter 42.
197 A little further on in the same chapter, where the *Parastaseis* call the emperor Phocas ἀνάξιος, which means «unworthy» in theological terms, the *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *Patria* once more omit the theological epithet assigned to an emperor; cf. *Parastaseis*, chapter 42; *Excerpta Anonymi* 15,29.
198 *Parastaseis*, chapter 46: «Ἰουλιανοῦ χαραγὰς θεοδόσιος ὁ μέγας ἡμαύρωσε μεθ’ ὧν καὶ τὴν τούτου στήλην ἔξω τῆς Χαραγῆς ἐστηκυῖαν θεασάμενος ήρυθρίασε, καὶ τοῖς συνοδεύουσιν ἐπύθετο, τίνος ἄν εἴη τὸ χάραγμα. Τῶν δὲ Ἰουλιανοῦ φησάντων, εὐθὺς ἐκεῖνον ἔπειτα ὅτι μέλων ἀνθρώπων τὴν στήλην τεθέαμαι καὶ πάνω ἠρυθρίασα καὶ παραυτίκα ταύτην κατέαξε καὶ δόγμα προέθηκεν, ὅτι ὅποι νῦν εὑρεθῇ ἐν χαραγάσι νομίμων τὸ τοιοῦτον ὑπόδειγμα καὶ μὴ τῷ δημοσίῳ καταμηνυθῇ, δημευθείς ὁ τοιοῦτος ἔξοριστος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως γένηται» (Theodosius the Great wiped out the coinage of Julian). In addition, when he saw his statue standing outside the
leading a lot of people to idolatry, chapter 48 reports the destruction of a statue depicting Jesus and the burning of a monk upon the orders of Julian and in chapter 49 Julian encourages people to idolatry.

Chapter 70 of the Parastases is devoted to the so-called «Philadelphion», but at the end of the passage, the compilers report that Julian ejected his wife from the throne because she was a Christian. Although the Excerpta Anonymi have included that chapter, its compiler has excised the reference to Julian.

«Τὸ καλούμενον Φιλαδέλφιον φασίν, ἐξεικόνιζε καὶ προσκυνεῖσθαι ταύτας ὡς βασιλέων εἰκόνας ἠνάγκαζεν τὸν Ξάνθιον κατέκλασεν ἐκάη, ἔλεγον «Ηπειρία ἡ και τὴν ἐκεί ὥσπερ τὰ ἄνθρωπα ἐξουθενήσας τὸν Χριστιανόν ἐξεικόνιζε καὶ λαμπρὰς καὶ ἐπιστῶς τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπεκείρατο. Αἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ στήλῃ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν σώζονται ἐν τῷ Φιλαδέλφιῳ.»

Mint, he turned red and asked his companions whose likeness it was. When they replied that it was Julian’s he said at once: ‘I have seen a black man represented in a statue and I grew very red’, and at once he broke it and issued a decree saying that whenever that same man’s likeness was seen on coins and the Treasury was not notified, he who was responsible should suffer confiscation and be banished from Constantinople.

Parastases, chapter 47: «Πολὺς ἦν Ἰουλιανὸς ἐν μαγγανείαις· ὅθεν καὶ τοῖς καταστασίοις ἢν καὶ τοῖς εἰδώλιοις ἐπεκείρατο τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιθύμησιν ἑτοῖμον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναστηλώθησιν;»

Chapter 48: «(...) ταῦτα Ἰουλιανὸς θεασάμενος ἐπύθετο τὸ μυστήριον, καὶ μαθὼν ἢριοῦ ἔτη καὶ τοῖς εἰδώλιοις ἐπεκείρατο τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπιθύμησιν ἑτοῖμον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναστηλώθησιν;» (Julian was deeply involved in sorcery; thus he fashioned eidola into the semblance of imperial statues, it is said, and forced everyone to do obeisance to them as if to images of emperors).

Chapter 48: «(...) καὶ Ἐνθα καὶ Μαρτύριος ἐπίσκοπος πολλὰ ἐξουθενήσας αὐτὸν ἐκάη πλησίον τοῦ ναοῦ, ὡς ἔλεγον, εἰς θυσίαν θεοῖς;» (... Seeing this, then, Julian asked its meaning and when he heard that the statue was of Jesus, he broke it (...). And there the bishop Martyrius, who strongly opposed the emperor, was burned near the temple, they say, as a sacrifice to the gods).

Chapter 49: «Διὰ τοῦτο ἢ μόνον ἐβασίλευσεν, καὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ καὶ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ εἰκόνας αὐτῷ ἐν τε σκύλῳ καὶ χαλκουργήματι μεγίστους ἀνέθετο;» (For this reason, as soon as he became emperor, he set up images to him, in Rome and Antioch, in the form of panels and large bronze statues).

On the Philadelphion see Cameron – Herrin (1984), 265-266.

Excerpta Anonymi 19,5-9.
The so-called Philadelphion represents the sons of Constantine the Great. One of them arrived in Constantinople from Gaul after his father's death. They greeted each other with a great meeting and rejoicing, and at once erected statues of themselves in the city preserving this scene. There was a statue of Julian and Anastasia his wife, whom he ejected from throne because she was a Christian. She was shorn in the monastery of Promotus. These same statues still stand in the Philadelphion to this day.

Parastaseis, chapter 70

If we bear in mind that Julian at that time embodied the enemy of Christianity, such suppressions on the part of the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi betray his admiration for the Roman past, which he primarily interprets as pagan.

b) Verina

Parastaseis chapter 29 refers to two statues of Verina, the wife of Leo the Great (457-474). It is noteworthy that the Excerpta Anonymi have left out the last sentence of the excerpted passage, according to which Verina was very orthodox, omitting, once more, a religious designation.

204 The Patriarch Germanus condemned Julian in his letters addressed to two Anatolian bishops; cf. PG 98, col. 164 B, 165 C-D, 168 D-188 B.

205 Excerpta Anonymi 12,24-32.
A bronze <statue> of Verina, the wife of Leo the Great, on a pillar near St Agathonikos above the steps. Another of her at the Anemodourion, to the south, near St Barbara. The first, at St Agathonikos, was erected during the lifetime of her husband; the one beyond St Barbara after the death of her husband Leo and the flight of her son-in-law Zeno, when she crowned her brother Basiliscus to the acclamations of the Green Faction: 'Long life to Verina the orthodox Helena'. For she was very orthodox.

**Parastaseis, chapter 29**

There are two statues of Verina, the wife of Leo the Great. One to the north of St Agathonikos, on top of the flight of steps, and the other near the place where St Barbara is. The (statue) at St Agathonikos was erected during the lifetime of Leo, the one at St Barbara after his death, when she crowned her brother Basiliscus, after the flight of her son-in-law Zeno.

**Excerpta Anonymi 12,24-32.**

c) Anastasius

The Excerpta Anonymi excerpt chapter 25 from the Parastaseis,²⁰⁶ where the emperor Anastasius (491-512) is associated with the restoration of the church of Saint Menas.²⁰⁷ Such a choice contrasts, as shown below, with their silence concerning Justinian’s building activities. It is noteworthy that some centuries earlier Procopius, John Lydus and Hesychius made favourable references to Anastasius that have been considered as implicit disapproval of Justinian’s policies.²⁰⁸

d) Justinian I

Chapter 1 of the Parastaseis refers to the rebuilding of the St Mocius church and chapter 2 reports the restoration of the St Agathonikos church both under Justinian’s reign (527-565).²⁰⁹ In addition, the unnamed emperor of chapter 4, associated with a wonder that

---

²⁰⁶The Parastaseis contain three chapters referring to the emperor Anastasius I (491-518). The Excerpta Anonymi excerpts only one of these.


²⁰⁹Parastaseis, chapter 1: «Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ᾿Ιουστινιανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀνεγείρεται ὁ αὐτὸς ναὸς καὶ ἱσταται ἕως ἡμῶν» (But in the days of the Emperor Justinian the same church was rebuilt and stands in our own day); Parastaseis, chapter 2: «Ὁ ᾿Αγίος ῾Αγαθόνικος ὑπὸ ᾿Αναστασίου τοῦ πρώτερον καὶ ᾿Ιουστινιανοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου τὸ δεύτερον οἰκοδομήθη» (St Agathonikos was built in the first place by Anastasius and a second time by Justinian the great).
happened when a statue was suddenly removed, could easily be Justinian I. None of the aforementioned chapters is included in the *Excerpta Anonymi*.

The *Parastaseis* chapter 61 makes a reference to the statue of Justinian erected to commemorate his victory over the Persians. Although the author of the *Excerpta Anonymi* excerpted chapter 61, he chose to omit the reference to Justinian’s statue:

> «Tac de deúteron, én oíkai plouton úpárchei, mē plerōthēnai, állla perimēnein. Ὄπερ ἀκόουσα ἐδάκρυσα, εἰ ἀρα γ’ ἐτι τοιοῦτον πάλιν τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐπέλθοι ἀλόγημα. Ἰουστινιανὸς ὁ μέγας ἐν τοῖς τοῦ καθίσματος κατ’ ἔπος ἐποχεῖτο ἐν ἵππῳ χαλκῷ μετὰ τὴν νίκην Μῆδων. Ἡ ἐν τῷ Ἰπποδρομίῳ καθεζομένη γυνή ἐν σελλίῳ χαλκῷ καὶ αὐτὴ ἰσοδύναμος, ὡς προείπομεν, ὁ μὲν Ἡρωδίων ἐδίδαξε Βερίναν εἶναι τοῦ μεγάλου Λέωντος ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ παρὰ πλείον ἠκουσα, ἔξ Ἐλλάδος εἶναι τὸ ἐἴδωλον μᾶλλον τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, ὅπερ καὶ ἐπίστευσα.»

> «Ἡ ἐν τῷ Ἰπποδρομίῳ καθεζομένη εἰς σελλίῳ χαλκῷ, ὁ μὲν Ἡρωδίων τὴν Βερίναν λέγει τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ μεγάλου Λέωντος ἄλλοι δὲ φασιν Ἀθηνάν εξ Ἐλλάδος ἐλθο ὦσαν.»

When I heard this, I wept to think that such a misfortune should yet again befall Constantinople. In the *area* of the Kathisma, Justinian the Great rode on a bronze horse, after the victory over the Medes. The woman seated on a bronze chair in the Hippodrome – she too is above *the imperial seat* as we mentioned before – Herodion told me is Verina, *the wife* of Leo the Great; but as I have myself heard from many people, it is instead the statue of Athena from Hellas, and this I believed.

> Οἱ ἐν τῷ Ἰπποδρομίῳ καθεζομένοις ἐν τῇ κατωγαίᾳ πόρτῃ τῇ πληρεστάτῃ στοιχεῖον ἵστατο Φιδαλείας τινὸς Ἑλληνίδος. Ἀρθείσης δὲ τῆς στήλης θαῦμα ἐἶδον ἰδέσθαι μέγα, τὸν τόπον ἐπιστρέφειν ὥστε καὶ τὸν βασιλέα θαυμάσαι καὶ λιτὴν ἀπελθεῖν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ καὶ οὕτως παῦσαι Σάβα τοῦ ὁσίου δι’ εὐχῶν τοῦτο ποιήσαντος;» (At the ground-level gate, which has been filled up, stood a statue of a certain pagan, Fidalia. When the statue was removed, a great wonder was to be seen, namely that the place shook for a long time, so that even the emperor marvelled and sent a procession to the place and only stopped it in this way. St Sabas achieved this by his prayers).

> «Ἐν τῇ κατωγαίᾳ πόρτῃ τῇ πληρεστάτῃ στοιχεῖον ἵστατο Φιδαλείας τινὸς Ἑλληνίδος. Ἀρθείσης δὲ τῆς στήλης θαῦμα ἐἶδον ἰδέσθαι μέγα, τὸν τόπον ἐπιστρέφειν ὥστε καὶ τὸν βασιλέα θαυμάσαι καὶ λιτὴν ἀπελθεῖν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ καὶ οὕτως παußαι Σάβα τοῦ ὁσίου δι’ εὐχῶν τοῦτο ποιήσαντος;» (At the ground-level gate, which has been filled up, stood a statue of a certain pagan, Fidalia. When the statue was removed, a great wonder was to be seen, namely that the place shook for a long time, so that even the emperor marvelled and sent a procession to the place and only stopped it in this way. St Sabas achieved this by his prayers).

> «Ἐν τῇ κατωγαίᾳ πόρτῃ τῇ πληρεστάτῃ στοιχεῖον ἵστατο Φιδαλείας τινὸς Ἑλληνίδος. Ἀρθείσης δὲ τῆς στήλης θαῦμα ἐἶδον ἰδέσθαι μέγα, τὸν τόπον ἐπιστρέφειν ὥστε καὶ τὸν βασιλέα θαυμάσαι καὶ λιτὴν ἀπελθεῖν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ καὶ οὕτως παῦσαι Σάβα τοῦ ὁσίου δι’ εὐχῶν τοῦτο ποιήσαντος;» (At the ground-level gate, which has been filled up, stood a statue of a certain pagan, Fidalia. When the statue was removed, a great wonder was to be seen, namely that the place shook for a long time, so that even the emperor marvelled and sent a procession to the place and only stopped it in this way. St Sabas achieved this by his prayers).

210 *Parastaseis*, chapter 4: «Ἐν τῇ κατωγαίᾳ πόρτῃ τῇ πληρεστάτῃ στοιχεῖον ἵστατο Φιδαλείας τινὸς Ἑλληνίδος. Ἀρθείσης δὲ τῆς στήλης θαῦμα ἐἶδον ἰδέσθαι μέγα, τὸν τόπον ἐπιστρέφειν ὥστε καὶ τὸν βασιλέα θαυμάσαι καὶ λιτὴν ἀπελθεῖν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ καὶ οὕτως παῦσαι Σάβα τοῦ ὁσίου δι’ εὐχῶν τοῦτο ποιήσαντος;» (At the ground-level gate, which has been filled up, stood a statue of a certain pagan, Fidalia. When the statue was removed, a great wonder was to be seen, namely that the place shook for a long time, so that even the emperor marvelled and sent a procession to the place and only stopped it in this way. St Sabas achieved this by his prayers).

211 On that statue see Cameron (1977), esp. 42-48.
In addition, chapter 68 of the *Parastaseis*, which refers to another statue of Justinian, set up in the Augusteum, has been entirely eliminated.\(^{212}\)

Finally, chapter 81 of the *Parastaseis*, which transmits information about a statue in the Zeuxippus, erroneously assigned to Justinian I instead of Justin II, has also been excised in the *Excerpta Anonymi*.\(^{213}\)

Only two chapters containing information on Justinian have been included in the *Excerpta Anonymi*. The first one is the *Parastaseis* chapter 11 referring to the rebuilding of the Hagia Sophia and presenting Justinian in a favourable way.

\[^{212}\textit{Parastaseis}, chapter 68: «Εν δὲ τοις Σωζομενοῦ γράμμασι, φησιν, Ἰουστινιανὸς ἐστιν, ὃ νῦν καθορᾶται τὸ μέγαν τοῦ Ζεύξιππο ζώδιον» (\textit{But in the writings of Sozomen, they say, it is Justinian who is seen there today}).\]

\[^{213}\textit{Parastaseis}, chapter 81: «Η στήλη ἣν πρὸς τὸ Ζεύξιππο θεωροῦσα, ἤτοι ἔμπροσθεν, Ἰουστινιανοῦ καὶ Θεοδώρας/ Λικινίου Ἀγούστου Ὀυάλεντιανοῦ καὶ Θεοδοσίου καὶ Ἀρκαδίου καὶ τοῦ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, Σεραπίωνος ὑπαιτίου καὶ ᾿Ελένης μητρὸς Κωνσταντίνου τρεῖς ἕκ δὲ ἐτέρα διὰ ψηφιδῶν ἄργυρων ἐν χαλκῷ κιόνι καὶ ᾿Αλλῆ ἔλεφαντώδης Κύπρου ῥήτορος προσενέγκαντος· ᾿Αστίνας ᾿Ιουστινιανὸς μερίς τῇ πόλει τοῦ ναὸν τῶν μέγιστων ἄνεγείρει μετὰ πίστεως καὶ πόνου. Οἱ δὲ πεπειραμένοι τῶν προειρημένων ἑπαρτικοῦ τοῦ μερίδος ἐκείνος καὶ Θεοδώρας ἐστίν καθʼ ἑν καὶ ἐδοξάσθη ᾿Ιουστινιανός, ὃτε ἐτίθετο ἡ αὐτή στήλη, κράζοντος τοῦ Πρασίου μέρους· Ἰουστινιανὸς καὶ Κωνσταντίνος νέοι παρά παρά πλούτου παρὰ Πλούμβα τοῦ φιλοσόφου ιαμβικοῖς μέτροις τοὺς ἐπαίνους ἐδέξατο» (\textit{The statue that faces the Zeuxippus, that is in front of it, is of Justinian and Theodora}. When it was erected Justinian was showered with praise. The Greens chanting: 'Justinian and Constantine the new apostles'. Also there was Sophia his wife, who received praise through iambic verses of the philosopher Plumbas).\]
At the Great Church which is now called S. Sophia, 427 statues were removed, most of them of pagans. Among the many were ones of Zeus, and of Carus, the ancestor of Diocletian and the North Star (...) Licinius Augustus, Valentinian and Theodosius and Arcadius [and] his son, Serapio the governor, and three of Helena the mother of Constantine; one of porphyry and [other] marbles, another with silver inlay on a bronze column and the other of ivory, given by Cypros the rhetor. These statues Justinian distributed about the city when he built the Great Church with faith and effort. Those who know the foregoing find a good number of them if they go around the city and look for them.

*Parastaseis*, chapter 11

In contrast to the *Parastaseis*, the *Excerpta Anonymi* describe the fact with brevity and limit it to one sentence only. It is also interesting that the name of the emperor is not accompanied by any typical epithet\(^{214}\) and that the compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* adds an extra word to the text, which is an adverb of time, «νῦν», in order to emphasise that the Hagia Sophia was greater at the time of the completion of the *Excerpta Anonymi*.

e) Philippicus and Justinian II

The *Parastaseis* appear to be favourable to the emperor Philippicus (711–713). This emperor had usurped the throne by deposing Justinian II (685–695, 705–711), to whom the *Parastaseis* are hostile, calling him «ἄθεος»,\(^{215}\) (=godless) whereas the *Excerpta Anonymi* name him «τύραννος» (=tyrant)\(^{216}\) twice:

\(^{214}\)[Excerpta Anonymi] 9,14.
\(^{215}\)[Parastaseis], chapter 61. It is also interesting that Philippicus was the first emperor to be hostile to the cult of images. He belonged to the Monothelite party. In the *Parastaseis* chapter 31 Justinian II is identified as «tyrant», as well: «τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν τυραννήσαντος».
\(^{216}\)[Excerpta Anonymi] 17,21.
Among the female statues, that near the epigram of the Medes <is of women> giving birth to wild beasts and they devour men. One <of them>, Herodion made clear to me, reveals the story of the godless Justinian in his second reign. The other, which is accompanied also by a boat, has not been fulfilled, but remains.

*Parastaseis*, chapter 61

About those (statues) that give birth to wild beasts and devour men. One is of the tyrant Justinian, revealing the story of his acts in his second reign. The other, which is also accompanied by a boat, has not been fulfilled, but is about to happen.

*Excerpta Anonymi* 17.19-23

In the golden-roofed Basilica behind the Milion, where the measure of Heraclius was set up, was the male, gilded and kneeling statue of the tyrant Justinian.

*Excerpta Anonymi* 13.27

Justinian II was a very unpopular emperor known for his despotic tendencies. The compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* follows the unfavourable attitude of the *Parastaseis* towards Justinian II but he has replaced the religious epithet «ἀθεος» (=ungodly) with a secular one, that is «τύραννος» (=tyrant).

Philippicus appears in another chapter of the *Excerpta Anonymi* «Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ κυνηγίῳ στηλῶν»,217 namely in the description of Philippicus’ order for a statue to be buried when a certain philosopher, called John, informs him that the statue involved malevolent power. It is noticeable that the *Parastaseis* add that the philosopher John has

---

217 *Excerpta Anonymi* 12, 7-23.
found the malevolent power of the statue «by divine providence», a statement which reinforces Philippius’ decision to bury it.

«A certain John, a philosopher, said ‘By divine providence, I find it so in the writings of Demosthenes, that a man of rank would be killed by the statue.’»

This quotation has been omitted from the same extract in the Excerpta Anonymi. Strikingly, the compiler has chosen, once again, to throw out a theological comment.

The last reference to Philippius in the Excerpta Anonymi is made in the chapter «Περὶ τῆς ἐν τῷ Ζεύξιππῳ». Philippius is called «πράος», which means the most gentle, alluding to the Parastaseis chapter 82, in which Philippius is also praised for being gentle and the picture painted by himself was admired by artists for its realism:

The coloured image in the Zeuxippus bath is of Philippius, the most gentle.

Parastaseis, chapter 82

The Excerpta Anonymi do not praise Philippius extensively (they just call him «the most gentle»), in contrast to the Parastaseis. In my view, what could have led the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi to adopt, to some extent, the favourable attitude of the Parastaseis towards Philippius is the fact that Philippius took the throne by murdering the «tyrant»

---

218Parastaseis, chapter 28: «Ἰωάννης δὲ τις τῆς φιλόσοφος φησιν, ὅτι ‘μὰ τῆν θείαν πρόνοιαν οὕτως εὐρίσκει ἐν τοῖς Δημοσθένους συγγράμμασιν ὑπὸ τοῦτο τοῦ ξωδίου ἀποκαλυπτήναι ἐνδόξων ἀνδρὰ’».

219Excerpta Anonymi 20, 20-22.
Justinian II. The latter was the last member of Justinian’s royal dynasty and the *Excerpta Anonymi*, as we have seen, contain a considerable number of cases in which we detect efforts made by the compiler to undermine the image of the emperor Justinian I. From this perspective, the hostility of *Excerpta Anonymi* to Justinian II could be interpreted as an indirect disapproval of Justinian I.

f) Leo III

The first iconoclast emperor, Leo III (717-741), is recorded three times in the *Parastaseis* under the name «Leo the Isaurian or Conon».

The passages may have been written at the beginning of the 8th century so that it is not surprising that it includes references to emperors in relation to iconoclasm. References to iconoclast emperors were largely suppressed in later works. Indeed, throughout the *Excerpta Anonymi* there are no references to the «ungodly» emperor Leo III. Leo III is called «Conon» in the *Parastaseis* chapters 1 and 72.Interestingly, chapter 1 belongs to the part of the *Parastaseis* concerned with Arianism, namely the chapters 1 to 10, which the *Excerpta Anonymi* compiler has entirely excised. It is likely that the *Excerpta Anonymi* have intentionally excluded the part of the *Parastaseis* dealing with Arianism for two reasons: first, the part contains information that belongs to ecclesiastical history, a topic that is of no interest to the *Excerpta Anonymi*; secondly and more intriguingly, the chapters 1 to 10 supply us with information about the building activities of Justinian I (527-565). It may be that these chapters were an important motive for the exclusion of the aforementioned chapters by the compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi*, in connection with the political issues dominating during the 10th century and as an expression of the Macedonian dynasty’s propaganda.

---

220 *Parastaseis*, chapters 1, 5d, 72. The *Parastaseis* chapter 5d is supplied from the *Patria*. The entry characterises Leo III as «ἀλόγιστος» (irrational). In iconophile context, the term «ἀλόγιστος» was used to criticise iconoclasts. Under this perspective, the term, probably an addition from the *Patria*, fits well the iconophile stance of the latter; cf. Cameron – Herrin (1984), 177-178. The earlier attestation of the epithet «Conon» is found in the *Adversus Constantinum Caballicum* (*PG* 95, col. 336c). A. Berger dates the latter not before 802; cf. Berger (1988), 43.

221 The *Parastaseis’* chapter 5, even, naming Leo «Isaurian», reports that many statues were destroyed by Leo III. On the two epithets in relation with Leo III see Cameron – Herrin (1984), 168-169.

222 It is noteworthy that the *Parastaseis* contain references to Arianism, linking the heresy of Arius with iconoclasm following thus the tendency of using Arianism in iconoclastic polemic of the 8th century; cf. *Parastaseis*, chapters 1, 7, 8, 10 and 39. The *Excerpta Anonymi* are more circumspect in writing about emperors, heresies and doctrines. Only once the *Excerpta Anonymi* refers to Arius himself. The *Excerpta Anonymi* chapter Περὶ Ἀρείου (*Excerpta Anonymi* 14,25-31), corresponding to the *Parastaseis* chapter 39, informs us that Arius met his death in the *Forum* and Theodosius represented him on a slab of marble, in order that passers-by could urinate and spit on it. However, it has to be pointed out that, whereas the author of that passage in the *Parastaseis* uses the wording «μιαρὸν» in order to describe Arius’ death, the author of the *Excerpta Anonymi* has changed it to «αἴσχιστον». I have already mentioned that in many cases the *Excerpta Anonymi* eliminates Christian terms in favour of secular ones.

223 On this see below section 5.2.2.
g) Constantine V

The tendency of the *Excerpta Anonymi* to avoid references to iconoclast emperors is better reflected on the case of Constantine V (741-745), Leo III’s son. Two chapters from the *Parastaseis* contain references to events that could be dated to the time of Constantine V. The two chapters have not been included in the *Excerpta Anonymi*, an exclusion that fits the inclination of the *Excerpta Anonymi* to avoid, as we have seen, religious matters.

### 2.5.1.2 Comparison of the Excerpta Anonymi and the Patria II

Having analysed how the *Excerpta Anonymi* adapted his source text, I shall study how the *Excerpta Anonymi* themselves were adapted in the *Patria II*.

Before discussing the attitude towards the aforementioned emperors in the *Patria II*, some remarks on the *Patria of Constantinople* are required. The text has been transmitted through a rich manuscript tradition analysed in detail by Preger. The *Patria of Constantinople* comprise four books originally produced at different periods of time but put together in an anthology around 989/990. The *Patria I* consist of the Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κατὰ Ἡσύχιον Ἰλλούστριον (Patria of Constantinople by Hesychius of Miletus), which is the only surviving fragment of Hesychius’ *Chronicle* and a revised version or paraphrase of Hesychius’ short final chapters, written in the 6th century. The *Patria II*, under the heading Πάτρια τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, περὶ στηλῶν, ἐν ὧν καὶ περὶ Ἀδιαβηνῆς (The Patria of Constantinople, on statues, together with a chapter on Adiabene), have used the *Parastaseis* extensively. The *Patria III*, under the title Περὶ Κτισμάτων (On Buildings), is a compilation of 215 notices on foundations and buildings in Constantinople. The *Patria IV* οἱ Δήμησις περὶ τῆς ὑιόδομῆς τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς μεγάλης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐπονομαζομένης ἁγίας Σοφίας (Narrative about the Construction of the Temple of the Great Church of God the so-called Hagia Sophia) is an account of the construction of the Hagia Sophia most likely composed in the middle of the 9th century.

This chapter is only concerned with the *Patria II*. The complex manuscript transmission of the *Patria II* does not permit definite conclusions as to the textual relationship of the former with the *Parastaseis* and the *Excerpta Anonymi*. The first editor of the *Patria II* as well as Cameron and Herrin are inclined to support the view that the *Patria II* had extensively relied on the first part of the *Excerpta Anonymi*. It has long been

---

224 *Parastaseis*, chapter 15 and *Parastaseis*, chapter 63
225 Preger (1895), 7-27; Preger (1907), iii-xxv.
226 Preger (1901), 1-18 and Preger (1907), 135-150.
227 Preger (1907), 151-209; henceforth, *Patria II*.
228 Preger (1907), 214-283.
230 The English translation of the passages is that of the edition of the *Patria of Constantinople* by Berger (2013).
231 Preger (1901), X; see also Cameron – Herrin (1984), 5-6.
supported that the *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *Patria II* had used a common model, a manuscript which was derived from the same codex that the *Parisinus gr. 1336* comes from.\(^{233}\) In fact, entries of the *Parastaseis* occur in the *Patria II* in the same abbreviated form as in the *Excerpta Anonymi*, with the same omissions. The *Patria II*, however, includes entries from the *Parastaseis* excised in the *Excerpta Anonymi* and in some cases supplement entries taken from the *Excerpta Anonymi* with material possibly drawn from another copy of the *Parastaseis*.

In particular, the *Excerpta Anonymi* do not include *Parastaseis* chapters 1-10, 13-15 and 17. The *Patria II*, instead, incorporate the complete chapters 1-20 of the *Parastaseis* at the end of the text. When looking at entries, such as the *Parastaseis* chapters 42, 61, 70, we detect that the *Patria II* supplement the passages with material not found elsewhere, i.e. neither in the *Parastaseis* nor in the *Excerpta Anonymi*. In addition, The *Patria II* entries 35-37, 45, 46a, 54-65, 72, 101, 103 are absent from, both, the *Parastaseis* and the *Excerpta Anonymi*. Finally, the *Patria* contain some references twice.\(^{234}\) It may be argued that the compiler of the *Patria II* had at hand not only the text of the *Excerpta Anonymi* but also a more extensive text of the *Parastaseis*.\(^{235}\) Nevertheless, this view is challenged by P. Odorico who argues that the *Parastaseis* is not a unitary work but that it was collected by a compiler in preparation of a chronicle.\(^{236}\) It seems more likely that the *Patria II* were indeed made in two stages drawing on the codex (codices) which the *Excerpta Anonymi* also drew on. Finally, the possibility that the *Excerpta Anonymi* were also in the possession of the compiler of the *Patria II* can by no means be excluded.\(^{237}\)

When compared with the *Excerpta Anonymi*, the *Patria II* is characterised by an iconophile tone, albeit a less intense one than the one detectable in the other three books of the *Patria of Constantinople*. In the *Patria II* iconophile implications are conveyed through unfavourable references to iconoclast emperors, which had been excluded from the *Excerpta Anonymi*. In the *Patria II* chapter 90, the iconoclast emperor Leo III is called «ἀλόγιστος» (irrational). Leo is also debased in the *Patria II* chapter 68, which calls him *Conon*.\(^{238}\) As regards Constantine V, Leo III’s son, the *Patria II* includes the *Parastaseis*

\(^{232}\)The codex preserving the *Parastaseis*. On the Parisinus gr. 1336 see above section 2.3.1.

\(^{233}\)P. Odorico also appears to hold the same view when supporting that the codex *Parisinus gr. 1336* is nearer to the dossier used, both, by the *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a* and the *Patria II*; cf. Odorico (2014), 755-784. In Berger’s view, the *Patria II* are divided into 2 parts: a. The *Patria II* 1-85 copied from the codex X, that is, a now lost codex from which also the *Excerpta Anonymi* derive, and b. the *Patria II* 86-110 copied from another manuscript containing the *Parastaseis*; cf. Berger (1988), 48-49 and 64-70.

\(^{234}\)Parastaseis, chapters 16, 18, 20 = *Patria II* 16, 18, 19 = *Patria II* 102, 104, 105.


\(^{236}\)On P. Odorico’s view see Odorico (2014), 755-784.

\(^{237}\)The transmission of the *Parastaseis*, chapters 42, 61, 70 is particularly interesting in this connection.

\(^{238}\)On the term see above n. 220.
chapter 15 concerning him, though the chapter has been excised in the *Excerpta Anonymi.*

It is also noteworthy that in the *Patria III*, Constantine V is given the epithet «κοπρώνυμος» (dung-named).

The abusive epithet «κοπρώνυμος» is absent from the original text of the *Parastaseis* as well as from the *Excerpta Anonymi.* Nevertheless, the aforementioned references do not constitute theological comments on the part of the copyist of the *Patria II*. The textual framework in which they are used is not theological either. The epithets seem to have been copied as common characterisations ascribed to certain iconoclast emperors. The *Patria II* was not intended to deliver any ideological message in support of orthodoxy, for in the late 10th century its triumph was undeniable. Like the *Excerpta Anonymi*, the *Patria II* omits theological comments of the *Parastaseis*. The case of the emperor Julian in the *Patria II* is indicative. There, the references to this emperor are left out. In particular, chapter 53 of the *Patria*, which contains a text close to that of the *Excerpta Anonymi*, omits the epithet «θεοστυγής» which occurred in the *Parastaseis*, as shown above.

Interestingly, neither the *Excerpta Anonymi* nor the *Patria* have included chapters 46-49 of the *Parastaseis*, where Julian is portrayed unfavourably. Finally, the theological comment on Julian in the *Parastaseis* chapter 70 is also excised in the *Patria* chapter 48 (concerning the Philadelphion) and in the *Excerpta Anonymi*.

The tendency in *Patria II* to follow the *Excerpta Anonymi* in avoiding religious references emerges once more in the chapters 24, 25, 56 and 77. Accordingly, *Patria II* deletes the statement «μὰ τὴν θείαν πρόνοιαν» in chapter 24 and the theological comment at the end of chapter 25 according to which Verina was a truly orthodox Christian. Both passages preserve a text copied from the *Excerpta Anonymi*. The *Patria II* supplements the chapter 25 with the additional information that the church of St Barbara was close to the «Artotyrianos» as well as the epithet «Makelles» accompanying the name of the

---

239 *Patria II*, chapter 105: «Περὶ τοῦ Σηρόλοφου. Τόν δὲ Σηρόλοφον πρώην θεάμα τινες ἐκάλουν ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ κοχλίαις καὶ συνθετὴ Άρτεμις καὶ ἄλλα πολλαὶ εἰς τὰς ἀψίδας ἐςχατον δὲ ἐκλήθη θεοδοσιακὸς Φόρος καὶ ἦν μέχρι Κοπρώνυμος» (On the Xerolophos. Formerly, some people called the Xerolophos a spectacle. For in it were sixteen spiral columns, and a composite statue of Artemis, and many others on the arches. Finally, it was called the Forum of Theodosius, an appellation which lasted until the reign of Constantine Kopronymos).

240 Constantine V is mainly referred to as «Κοπρώνυμος» in the *Patria III*; cf. *Patria II*, chapters 9, 63, and 149. The *Patria III* also portray Constantine V in an unfavourable way in *Patria III*, chapters 68, 134.


242 *Patria II*, chapter 53: «ὁθεν καὶ ὁ Ἰουλιανὸς προφάσει τῶν καταδίκων πολλοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ κατέκαυσεν Χριστιανοὺς» (Criminals were punished there, and Julian had many Christians burned in it on the pretext of them being convicted criminals).

243 See above n. 203.

244 On Artotyrianos see Jannin (1964), 37 and 100.
But in the days of Justinian the Great, the same church was rebuilt and stands to our own day. Marcellus the Lector falsely states that the church collapsed in the second year of Conon the Isaurian.

Parastaseis, chapter 1

Chapters 86 and 107 of the Patria II are copied almost verbatim from the Parastaseis chapters 4 and 2 respectively, referring to Justinian in a favourable way. In addition,

245 The Patria chapter 53 deletes the epithet «ἀνάξιος», which means unworthy, applied to the emperor Phocas in the Parastaseis. Finally, in chapter 77, the Patria replaces the religious epithet «ἀθεος» (ungodly) by the secular epithet «τύραννος» (tyrant), to characterise Justinian II, obviously copying the Excerpta Anonymi.

Proceeding to the case of Justinian I, we can now ask if the Patria II adopts the tenor of the Excerpta Anonymi in depicting this emperor.

The Patria II includes the Parastaseis chapters 1, 2 and 4 on Justinian I. As shown above, these chapters were excised in the Excerpta Anonymi. It is noteworthy that in chapter 110 of the Patria II Justinian is referred to as «τοῦ μεγάλου» (the great) whereas in the Parastaseis the appellation was «τοῦ βασιλέως».

But in the days of the Emperor Justinian the same church was rebuilt and stands in our own day. Marcellus the Lector falsely states that the church collapsed in the second year of Conon the Isaurian.

Parastaseis, chapter 1

Chapters 86 and 107 of the Patria II are copied almost verbatim from the Parastaseis chapters 4 and 2 respectively, referring to Justinian in a favourable way. In addition,
the Patria II chapter 96 draws directly on the chapter 11 of the Parastaseis, which praises Justinian I, even though this very chapter 11 had been included in the Excerpta Anonymi.250 Entry 40 of the Patria II concerning the cistern of the Basilica reads as follows:

«Ἡ δὲ καθεξομένη ἐπὶ δίφρου ἐκεῖσε μεγάλη στήλη ἐστὶν τοῦ Σολομῶντος, ἣν ἀνέστησεν ὁ μέγας Ιούστινιανὸς κρατοῦντα τὴν σιαγόνα αὐτοῦ καὶ ὅρωντα τὴν ἀγίαν Σοφίαν ὅτι ἐνικήθη εἰς μήκος καὶ κάλλος ὑπὲρ τὸν παρ’ αὐτοῦ κτισθέντα ναὸν ἐν Ἴερουσαλήμ»251

The entry clearly emphasises the magnificence of the Hagia Sophia built by Justinian I but it is noteworthy that the Parastaseis and the Excerpta Anonymi do not transmit the above laudatory image of this emperor.252 The late 10th century Patria II, unlike the Excerpta Anonymi, does not yield significant evidence that its compiler intended to undermine the image of the emperor Justinian. In fact, it seems to be in line with the Patria IV, which supplies us with a laudatory image of Justinian.253 Nevertheless, the Patria II is silent with regard to Justinian’s successful military policies or his achievements in the field of jurisdiction. The Patria II, as a genuine product of the patriographic genre, is exclusively concerned with the Constantinopolitan monuments and statuary. The entries on Justinian are favourably inclined like the ones dedicated to works ascribed to other emperors.

To conclude, both texts, the Excerpta Anonymi and the Patria II, exhibit a special interest in ancient monuments and statues and discuss disparate and obscure facts associated with them. Their attitude towards emperors is conditioned by the aim for which each work was designed and the message their author desires to convey. Accordingly, the Excerpta Anonymi is a composition made for practical as well as didactical purposes. The portrayal of emperors in the Excerpta Anonymi is influenced by the political ideology current at the time of their composition. The selection, as well as the omissions and the insertions in the Excerpta Anonymi should be seen as influenced by the propaganda of the Macedonian dynasty: the conception constantinienne254 and the notion of restricted

250The Excerpta Anonymi describe briefly the rebuilding of the Hagia Sophia; see above.
251Patria II, chapter 40: “The great statue, which Justinian the Great erected, sitting on the chariot is of Solomon holding his cheek and looking at Hagia Sophia, as he was awed by its size and beauty, which is greater than that of the temple he built in Jerusalem”.
252Parastaseis, chapter 74; Excerpta Anonymi 19,26-29.
253Justinian is credited with the construction of the Hagia Sophia and other buildings in the Patria IV; cf. Preger (1901), chapters, 2, 8-10, 12-18, 21-26, and 29.
254The term was coined by Hélène Ahrweiler; cf. Ahrweiler (1975), 48. Basil I, the founder of the dynasty, came to be descended from Constantine the Great, the founder of Constantinople.
ecumenism. Constantine Porphyrogenitus was considered the New Constantine who attempted systematically to erode Justinian’s reputation by distorting the emperor’s military ambitions and policies of reforming and restoring the Roman state, as the age of Justinian I was a time of territorial expansion. Aligned with this, the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi undermines the images of Justinian I, Justinian II and other members of their royal dynasty.

This contrasts with the portrayals of emperors in the Patria II. The author of the Patria II does not seem to have held particularly strong views on emperors of the past. For the Patria of Constantinople is an exposition of the Constantinopolitan statuary and monuments intended to emphasise not only the eminence of the city but also the link with the magnitude of Rome. The Patria II follow the Excerpta Anonymi, however, in avoiding religious references. The epithets accompanying emperors’ names in the Patria II do not constitute theological comments on the part of the author but they have been copied as conventional characterisations ascribed to certain iconoclast emperors. The absence of theological judgments or comments and the selection of the material presented in the Excerpta Anonymi conform to their compiler’s interests in the pagan statuary, the magic powers the statues conveyed, portents and predictions that relied on occult science. Throughout the collection, the entries reflect antiquarian interest on the part of the compiler in historical figures, in Roman history, in geographical and in astronomical subjects.

2.5.2 The politics of ethnography and geography in the Excerpta Anonymi

In the following, I aim to evaluate the perception of late antique ethnographic accounts in the 10th-century Excerpta Anonymi. I shall demonstrate that a scholar’s attitude towards ethnographic material of preceding centuries is influenced by the cultural and political context of his age. I will examine the function of the ethnographic passages in Procopius and in the late antique ethnographical tradition, and then discuss the function they assume in the different cultural and political context of the 10th century.

To begin with, chapter 20 of book VIII of Procopius’ De belis, which deals with the island of Brittia and the nations living on it, has been preserved in the codex Parisinus suppl. gr.

---

255 The concept of limited ecumenism, as a specific theory about Byzantine foreign policy in this period, was first advanced by T. Lounges; cf. Lounges (1981), 49-85; Lounges (1990). For a reappraisal of his theory see Magdalino (2013b), 23-42. Certain preoccupations in the Excerpta Anonymi seem to reflect the 10th-century restricted ecumenism. On the matter see below section 2.5.2.

256 Markopoulos (1994), 162-166.

257 Section 2.5.2 originates in my article “Geography and history in the Excerpta Anonymi” published in Byzantion, 87 (2017), 233-257.
Six excerpts have been selected, copied, rearranged and synthesized by the anonymous author of the Parisinus in two separate chapters entitled On the island of Brittia and About the Sorcery of the Varni.\textsuperscript{258}

It has long been recognized that the geographic and ethnographic descriptions of Procopius were published during the reign of Justinian I, at a time of territorial expansion and ideological transformation.\textsuperscript{259} They serve as vehicles of criticism of his own society by reflecting on how the Romans viewed themselves in relation to other peoples.\textsuperscript{260} The Excerpta Anonymi, instead, bear witness to a period in which the transformative power and civilising influence of the Byzantine Empire had been restricted. As will be shown, the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi did not seek to change traditional perceptions of the other; he did not intend to make the reader reflect on dominant beliefs of those societies, but highlight the cultural differences in order to reinforce the geographical and political frontiers already in place.

\paragraph{2.5.2.1 Ethnography and Geography}

Ethnography focuses on accounts of foreign peoples, their way of life, physical features, social structure, military organization, religion and beliefs, sexual habits, laws and institutions, and geography. Ethnography and geography often appear in short or extensive digressions embedded in historical texts or other literary genres such as epics or imperial panegyrics.\textsuperscript{261} In most cases, such ethnographical or geographical digressions retain their identity and predominant function within the narrative sequence. Very often, the digression is not an integral part of the main narration, so that it can be isolated and function separately from its original context.

Anthony Kaldellis distinguishes two subcategories of late antique ethnography. In the first one, ethnography is a description of a land with its people, incorporated into a historical text written from a distant point of view. In the second one, it is an account of foreign peoples written in the first person by an ambassador who has travelled to a foreign land.\textsuperscript{262}

It could be argued with a fair degree of certainty that ethnography, for both classical and late antique literature, was mostly used to stress or even to confirm the cultural distinction between Romans and barbarians. Romans who wrote ethnographic accounts wanted to describe and emphasise the distance between the uncivilised barbarians and their own society.

\textsuperscript{258}The Greek original titles are: Περὶ Βριττίας νήσου and Περὶ οἰωνοσκοπίας τῶν Οὐάρνων.
\textsuperscript{259}See in general Cesa (1982), 189-215; Cameron (1996b); Maas (2007), 67-84.
\textsuperscript{260}Kaldellis (2013), 11-25.
\textsuperscript{261}Kaldellis (2013), 2.
\textsuperscript{262}Kaldellis (2013), 1-2.
Roman rule characterised and reassured the civilised society. Thus, Romans considered as “barbarians” peoples that had not yet been subjugated to Roman rule. This distinction could easily justify Roman imperialism as Rome believed in the transformative power of Roman law and society and in the civilising mission of transforming barbarians into civilised people.

Therefore, Romans following classical models in their writings highlighted the well-established contrast between them and barbarians and so did authors of ethnographies from the 5th century onwards. The historians of the fifth and sixth centuries were aware of the power of the Roman Empire. Even the loss of western lands in the 5th century was considered a temporary event, and indeed, Justinian soon reconquered North Africa, Italy and a part of Spain. Foreign peoples were regarded as culturally, politically and militarily inferior seeking recognition from Constantinople. Accordingly, Roman ethnography and geography expressed contemporary attitudes, preoccupations and politics.

Procopius was very interested in geography and gives us extensive descriptions of lands, mountains and rivers and their inhabitants. He begins the narrations of the Vandal and Gothic wars with extensive accounts of the geography of the Mediterranean and of Europe. He also introduces a major digression on the geography of Italy, on the ancestry of the Heruls, on the land of Thule and the ancestral customs of its inhabitants, on the Caucasian mountains and its peoples. Procopius used geographical mixed with historical and ethnographic material in his excursuses.

---

263Maas (2003), 153.
265See for instance: Priscus’ account of the ambassador to Attila; cf. Blockley (1983), fr. 11.2.407-547; Procopius’ description of the Huns and Moors; cf. Procopius, De bellis 1.3.2-7, and 4.11.5-13; and Agathias’ passages on the Franks; cf. Agathias, Historiae I.2.
266Two prime examples are two passages in Procopius’ History of the De bellis; cf. Procopius, De bellis 8.20.10 and 7.33.4.
267See how political reasons affected Agathias’ positive description of the Franks; Agathias, Historiae I.2, I.7.1-3, II.1.6-7, II.23.8-9, II.25.3, III.5.1. See also Cameron (1965), 1203-1216; Cameron (1968), 95-140.
268Procopius, in his accounts of the Persian, Vandal and Gothic wars, introduced information about foreign peoples, their land and their customs having drawn from classical models. Herodotus’ account of the Scythians had probably become the main source on which subsequent narrations of Huns, Chazars, Avars and Turks were based.
269Procopius, De bellis 3.1.4-19 and 5.12.
270Procopius, De bellis 5.15.
272Procopius, De bellis 8.3.1-2.
Procopius’ ethnographic digressions can be understood as reflecting his age and the self-perception of late Roman society in relation to other peoples.\textsuperscript{274} In line with one of the traditional functions of ethnography, Procopius intended to reflect on aspects of the customs, the social structure, the social justice and injustice of his own time through representations of the way of life of foreign peoples. Accordingly, barbarian features were occasionally idealized in order to reveal the immorality of the decadent Romans.\textsuperscript{275} At the same time, we must not forget that Procopius employed geography in the service of imperial history and his narratives in the \textit{De belis} reflected the emperor’s military ambitions and policies of reforming and restoring the Roman state, as the age of Justinian I was a time of territorial expansion and ideological transformation.\textsuperscript{276}

Noticeable is the decline of ethnography in the Middle Byzantine period, from the 7\textsuperscript{th} century up to the thirteenth centuries, although the Byzantine scholars who wrote historical texts in those centuries were familiar with the previous tradition and had sufficient material to draw from as well as the know-how. A few ethnographic digressions\textsuperscript{277} written and embedded in the literature of that period have come down to us.\textsuperscript{278} One of the reasons for this is that historiography, the primary genre in which ethnographic and geographical accounts were embodied,\textsuperscript{279} from the 8\textsuperscript{th} century onwards

\textsuperscript{274}Kaldellis (2013), esp. 3-10 and 17-21.

\textsuperscript{275}For a similar attitude in earlier historians see Ammianus ethnographic digression on the Persians; cf. \textit{Ammianus Marcellinus}, 23.6. Priscus’ account on the embassy to Attila; cf. Blockley (1983), fr. 11.2.407-547.

\textsuperscript{276}Maas (2007), 69. Av. Cameron also traces the 6\textsuperscript{th}-century belief that Justinian would restore the magnificence of Roman antiquity in Procopius’ \textit{De aedificiis}; cf. Cameron (1996b), 112. On the \textit{De aedificiis} in general see Whitby (2000), 45-57. In the early years of Justinian’s reign belong also the geographical treatises by Stephanus Byzantius and Hierocles; cf. Meineke (ed.) (1849); Billerbeck (ed.) (2006-2016); Honigmann (ed.) (1939).

\textsuperscript{277}Ethnography can be found in military treatises such as the \textit{Taktika} by Leo VI; cf. Dennis (ed.) (2010). It should be stressed that the rhetoric of the Christian empire, which originated in the age of Justinian, is apparent in Leo’s \textit{Taktika}. Thus, the Bulgars differ from the Hungarians because the first are Christians (\textit{Taktika} 18.59), the Franks and the Lombards are Christians and therefore somewhat friendlier towards the Empire (\textit{Taktika} 18.74) whereas the Saracens were always presented as enemies of the Romans because they were not Christians (\textit{Taktika} 18.105). The \textit{De Administrando Imperio} by Constantine Porphyrogenitus also contains geographic material; cf. \textit{DAI}, chapters 9, 30, 40, 42.

\textsuperscript{278}It is interesting to observe that at the same time a substantial number of manuscripts containing geographical texts was produced in the West, betraying the Carolingian scholars’ interest in Roman geography and ethnography; cf. Lozovsky (2006), 325-327.

\textsuperscript{279}In the 5\textsuperscript{th} century, ethnographic accounts appear also in the ecclesiastical history of Philostorgius and in Palladius’ work \textit{De gentibus Indiae et Bragmanibus}. In the 6\textsuperscript{th} century, ethnography appears in the hagiographical work of Ps.-Neilos of Ankyra called \textit{Narrationes} and in \textit{Topographia Christiana} by Cosmas Indicopleustes. In the middle Byzantine period ethnography is almost absent from Christian literature. Nevertheless, ethnography is traced in the \textit{Vita Barlaam et Joasaph}, the \textit{Vita Sancti Macarii Romani} and the \textit{Vita Andreae Apostoli}; cf. Kaldellis (2010), 64-67.
focused chiefly on Constantinople and the imperial court. Another chief reason for the decline of ethnography can be traced back to the Islamic conquests and the establishment of the Lombards in Italy and the Slavs and Bulgars on the Balkans, which seems to have provoked a significant decline in historiography as well.

Consequently, from the 7th century onwards, historians were uncertain about the dominant position of the Roman Empire, whose territory had been continuously shrinking. They were, therefore, reluctant to apply similar interpretative strategies to ethnic differences as Procopius or Agathias had previously done. The historians preferred to write about nations that were not a big threat for the Empire or peoples that were subjects to the Romans. Above all else, Byzantium was a community of faith. So the Byzantines could explain the rise of Islam and their defeat solely by ascribing them to God’s anger at their sins.

In the following, I will show how a 10th-century compiler imposed a new meaning onto the excerpts of Procopius, thus shedding more light on the history of ethnography in the subsequent centuries of Byzantine history. Ethnography did not disappear completely, but its meaning changed profoundly, under the influence of the changed political circumstances of the 10th century.

2.5.2.2 Περὶ Βριττίας νήσου and Περὶ οἰωνοσκοπίας τῶν Οὐάρνων

The two chapters, Περὶ Βριττίας νήσου and Περὶ οἰωνοσκοπίας τῶν Οὐάρνων, are part of the historical part of the Excerpta Anonymi. As has already been noted, the text of the two chapters has been excerpted from the eighth book of Procopius’ De bellis. It is clear that an ethnographic and geographic interest dominates this book published two years after Procopius had finished the first seven books of the De bellis.

---

280 C. Mango first argued that Byzantine writers and the Byzantine public ceased to be interested in lands that had broken away from Constantinople under the Arab conquest in the 7th century; cf. Mango (1988-1989), 360-372.

281 Whitby (1992), 66-74; Haldon (1990), 425-435. It has been claimed to be due to the weakness of historians to interpret the failures of the Empire: the well-established faith in the superiority of Orthodoxy over “the infidel peoples” was difficult to overcome. Defeat in religious war made it difficult for the Byzantines even to discuss their enemies and impossible to understand their motivation; cf. Kaldellis (2013), 71-77.

282 This is apparent among the historians of Late Antiquity. We encounter, however, such an attitude among the historians of the middle Byzantine period as well. See, for instance, Psellus’ ethnographic account on the Pechenegs; cf. Chronographia 7.67-69.

283 Maas (2003), 156.

The excerpt begins abruptly with the description of the geographical position of Brittia. Procopius states clearly that Brittia is an island: Βριττία νῆσος. Brittia is only about two hundred stades from the continent, approximately opposite the mouth of the Rhine. Then, Procopius distinguishes Brittia from Brettania and Thule; Brittia is situated between them. The former is situated in the West and the latter in the East. Procopius mentions that Brittia is inhabited by three peoples and that each of them has a king of its own. The three nations are: the Angles, the Frisians and the Britons. They dwell in a land belonging to the Franks.

As can be observed in Appendix I: text I, the first passage excerpted from Procopius halts at the point where Procopius gives us a brief description of a Frankish embassy at Justinian’s court in Constantinople, in paragraph 10. In Procopius’ text the Franks had invited some of the Angles who had settled in their land, to accompany them to Constantinople. The reason behind this obviously was, as Procopius states, to show that Brittia was ruled by the king of the Franks.

What is of major importance there is that the Franks sent an embassy to Constantinople to secure Justinian’s recognition of their

285See Appendix I: text I.
286Excerpta Anonymi 23,12. Procopius repeatedly mentions in this chapter that Βριττία is an island; cf. Procopius, De bellis, 8.20.1, 4, 6, 7, 10.
288Excerpta Anonymi 23,17. Procopius had already mentioned earlier that Brettania is larger than even Sicily; cf. Procopius, De bellis 6.6.28.
289J. B. Bury supported the opinion that Brittia in Procopius’ text means Britain; cf. Bury (1907), 79-88. A. R. Burn also believes that Brittia as well as Brettania represent Britain; cf. Burn (1955), 258. The argument that Brittia and Britain is one and the same island is reinforced by a comment that occurs later in the same chapter, viz. that on this island of Brittia men in ancient times had built a long wall, cutting off a large portion of it; cf. Excerpta Anonymi 24,2-4. Jordanes, however, refers to British horses; cf. Jordanes, Getica II.15. Bury went further arguing that Procopius by Brittia meant Britain, but that he did not realize that the land he described was indeed Britain; cf. Bury (1907), 83. Thompson agrees that Brittia represents Britain but he believes that by Brettania Procopius meant Armorica, the province that nowadays is called Brittany; cf. Thompson (1980), 499; cf. Bury (1906a), n. 168, 157. Cameron judges positively Thompson’s proposition; cf. Cameron (1993b), 215. The view that Brittia and Brettania are two different islands was supported by J. O. Ward, too; cf. Ward (1968), 465.
290That this migration took place in the first half of the 6th century can be argued with certainty and Procopius’ account of the immigration of people from Brittia to the Continent conforms with the situation presented by his contemporary Gildas; cf. Stenton (1967), 5-8 and Stevenson (1899), 32-46. Procopius’ account also bears resemblance to an account written by a monk of Fulda shortly before the year 865; cf. Langebec, (ed.) (1773), 38-49 and Pertz (ed.) (1829), 673-681.
291This Frankish embassy was set up in ca 550; cf. Procopius, De bellis 8.20.10.
292The term Franks (in Greek Φράγγοι) is not classical but is an ethnonym that emerged in Late Antiquity. The use of that name was not a form of classicism; cf. Kaldellis (2010), 112 and 115.
293Procopius, De bellis 8.20.9-10.
claim to rule the land where the immigrants had settled. It is worth noting that in the De bellis 7.33.4 Procopius also tells us that the Franks did not consider their possession of Gaul secure until the emperor had put the seal of his approval upon their title.

The passage on the Frankish embassy is absent in the Excerpta Anonymi. A closer look at the collection suggests that the suppression is possibly linked to the compiler’s attitude towards Justinian throughout the Excerpta Anonymi. I showed already that omissions and simplifications in the passages excerpted from the Parastases occur intentionally and not without a goal. When reading the Parastases it turns out that the building activity of Justinian I figures rarely in the Excerpta Anonymi and is largely pruned away.

This we have to understand against the political background of the 10th century and as an expression of the Macedonian dynastic propaganda. Certain preoccupations in the Excerpta Anonymi confirm that they belong to the context of the 10th-century ‘restricted ecumenism’, as expressed in the treatises that appeared under the auspices of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The concept of ‘limited ecumenism’, as a specific theory about Byzantine foreign policy in this period, was first advanced by T. Lounges. His theory, long neglected, was recently unburied and reappraised by P. Magdalino. Indeed, Constantine Porphyrogenitus only occasionally refers to Justinian I in the DT and Justinian I is markedly ignored in the DAI. Moreover, in the EC, an enterprise also undertaken under Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ auspices, excerptors have intervened in the excerpts from the chronicle of Theophanes, distorting what the emperor had considered irrelevant to his purpose and presenting Justinian I unfavourably. The geographical perspective outlined by Constantine Porphyrogenitus in his DAI is also determined by the prospects and expectations of possible imperial administration and rule in formerly imperial territories that were still considered to be within the grasp of the Empire. But this Empire was smaller than the one Justinian I had conquered. The DAI chapters 26-28, centered on the history of Italy and the Lombard invasions, seem to have been constructed to justify the Venetian, Lombard and Frankish settlements on former

---

294 Thompson argues that Procopius in writing this passage had in mind the move to Brittany started in the 5th century. According to Thompson, by Britania Procopius means Brittany; cf. Thompson (1980), 499-503.

295 The matter of Roman power over Brittia during Justinian’s reign has been treated by J. O. Ward; cf. Ward (1968), 460-471. It is likely that Justinian claimed a theoretical title over the island of Brititia. In the third book of the De bellis (cf. Procopius, De bellis 3.2.38), Procopius states that the Roman rule over Britain ended after 409. Roman rule is unlikely to have come to such an abrupt end; cf. Cameron (1996b), 213. This topic has been treated by many scholars; cf. Thompson (1980), 409-503; Thompson (1982); Johnson (1980); Welsby (1982); Wood (1984), 1-25.


297 Magdalino (2013b), 23-42.

298 DT, 61, 62, 63, 65, 70, 76.


300 Magdalino (2013b), 23-42.
imperial territories. Their content distorts the origins of the division of Italy into Frankish and Byzantine rule by providing ‘information’ with no basis in reality. In the chapters appear to propagate the division of the West according to the political agenda of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. In the 10th century, the Macedonian dynasty had already accepted the division of the Empire, and Italy was considered definitely lost. Consequently, Constantine Porphyrogenitus intended to erode the memory of Justinian I by omitting or distorting the reconquest of Italy for the Byzantine Empire under the reign of this emperor.

Seen from this perspective, the *Excerpta Anonymi* belong to a time when the transformative power and civilising influence of the Empire had already been restricted. Accordingly, the omission of the reference to the Frankish embassy should be placed within this historico-political context. The compiler wanted to avoid to remind Byzantine readers of the late 10th century of a period in which the possession of Gaul by the Franks was not guaranteed until the emperor had put the seal of his approval upon their title.

**Excerpts 2 and 3.**

The second excerpt from Procopius reports that the people who live closer to the Franks are the Varni. Only the river Rhine separates the Varni from the Franks, whereas the Britons are settled in another land, called Ἰοβερνία.

First, it is worth noting that the compiler is concise regarding that passage and greatly simplifies the original text. Let us have a look at the original context of the passage: after speaking about the geographical position of Brittia and the nations settled on it, Procopius goes on to narrate a curious story about the king of the Varni. This king, called Hermegisclus, predicted his own death on the basis of a portent he had suddenly seen: a bird that was croaking loudly, which Hermegisclus interpreted as a sign of his own death after forty days. Accordingly, the king, in a speech addressed to his people, warned them to take only Frankish women as spouses and not from the people of the Britons, because the former were their real neighbours. Similarly, the king compels his son to abandon his future wife because she belongs to the people of the Angli. The girl then decides to take revenge by waging war on the people of the Varni.

---

301 In the chapter 27 Constantine Porphyrogenitus places the Lombard invasion in the 8th century, rather than in the sixth; cf. DAI, 27.
302 See also Von Falkenhausen (1989), 25-38. Chapters 29-36 is an attempt to make allowances for the settlement of the Croats and the Serbs in Dalmatia and the Balkans; cf. Magdalino (2013b), 23-42.
304 Procopius again refers to this; cf. Procopius, *De bellis* 7.33.4.
305 See in the Appendix I: text I.
306 This account is the subject of the following chapter (excerpt 6 in this paper) in the anonymous collection, that is Περὶ σιωνοικοπαίας τῶν Οὐάρνων; cf. *Excerpta Anonymi* 25,25-26,4.
307 Procopius, *De bellis* 8.20.11-25.
The Procopian passage 8.20.18 is part of the speech of Hermegisclus. It is apparent, therefore, that the compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* has singled out a reference to the neighbours of the Varni and incorporated it as an independent piece of information into his text. Excerpt 3 is a short excerpt from the account on Hermegisclus, too. The *Excerpta Anonymi* author again cuts out an isolated piece from its genuine context, referring to the *mores* of the Angli. It is obvious that the author of the codex preferred to represent that story in an independent chapter, namely the chapter Περὶ οἰώνουσκοπίας τῶν Οὐάρνων, which follows immediately.

Up to this point, the compiler has spoken about the geographical position of Brittia, has informed us on the nations settled on it and he now tells us something about the customs of one of the island’s peoples. We never learn from the *Excerpta Anonymi* about the romantic story of a couple in Brittia. The author of the *Excerpta Anonymi* has also chosen to omit the conduct of the king of the Varni. The passage contains only three sentences reflecting the virtue amongst the Varni.

It must also to be stressed that the author of the *Excerpta Anonymi* has excluded the wording βάρβαροι (= barbarians) from his text. He never uses this characterisation to refer to peoples who settled in the West. For Procopius and surely for the Romans of the 6th century the foreign peoples who are presented through these digressions were first of all barbarians. What we detect throughout these six excerpts is an ethnographic account, the main goal of which is not to underline the superiority of the Romans over a foreign people. Interestingly, the excerpts comply with Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ high regard for the Franks, which is evident especially in his *DAI*. It should also be noted that, in this line, the *Excerpta Anonymi* compiler supplies better information on the West than Procopius did, by mentioning Hibernia and by identifying the Germans with the Franks. It could also be argued that the *Excerpta Anonymi* compiler did not attempt to distinguish Brittia’s nations from the Romans on the basis of their distinctive manners of living. Consequently, there is no reference to the social structure of these peoples, their religious beliefs or their way of life. The fact that each of the three nations has its own king denotes merely that they are three distinct peoples who live in different parts of Brittia.

---

308 Leon VI in his *Taktika* includes a very brief description about Franks. It is likely that it was less urgent for the Empire of his time. Franks were Christian and generally friendly to the Empire; cf. *Taktika*, 18.74-92.

309 See for instance the *DAI*, 13.110-121.

310 I am indebted to Prof. Paul Magdalino for this remark. The only reference to Hibernia that I was able to find is the one in the *Expositio fidei* by Joannes Damascenus: Εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ γνωσθεῖσαι ἐπαρχίαι τῆς γῆς ἤτοι σατραπίαι ἄντι-Εὐρώπης μὲν ἐπαρχίας λόγῳ, πίνακες τ’ α’ Ἰουβερνία, νῆσος Βρετανική; cf. *Expositio fidei*, 24b.2.

311 This piece of information is possibly taken from Procopius, *De bellis* 3.3.1. Agathias also identifies the Franks with the Germans; cf. Agathias, *Historiae* I.2.
Excerpt 4.312

Excerpt 4 is a very brief description of the Britons and the Varni’s battle gear on the battlefield: peoples on Brittia have never seen horses. I suggest that at this point the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi introduces a mini-military ethnography. He, once again, isolates a couple of sentences from an entire episode in order to offer what he considered most important to serve his purpose of thematic homogeneity throughout the compilation. The two sentences were excerpted from Procopius’ account of the Angles’ attack on the Varni, under the leadership of the woman whom the son of Hermegisclus had decided not to marry.313 The ethnographic digression of excerpt 4 has been placed between the moral comment upon the Angli (excerpt 3) and the tale of the dead souls that are ferried to Brittia (excerpt 5). I believe that such a digression could be seen as an ethnographic addition to the previous brief representation of the people of Brittia and serves to introduce us to the fantastic and exaggerated account that follows. If the author had stopped his narrative with the morality of Angli, the following tale would have been presented abruptly and without any ostensible reason.

Excerpt 5.314

Excerpt 5 contains a story about the souls of the dead that are ferried to the island of Brittia by fishermen inhabiting the land of the Franks. It is likely that Procopius had heard that story from the Anglian members of the Frankish embassy at Constantinople.315 Procopius also states clearly that the story of the transfer of these souls was well known in Byzantium.316 It was a story recounted by men who had taken part in the transportation of the souls and was common knowledge among the Byzantines, so that Procopius claims he feels obliged to include it into his historical narrative.318 He adds a story, however, which he himself does not even believe to be true: he states that he will record a story that belongs to the sphere of mythology.319

The same story was included in our anonymous collection. The question is what was the rationale for the selection of that passage. I suggest we have to think about the role the socio-political context played in the selection and the presentation of the present story. I propose that the incorporation of this kind of material is very much in line with the 10th century post-imperial political agenda: the notion of restricted ecumenism. Accordingly, the Excerpta Anonymi author consciously attempts to restrict himself and all

---

312See in the Appendix I: text 1.
313Procopius, De bellis 8.20.26-31.
314See in the Appendix I: text 1.
315Burn (1955), 259. F. M. Stenton argues that Procopius’ narration shows a knowledge of Germanic customs, which could only have been acquired from a barbarian informant; cf. Stenton (1967), 5.
316Procopius, De bellis 8.20.47.
317Procopius, De bellis 8.20.47.
318Procopius, De bellis 8.20.47.
319Procopius, De bellis 8.20.47.
the Byzantines in an area located in one part of the continent, whereas in another one, far away from Constantinople, a fictitious and frightening event takes place: fishermen conveying dead souls. In addition, we do not detect any covert comment upon any previous presence of Byzantines in Britain. The story is set in a distant place, distinguishing a civilised and erudite people on the one hand and an exotic and peculiar place and community on the other. The compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi represents Brittia as a fabulous place. The differentiation could thus justify why such a story would only take place distant from Constantinople and accordingly the description of Brittia and its peoples excludes in the Excerpta Anonymi the possibility of political inclusion and cultural transformation. The civilising mission of the Empire depicted in Justinian's missionary activity\textsuperscript{320} and testified to in Procopius' writings is totally missing.\textsuperscript{321}

The compiler's attempt to reinforce the distinction between Byzantines and peoples in Brittia is also evident in the passage on Brittia excerpted from Cassius Dio.\textsuperscript{322} The ethnographic description that follows reports mostly on the military equipment of the Kalydonians. The text puts an emphasis on their primitive poverty and their hardiness on the battlefield: ύπομένουσι δὲ καὶ λιμὸν καὶ ψύχος καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν ἀπασαν· καταδύομενοι γὰρ εἰς τὰ ἐλη καρτεροῦσιν ἐπί πολλὰς ἡμέρας, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἔλαζις τῷ τε φλοιῷ καὶ ταῖς βίζαις διατρέφονται (They can endure hunger and cold and any kind of hardship; for they plunge into swamps and exist there for many days, and in the forests they support themselves upon bark and roots).\textsuperscript{324} The passage does not contain any reference, direct or indirect, to the importance of the foreign peoples' adoption of civilised life. In the Excerpta Anonymi ethnographic passages peoples become identifiers of the lands and the possibility of cultural transformation is totally lacking.

\textsuperscript{320}On the subject see Beck (1967), 649-674; Cameron (1996b), 120-125; Ševčenko (1988-1989), 7-27; Greatrex (2005), 477-509.

\textsuperscript{321}See Procopius’ account of the Tzani's conversion; cf. Procopius, De bellis 1.15.18-25. Procopius' account of Heruls' conversion; cf. Procopius, De bellis, 6.14.33-34. See also Procopius' account of Tzani in De aedificiis, a work devoted to the building activity of Justinian; cf. Procopius, De aedificiis 3.6.1-14.

\textsuperscript{322}Excerpta Anonymi 21,26-22,19.

\textsuperscript{323}CD 77.12.1.

\textsuperscript{324}CD 77.12.4.
Excerpt 6.\(^{325}\)

Though the chapter Περὶ οἰωνοσκοπίας τῶν Οὐάρνων\(^{326}\) breaks the alphabetical order, it was embedded at this point in the Excerpta Anonymi because the chapter refers to Brititia and its inhabitants (the nation of Varni). In addition, the chapter begins with the statement Μνησθήσομαι δὲ καὶ περὶ οἰωνοσκοπίας, written by the compiler and denotes that he felt the necessity to justify his choice to include a title that does not follow the previous alphabetical arrangement. It is possible that the author considered the passage so important that he needed to insert it at that point of his compilation; the chapter on the one hand provides additional information concerning the island of Britain, and, on the other, links a nation of Britain, namely that of the Varni, to the tradition of omens and prophecies. The introductory statement, Οὔαρνοι ἑδὸν ἐσὶ Βρεττανικόν,\(^{327}\) sets once again the event that follows in a distant place, in Britain.

The central point in Procopius’ narration is the figure of Hermegisclus and his crucial decision to repudiate the wife chosen by his son, which leads to the war against the Angli later on. By contrast, the central point in the Excerpta Anonymi is the portent that Hermegisclus interpreted as an omen of his own death after forty days. Our compiler omits almost the entire story of Hermegisclus and only keeps the reference to the portent that made the king change the decision concerning his son’s wedding. In the Excerpta Anonymi, the central point is the prediction of Hermegisclus’ death. It is obvious that the author of the Excerpta Anonymi desired to include passages that matched, in terms of subject matter, the ones of the first part of the compilation, which concern prophecies, omens and hidden powers.\(^{328}\)

I have argued that Roman geographic descriptions reflect contemporary attitudes and the perception of the world current in the period they are composed. In the Excerpta Anonymi as well as in Procopius’ ethnographical accounts foreign lands and their people are set apart from civilisation by their isolation. Barbarian lands are inhospitable and impassable and cut their inhabitants off from contact with the Roman Empire. The people inhabiting these distant places have peculiar habits and beliefs. However, Procopius’ geographic digressions come from the age of Justinian I, which was a time of territorial expansion and ideological transformation. His ethnographic accounts express a belief in the civilising influence of the Empire and in the transformative power of Roman imperialism by integrating foreign people into Roman institutions or into a Christian community. In Procopius’ De bellis we encounter geographical accounts which reveal how the Romans helped these inferior nations on the way to civilisation. Such integrating efforts depicted primarily the superiority of the Romans over these peoples. In the

---

\(^{325}\)See in the Appendix I: text I.

\(^{326}\)Excerpta Anonymi 25,25-26,4.

\(^{327}\)The Varni are a nation of Britain; cf. Excerpta Anonymi 25,26-27.

\(^{328}\)The part that is predominantly based on the Parastaseis.
Excerpta Anonymi, instead, these ideas are missing. They rather use the difference in the civilisation level to reinforce already established geographical and political frontiers.

In the foregoing pages I have suggested that this changed perception has parallels in other sources as well, in particular the Constantinian treatises. I would suggest that the author of the Excerpta Anonymi was writing under the pressure of the dominant imperial policy, even if he has not been commissioned directly to serve it. It has to be stressed that an author belonging to the contemporary bureaucratic or intellectual milieu is likely to absorb the dominant ideology expressed at that time. Even if he is not a tool of propaganda, he is likely to be influenced by it. In fact, indirectly the codex depicts the contemporary political situation and contains information that seems to be anachronistic. However, the Excerpta Anonymi update the information about the past by placing it in a 10th-century context, thereby revealing the author’s efforts to preserve certain texts by making them fit into a new time frame. As noted, the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi collects and rearranges material that corresponds to meticulously selected themes, such as the otherness of non-Byzantines and the belief in portents. Finally, the Excerpta Anonymi reflect the choices and interests of its compiler, while, at the same time, betraying what kind of texts attracted particular attention in his own age.329

2.6 Conclusions

In this section, I would like to repeat the main arguments I have made in this chapter: 1) Paleographic, textual and contextual evidence suggest that the Excerpta Anonymi date to the second half of the 10th century. 2) The sylloge comprises excerpts taken from a variety of sources; patriographic, geographic, geometric and historical treatises. A certain number of excerpts had been excerpted in the Excerpta Anonymi through earlier collections of excerpts. Structurally, the passages were selected thematically and arranged alphabetically. The author of the Excerpta Anonymi, at times, breaks the alphabetical sequence of excerpts and inserts passages that clarify the content of earlier passages and enhance the thematic homogeneousness of the sylloge. 3) I also elucidated the working method applied in the Excerpta Anonymi and I identified the three procedures followed by a compiler, namely a) reading and selection b) editing c) synthesis. 4) The EC and the Excerpta Anonymi share significant similarities in terms of content, format and

329The Parisinus interest in history matches a cultural revival that had started at the end of the 8th century and was lively during the 10th century. I. Ševčenko has pointed out that the Ecloga chronographica of Georgius Syncellus, the Chronographia brevis of Patriarch Nicephorus and the Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai constitute the beginning of Byzantine interest for the past; cf. Ševčenko, (1992b) 279-293. See also Markopoulos (2006), 283-286.
methodology. I suggested that, for the chapter On the river Istros, the Excerpta Anonymi drew on a collection of geographical material, whereas for the chapters On Cyrus and On Remus and Romulus they drew on a Constantinian collection of occult science. Similarly, some passages on Roman history in the Excerpta Anonymi derive from a collection on dreams and occult science. And 5) The 10th century-socio-political context played a significant role in the selection and in the re-editing of excerpts. In particular, I suggest that a) the excerptor of the Excerpta Anonymi debases Justinian and b) that Roman geographic descriptions in the Excerpta Anonymi reflect contemporary attitudes and the current perception of the world in the period they were composed in. It has also been shown that the purification of the text from religious references should be seen against the intellectual and cultural tendencies of the 10th century.
Chapter 3  **Excerpta Salmasiana**

The *Excerpta Salmasiana* are an anonymous *sylloge* of historical excerpts named after the French humanist Claude Saumaise, who copied them around the year 1606 from a mid-12th century codex in Heidelberg. The *sylloge* was probably put together between the 8th and the 11th-12th centuries. This chapter argues that the *Excerpta Salmasiana* comprise three distinct *syllogai* of excerpts: 1) the *Exc.Salm.I*, which consists of excerpts taken from a single historical work, namely John of Antioch’s *Historia chronica*, 2) the *Exc.Salm.II*, which comprises excerpts from John Malalas’ *Chronographia*, Cassius Dio’s *Historiae Romanae* and an unidentified lost chronicle that used a variety of late antique sources, and 3) a *sylloge* of excerpts from Agathias’ *Historiae*.

The chapter 1) considers the manuscript transmission of the entire *Excerpta Salmasiana*, 2) surveys the relationship between the *Excerpta Salmasiana* and John of Antioch’s chronicle 3) undertakes a close analysis of the source texts each of the three *syllogai* depended on, 4) considers the selective use of historical material on the part of the compiler of the *Excerpta Salmasiana*, and 5) examines the methodological principles underlying the compilation process of the *Excerpta Salmasiana*. These last two points shall be undertaken on the basis of the third part, the excerpts from Agathias, which has hitherto received no attention at all.

### 3.1  Manuscript transmission

The *Excerpta Salmasiana* have been transmitted through three manuscripts; namely, the Vaticanus gr. 96 (mid-12th century), the Vaticanus pal. 93 (mid-12th century), and the Parisinus gr. 1763 (ca 1606).

---

³This manuscript is the codex Vaticanus Palatinus 93, on which see below.
3.1.1  Vaticanus graecus 96

Bombyc., ff. IV + 229, 244 x 175 mm, (180 x 105, 187 x 112, 195 x 97 mm), II 28-35, saec. XII med.²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLIOS</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r-10r</td>
<td>Flavius Philostratus</td>
<td>Epistulae³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11r-18v</td>
<td>Marcus Antonius Polemon</td>
<td>Declamationes⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r-29v</td>
<td>Ps.-Hesychius</td>
<td>De Viris Illustribus⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29v-88r</td>
<td>Laertius Diogenes</td>
<td>Vitae philosophorum⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88r-88v</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Excerpta gnomologii⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88v-89r</td>
<td>Ps.-Herodotus</td>
<td>Vita Homeris⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89r-97v</td>
<td>Flavius Philostratus</td>
<td>Lives of the Sophists⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97v-98v</td>
<td>Zosimus</td>
<td>excerpts from two Lives of Demosthenes¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98v</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>epitome of Philip’s life¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98v-99r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>gnomai¹²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99r-100v</td>
<td>Joannes Antiochenus</td>
<td>Exc.Salm. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100v-102v</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Exc.Salm. II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103v-105v + 112r-114v + 103rv</td>
<td>Agathias scholasticus</td>
<td>Historiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114v-131v</td>
<td>Claudius Aelianus</td>
<td>Variae historiae¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131v-132r</td>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>Excerpta politiarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132r-157v</td>
<td>Claudius Aelianus</td>
<td>De natura animalium¹⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157v-159r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>excerpts on marvels¹⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159r-229r</td>
<td>Claudius Aelianus</td>
<td>De natura animalium¹⁶</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴Kayser (ed.) (1964), 225-257.
⁷Marcovich (1999), 140-320.
⁹Vaslouidi (2013), 93-108; The text is edited in Vasilouidi (2013), 156-158.
¹⁰Kayser (ed.) (1838).
¹¹One of the two Lives is written by Zosimus of Ascan, a grammarian who lived during Anastasius reign (491-518 AD). The other Live is anonymous. On Zosimus see PLRE II, 1206. The two Lives were published by Westermann (1845), 297-309.
¹²The text was edited in Cook (2005), 194.
¹³See the text published in Cook (2005), 191, n. 11.
¹⁵Part of the text in the Vat.gr. 96 was published in De Stefani (1904), 154-158, 176-178.
¹⁶Published in De Stefani (1903), 93-98.
¹⁷See n. 14.
The Vaticanus graecus 96 transmits works by Flavius Philostratus and Polemon as well as excerpts from ps.-Hesychius, Diogenes Laertius, Heraclides Lembus, Claudius Aelianus and some anonymous excerpts. F. 10v was left blank. The codex transmits the series of historical excerpts under the heading: ἀρχαιολογία Ἰωάννου Ἀντιοχέως ἔχουσα καὶ διασάρησιν τῶν μυθευομένων (f.99r). The series of excerpts is interrupted by a marginal note bearing the new title: ἑτέρα ἀρχαιολογία (f.100v). The ff. 103r-105v have been inserted in a wrong position by a later binder, probably in the 14th-15th centuries. The correct position of the folia in the codex is after f. 111v.

In the margins, there are plenty of notes written in different hands. N. G. Wilson argued that the codex was written by a scholar rather than a professional scribe. A. Biedl regards the Vat.gr. 96 incomplete and dates the codex in the year 1300. A. Biedl compared the script of the Vat. gr. 96 with the one of the codex Par. gr. 1671, prepared on behalf of Maximus Planudes in 1296, and proposed a terminus ante quem for the Vat. gr. 96 after the year 1338. N. G. Wilson, instead, dated the Vat. gr. 96 in the middle of the 12th century. For his dating, he also relied on the script of the manuscript as well as on its relationship to the codex Vat. pal. 93. The latter is a direct copy from the Vat. gr. 96 (ff. 10r-141r) and it was written before 1152, as a margin note on fol. 10 reveals. In addition, N. G. Wilson pointed out that at the bottom of fol. 109 there are verses clearly written by a later hand. N. G. Wilson dated these verses between 1250-1280. Finally, C. Giannelli, based also on the analysis of the marginalia, proposed a date close to the middle of the 12th century.

The codex seems to have been kept in Constantinople by the end of the 15th century, being in the possession of various scholars such as Nicephorus Gregoras (1295-1359) and Matthaios Kamariotes (died 1490). Nothing is known of the circumstances under which the manuscript reached the Vatican Library, but it is certain that it was there in 1518 already.

17Transl. Mariev (2008), 5: John of Antioch's archeology containing the explanation of the mythical tails.
18A different archeology.
19Biedl (1955), 53.
22Biedl (1955), 53.
23Omont (1891), tables LXVII-LXVIII.
25Giannelli (1939), 463.
26Vasiloudi (2013), 93.
27Biedl (1955), 59.
### 3.1.2 Vaticanus Palatinus 93

Bombyc., ff. II + 191 (immo 192), 278 x 199 mm, (246 x 163 mm), II 29-42, saec. XII med.\(^{28}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>folios</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r-2r</td>
<td>Joannes Damascenus</td>
<td>De Immaculato Corpore(^{29})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r-v</td>
<td>Ps.-Caesarius</td>
<td>Quaestiones et Responsiones(^{30})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v-3v</td>
<td>Florilegia</td>
<td>Definitiones(^{31})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r-8r</td>
<td>Anastasius Sinaita</td>
<td>Definitiones(^{32})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8v-9v</td>
<td>Florilegia</td>
<td>Definitiones(^{33})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r</td>
<td>Marcus Antonius Polemon</td>
<td>In Cynaegirum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Notae chronol. de rebus Constantinopolitanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10v-41v</td>
<td>Diogenes Laertius</td>
<td>Vitae philosophorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Excerpta gnomologii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42r-46r</td>
<td>Flavius Philostratus</td>
<td>Vitae philosophorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46r-46v</td>
<td>Zosimus</td>
<td>excerpts from two Lives of Demosthenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46v</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>epitome of Philip’s life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47rv</td>
<td>Joannes Antiochenus</td>
<td>Exc.Salm. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47v-52v</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Exc.Salm. II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52v-55r</td>
<td>Agathias scholasticus</td>
<td>Historiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55r-64r</td>
<td>Claudius Aelianus</td>
<td>Variae historiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64r-64v</td>
<td>Heraclides Lembus</td>
<td>Excerpta politiarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64v-141v</td>
<td>Claudius Aelianus</td>
<td>De natura animalium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141r-145r</td>
<td>Xenophon</td>
<td>Cyropaedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145r-146v</td>
<td>Xenophon</td>
<td>Anabasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146v-147r</td>
<td>Xenophon</td>
<td>Apologia Socratis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147r-147v</td>
<td>Xenophon</td>
<td>Agesilaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147v-151r</td>
<td>Xenophon</td>
<td>Memorabilia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151r-191ar</td>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>Historiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191bv</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Breve chronicum Constantinopolitanum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{28}\)Biedl (1955), 60-70; Stevenson (1885), 46-47; Canarti Peri (1970), 242; Sotiroudis (1989), 188-191; Roberto (2005b), LVIII; Mariev (2008), 27*-28*; Dorandi (2009), 5-6.

\(^{29}\)CPG 8117.

\(^{30}\)CPG 7482.


\(^{32}\)Furrer-Pilliod (ed.) (2000), 48-49.
The codex transmits the series of historical excerpts under the heading: ἀρχαιολογία Ἰωάννου Ἀντιοχέως ἔχουσα καὶ διασάφησιν τῶν μυθευομένων (f.47r). The title ἔτερα ἀρχαιολογία, added in the Vat.gr. 96, is missing.

The codex was written by one or two hands and as far as the Excerpta Salmasiana are concerned the codex is an exact copy of the Vat. gr. 96. The excerpt collection seems to be embedded in a shared set of texts (Philostratus, Aelian). Nevertheless, the Vat. pal. 93 contains a significant number of orthographic mistakes as well as omissions of words or even of entire passages. Unlike the Vat. gr. 96, the codex Vat. pal. 93 is written in an untidy minuscule. According to N. G. Wilson, the manuscript was executed prior to 1152. A. Biedl, based on a reference at the end of the codex, suggested that the Vat. pal. 93 was written in 1338. N. G. Wilson, however, showed that the reference derived from a different hand than the rest of the text.

An indication transmitted on fol. 191bv suggests that the codex was in Constantinople at least up to the middle of the 14th century. We know nothing about its fate in the next two centuries. The manuscript was brought to the Bibliotheca Palatina in Heidelberg in 1584 and from there it was moved to Rome in 1623. The codex is deposited there till today.

### 3.1.3 Parisinus graecus 1763

Chartac. pp. 24, 206 x 155 mm, (190 x 135 mm), II 23-30, an. ca 1606.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLIOS</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Joannes Antiochenus</td>
<td>Exc.Salm. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-23</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Exc.Salm. II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The excerpts are headed by the title: ἀρχαιολογία Ἰωάννου Ἀντιοχέως ἔχουσα καὶ διασάφησιν τῶν μυθευομένων. The other title, ἔτερα ἀρχαιολογία, is missing. Page 24 is empty.

---

34N. G. Wilson holds the view that folios 2-62 were not written by the same hand as the rest of the codex; cf. Wilson (1977), 237. In P. Sotiroudis’ view a later hand has only included minor additions to the body text; cf. Sotiroudis (1989), 188-191.
37Fol. 191bv transmits a short Chronic of Constantinople, the last sentence of which reads as follows: τα δε αναρρυσεως αυτης [sc της Πολεως] ετη μεχρι συμπληρωσεως της παρελθουση σ' (ινδικτιωνος) εισιν οζ +. Accordingly, A. Biedl proposed the year 1338 since the text records that it was written 77 years after the liberation of Constantinople and the capture of the city by Michael VIII took place on 25 July 1261; Biedl (1955), 61.
38Biedl (1955), 61.
39Omont (1888), 137; Sotiroudis (1989), 191-193; Roberto (2005b), LVIII-LVIV; Mariev (2008), 28*.
The Par. gr. 1763 was copied by Salmasius in Heidelberg around the year 1606. The Par. gr. 1763 is a copy of the Vat. pal. 93. Indeed, in a margin of the Vat. gr. 96 is found a brief passage labeled περὶ τοῦ Ἰορδανοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ἱστορίας Φιλοστοργίου. The same passage is also copied in the Exc.Salm.II of the Vat. pal. 93 and from this codex it was later copied in the Par. gr. 1763. Cramer published the Excerpta Salmasiana from this manuscript in 1839.

Three more manuscripts transmit the Excerpta Salmasiana but all of them are copies either from the Vat. gr. 96 or the Vat. pal. 93. These codices are: the Codex Neapolitanus graecus 166 [II D 4], the Codex Par. gr. 3026 and the Codex Heid. Pal. Gr. 129.

With regard to the manuscript transmission of the two aforementioned ἀρχαιολογία, I have two points to make. First, the Excerpta Salmasiana, in the form they have been handed down to us, represent a compilation of three distinct collections of excerpts, which is, however, held together by a shared interest across the three of them. Each of the collections is based on a different historiographical tradition: (1) the Exc.Salm.I is transmitted under the name of John of Antioch. In S. Mariev’s edition of John of Antioch the Exc.Salm.I are made up of 39 excerpts. The Exc.Salm.I embrace excerpts, which retain coherence in terms of content and narrative sequence. It is difficult, however, to say if the selection of excerpts was made by the anonymous compiler of the entire Excerpta Salmasiana or if he copied a pre-existing sylloge. (2) With the Exc.Salm.II, an excerptor attempted to expand on the Exc.Salm.I by composing a sylloge running from the Deluge to the 5th century AD, relying mostly on Malalas and Cassius Dio. The later insertion ἐτέρα ἀρχαιολογία at the point where the Exc.Salm.II begin is an indication that the two collections of excerpts stem from different sources. The later hand that added the title ἐτέρα ἀρχαιολογία was aware of the fact that the second part of the Excerpta Salmasiana had not been excerpted from the same historical work containing the Exc.Salm.I, that is, the Historia chronica of John of Antioch. And (3) to these two was added the collection of excerpts from Agathias of Myrina’s Historiae. Together, the Exc.Salm I and II plus the

---

40See Biedl (1955), 69.
41Cramer (1839), 383-401.
43Vitelli (1895), 382-384; Sotiroidis (1989), 197-200.
44Biedl (1948), 100-106; Sotiroidis (1989), 200-201.
46In fact, this point could support that the compiler of the Excerpta Salmasiana is not the compiler of the sylloge of John of Antioch. Even U. Roberto’s view that the Exc.Salm.I derive from Julius Africanus does not change the fact that this part of the Excerpta Salmasiana compilation was excerpted from a historical treatise.
47Agathias of Myrina’s Historiae are dated in the second half of the 6th century. Agathias wrote also series of epigrams, the so-called Cycle and Daphniaka. An epigram identifies Agathias as curator civitatis in Smyrna (Cameron 1970, 2). The Agathian passages are edited for the first time in the appendix of this thesis; see Appendix
Agathias-collection make up a single sylloge of excerpts that betrays a single interest. All the excerpts are concerned with omens, dreams, superstition as well as cultural and religious beliefs of peoples surrounding Byzantium.

Second, the sylloge shows that late antique authors, such as Cassius Dio, John Malalas, John of Antioch and Agathias circulated through excerpt collections throughout the Byzantine period. Specifically, the Exc.Salm.I show that the compiler intended to compile an excerpt collection from John of Antioch’s historical work. The thematic homogeneity of Malalas excerpts in the Exc.Salm.II coupled with the fact that a significant part of these excerpts were also used by chroniclers in the 10th-11th centuries, mirror the existence of a collection of Malalas excerpts, which the excerpts were taken from.48 Cassius Dio is the main source of the second part of the Exc.Salm.II. The fact that part of the excerpts are very similar to the excerpts taken from Dio in the tenth-century Excerpta Anonymi indicates that Cassius Dio circulated in an excerpt collection, which both, the Exc.Salm.II and the Excerpta Anonymi must have drawn on (see below section 3.3.2.4).

The structure and sources of the sylloge will be elucidated in the following sections. Before we proceed, however, a few remarks on the relationship between the collection and the historical work of John of Antioch are required.

### 3.2 Excerpta Salmasiana and John of Antioch

The Excerpta Salmasiana are often associated with the so-called Johannische Frage,49 which I need to discuss briefly, so as to lead us to a better understanding of a series of problems central to the nature of the collection. The oldest and best manuscript of the Excerpta Salmasiana is the codex Vaticanus graecus 96,50 dated in the mid-12th century. As noted, the series of excerpts in the manuscript is labelled ἀρχαιολογία Ἰωάννου Ἀντιοχέως ἔχουσα καὶ διασάφησιν τῶν μυθευομένων (f.99r). However, a note was inserted in a different hand in the margin of f.100v, namely ἔτέρα ἀρχαιολογία.

---


48See below section 3.2.3.

49The debate among scholars about the historical excerpts that could or should not be ascribed to John of Antioch, author of the universal chronicle known as the Historia Chronica. According to S. Mariev John of Antioch wrote his chronicle in the first half of the 6th century; cf. Mariev (2008), 8*. U. Roberto, instead, dates him in the early 7th century; cf. Roberto (2005), XI-XX.

50On the codex see above.
The insertion sparked a debate among scholars as to which of the two parts is originally derived from John of Antioch. The proposition that the first part (henceforth *Exc.Salm.I*) does not derive from John of Antioch was first advanced by Patzig, who argued that the second part (henceforth *Exc.Salm. II*) did.\(^51\) De Boor, by contrast, put forward that solely *Exc.Salm.I* belong to John of Antioch, whereas the second part derives from an anonymous but now lost chronicle,\(^52\) which was also used by subsequent writers, such as Symeon Logothetes, Ps.-Symeon, George Cedrenus and Constantine Manasses.\(^53\) U. P. Boissevain, in turn, proposed that only the first part of the *Exc.Salm.II*, namely up to excerpt 44, derived from John of Antioch.\(^54\)

This disagreement continues among the latest editors: S. Mariev follows de Boor and accepts only the *Exc.Salm.I* as the genuine work of John of Antioch\(^55\) and argues that *Exc.Salm.II* derive from a paraphrased version of Malalas’ chronicle.\(^56\) U. Roberto, instead, regards the first part spurious, and ascribes the second part to John’s historical work.\(^57\) Roberto assigns the *Exc.Salm.I* to Julius Africanus and argues that they represent an anonymous collection of excerpts extracted from the Books III and IV of the *Chronographiae* by Julius Africanus. As far as the *Exc.Salm.II* are concerned, U. Roberto believes that they entirely stem from an epitome of the *Historia chronica* of John of Antioch. In his view, the anonymous compiler of the epitome downgraded the stylistic and linguistic register of the *Historia chronica*, in line with the working method of most of the excerptors at that time.\(^58\) In this way, he attempts to explain the obvious discrepancies between the *Exc.Salm.II* and the excerpts of the *Historia chronica* incorporated into the *Excerpta Constantiniana* (*EC*) in terms of style, language and historiographical tradition. Indeed, from *Exc.Salm.II* 44 onwards the sylloge differs markedly from the *EC*:\(^59\) the section dealing with Roman history in the *Exc.Salm.II* is based on Cassius Dio, whereas in the *EC* it is derived from Eutropius. Indeed, the comparison of the excerpts in the *EC* and those in the *Excerpta Salmasiana* confirms that the *Exc.Salm.II* derive from a different historiographical tradition\(^60\) and that they cannot derive from John of Antioch.\(^61\)

\(^{51}\) Patzig (1900), 357-369.

\(^{52}\) De Boor (1899), 298-304; de Boor (1893), 195-211.

\(^{53}\) On the passages from the *Exc.Salm.II* found in Symeon Logothetes, Ps.-Symeon, Cedrenus and Manasses see below table 13 and Appendix II: table V.

\(^{54}\) Boissevain (1887), 161-178.

\(^{55}\) Mariev (ed.) (2008), esp. 16*.

\(^{56}\) Mariev (2009), 177-190.

\(^{57}\) Roberto (ed.) (2005).

\(^{58}\) Roberto (ed.) (2005), LXII.

\(^{59}\) The numbering of the excerpts is that of the edition of the *Historia chronica* by Roberto (ed.) (2005).

\(^{60}\) Boissevain (1887), 161–178; de Boor (1899), 298-304; Sotiriadis (1888), 1-126.

Therefore, the marginal note inserted in the codex Vat. gr. 96 must refer to the material that follows it.\textsuperscript{62}

The question to be raised, then, is what the source of the \textit{Exc.Salm.II} was. In the following, I shall argue that the \textit{Exc.Salm.II} were a \textit{sylloge} of historical excerpts composed, at least partially, between the eighth and the tenth centuries and then added to the \textit{Exc.Salm.I}, so as to form a collection of historical excerpts on the topic of the legendary Greco-Roman past of the Byzantine Empire.

\section*{3.3 Structure and sources of the \textit{Excerpta Salmasiana}}

I shall now discuss the structure and the sources of each of the three \textit{syllogai} constituting the \textit{Excerpta Salmasiana}.

\subsection*{3.3.1 \textit{Excerpta Salmasiana I}\textsuperscript{63}}

The \textit{Exc.Salm.I} comprise 39 excerpts taken from a single historical work, namely John of Antioch’s \textit{Historia chronica}. John of Antioch derived his information from Africanus’ \textit{Chronographiae}.\textsuperscript{64} In terms of content, the 39 excerpts deal with Greek-Hellenistic, Jewish and Egyptian history. H. Gelzer and E. Patzig argued that the selection of excerpts on the part of the excerptor was not accidental.\textsuperscript{65} Excerpts 1-24 are concerned with the interpretation of Greek myths.\textsuperscript{66} Chronologically, they cover the period from the Exodus to the first Olympiad and thematically, they reflect on Greek mythological history, while making references to contemporary Jewish and Egyptian persons or events. The last three excerpts of this group, namely the excerpts 22-24, refer to the origins of Greek feasts associated with competitive games, such as the Isthmia in Corinth and the Pythia in Delphi. In addition, the entire group of excerpts exhibits an interest in synchronising Greek mythology and Jewish and Greek history.\textsuperscript{67}

\textsuperscript{62}Mariev (2006), 546; Paschoud (2006), 333-334.
\textsuperscript{63}The numbering of the excerpts is that of the edition of the \textit{Historia chronica} by Mariev (ed.) (2008).
\textsuperscript{64}Wallraff – Roberto – Pinggera – Adler (2007), esp. XXXIX-XLII.
\textsuperscript{65}Gelzer (1880), 118-119; Patzig (1900), 357-369, here 366-367. H. Gelzer, however, argued that both the \textit{Exc.Salm.I} and the \textit{Exc.Salm.II} are written by John of Antioch. According to H. Gelzer, there have been two versions of the \textit{Historia chronica}: the original one and a reworked one.
\textsuperscript{66}The passages are originally derived from diverse authors who attempted to rationalise texts on Greek mythology (Palaephatus, Philochorus, Didymus). The excerpts in the \textit{Exc.Salm.I} omit the references to the original sources recorded in Syncellus and Eusebius. See also Roberto (2005a), esp. 261-288.
\textsuperscript{67}Roberto (2005a), 281-286.
Excerpt 25 marks a turning point in the thematic sequence of excerpts by introducing us to Egyptian history. In particular, excerpts 25-32 are dealing with the origins of Egyptian history, the first reigns of Egypt and peculiar facts and wonders that occurred during the reigns of several pharaohs.

Finally, excerpts 33 to 39 show some inconsistencies in terms of content. In particular, excerpt 33 marks a shift to Greek history once more. Excerpt 34 transmits an etymology for the Peloponnese peninsula. Excerpts 35-38 turn back to the topic of Greek competitive games, and the final excerpt 38 makes a seemingly irrelevant reference to Holofernes, the general of the Chaldean king of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, Nebuchadnezzar II.

It becomes apparent, therefore, that the Exc.Salm.I are thematically divided into two parts. As concerns the first part (exc.1-24), the criterion of selection is the interest in mythological accounts. The second part (exc.25-39) is dominated by a concern about peculiar events and wonders associated with Oriental history. The excerptor intended to collect passages that rationally explain Greek mythical accounts. Accordingly, the careful selection of such passages and the arrangement of excerpts represent the activity of an excerptor who was interested in the διασάφησις τῶν μυθευομένων (explanation of the mythical tales). Syncellus and Eusebius drew on the same tradition of Julius Africanus. Whereas Syncellus and Eusebius cite Philochorus, Palaephatus and Didymus as the original authors of the mythical accounts, the excerptor of Exc.Salm.I omits references to these authors. It is impossible to say whether the compiler of the Exc.Salm.I was in possession of the entire Historia chronica or made use of another excerpt collection.

3.3.2 Excerpta Salmasiana II

The Exc.Salm.II represent a selection of a variety of texts, which were re-edited and often extensively abridged before their inclusion in the sylloge. Occasionally the original text is much changed pointing to either already summarised and contaminated texts which the compiler came across in an other collection of excerpts or to efforts made by the compiler himself to epitomise and summarise the source texts he had at hand.

Provided that the Exc.Salm.II definitely does not derive from John of Antioch, the main issue that should trouble scholarship is the identification of its source or sources. The two

---

68 Wallraff – Roberto – Pinggéra – Adler (2007), XXXI-XXXIV, XLII-XLIV.
71 Exc.Salm.I 10 = Eus.-Hier, Chron. 52c-d; Sync. 189.29-190.4.
main suggestions regarding the origin of the *Exc.Salm.II* are the following. U. P. Boissevain supported that from excerpt 44 onwards the *sylloge* derives from a lost chronicle. De Boor, by contrast, argued that the entire *Exc.Salm.II* drew on a lost chronicle. Except for the ostensibly differing opinions, both scholars agree that a chronicle stands behind the entire or a part of the production of the *Exc.Salm.II*. S. Mariev highlighted the textual similarities between some excerpts in the *Exc.Salm.II* and some excerpts preserved in the codex Parisinus gr. 1630 and concluded that the excerpts in both came from a paraphrased version of Malalas’ chronicle. In the following, I shall attempt to highlight some specific textual features of the *sylloge* that could shed some light on the question as to the original source of the *Exc.Salm.II*. First, let us have a look at the content of the *Exc.Salm.II*. The *sylloge* consists of 82 excerpts, which, in my view, can be divided into two main parts according to themes: the *Exc.Salm.II* 1-43 and the *Exc.Salm.II* 44-82.

### 3.3.2.1 *Exc.Salm.II* A

In *Exc.Salm.II* A (excerpts 1-43), the compiler shares with Malalas an interest in signs and oracles as well as in Euhemeristic interpretations of the Greek and oriental mythology. Excerpts 1-37 run from the creation to the Trojan War. According to Roberto, the compiler of the *sylloge* relied on the *Chronographia* by John Malalas. Indeed, the bulk of the excerpts 1-37 are drawn from John Malalas, but not without exceptions; Exc. 16, Exc. 18, Exc. 23 and Exc. 27-30 must be assigned to sources other than Malalas.

**Table 8: excerpts that do not derive from John Malalas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 16</td>
<td>Plutarch, fr. 187,2 Bern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 18</td>
<td>Procopius, <em>De Bellis</em> 4.10,13-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 23</td>
<td>Charax, <em>FGrHist</em> 103 F 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 27-30</td>
<td>Dictys, III 15-16, II 27, II 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the first part of the *Exc.Salm.II* relies on Malalas as well as on Plutarch, Dictys, Charax and Procopius. The compiler of this part appears to have made direct use of Dictys in the excerpts 27-30, rather than indirect use through Malalas. With regard to the use of Procopius, U. Roberto, who sees John of Antioch as the author of the *Exc.Salm.II*, suggests an intermediate source between the *sylloge* and Procopius. Procopius is the source in the *Exc.Salm.II* 81 and 82 as well.

---

72See n. 54.
73De Boor (1899), 298-304; de Boor (1893), 195-211.
74See n. 56.
75Roberto (ed.) (2005), CXXV.
76Sotiroudis (1989), 146.
Excerpts 38-43 make up a mix of passages taken from Malalas, Suetonius, John Lydus, Diodorus and Julius Africanus. Excerpt 38 marks a turning point with regard to the content and format of the first part of the Exc.Salm.II. Specifically, from excerpt 38 onwards the text deals with prominent historical figures or Roman emperors. Interestingly, this focus on emperors is also applied, as shown below, in the second part of the Exc.Salm.II. Excerpts 39-41 dealing with the court and institutions in Ancient Rome derive from the De genere vestium (Περὶ όνομάτων κυρίων καὶ ἱδέας ἐσθημάτων καὶ υποθημάτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οίς τις ἀμφιέννυται) and the De regibus libri tres of Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus. It is difficult to say whether the compiler used the Latin text or an intermediary work in Greek. Diodorus Siculus is the source of excerpt 42. The original text underwent much alteration and was contaminated with information probably derived from Aelian’s Varia Historia.

3.3.2.2 The codex Parisinus gr. 1630 and Exc.Salm.II A

Excerpts 1-23 of Exc.Salm.II A bear significant similarities with the text transmitted on a series of folios (234r–239v) in the codex Parisinus gr. 1630 (B). B is a 14th century miscellaneous codex consisting of 278 folia of Oriental paper. It contains more than a hundred texts of different authors and literary genres: medical texts, epigrams, poems, theological texts, homilies, geometrical texts, epistles, and historical excerpts. The codex has also been subject to the so-called Johannische Frage. Cramer, was the first to attribute the text in B to Malalas. A few years later, G. Sotiriadis’ research on the text in B demonstrated that the major part of the text in the codex derives from Malalas, but for a few excerpts, which must be attributed to John of Antioch. P. Sotiroudis confirmed G. Sotiriadis’ arguments except that he attributed two more passages to John of Antioch. Recently, S. Mariev embarked upon a close analysis of the text in B and the corresponding passages in the Exc.Salm.II, the Suda, the direct tradition of Malalas’ text

---

77 The Greek title of the De genere vestium has been handed down to us in the Suda; cf. Suda T 895 Τράγυκυλλος. The Latin title is transmitted in Serv. ad. Aen. 7.612 = fr. 165 Reiff; cf. Power (2014), 231. Gelzer considered the Chronographiae of Julius Africanus as the Greek text transmitting Suetonius’ passages; Gelzer (1880), 236.

78 Varia Historia VI 8.


80 I have already referred to Patzig’s various surveys supporting that the Exc.Salm.II as well as almost all the excerpts in B come from John of Antioch; cf. Patzig (1892), (1896), (1897), (1900) and (1901). K. Müller shared a similar view: the text in B stems from John of Antioch; cf. Müller (1851), 540. U. P. Boissevain and C. de Boor, instead, were confident that the text in B was not from John of Antioch. U. P. Boissevain, as noted already, considered a chronicle now lost as the source behind both, the text in B and the Exc.Salm.II.; Boissevain (1887), esp. 173-178.

81 Cramer (1839), 379.

82 Sotiriadis (1888), esp. 84-91.

He arrived at the conclusion that the first part of B (ff. 234r,16-237r,7) must derive from the direct Malalas-tradition, whereas the second part of B (ff. 237r,7-239,7) deviates from it. Indeed, this part represents a much more shortened and altered version of Malalas’s text. S. Mariev attributed the origins of the second part to a secondary Malalas-tradition. In S. Mariev’s view, the common passages between B and Exc.Salm.II A must represent a common source. If we accept S. Mariev’s argument, the Exc.Salm.II 1-12 must stem directly from Malalas’ text and the Exc.Salm.II 13-23 must come from a secondary Malalas-Tradition, that is, a paraphrased Malalas text.

What could possibly shed light on the quest for the derivation of the passages in the Exc.Salm.II is the examination of the textual relationship between the Exc.Salm.II 1-12 and the direct tradition of Malalas (PV, O, A). This would help us comprehend the two thorny issues in S. Mariev’s view: 1) the establishment of a common source between B and the Exc.Salm.II in relation to two distinct Malalas-traditions in both texts, and 2) the source of the rest of the Exc.Salm.II, that is the excerpts after the last common excerpt in B (238v,27-239r,11) and in the Exc.Salm.II (excerpt 23).

For the sake of clarity, I repeat the results of S. Mariev’s survey: 1) B relied both on the direct tradition of Malalas (M) and a paraphrased version of this tradition (P), 2) the Exc.Salm.II and B relied on a common source, 3) the Exc.Salm.II, the Suda and B relied on the same source.35

The following table depicts S. Mariev’s view. The column under the siglum B bears the folia transmitting Malalas’ texts in the Parisinus gr. 1630. The numeration of the excerpts from the Exc.Salm.II, in the second column, is the one given by U. Roberto in his edition of John of Antioch. In the last column, Malalas’s text is represented by the direct tradition (A, PV, O = M) and the shortened version of it (= P).

---

34Mariev (2009), 177-190.
35The Suda used both, the direct Malalas tradition (M) and the paraphrased version of it (P); cf. Mariev (2009), 185.
### Table 9: Malalas’ Chronographia in B and in the Exc.Salm.II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malalas, Chronographia</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Suda</th>
<th>Exc.Salm.II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,7,39-1,11,18 (M)</td>
<td>235r,15-235v,10</td>
<td></td>
<td>fr.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,11,9-18 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Z 160</td>
<td>fr.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,12,19,30 (M)</td>
<td>235v,10-14</td>
<td>Θ 417</td>
<td>fr.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,13,43-52 (M)</td>
<td>235v,20-25</td>
<td>Π 1500</td>
<td>fr.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,14,53-87 (M)</td>
<td>23v,25-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>fr.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,15,88-10 (M)</td>
<td>236r,13-18</td>
<td>H 661</td>
<td>fr.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,1,1-22 (M)</td>
<td>236r,18-28</td>
<td></td>
<td>fr.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,3,41-53 (M)</td>
<td>236r,32-236v,2</td>
<td>Σ 867</td>
<td>fr.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4,54-76 (M)</td>
<td>236v,2-18</td>
<td>Ε 3038</td>
<td>fr.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,6,81-28 (M)</td>
<td>236v,18-27</td>
<td>Π 453</td>
<td>fr.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,11,24-87 (P)</td>
<td>237r,9-21</td>
<td>Μ 406</td>
<td>fr.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,15 (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fr.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,18,7-53 (P)</td>
<td>237v,14-25</td>
<td>Σ 253; Σ 254</td>
<td>fr.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>237v,28-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>fr.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,9 (P)</td>
<td>238r,5-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>fr.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>238r,20-21</td>
<td>X 79</td>
<td>fr.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,12,97-19 (P)</td>
<td>238r,25-30</td>
<td>Κ 2078</td>
<td>fr.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,3,29-40 (P)</td>
<td>238v,1-3</td>
<td>Π 2506, 2-8</td>
<td>fr.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,5,44-74 (P)</td>
<td>238v,4-8</td>
<td>Π 2506, 8-21</td>
<td>fr.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,9,91-24 (P)</td>
<td>238v,27-239r,8</td>
<td></td>
<td>fr.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>238r,8-239r,11</td>
<td>Δ 250</td>
<td>fr.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In what follows, I argue that the comparison between the Exc.Salm.II, B and the Suda indicates that the common Malalas-passages in the Exc.Salm.II and the Suda derive from a common source X. X must have contained passages from Malalas, which had already been abridged (T) and contaminated with passages taken from a variety of other texts, such as Plutarch and Charax (Π). With (Ψ) I indicate the stage at which the shortened Malalas excerpts and passages from other authors were combined. The Suda remains closer to X, while the Exc.Salm.II shorten even further passages from X. Mariev showed that B, in its entirety, depended both, on the direct Malalas-tradition M and on a paraphrased version of it (P). As I will show, the latter was not identical to X, though. It is more likely that P comes from the same source that X derives from. The situation could be illustrated as in the following scheme:
First, it is noteworthy that, as Table 9 shows, two Salmasian excerpts, namely, fr.4 and fr.14 as well as a part of fr.17 are absent in B. What is not found in B is present in Malalas, though. Interestingly, the passages in question are present in what S. Mariev calls the “direct tradition” of Malalas’ text, namely, in the codex Baroccianus 182 (O). This is an indication that the Exc.Salm.II did ultimately originate in Malalas’ Chronographia.

With regard to the derivation of the Exc.Salm.II, the case of the fr.8 is of particular importance. The passage is concerned with Hephaestus, the successor of Hermes to the throne of Egypt. The text records that Hephaestus was once wounded in war and went lame. According to the text, he was the king who introduced monogamy to the people of Egypt. Hephaestus received the tongs from the air, by which he constructed irony weapons for war.

The text is also preserved in Malalas, B and the Suda. Although both the Exc.Salm.II 8 and B transmit an abridged version of Malalas’ text, the two versions differ markedly. First, I would like to draw attention to the phrase ὃς πολεμῶν ἐπλήγη τὸν πόδα καὶ γέγονε χωλός. The sentence is found in the Suda verbatim. B transmits additional information as to how Hephaestus was wounded; he fell with his horse: ὃς συμπεσόντος αὐτῷ ἵππου ἐν τῷ πόλεμῳ πληγεὶς ἐμείνε χωλεύων. The text in B derives from the direct Malalas-tradition:
Second, I would like to highlight the adjective πολεμικά occurring at the end of both, the Exc.Salm.II 8 and the entry in the Suda. The adjective πολεμικά summarises the following passage in Malalas’ text: ὅπλων ἕφυρκότα καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις δύναμιν καὶ σωτηρίαν ποιήσαντα. On the other hand, the text in B comes, once again, directly from Malalas’s text as it is preserved in the direct tradition. The identical beginning in the Exc.Salm.II 8 and B (Μετὰ Ἐρμήν ἐβασιλεύσεν Αἰγυπτίων Ἡραίοτος)87 could be explained by the existence of the common source Ψ in the transmission of the shortened version of Malalas’ text.

---

Table 10: the derivation of the Exc.Salm.II 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malalas, Chronographia</th>
<th>Exc.Salm.II 8</th>
<th>B, 236r,13-18</th>
<th>Suda H 661 Ἡραίοτος</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,15,88-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>B, 236r,13-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

86See table 10.

87The Exc.Salm.II 8 transmits a δὲ after the μετὰ.
διάγειν, τάς δὲ ἐπὶ μοιχεία εὐρισκομένας τιμωρεῖοναὶ καὶ ἡχαρίστησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἀιγύπτιοι, διότι πρῶτον νόμον σωφροσύνης <τεύχον> ἐξεδέξαντο. ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Ἡραίος ἀπὸ μυστικῆς τινος εὐγῆς τὴν ὀξυλάβην ἐξέδεξα ἐκ τοῦ ἀέρος εἰς τὸ κατασκευάζειν ἐκ σιδήρου ὅπλα. ὦθεν καὶ ἐπικρατὴς ἑυρέθη εἰς τοὺς πολέμους, ἀπεθέσαν σὺν αὐτὸν ὡς σωφροσύνην οἰομοθετήσαντα καὶ τροφὴν ἀνθρώπους διὰ κατασκευῆς ὅπλων εὐρηκότα καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις δύναμιν καὶ σωτηρίαν ποιῆσαν· πρὸ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἀπάλοις καὶ λίθος ἐπολέμουν.

<Ὅθεν καὶ ἐπικρατής εὐρέθη εἰς τοὺς πολέμους> πρὸ γὰρ αὐτοῦ μετὰ ὀσπάλων καὶ λίθων ἐπολέμουν.

Table 9 also shows that three excerpts in the Exc.Salm.II (fr.16, fr.18 and fr.23) which are not found in Malalas exhibit similarities with the text in B. The three passages in question are included in the Suda, though: Exc.Salm.16 = B = Suda Ι 422, Exc.Salm.18 = B = Suda X 79, Exc.Salm.II 23 = B = Suda Δ 250. The textual comparison between the Exc.Salm.II, B and the Suda confirms that they all descend from a common text. Here I present the case of the Exc.Salm.18 = B = Suda X 79:

Table 11: the Exc.Salm.II 18, B and the Suda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exc.Salm.II 18</th>
<th>B, 238r,20–21</th>
<th>Suda X 79 Χαναάν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οἱ δυνάσται τῶν ἐθνῶν ὑπ’ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυὶ διωκόμενοι, καὶ μὴ προδεχόμενος των Αἰγυπτίων, εἰς τὴν τῶν Ἀφρων χώραν μετοικίσαντες ἐπέγραφαν ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν Χανααιοῖ, οὐς ἔδιωκαν Ἰησοῦς ὁ ληστῆς</td>
<td>μ’ ἔπειραν τῶν λαῶν καταλιπὼν Ἰησοῦς τὸν τοῦ Ναυὶ καταλιπὼν.</td>
<td>Χαναάν: δύσμα κύριον, καὶ ἔξα πρὸς αὐτοῦ Χανααῖοι. ὁ δὲ Μωσῆς μ’ ἔπειραν τῶν λαῶν καταλιπὼν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *Exc.Salm.II* 18 is, in fact, an abridged version of the text in the *Suda*. Passages exhibit literal similarities and the vocabulary is almost identical. The past participle ἀναγραψάμενοι and the verb ὑκησαν, occurred in the *Suda*, were turned into a verb (ἐπέγραψαν) and a participle (μετοικήσαντες) in the *Exc.Salm.II* 18, respectively. The text in *B* is identical to the beginning of the entry in the *Suda*, too. *B* transmits also the exact year of Moses’ death: ἐτῶν ρκ. This piece of information is absent in both, the *Suda* and the *Exc.Salm.II* 18. It is obvious that the passage in *B* derives from the same tableau (Ψ) as *X*, where the *Suda* X 79 and the *Exc.Salm.II* 18, also come from.

S. Mariev and Roberto have drawn attention to *Exc.Salm.II* 15. This excerpt, the corresponding passage in *B* and the *Suda* share a common error when referring to Ἑλληνα as the giant who took part in the construction of the Tower of Babel. According to S. Mariev, the error in the shortened version of Malalas’ text points to a common source between its transmitters. However, as shown above, the *Exc.Salm.II* and *B* are more likely to have included the mistake through different paths.

To sum up, the textual comparison between the *Exc.Salm.II* 1-23 and excerpts in *B* reveals a stage at which shortened passages from Malalas’ *Chronographia* were contaminated with passages excerpted from a variety of other texts. I signify this stage in the stemma above with the siglum Ψ. The common Malalas-passages in the *Exc.Salm.II* 1-23 and *B* belong to two different versions of Ψ, respectively. As can be seen in the stemma presented above, the *Exc.Salm.II* 1-23 derive from *X*, whereas the corresponding passages in *B* derive from Π.

As already noted *Exc.Salm.II* 24-43 are not found in *B*. Yet, the majority of them originate in Malalas’ *Chronographia*. Five of these excerpts are also preserved in the *Suda*:

---

88Mariev (2009), 184; Roberto (2005b), L-LI.
89See Appendix II: table III.
Exc.Salm.II. 24 = Suda A1 23, Exc.Salm.II. 26 = Suda T 7, Exc.Salm.II. 30 = Suda P 146, Exc.Salm.II. 32 = Suda Π 34, Exc.Salm.II. 40 = Suda A 4126. When comparing the Exc.Salm.II 24-43, Malalas’ text and the Suda we arrive at the conclusion that a common source stands, once again, behind Exc.Salm.II 24-43 and the Suda. It is highly likely, therefore, that (Ψ) is the source of the entire Exc.Salm.II 1-43. Here I present the case of the Malalas 5,12,9-12 = Exc.Salm.II 32 = Suda Π 34. The Exc.Salm.II 32 is concerned with the Palladium, a wooden statue, believed to guard the kingdom of Troy.\footnote{The Exc.Salm.II 32 mistakenly transmits that the statue was constructed by a philosopher named Asios: the Palladium was given to the king of Troy, when he was founding the city, by a philosopher and priest called Asios. On the presence of Palladium in Malalas see Praet (2016), 294-297.} I would like to draw attention a) to the use of the imperfect ἦν in the Exc.Salm.II and the Suda, in the place of the present tense ἔστι in Malalas, and b) to the sentence ὑπὸ Ἀσίου τινὸς φιλοσόφου in the Exc.Salm.II, which is found in the Suda verbatim.

Table 12: the Exc.Salm.II 32, Malalas and the Suda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malalas, 5,12,9-12</th>
<th>Chronographia</th>
<th>Exc.Salm.II 32</th>
<th>Suda Π 34 Παλλάδιον</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὀπερ ἔστι τὸ Παλλάδιον, τὸ ἐν Τροίᾳ Παλλάδιον</td>
<td>ζώδιον τῆς Παλλάδος μικρὸν, ἔλεγον εἶναι τετελεσμένον εἰς νίκην, κατασκευασθὲν εἰς φυλακὴν τῆς πόλεως.</td>
<td>Παλλάδιον: τούτῳ ἦν ζώδιον μικρὸν ἔλεγον εἶναι τετελεσμένον, φυλάττοντα τὴν βασιλείαν τῆς Τροίας: ἔδοθη δὲ Τρωὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ κτίζοντι τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ Ἀσίου τινὸς φιλοσόφου καὶ τελεστοῦ (...).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ εν Τροίᾳ Παλλάδιον</td>
<td>ἔλεγον εἶναι τετελεσμένον, φυλάττοντα τὴν βασιλείαν τῆς Τροίας: ἔδοθη δὲ Τρωὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ κτίζοντι τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ Ἀσίου τινὸς φιλοσόφου καὶ τελεστοῦ (...).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2.3 The source of Exc.Salm.II 1-43

Provided that what I call (Ψ) is the source of the Exc.Salm.II 1-43, the next question to be answered is what kind of text (Ψ) was. To begin with, four historical works have made extensive use of excerpts included in Exc.Salm.II: Symeon Logothetes’ Chronicon, Ps.-Symeon’s Chronographia, George Kedrenus’ Compendium historiarum and Constantine Manasses’ Breviarium Chronicum.\footnote{See Appendix II: table V.} Two of these, namely Ps.-Symeon’s chronicle and a part of Symeon Logothetes’ chronicle attached to the text of George the Monk, were produced in imperial circles in the 10th century. The histories show affinities in methodology,
content and sources. Accordingly, they quite often correlate with each other in terms of common references to the past, of mythological figures, exaggerated accounts and geographical allusions. The phenomenon implies the existence of a common source.\(^{92}\) As has been mentioned, J. Signes Codoñer argued that the common source must have been a collection of historical excerpts.\(^{93}\) This could mean that Symeon Logothetes, Ps. Symeon and the compiler of the Exc.Salm.II drew on a common source and not necessarily that the Exc.Salm.II was used directly by the historians. In addition to these two chronicles, the tenth-century Excerpta Anonymi bear significant similarities with the Exc.Salm.II in the selection of excerpts from Cassius Dio (on these excerpts see below). Accordingly, my argument is that the Exc.Salm.II are likely to have drawn on a number of earlier collections of excerpts.

Table 13: passages in common between the Exc.Salm.II 1-43, Symeon Logothetes’ Chronicon and Ps.-Symeon’s Chronographia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malalas, Chronographia</th>
<th>Exc.Salm.II</th>
<th>Symeon Logothetes’ Chronicon</th>
<th>Ps.-Symeon’s Chronographia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malalas I 7-8</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas I 11</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas I 12</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 5</td>
<td>Sym.Log. 28.4,19-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas I 13</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas 1,14,53-87</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 7</td>
<td>Sym. Log. 28.5,23-24</td>
<td>Ps.-Sym. 27r,25-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas I 15</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas II 1</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas II 3</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas II 4</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 11</td>
<td>Ps.-Sym. 27v,32-28r,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas II 6</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 12</td>
<td>Ps.-Sym. 28r,13-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas II 11</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 13</td>
<td>Ps.-Sym. 28v,23-29r,12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas II 15</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 14</td>
<td>Ps.-Sym. 29r,38-29v,29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas II 18</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas III 9</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 17</td>
<td><strong>Exc.Salm.II. 16</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas III 12</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas IV 3</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 20</td>
<td>Sym. Log. 37.2,6-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas IV 5</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 21</td>
<td>Sym. Log. 37.4,20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malalas IV 9</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II. 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{92}\)See n. 185 in chapter 2.

\(^{93}\)See n. 186 in chapter 2.
In my view, despite the contamination of the Malalas text, *Exc.Salm.II* 1-43 are very likely to have been derived from a single text, that is the Ψ in the stemma presented above. To support my argument, I have two points to make. First, the textual transmission and composite nature of group 1-43 corroborate that it stems from a common source in its entirety. Excerpts 1-43 represent a conflation of different texts, but their basis must be the chronicle of Malalas. The compiler of Ψ extracted and edited the Malalas-material, while respecting its general structure and meaning. The passages taken from other sources, by contrast, underwent so much alteration that is difficult to identify them. Obviously, the compiler of Ψ – a collection of excerpts or a chronicle – contaminated the Malalas text with this other material to form a new text, from which the first part of the *Exc.Salm.II* stems.

My second point is related to the common use of passages between the *Exc.Salm.II* and the 10th century Symeon Logothetes and Ps.-Symeon’s tradition. These historical works contain texts found throughout the *Exc.Salm.II*. It is also accepted by contemporary scholars that both histories drew part of their material from collections of excerpts produced and circulated inside and outside imperial circles.94 When examining the textual relationship between the *Exc.Salm.II* and the two histories, we come to interesting

---

94Markopoulos (1994), 167; Markopoulos (2003), 189-190.
conclusions. First, one common passage is not from John Malalas. The presence of excerpt 40 in Ps.-Symeon indicates (a) a common source for Ps.-Symeon and the Exc.Salm.II or (b) the use of the Exc.Salm.II by the Ps.Symeon. Both possibilities point to an aggregation of material from Malalas and texts from other sources. Second, the augmented passages of Exc.Salm.II 1-43 are among those used on the part of Ps.-Symeon, but they are not used by Symeon Logothetes. The last fact could mean that Symeon Logothetes did not use the first part of the Exc.Salm.II but a collection of excerpts containing exclusively John Malalas’ excerpts.

3.3.2.4 Exc.Salm.II B, 44-65

Excerpts 44-65, dealing with Roman history from Julius Caesar to Commodus, derive, with one exception, from the Cassius Dio tradition; some excerpts show similarities with Dio’s direct tradition and some others exhibit textual congruence with Xiphlinus’ epitome of Dio.⁹⁵ Only excerpt 61 derives from Eutropius. All excerpts have been selected thematically to correspond to subject matters, such as emperors’ dreams and occult science. The compiler of this part excerpts passages on Roman emperors. The selected passages briefly reflect on personal traits, life, deeds and deaths of certain emperors. It should be noticed that historical writings, where the narration was focused on a certain emperor’s life, became fashionable from the 10th century onwards.⁹⁶ Their aim was to laud the emperors and legitimize their political authority. Though the Exc.Salm.II is far from being an attestation of imperial legitimacy, the focus on emperors is striking. In addition, and as can be seen in Table 14, the Exc.Salm.II exhibit significant similarities with the mid-10th century Excerpta Anonymi with regard to the selective use of passages in the section on Roman history. Both excerptors have chosen to excerpt and include the same passages from the Cassius Dio tradition and the wording is virtually identical. Accordingly, the excerptors appear to share an interest in occult science as well as in dreams predicting the future. They both incorporate texts dealing with emperors who mistakenly underrated the abilities of astrologers to foresee the future. The common selective use of passages testifies to the use of a common source, that is, an excerpt collection comprising excerpts from the Cassius Dio tradition⁹⁷ about dreams and occult science.⁹⁸

---

⁹⁵Much attention is needed in dealing with U. P. Boissevain’s edition of Cassius Dio. See n. 159 in chapter 2.
⁹⁷It is noteworthy that Exc.Salm.II 53, 54 and 59 correspond to Peter the Patrician, ES 59, 89 and 112, respectively.
⁹⁸The textual relationship between the Excerpta Salmassiana and the Excerpta Anonymi was discussed in detail in chapter 2 (section 2.4.4).
Table 14: shared passages in the *Exc.Salm.II* and the *Excerpta Anonymi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Exc.Salm.II</em></th>
<th><em>Excerpta Anonymi</em></th>
<th><em>Pet.Patr.</em></th>
<th><em>CD</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em> 44</td>
<td>Excerpta Anonymi 29,19-21, 25-27</td>
<td>CD 44,17,1 and 37,52,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em> 45</td>
<td>Excerpta Anonymi 29,28-30,10</td>
<td>CD 45,1,3-45,2,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em> 54</td>
<td>Excerpta Anonymi 31,24-30</td>
<td>Pet.Patr. (ES89)</td>
<td>CD 65,1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em> 57</td>
<td>Excerpta Anonymi 32,11-21</td>
<td>CD 67,18,1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2.5 *Exc.Salm.II* B, 66-82

Excerpts 66-82 represent a conflation of passages from ostensibly different sources. Thematically, the passages deal with Roman emperors and generals:

Table 15: excerpts 66-82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Exc.Salm.II</em></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 66</td>
<td>Gallus (251-253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 67</td>
<td>Probus (276-282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 68</td>
<td>Numerian (283-284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 69</td>
<td>Carinus (283-285)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 71</td>
<td>Diocletian (284-305); Maximian (286-305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 72</td>
<td>Constantine the Great (306-337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 73</td>
<td>Julian (360-363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 74</td>
<td>Constantine the Great (306-337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 75</td>
<td>Licinius (308-324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 76-79</td>
<td>Julian (360-363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 80</td>
<td>Valentinian I (364-375)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 81</td>
<td>Galla Placidia, regent to Valentinian III (423-437); Bonifacius and Flavius Aetius, both Roman generals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 82</td>
<td>Valentinian III (424-455); Petronius Maximus (455)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U. Roberto considers excerpts 66-82 as part of John of Antioch’s chronicle. In his view, John of Antioch drew on Eutropius, Zosimus, Ammianus Marcellinus and Priscus. The following table shows the parallel passages for each of the excerpts 66-82 as suggested by U. Roberto.\(^99\)\(^100\)

---

99 Roberto (2005b).
100 Roberto (2005b).
Table 16: the *Exc.Salm.II* 66-82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpts</th>
<th>parallel passages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 66</td>
<td>Dexippus, <em>FGrHist</em> 100 F 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 67</td>
<td>Zosimus, <em>Historia nova</em> I 67,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 68</td>
<td>Eutropius, <em>Breviarium</em> IX 18,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 69</td>
<td>Eutropius, <em>Breviarium</em> IX 19,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 70</td>
<td>Diodorus of Sicily, <em>Bibliotheca historica</em> IV 5,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts 73</td>
<td>Ammianus Marcellinus, <em>Res Gestae</em> XV 8,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 74</td>
<td>Ammianus Marcellinus, <em>Res Gestae</em> XXI 14,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 75</td>
<td>Ammianus Marcellinus, <em>Res Gestae</em> XVI 10,16; Zosimus, <em>Historia nova</em> II 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 76</td>
<td>Ammianus Marcellinus, <em>Res Gestae</em> XVIII 1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 80</td>
<td>Eunapius fr. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 81</td>
<td>Marcellinus Comes, <em>Annales</em> 432,2-3; Procopius, <em>De bellis</em> 3.3.14-36; Jordanes, <em>Romana</em> 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 82</td>
<td>Hydatius, <em>Chronicon</em> 167; Procopius, <em>De bellis</em> 4.4.16-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpts 66 and 67 are not closely based on Dexippus and Zosimus, respectively. The text in the *Exc.Salm.II* is largely abridged. The end of the *Exc.Salm.II* 66 (Τὰ γυναικὰς βουλομένας ἐγκύους γενέσθαι λέγουσι πίνειν ἀπὸ τοῦ Στρυμόνος ποταμοῦ καὶ κύειν) is absent in the passage attributed to Dexippus by Syncellus. There is no proof that the text was part of a lost fragment in Dexippus’ *Skythika*. Moreover, the beginning of the *Exc.Salm.II* 66 departs from Dexippus in terms of language and style, as well. Similarly, *Exc.Salm.II* 67 deviates from Zosimus’ text. Though the *Exc.Salm.II* 67 transmits the piece of information found in Zosimus, the vocabulary is thoroughly different. For instance, the *Exc.Salm.II* 67 gives ἐποίησαν instead of συντεθῆναι, while the phrase Ἐπὶ Αὐρηλιανοῦ ψεκάδες ἀργυρὰ κατηνέχθησαν is absent in Zosimus.

Table 17: the *Exc.Salm.II* 66 and 78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Exc.Salm.II</em> 66</th>
<th>Dexippus 100 F 22 (cf. Syncellus, <em>Ecloga chronographica</em> 459,5-16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Γάλλου βασιλεύσαντος, ιε’ ἕτη (μήνας?) ἐκράτησε λοιμός, κινηθεὶς ἀπὸ Αἰθιοπίας ἔως τῆς δύσεως μετεδίδοτο δὲ ἀπὸ ἰματίων καὶ ψυλῆς θέας καὶ οἱ Σκύθαι περάσαντες τὸν Ἰστρον ἐλαβον φ’ πόλεις. Τὰ γυναῖκας βουλομένας ἐγκύους γενέσθαι λέγουσι πίνειν ἀπὸ τοῦ Στρυμόνος ποταμοῦ καὶ κύειν.</td>
<td>Σκύθαι περασώντες οἱ λεγόμενοι Γότθοι τὸν Ἰστρον ποταμὸν ἐπὶ Δέκιον πλεῖστοι τὴν Ῥωμαίοις ἐπικράτειαν κατενέμοντο. οὗτοι τοῦ Μυσοῦ εὐγοντας εἰς Νικόπολιν περιέσχον. Δέκιος δὲ ἐπελθὼν αὐτοῖς, ὡς Δέξιππος ἵστορει, καὶ τρισμυρίους κείνας ἐλατοῦτα κατὰ τὴν μάχην, ώς καὶ τὴν Φιλιππούπολιν (...) βασιλεά πάλαι τινὰ γενόμενον ὑπατὸν Γάλλον ἀναγερέσουσιν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same holds true for excerpts 68-69, which transmit a heavily summarised version of Eutropius’ text.

**Table 18: the Exc.Salm.II 68 and 69**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exc.Salm.II 68</th>
<th>Eutropius, Breviarium IX 18,2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Νουμεριανός τυφλωθείς ἐν κεκαλυμμένῳ φορείῳ ἀπὸ Περσίδος ἐβαστάζετο· δέλω λάθρα καταρραγεόμενος κατηνέχθησαν. Επὶ Αὐρηλιανοῦ ψεκάδες ἀργυραὶ καθηνέχθησαν.</td>
<td>Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον ὁ παῖς Νουμεριανός, συνεκστρατεύσας, ἐκ τῶν ὅμων γεγονές, κατ' ὅικα κατήγαγε σωροῖς, καὶ συγκατήγαγε ταῖς φακάσι καὶ σῖτον, ὥστε καὶ σωροὺς αὐτομᾶτως ἐν τόποις τισὶ συντεθήναι.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exc.Salm.II 69</th>
<th>Eutropius, Breviarium IX 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Καρῖνος ὁμότατος ἦν· δὲ καὶ τοὺς ποτε ἐν τῷ παιδευτηρίῳ σκώψαντας εἰς αὐτὸν ἠμύνατο. | Ἔν τούτῳ δὲ ὄντων τῶν ἐκ Περσίδος ἐπανίοντων, Καρῖνος ὁ καταλειψθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς Ἰλλυριοῦς τε καὶ γάλλως φυλάττειν καὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν, πάσας ὑπερβᾶς ἀτοπίας, τοὺς μὲν ἀνήρει, πλάτων ἐγκλήματα, τῶν δὲ τὰς εὐνᾶς ὑβρίζειν. Ἡδὲ δὲ καὶ τῶν συμπεφοιτήκοτῶν αὐτῶ τινας ὑπὲρ τῶν γενομένων ἐν τῇ νεότητι
The textual discrepancies rule out any direct link between the *Exc.Salm.II* and the above presented passages from Dexippus, Zosimus and Eutopius. Besides, such a link would be irreconcilable and incongruous with the excerpting method throughout the *Exc.Salm.II*. The *Exc.Salm.II*, as the employment of the excerpted passages from Dio Cassius shows, remain close to their sources in terms of structure, vocabulary and style. Such incompatibility in content and style between, on the one hand, the *Exc.Salm.II* and, on the other, Dexippus, Eutropius and Zosimus seem to point to an intermediate stage of development of the information preserved in the three historians.

As far as excerpts 73-78 are concerned, B. Bleckmann satisfactorily showed that they do not stem from Ammianus Marcellinus; the *Exc.Salm.II* and Ammianus made, instead, use of a common source. In particular, B. Bleckmann argues that the final part of the *Exc.Salm.II* derives, for the most part, from a high-quality late antique source. In B. Bleckmann’s view, the *Exc.Salm.II* 66-79 draw on the so-called *Leoquelle*, a source covering events of the third and fourth centuries. The *Leoquelle*, which exhibits similarities with the history of Ammianus Marcellinus in content, was also used by Peter the Patrician as well as by a number of later Byzantine works, such as Logothetes’ chronicle, the *Σύνοψη Ἰστοριῶν* by George Kedrenos and the *Ἐπιτομὴ Ἰστοριῶν* by John Zonaras. B. Bleckmann identified Nicomachus Flavianus as the author of the *Leoquelle*.

On internal evidence (common pagan, anti-Constantinian and philo-Julian elements) and on the basis of parallels with Zonaras and Symeon Logothetes the *Exc.Salm.II* appear to have made use of the *Leoquelle* in the following excerpts:

---

102 Bleckmann (2010), 57-58.
103 In the 1980s, M. DiMaio argued that Zonaras drew on John of Antioch; cf. DiMaio (1980), 158-185. M. DiMaio’s arguments relied on previous research on the matter done by E. Patzig; cf. Patzig (1896), 24-53 and Patzig (1897), 322-356. Their hypothesis was strongly questioned when P. Sotiroudis postulated that the Salmasian John of Antioch is spurious; cf. Sotiroudis (1989).
105 Table 19 is based on Bleckmann (2010), 58-59.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>Parallel</th>
<th>Other evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Zonaras, Epitome historiarum 12,21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Zonaras, Epitome historiarum 12,29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Pagan and Anti-Constantinian elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Amm. Marcellinus, Res Gestae XV,8,17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Amm. Marcellinus, Res Gestae XXI,14,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Amm. Marcellinus, Res Gestae XVI,10,16; Zosimus, Historia nova II 27; Zonaras, Epitome historiarum 13,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Philo-Julian elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Amm. Marcellinus, Res Gestae XVIII 1,4; Zonaras, Epitome historiarum 12,8-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Pagan and Philo-Julian elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpts 68, 69 and 70 are also likely to derive from the Leoquelle, for they show affinities with pagan late antique historiography in content and style.\(^{106}\) Excerpts 71, 76, 80, 81 and 82, by contrast, do not belong to the same tradition. Excerpt 71 shows parallels with a passage in Manasses’ Breviarium Chronicum, written ca 1145.\(^{107}\) Excerpt 76, which deals with a dream of the emperor Julian, remains unidentified. Excerpt 80 is an excerpt from Malalas’ Chronographia.\(^{108}\) According to excerpt 80, the emperor Vallentinian I burned alive a man called Rhodanos who had seized some property from a widow. The anonymous compiler returns to Malalas and he, once again, singled out the most important pieces of information of Malalas’ text and unified these in a new entity. Excerpts 81 records that Galla Placidia, regent to Valentinian III (423-437) had two generals: Bonifacius and Flavius Aetius. Bonifacius was given Libya to rule. Aetius was seized with jealousy and he plotted to overthrow Bonifacius. His plan, however, was not

---

\(^{106}\) Bleckmann (2010), 58-59.
\(^{107}\) On the dating of the Breviarium Chronicum see Jeffreys (2012), 273-274.
\(^{108}\) Malalas, Chronographia 13,31.
successful. Excerpt 82 records the assassinations of Aetius and Valentinian III, plotted by Petronius Maximus. Both passages show similarities with Procopius’ *De bellis*. The record of events in the *Exc.Salm.II* and Procopius differ markedly with what is transmitted in the Constantinian John of Antioch, which is based on Priscus’ account. B. Bleckmann argues that the textual comparison of the *Exc.Salm.II* and Procopius’ *De bellis* suggests that the *Exc.Salm.II* relied on an intermediary source containing Procopius.

To sum up, the textual transmission of the *Exc.Salm.II* does not lead to a definitive conclusion regarding the sources used by the compiler. De Boor’s view that the *Exc.Salm.II* was a *sylloge* of excerpts taken from a single chronicle does not seem to be tenable, given the difference in style and narrative technique in excerpts 44-82. Boissevain’s assertion that excerpts 1-44 and 45-82 derive from two distinctive, now lost, chronicles, respectively, comes closer to the evidence detected above. Excerpts 45-65 and 66-82 obviously belong to two different traditions, though. Despite their thematic uniformity, it is not likely that they were excerpted from a single text (a chronicle in U. P. Boissevain’s view). As mentioned above, the use of certain passages from Cassius Dio points to an earlier collection of *Dio*-excerpts. In my view, the *Exc.Salm.II* appear to have been compiled from a) excerpts from a now lost work based on Malalas’ text, from what I indicated (Ψ) in my stemma (*Exc.Salm.II A*), b) passages excerpted from a collection of excerpts by Cassius Dio and Peter the Patrician (*Exc.Salm.II B*, first part), and c) excerpts from a now lost source on events of the third and fourth centuries, possibly from what Bleckmann calls the *Leoquellae*. This series of excerpts was augmented with passages taken from later sources, namely Procopius and Malalas (*Exc.Salm.II B*, second part).

### Table 20: the source texts of the *Exc.Salm.II*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Exc.Salm.II</em></th>
<th>source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II A</em> 1-43</td>
<td>(Ψ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II B</em> 44-65</td>
<td>A collection of excerpts from Cassius Dio and Peter the Patrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II B</em> 66-82</td>
<td><em>Leoquellae</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

109 Exc. 81 = Procopius, *De bellis* 3.3.14-36; excerpt 82 = Procopius, *De bellis* 4.4.16-28.

110 This is a further indication that the *Exc.Salm.II* do not belong to the chronicle by John of Antioch.

111 Bleckmann (2010), 60-61.
3.3.3 The Agathias-part

The last part of the sylloge makes up a brief collection of excerpts extracted from a single historical work, namely the Historiae by Agathias of Myrina. The part comprises 52 excerpts on ethnography and geography and was attached to the so-called Excerpta Salmasiana in order to form a coherent sylloge of excerpts. Thematically, the excerpts deal with the Franks, the Goths, the Alamanni, the Colchians and the Sassanians. In particular, the excerpts are thematically divided into three parts; excerpts 1-13 and 52 are concerned with the West, excerpts 14-43 are concerned with Egypt, the Caucasus and Persia, and excerpts 44-51 are concerned with Constantinople. The first group of excerpts takes up the narrative thread at the point where the Exc.Salm.II had left off, namely, western affairs. In terms of subject matter, the second group is similarly compatible with the Exc.Salm.I as well as with the first part of the Exc.Salm.II. Excerpts 44-51 deal with the two earthquakes that hit Constantinople in 557 and 558, respectively and record two tricks played by Anthemius, the architect of the Hagia Sophia, on Zeno. The 52 excerpts of the codex Vaticanus gr. 96 are edited for the first time in the appendix of the thesis. The numbers in bold throughout the text body indicate the beginning of a new excerpt. The critical apparatus gives the passages in Agathias’ Historiae to which each excerpt in the Vaticanus gr. 96 corresponds. The excerpts are accompanied by a commentary. The commentary serves to explain internal inconsistencies of the Agathias-part and contains informative references to figures, places and events central to the selection of excerpts.

3.4 The selective use of historical material in the Excerpta Salmasiana

The study of the content of the Agathias-part enables us to contextualise the Excerpta Salmasiana and sheds light on the reciprocal influence between late antique texts and the 10th century Constantinopolitan cultural environment. In what follows, I shall first discuss the function of the ethnographic passages in Agathias, and then consider the function they assume in the different cultural and political context within the Excerpta Salmasiana were compiled.

---

112Keydell (ed.) (1967); Frendo (transl.) (1975).
113See Appendix I: text III.
3.4.1 Agathias on the others

Following the example of Procopius, Agathias augmented his Historiae by a good deal of ethnographic and geographical accounts. Specifically, beside his short accounts of the Alamani (Historiae 1.6.3–7), the Franks (Historiae 1.19.2, 2.5.2.8, 2.14.8–11), the Colchians (Historiae 2.18.4–5) and the Dilimnitai (Historiae 3.17.6–9), Agathias enriched his narrative with three long excursus, one on the Franks (Historiae 1.2.1–7.7) and two on Persia (Historiae 2.22.6–27.9, 4.23.7–30.5). In all of them, Agathias reflects on the religion, culture and military tactics of the barbarians.

As far as the digression on the Franks is concerned, Agathias deviates from the traditional hostile representation of the Franks in late antique historiography. Scholarship has long recognized Agathias’ eulogy of the Franks as well as the distortion of reality in their representation.114 Agathias’ positive attitude towards the Franks has been read by scholarship in more than one way. Some scholars explained Agathias’ eulogy of the Franks in the light of the political situation in Constantinople in the early 570s; the court was seeking Frankish help in driving the Lombards out of Italy.115 This view is, however, challenged by A. Kaldellis, who assigned Agathias’ praise of the Franks to the historian’s moral agenda, attested also in the preface to his work. According to this line of thinking, Agathias desired to teach Romans a moral lesson through a praiseful representation of the Franks.116 Whether one opts for the first or the second interpretation, what is certain is that Agathias’ passages on western or eastern peoples reveal more about the Romans themselves than about the nations in question.

The first of the two long digressions on Persia are concerned with customs and religious beliefs of the Sassanians.117 The second digression deals with the annals of the Sassanian kings.118 For both, Agathias drew his material mostly from the Persian Royal Annals119 as recounted to him by Sergius, an interpreter who had been to the Sasanian

---


117 Agathias, Historiae 2.22.6–27.9.

118 Agathias, Historiae 4.23.7–30.5.

119 Agathias refers to this work as the Περσικαὶ βιβλίοι and βασιλικὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα; cf. Historiae 4.30.2 and 4.30.3. Av. Cameron has no doubt that the Annals must have originally been written in Pahlavi, that is Persian.; cf. Cameron (1969-1970), 162. From a different view, suggesting that the Royal Annals were first written in Syriac, see Baumstark (1894), 368-369. The Persian Royal Annals were extensively used by the now lost Book of Lords or Khvadhaynamaghi. Later Arabic and Persian chroniclers drew heavily on the Khvadhaynamaghi; cf. Cameron (1969-1970), 112. For the Persian archives, see Lee (1993), 177.
court during an embassy. In addition to this source, Agathias supplemented his account with material derived from popular accounts of the Sassanians as well as from an earlier handbook of chronology. The content of the two accounts reveals that Agathias was much interested in representing the various Persian dynasties as well as the characteristics and qualities of the Persian kings. Even the first of the two excursuses on Persia, dealing ostensibly with Persian religious customs, includes a brief chronological subsection cataloguing the Persian kingdoms from the Assyrian dynasty onwards (Historiae 2.25.4-26.1).

Throughout his Historiae, Agathias follows the traditional ethnographical model of differentiating between the superior Romans and the inferior foreigners in terms of culture but not in terms of military capacity. Indeed, beside Agathias, other writers of the same period hint at a possible admiration for the barbarians’ achievements, both, in war and in diplomacy. Attention should be drawn to the fact that it is only the Oriental world that attracts such a positive portrayal in late antique historiography; Agathias, Procopius, Peter the Patrician and Ps.-Maurice’s Strategikon provide us with sufficient evidence that the Romans had great respect for the Sassanian’s patriotism, braveness on the battlefield and diplomatic maneuvers.

By contrast, the attitude of late antique historians towards western people was different. Procopius, for instance, when digressing briefly on the Vandals, the Heruls and the people of Brittia, confines himself to only giving classical negative stereotypes. Thus, he emphasised the distinction between the uncivilised barbarians and the civilised Romans in his endeavour to justify Roman imperialism. The willingness of historians of Late Antiquity to accept that the Sassanians were not inferior to the Romans in war and

120 Agathias claims that his version should be preferred over that of Procopius because it is based on the Persian archives; cf. Historiae 4.30.5.
121 In fact, the excursus contains little material directly from the Annals. According to Av. Cameron, Agathias should have had no any familiarity with earlier Greek historiographical accounts of the customs of the Sassanians. On the sources, in general, used by Agathias for the Sassanians’ religion see Cameron (1969-1970), 90-111.
122 The Strategikon praises the Persians (cf. Ps.-Maurice, Strategikon 11.4). Menander represents favourably the Persian diplomat Yesdegusnaph (cf. Menander fr. 6.1.100-101). See also Agathias, Historiae 2.22.5, 2.28.1-6, 2.32.5 and Procopius, De belis 1.2.1-10, 1.2.11-15, 1.7.29-35, 1.11.1-35. See also Peter the Patrician’s positive view of Persia (cf. Peter the Patrician, fr. 13; FHG 188).
123 The topic has been treated in Canepa (2009), 79-121, 188-225; McDonough (2010), 55-66; Drijvers (2010), 67-76.
124 Procopius, De belis 4.6.5-14 on the Vandals; Procopius, De belis 5.15, 6.14-15 on the Heruls and peoples of Thulle; Procopius, De belis 8.20 on peoples of Brittia. Unlike Agathias, Procopius’ opinion of the Franks was very negative as well (cf. Procopius, De belis 6.25.1-9). It should be noticed that Agathias emphasises only the Frankish political institution and religion, which according to him are identical to those of the Romans. I would argue in favour of A. Kaldellis’ view, that Agathias’ account of the politeia of the Franks aimed to criticize the Roman social and political institution; cf. Kaldellis (2013), 21-25.
diplomacy can be understood in relation to the political context of the sixth century. A possible explanation could be that those historians espoused a positive approach to the Persians after having met them on embassies or diplomatic missions.\(^{126}\) Another reason could be sought in the need to create a strong adversary in order to juxtapose the qualities of the Byzantine Empire, all the more so since in Late Antiquity the Byzantines had already been defeated several times by the military strength of the Sassanians.\(^{127}\) But first and foremost, depictions of despotic Persian kings were meant to criticize Roman emperors, whereas favourable portrayals of the Persian army or diplomacy should be interpreted as veiled attempts to disapprove of the diplomatic policies of Roman emperors.\(^{128}\)

It should be noticed that after the 7th century, ethnographical accounts were reduced markedly; unlike their predecessors, middle Byzantine authors do not write contemporary ethnography, and middle Byzantine ambassadors are not open to recounting what they saw on their journeys.\(^{129}\) But ethnography did not disappear completely. In the middle Byzantine period, short ethnographical and geographical passages are to be found in texts, though not in histories or chronicles in the classical sense. Theophanes is a prime example of a middle period chronicler who avoids including descriptions of peoples in his work.\(^{130}\) Contrary to Theophanes’ text, the Taktika by Leo VI,\(^{131}\) a military treatise, Photius’ Bibliotheca\(^{132}\), the DAI, a manual of domestic and foreign policy by Constantine Porphyrogenitus,\(^{133}\) and the Vita Basilii,\(^{134}\) a historical biography, abound with ethnographic and geographical material. In addition to this, ethnographic passages were excerpted from classical and late antique writers and incorporated into collections of historical excerpts, such as the Excerpta Anonymi and the Excerpta Salmasiana. It becomes manifest, therefore, that after the 7th century we only encounter short ethnographies or ethnographical excerpts inserted in a variety of literary structures. The issue to be investigated is what literary and political purposes the selection, extraction and representation of ethnographic or geographical excerpts serve in the subsequent centuries of Byzantine history.

\(^{126}\)That could be the case of Procopius, Menander and Peter the Patrician; cf. McDonough (2010), 57-59.
\(^{127}\)An idea proposed by J. W. Drijvers, without, however, to be further developed; cf. Drijvers (2010), 75.
\(^{128}\)It is noteworthy that John Lydus’ interest in Persian institutions should be viewed in the light of conveying implicit criticism of Justinian’s institutional reforms; cf. John Lydus, De Magistratibus 3.34. On the politics of ethnography in late antique historiography see Maas (1992); Kelly (1994), 161-176; Kaldellis, (2013), esp. 10ff.
\(^{131}\)Dennis (ed.) (2010).
\(^{133}\)Moravcsik – Jenkins (edd.) (1967).
3.4.2 The politics of ethnography in the Agathias-part of the Excerpta Salmasiana

In the following, I argue that the excerptor of the Agathias-part must have made a heedful selection of passages from Agathias and imbued them with a new meaning. As noted, Agathias’ ethnographic accounts of western peoples as well as of the Sassanians serve certain literary purposes, namely, that of providing the Romans with moral paradigms and criticizing current imperial policies. The sequence of excerpts in the Exc.Salm., instead, does not fulfill the same political function and objective. To my view, the Agathias-part narrates the traditional cultural distinction between Romans and barbarians in order to reinforce the geographical and political frontiers already in place. The tenor of the concatenation of excerpts is determined by the political context of the 10th century. In what follows, the numeration of the excerpts from the Agathias-part is the one given in my edition of the text presented in the appendix of this thesis.

Agathias’ goals required him to digress on the political system of the Franks (Historiae A 19,2) and enrich his narrative with a comparison between the Franks and the Alamanni (Historiae A 6,3-7). The excerptor of the Agathias-part, by contrast, excised any reference to the social order, government or religion of the Franks or the Alamanni (excerpts 1 and 2). The Agathias-part does not share Agathias’ eulogy of the Franks either. In the Agathias-part the Franks are alike barbarians. The excerptor limits himself to briefly recording the derivation of the names of the Franks (excerpt 1) and the Alamanni (excerpt 2) and he stresses that the latter are a dark-skinned people (excerpt 2). It should be noticed that Procopius (De bellis 4.6.5-14) correlated the darker skin with negative moral characteristics and when he portrays the Epthalitai favourably he puts emphasis on their white skin stating that they were not as ugly as the other Huns (Procopius, De bellis 1.3.2-7). The excerptor of the Agathias-part depicts barbarians in a positive light, only when he comes to refer to their successes in war. For instance, during the siege of Cumae by the Byzantines, Aligern, a Goth military leader, killed Palladius, a Roman official and companion of the Roman general Narses (excerpt 3). There is nothing negative in the description of Aligern. On the contrary, Aligern is described as, ἄριστος ἐπὶ τοξικῆ (excerpt 3).

Similarly, the representation of the Persian burial customs (excerpt 17, 25), the Persian habit of incest (excerpts 18, 19), their pagan feasts (excerpt 20) and their dualism (excerpt 21) serve to enhance the cultural superiority of the Byzantines over the Persians. In the Agathias-part any, even, negative reference to the political system of the Sassanians is absent. In sixth-century Byzantium, such allusions served, as already mentioned, as a

135Exc 3: Aligern, one of the leaders of the Goths, was so excellent in throwing javelins that when he shot an arrow, even if it happened to strike against a stone or some other hard object, it smashed it to pieces with the sheer force of its trajectory. He shot an arrow from the wall at Palladius, a general of the Romans, which ran through the man’s shield, breastplate and body.
covert expression of political opposition and a criticism of the despotic system imposed by Justinian. In the 10th century, instead, such a strategy was out of date. Accordingly, in the Agathias-part, Persian despotism is not topical anymore and what is needed to be emphasised is a) the false religion of the Persians as well as the danger of coming into contact with their infidel beliefs and customs and b) their brutality, savagery and ferocity in war, from which the Romans had severely suffered in the past. Significantly, the latter implies, likewise, how many perils and hazards were to meet them again in a fight. Thus, the Roman emperor Valerian was captured, tortured and eventually flayed to death (excerpt 38). Cappadocia was savagely and fiercely pillaged by Shapur’s army (excerpt 39). Persian kings tend to treat defeated rival leaders to the most lamentable and deplorable fate (excerpt 40). From this perspective, the Agathias-part is compatible with attempts to deal with Islam in Byzantine literature after the 7th century. After the Arab conquests, Byzantine historians, theologians and philosophers view Arabs and their religion as a deviation of the true religion, that could threaten and contaminate Orthodox Christianity.\footnote{The examples of religious polemic in Byzantine literature given by Kaldellis (2013), 76 do not simply reflect theological attacks against Islam on the part of the Byzantines. The sources reveal also their concern about a likely contact with the infectious beliefs of Islam. On the hostile views of Byzantines towards Islam after Arab conquests see Ducellier (1996), 146-174.}

To my mind, the Exc.Salm. are witness to the ideological consequences of the shrinkage of the Empire after the seventh century. The snippets of ethnography in the collection of excerpts reveal, obliquely, the geopolitical position of Constantinople. The excerptor bases himself on classical models of representation of the other. Thus, like classical ethnographers, the excerptor of the Agathias-part underscores the distinctiveness between Romans and barbarians. Unlike his late antique predecessors (Procopius, John Lydus, Peter the Patrician, Agathias and Menander), he omits any outrightly or covertly positive assertion of the Persian civilisation, moral character or military capacity of individual Persian kings. The excerpts emphasise the otherness of opponents to Byzantium insofar as any contact with their irreconcilable and perilous beliefs as well as their cruelty and inhumanity in war are deemed to be dangerous and undesirable. Thus, the purpose of the ethnographical selection in the Exc.Salm. differs markedly from that of the late antique writers. The change of the geographical status-quo (the definite loss of the eastern provinces in the 7th century and of central and Northern Italy in the 9th-10th centuries)\footnote{On the impact of the Arab conquests on the Constantinopolitan policies see Whittow (1996), esp. chapter 6.} fundamentally altered the political context within which ethnography was written.\footnote{This altered perception of late antique ethnographic accounts is detected in the Excerpta Anonymi too. See section 2.5.2.2.}
3.5 Towards the methodological principles of the *Excerpta Salmasiana*

This section scrutinizes the methodological principles underlying the compilation process of the *Exc.Salm*. The examination of the structure of the *Exc.Salm* in the previous sections revealed how the historical excerpts were arranged in the collection of excerpts. This section sets out to embark upon a detailed analysis of single excerpts included in the *Exc.Salm*. The comparison of passages in the *Exc.Salm* with the original texts, as preserved in earlier manuscripts, will shed light on the textual alterations as well as on structural modifications made by the excerptor of the *Exc.Salm*. The analysis of the textual interventions on the part of the excerptor of the *Exc.Salm* enables us to reconstruct the three steps of redacting an excerpt collection as seen already in the *EC* and the *Excerpta Anonymi*: a. reading of the whole source text and selection of passages, b. rewriting of the source text, and c. composition of a new unity.

In what follows, I present a number of instances of the changes imposed on the original text in the course of the redaction of the *Exc.Salm*. The focus will be on the last part of the *Exc.Salm*., namely the *Agathias*-part, which comprises 52 excerpts selected thematically, since ethnography and geography dominate the sylloge of excerpts. It is also noteworthy that the excerptor endeavoured to keep up to the original sequence of the passages. It is only in three cases that an excerpt breaks up the succession of the passages in Agathias’ *Historiae*. 139

Before discussing the textual alterations detected in the *Agathias*-part, I would like to note that a significant portion of excerpts (21 out of 52 excerpts) is identical or very nearly identical to the text transmitted by the primary *Agathias*-manuscript tradition. 140 The rest (32 excerpts) exhibits textual deviations. The alterations do not modify the original narrative sequence, though. Accordingly, the excerptor of the *Agathias*-part intervenes in the original text but he does not epitomize it. His principles of re-editing material extracted from a historical text are identical to those detected in the *EC* and the *Excerpta Anonymi*. The excerptor chose to appropriate rather than to synopsize the original narrative. In this way, he intervenes in the old text insofar as to make its content suitable for the aims of his collection.

a) additions and excisions

In 13 excerpts in particular one or more words, taken out of the original text, were added to the beginning of the excerpt. 141 Such additions were intended to plug the gaps in the context that had arisen when extracting a single passage from the whole unit. Let us have a look at *Agathias*-excerpt 3 of the *Exc.Salm*. The passage originally comes from

---

139 Excerpts 21, 30 and 49.
140 On the primary *Agathias*-manuscript tradition see Keydell (1967), XI-XXXIV.
141 See the numeration of excerpts in table 26.
the section where Agathias narrates the siege of the city of Cumae by the Byzantines. The Agathias-part extracted the following episode: in the course of a fight, a Roman general named Palladius was killed by a Goth military figure named Aligern. The historical context of the episode is missing; e.g., the Byzantine attempt to subdue Cumae. Thus, the focus shifts to the proficiency of the Goth leader in throwing arrows.

Table 21: the Agathias-excerpt 3 of the Exc.Salm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agathias, Historiae 1.9.3-4</th>
<th>Exc.Salm. excerpt 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. τὰ γε μὴν Ἀλιγέρνου τοξεῦματα καὶ μᾶλα τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ἀρίδηλα ἦν. ῥόις τε γὰρ πολλῷ καὶ ταχυτῆτι οὐ σταθμητῇ τὰ ἐκείνου ἐφέρετο βέλη, ως εἴπερ καὶ ἐς λίθον τινὰ ἐμπέσον ἢ ἔτερον τι σκληρὸν καὶ ἀτέραμνον, διαρρήγνυσθαι ἤπεα τῇ βίᾳ τῆς ῥύμης. 4. Παλλάδιον γούν ἐκείνον (ἵν δὲ οὗ τὸν ἐραφθυμημένον παρὰ τῷ Ναρὸς ὁ Παλλάδιος, ἀλλὰ στρατεύματός τε ἡγεῖτο Ῥωμαίκῳ καὶ ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις ταξιάρχοις ἐτέλει,) ἱδὼν γούν αὐτὸν Ἀλιγέρνος σιδήρῳ τεθωρακισμένον καὶ φρονήματι ξύν πολλῷ τῷ τείχῃ ἐπιφερόμενον ἀφίησι βέλος αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ μετεώρου καὶ αὐτίκα διεπερόνησε τὸν ἄνδρα διαμπάξ αὐτῷ θώρακι καὶ ἁπάδι.</td>
<td>3. Ἀλιγέρνος τις Γότθος ἡγεμῶν τοσούτον ἦν ἄριστος ἐπὶ τοξικῇ ὡστε εἰ ἐπαφηκε βέλος, κἂν εἰς λίθον τινὰ ἐνέπεσεν ἢ εἰς ἔτερον τι ἀτέραμνον, διαρρήγνυσθα ἄπαν τῇ βίᾳ τῆς ῥύμης. Παλλάδιον γούν, Ῥωμαίον στρατηγὸν, βαλών ἄπο τοῦ τείχους διαμπάξ τὸν ἄνδρα διεπερόνησεν αὐτῷ θώρακι καὶ ἁπάδι.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it becomes clear from the texts in the table, the opening of excerpt 3 (Ἀλιγέρνος τις Γότθος ἡγεμῶν) is absent in Historiae 1.9.3-4. In fact, this passage derives from an earlier section in Agathias’ text. In Historiae 1.8.6 Agathias introduces us to Aligern: Ἀλιγέρνος γὰρ ὁ Τεία νεώτατος ἀδελφὸς τοῦ ἡγεμόνος τῶν Γότθων. The excerptor of the Agathias-part appears to be aware of the fact that splitting a text and extracting a piece of information from it might cause a certain incomprehensibility. Indeed, the insertion of the aforementioned phrase into excerpt 3 makes the excerpt intelligible and transforms it into an independent piece of text. The same strategy to overcome such obstacles in excerpting a text is to be found in other collections of historical excerpts as well (the EC, the Excerpta Anonymi, the Epitome, and the Excerpta Planudea).

In most cases, that is, in 24 out of 52 excerpts material which was originally found in Agathias’ text was reduced. On the one hand, such omissions served the compiler’s intent to include as much thematically connected material as wanted. On the other hand, omissions served the compiler’s aim at accuracy and brevity, principles which are
outlined in the preface to the EC. Let us consider excerpt 6, which like excerpt 3, belongs to the context of Narses’ expedition in Italy.

### Table 22: the Agathias-excerpt 6 of the Exc.Salm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agathias, Historiae 1.11.3</th>
<th>Exc.Salm. excerpt 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ἐκέλευσεν ἀμα Ἰωάννη τῷ Βιταλιανοῦ καὶ πρὸς γε Βαλεριανῷ καὶ Ἄρταβάνῃ καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄλλης στρατηγοῖς καὶ ταξιάρχοις ξύν τῷ πλείονι καὶ ἄλκιμωτῶς στρατῷ τάς Ἀλπεῖς τό ὄρος περιέλθόντας, ὅ δὴ ἐν μέσῳ Τούσκιας τῆς χώρας καὶ Αἰμιλίας ἀνέχει. Αἱ γὰρ Ἰωάννης καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν τέσσαρας ἐις ἄλλοις στρατηγοῖς καὶ ταξιαρχοῖς ἠλέθη στρατοπεδευσαμένους καὶ τὰ ἐρυμνά ἅρπος περιελθόντας, ὃ δὴ ἐν μέσῳ Τούσκιας τῆς χώρας καὶ Αἰμιλίας ἀνέχει. Αἱ γὰρ Ἰωάννης καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν τέσσαρας ἐις ἄλλοις στρατηγοῖς καὶ ταξιαρχοῖς ἠλέθη στρατοπεδευσαμένους καὶ τὰ ἐρυμνά ἅρπος περιελθόντας, ὃ δὴ ἐν μέσῳ Τούσκιας τῆς χώρας καὶ Αἰμιλίας ἀνέχει. Αἱ γὰρ Ἰωάννης καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν τέσσαρας ἐις ἄλλοις στρατηγοῖς καὶ ταξιαρχοῖς ἠλέθη στρατοπεδευσαμένους καὶ τὰ ἐρυμνά ἅρπος περιελθόντας, ὃ δὴ ἐν μέσῳ Τούσκιας τῆς χώρας καὶ Αἰμιλίας ἀνέχει.

In Agathias’ text, Narses comes to realize that it was impossible to take Cumae at that time and so orders his forces to move to the region of Tuscany and attempt to restore control over the towns there. He therefore ordered Fulcaris, the new leader of the Heruls, to set off along with John, the nephew of Vitalian, with Valerian and Artabanes and other Roman generals and commanders for the area surrounding the river Po. Narses instructed them to go through the Alps, that is, between Tuscany and Emilia. The excerptor of the Agathias-part left out the entire historical context and only singled out the geographical note on the Alps. The excerptor’s awareness of the lack of context in the new excerpt leads him to a dual intervention: he adds the conjunction ὅτι at the head of the excerpt and excises the περιελθόντας (the participle would not make sense without the verb ἐκέλευσεν and its historical context) originally found in the middle of the sentence.

Excerpt 15 represents a similar case, as well. The rewriting of the original text consists in both, textual insertions and omissions. Excerpt 15 deals with the origins of the Lazi. According to the ancient tradition, the Lazi are descended from the Egyptians.

### Table 23: Agathias-excerpt 15 of the Exc.Salm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agathias, Historiae 2.1.4-5</th>
<th>Exc.Salm. excerpt 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 οἱ δὲ Λαζόι Κόλχοι τὸ παλαιὸν ὤνομάζοντο, καὶ οὕτως ἔκεινοι τυχχάνουσιν ὄντες, τοῦτο τε οὐκ ἄν τις ἀμφιγνόησε τεκμαίρόμενος τῷ τῷ Φάσιδι καὶ Καυκάσῳ καὶ τῇ περὶ τοῦτα ἐκ πλείστου οἴκησε. 5 λέγεται δὲ τούς Κόλχους Ἀιγυπτίων ἐνναὶ ἀποίκους, φασὶ γὰρ πολλῷ ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ ἐπίπλου τῶν | 15. οἱ νῦν λεγόμενοι Λαζόι, Κόλχοι τὸ παλαιὸν ὤνομάζοντο εἰσὶ δὲ Ἀιγυπτίων ἀποίκοι. Σεσώστριος βασιλέως Ἀιγύπτου πᾶσαν κατεστρεψαμένου τὴν Ἀσίαν, καὶ ἀπόμοιραι ἐνταῦθα τοῦ ὁμίλου καταλιπόντος.

See above section 1.3.
The phrase νῦν λεγόμενοι in excerpt 15 is a supplement on the part of the excerptor. The phrase, which is not transmitted throughout the relevant section in Agathias’ text, can be found in Historiae 1.2.1, where Agathias refers to the origins of the Franks. The passage has, also, been excerpted in excerpt 1 of the Agathias-part: <Ὀἱ> νῦν λεγόμενοι Φράγγοι, Γερμανὶ παλαιὸν ἐκαλοῦσι καὶ τὴν ταύτῃ ἡπειρον, ἔχουσι δὲ καὶ Γαλλίων τὰ πλείστα. The insertion of the phrase (νῦν λεγόμενοι) in excerpt 15 served to make the text clearer within its new context. The repetition of the same sentence at the beginning of excerpt 15 points to a technique traced in the EC as well: there is an important number of cases in which the same text was included twice, as part of a different excerpt from the same author, in a single or in two different collections of the EC. D. Rafiyenko has spotted 54 such cases throughout the extant parts of the EC.143

b) repositions
In 3 excerpts the intervention on the part of the excerptor consists in a. textual additions or omissions and b. in the re-arranging of words within the old text.144 Excerpt 23 of the Agathias-part, concerning the philosophical interests of Chosroes I, is a typical example.

Table 24: the Agathias-excerpt 23 of the Exc.Salm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agathias, Historiae 2.28.2</th>
<th>Exc.Salm. excerpt 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ βραχεὰ ἄττα περὶ Χοσρόου διεξελθὼν αὐτικὰ ἔγγυαι ἀνά τὰ πρότερα καὶ δὴ ἐπανήξω. ὤμοιοι γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ ἄγανται ρέα τῆς ἄξιας, μὴ ὡσὶν πέρα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔνιοι τῶν Ῥωμαίων, ὡς λόγων ἑρασθὲν καὶ</td>
<td>23. ἐλέγετο περὶ Χοσρόου ὡς ὅλον καταπίοι τὸν Σταγειρίτην ἡπερ τὸν Ὄλλόρου ὁ Παιανιεύς.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

143 The classification of the instances given by D. Rafiyenko seems to blur the methodological strategies of the excerptors even further. Especially the distinction of reiterations she makes between what she calls patchworking and extraction; Rafiyenko (2017), 303-309.

144 See table 26.
The beginning of excerpt 23 (peri Xosroou) is a passage extracted from the preceding paragraph in Agathias’ text. The excerptor, once again, tackled the lack of context for the selected passage by enriching it with information taken from the original text.

c) changes in vocabulary

In 4 other excerpts, the Agathias-part transmits a text which shows marked dissimilarities from the original either in vocabulary or in changes in the word order of the original text. This is the case, for instance, with excerpt 38.

Table 25: the Agathias-excerpt 28 of the Exc.Salm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agathias, Historiae 4.23.7</th>
<th>Exc.Salm. excerpt 38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 ὁ δὲ Σαπώρης ἀδικός τε ὡν ἐς τὰ μάλιστα καὶ μιαφόνος καὶ δέξις μὲν εἰς ὁργὴν καὶ ὕμοστη, βραδὺς δὲ πρὸς φειδώ καὶ συγγνώμην, εἰ μὲν καὶ ἐφ’ ἐτέροις αὐτῷ πρότερον τόδε τὸ ἁγος ἐξειργάσαιται, οὐκ ἔχω σαφῶς ἀπισχύρισασθαι ὅτι δὲ Βαλλεριανὸν τὸν Ῥωμαίων ἐν τῷ τότε βασιλέα προσπολεμήσαντα οἱ καὶ εἶτα νεκρικέμενον, ὁ δὲ ζωγρία ἐλὸν τόνδε τὸν τρόπον ἐτιμωρήσατο, πολλὴ μαρτυροῦσα ἡ ἱστορία</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Σαβώρης ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεὺς πολεμήσαντα οἱ τὸν Ῥωμαίων βασιλέα Βαλλεριανὸν ζωγρία ἐλὼν ἀπέδειρεν ἀπ’ αὐχένος ἀχρὶ ποδῶν.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 38 transmits the lamentable fate of the emperor Valerian, who was flayed to death by Sharpur I. The phrase Σαβώρης ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεὺς introducing excerpt 38 is not transmitted as such by Agathias. But the phrase summarises the context of the entire section in Agathias’ text. The focus of excerpt 38 lies on the savagery and cruelty of the Persian king. The verb ἐτιμωρήσατο was, therefore, substituted with ἀπέδειρεν and the closing passage of excerpt 38 (ἀπ’ αὐχένος ἀχρὶ ποδῶν) is a supplement on the part of the excerptor.

The table below exhibits what was shown in the afore-presented instances: a selected passage could involve two or even three types of changes, e.g. insertions and omissions of material or the re-arranging and omission or addition of material.

Table 26: type of textual changes in the Agathias-part

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No changes</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Omissions</th>
<th>Re-arranging</th>
<th>Changes in vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts: 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 18, 19, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 35, 47</td>
<td>Excerpts: 3, 5, 14, 15, 22, 23, 32, 34, 38, 40, 41, 46, 49</td>
<td>Excerpts: 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 25, 27, 31, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49</td>
<td>Excerpts: 22, 36, 48</td>
<td>Excerpts: 37, 41, 44, 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reworking of selected passages in the Agathias-part involved textual changes similar to those in other collections of historical excerpts, such as the EC and the Excerpta Anonymi. The compilation process in all the aforementioned collections was determined by similar principles and methods, as they are outlined in the preface to the EC. Accordingly, the prime goal of the compilers was the thematic arrangement of the selected material, presenting it with accuracy and brevity, while retaining the sequence of the original narrative. The compilers had to cope with the issue of flawed contextualization caused by their excerpting methods. It is evident that with all three collections the excerptors resorted to identical strategies in order to establish the context in the excerpted passages as follows: a) an introductory sentence, made up of material from the original text is inserted into the excerpts. As noted, this technique is detectable throughout the EC, as well. The excerptors of the EC supplemented the excerpted passages with short sentences summarising the original text. This strategy is not an innovation on the part of Constantine VII’s team, though. It was applied in the Excerpta Anonymi as well as in the so-called Epitome of the Seventh Century. Yet, shortening the original text shifted the thematic focus of passages in all of them, the EC, the Excerpta Anonymi and the Epitome. b) omissions of text passages. This seems to have been the most common strategy on the part of the compilers. There are instances in the EC in which the entire passage was omitted but for key phrases and names. It has been shown in chapter 2 that a significant number of selected passages in the Excerpta Anonymi had been shortened before their inclusion in the sylloge. And c) repetitions of passages. This method can also be seen in the EC, the Excerpta Anonymi and the Epitome.

---

146 See the examples given by Rafiyenko (2017), 300-303.
147 On the redaction of the Epitome see section 4.4.3.
149 See section 2.3.
150 Rafiyenko (2017), 304-309.
3.6 General conclusions on the *Excerpta Salmasiana*

Chapter 3 concerned the study of the content and structure of the so-called *Excerpta Salmasiana*. Since the *sylloge* is often associated with the scholarly debate on the composition of the genuine corpus of John of Antioch, I first discussed this matter by offering an overview of the ongoing scholarly discussion. In this chapter, I argued that the *Excerpta Salmasiana* is a compilation of three distinct *syllogai* of excerpts: 1) the *Exc.Salm.I*, which consists of excerpts taken from a single historical work, namely John of Antioch’s *Historia chronica*; 2) the *Exc.Salm.II*, which comprises excerpts from a variety of late antique texts. In particular, I distinguished between the *Exc.Salm.II A* and the *Exc.Salm.II B*; each have their own characteristics in terms of sources. The *Exc.Salm.II A* consist of excerpts from a now lost work based on Malalas’ text. The *Exc.Salm.II B* are composed of excerpts from a collection of excerpts by Cassius Dio and Peter the Patrician as well as from passages derived from what B. Bleckmann calls the *Leoquelle*; and 3) a *sylloge* of passages on ethnography and geography excerpted from Agathias’ *Historiae*. This collection was edited in this thesis for the first time. As I have suggested, the selection and the re-editing of excerpts in the *Agathias*-part was determined by the political context of the 10th century. The passages reflect on a period in which the Empire had territorially shrunk and its civilizing influence had been restricted. Finally, in this chapter I embarked upon a close analysis of the working method applied by the excerptor in the *Agathias*-part. It became evident that the *Agathias*-part reflects a traditional mode of selecting, re-editing and presenting earlier historical material. The examination of the modifications which the selected text passages underwent, corroborated the view that the *Agathias*-part shares compositional methods and excerpting techniques with all the other collections of historical excerpts examined in this thesis.
Chapter 4  The Epitome of the 7th century

A sylloge of passages taken from a number of historical works is known under the conventional title Epitome of the 7th Century (hereafter Epitome). The Epitome comprises excerpts from the ecclesiastical histories by Eusebius of Caesarea,1 Gelasius of Caesarea2 and Theodorus Anagnosta3 as well as excerpts from John Diacrinomenus4 and Philip of Side,5 and a series of anonymous fragments.6

This chapter a) considers the manuscript tradition of the Epitome, b) demonstrates that the text is a collection of passages excerpted from different sources, contrary to the widely held opinion that the Epitome was the summary of a single work,7 c) reflects on the original structure of the Epitome, and d) examines the use of Eusebius’ HE by the compiler.

---


2On the extant fragments from Gelasius’ HE see Wallraff – Marinidis – Stutz (edd.) (2017). On the view that the text should be dated between 439 and 475 and, therefore, not to be assigned to Gelasius of Caesarea see Van Nuffelen (2002), 621–640.

3The HE by Theodorus Anagnosta, which is partially preserved, dates back to the year 518. G. C. Hansen published the surviving books 1 and 2 of Theodorus’ HE in Hansen (ed.) (1995), 1-151. The text originally covered events from the reign of Constantine to the accession of Justin I (306–512); Van Hoof – Van Nuffelen (2017).

4The composition date of Diacrinomenus’ historical work is placed after the year 512. The text has been handed down to us in fragments. The fragments have been published in Hansen (ed.) (1995), 152-157. On Diacrinomenus see Pouderon (1997); Blaudeau (2001), 76–97.

5On the extant fragments from Philip of Side’s work see in Heyden (2006), 209–243. The historical work by Philip of Side covered the period from Adam down to his own time. The text was composed between 426–439; Van Hoof – Van Nuffelen (2017).

6The codex Paris. gr. 1555a transmits two series of anonymous fragments of the periods from 527 to 609 AD, and from 465 to 562 AD, respectively. G. Greatrex, B. Pouderon and G. C. Hansen agree that only the first of the two anonymous series of fragments was part of the Epitome, whereas the second one was a later addition. Pouderon suggests a possible connection between the second series of fragments and John of Antioch; cf. Pouderon (1998), 170–174, 180–182. See also Hansen (ed.) (1995); Greatrex (2014b), 10–12.

of the Epitome. The passages excerpted from Eusebius are edited in the appendix (Appendix I: Text V) for the first time.

4.1 Manuscript transmission

The Epitome has been transmitted through four manuscripts, namely the Paris. supp. gr. 1156, p. 26-29 (10th century), the Ath. Vat. 286, fol. 91r-218r (13th century), the Paris. gr. 1555 A, fol. 7r2-20r (13th-14th centuries), and the Barocc. gr. 142 (14th century).

4.1.1 Parisinus suppl. gr. 1156

Bombyc., ff. 29, 192 x 290 mm (150 x 240 mm), 33, saec. X-XI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLIOS</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leontius Hierosolymitanus presbyter</td>
<td>Hom. In Samaritanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r-1v</td>
<td>Basilius Seleuciensis</td>
<td>In Duos Evangeli Caecos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r-2v</td>
<td>Joannes Chrysostomus</td>
<td>Thema: Prodigus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r-3v</td>
<td>Theodoretus Cyrensis</td>
<td>Interpretatio in Amos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r-4v</td>
<td>Theodoretus Cyrensis</td>
<td>Interpretatio in Abdiam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5r-10v</td>
<td>Catenae</td>
<td>In Psalmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11r</td>
<td>Ephraem Graecus</td>
<td>De His, Qui Animas Ad Impudicitiam Pelliciunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11r-12v</td>
<td>Ephraem Graecus</td>
<td>De Abstinendo Ab Omni Consuetudine Perniciosa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#The Barocc. gr.142 and the Ath. Vat. 286 were copies from a common exemplar, different from the one that the Par. gr. 1156 and the Par. gr. 1555a come from; Nautin (1994), 214. According to G. C. Hansen, the Parisinus suppl. gr. 1156 represents the Epitome better; Hansen (1995), XXV, XXXIII-XXXIX. In P. Blaudeau’s view, the scribe of the Parisinus gr. 1555a has reduced by a quarter the records he found in the Parisinus suppl. gr. 1156; cf. Blaudeau (2006), 537, esp. n. 217.

#On the codex see Hansen (1995), XXIV-XXV.

#CPG 7912.

#CPG 6656.36.

#CPG 6208.02; BHG 71-71a; PG 81, col. 1697 C11-1701 A12.

#CPG 6208.05; BHG 1-1d; PG 81, col. 1713 B10-1716 D3.

#CPG C10-C40.

#CPG 3998.

#CPG 4000.
The codex contains excerpts of the *Epitome* taken from Theodorus Anagnosta’s and John Diacrinomenus’ historical works. In particular, ff. 26r-27r transmit Theodorus Anagnosta’s and ff. 28r-29v John Diacrinomenus’ passages, respectively. These excerpts were first published by E. Miller. They correspond to excerpts E 477-496, 520-524 and E 525-561 in the edition by Hansen. Unlike the excerpts from Theodorus Anagnosta, those from John Diacrinomenus in the Parisinus suppl. gr. 1156 are headed by the title: Ἰωάννου τοῦ Διακρινομένου ὄσα ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ σποράδην ὡς ἀναγκαῖότερα παρεξέλαβον. G. C. Hansen showed that the Parisinus suppl. gr. 1156 relied on a manuscript which was a direct copy of the original *Epitome*.

### 4.1.2 Parisinus graecus 1555 A

Chartac., ff. 10+194, II 29, saec. XIV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLIOS</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-J</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Mutilated folia containing historical fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r-3r</td>
<td>Josephus</td>
<td>ὑπομνηστικὸν βιβλίον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r-4r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>a calculation of the years from Adam to Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r-5r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>an incomplete list of Roman emperors as far as Tiberius II (578)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17Berger (2005); Ronconi (2012), 137-166.
18Wallies (ed.) (1905).
20See the edition by Heiberg (1921-1924).
21Miller (1873), 396-403.
23John Diacrinomenus, *all that I found scattered in his work and necessary to be excerpted.*
26The ὑπομνηστικὸν βιβλίον by Joseph is published in *PG* 106 col. 15-176.
The full text is in Greek and it is now deposited in the National Library of France. The Parisinus gr. 1555a is a faithful copy of the Parisinus suppl. gr. 1156, since it repeats the same orthographic errors of its prototype.\textsuperscript{29} J. A. Cramer published the part of the Epitome preserved in this manuscript in 1839.\textsuperscript{30}

The text of the Epitome begins from the second column on f. 7r bearing excerpts from Eusebius without being preceded by any title. The Eusebian text reaches as far as f. 9v. What follows is a short series of excerpts attributed by scholars to Gelasius or to a pseudo-Gelasius (f. 9v).\textsuperscript{31} After these excerpts, the Parisinus gr. 1555a sequentially transmits excerpts from the HT (ff. 9v-15v) and the HE by Theodorus Anagnosta (ff. 15v-20r), and also from the HE by John Diacrinomenus (ff. 20r). None of these series of excerpts is preceded by a title. The Epitome ends with a series of anonymous excerpts down to the reign of Phocas (ff. 20v-21v). It is unlikely that the series of excerpts which ensues (ff. 21v-23v) was part of the original Epitome.\textsuperscript{32}

At the bottom of f. 3r, a series of names are written in a later hand: Πέτρος, Μαρίας Μανώλης, Γεώργιος, Θεώφηλη μοναχή (diplomatic transcription). At the bottom of f. 6r in a later hand: δέξου χέρ μου ἀγαθή μᾶθε γράφε γράμματα καλά μη δαρίε· καί ληπεθυ.\textsuperscript{33} The verses constitute an alternative version of a poem in seven syllables which appears quite often in Byzantine manuscripts: Ἀρξου χείρ μου ἀγαθή γραφε γράμματα καλά· μη δαρίε· καί ληπεθυ.\textsuperscript{34}


\textsuperscript{28}The text bears the title: Τάξις προκαθεδρίας των ὁσίων τούτων πατριαρχῶν, μητροπολίτων καὶ αὐτοκεφάλων; cf. Parisinus gr. 1555a, f. 23v.

\textsuperscript{29}G. C. Hansen gives a number of cases in which the Parisinus gr. 1555a faithfully follows the errors of its prototype; cf. Hansen (1995), XXVI.

\textsuperscript{30}Cramer (1839), 87-114.

\textsuperscript{31}Nautin (1992); Van Nuffelen (2002). On the matter see section 4.2.


\textsuperscript{33}This is a diplomatic transcription of the text. An English translation of it would be: accept (it), my good hand, learn, write good letters, so as not to be beaten and chastised and later be regretful.

\textsuperscript{34}See Vassis (2005), 77; Kadas (2000), 12. See also the occurrences of the poem in http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/typ/3084.
4.1.3  The Athonensis Vatopedinus graecus 286

Bombyc., ff. 305, 220 x 300 mm, 19-22, saec. XIII.\(^{35}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLIOS</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001-305</td>
<td>Iobius monachus</td>
<td>Opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62v-64v</td>
<td>Photius</td>
<td>Bibliotheca(^{16})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65r-90r</td>
<td>Hagiographica</td>
<td>Petrus et Paulus ap. (SS.),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commentarius metaphrasticus(^{37})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90v-91r</td>
<td>Ascetica</td>
<td>Quaedam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91r-218r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Epitome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218v-221v</td>
<td>Maximus Confessor</td>
<td>De Duabus Christi Naturis(^{38})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221v-223r</td>
<td>Joannes Damascenus</td>
<td>Opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223r-285r</td>
<td>Theodorus Abucara</td>
<td>Opuscula varia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223r-298r</td>
<td>Leontius scholasticus</td>
<td>Liber De Sectis(^{39})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285v-298r</td>
<td>Florilegia</td>
<td>Varia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298r-302v</td>
<td>Cyrillus Alexandrinus</td>
<td>Commentarii in Iohannem(^{40})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parts from the Epitome are preserved on ff. 91r-218v. In particular, ff. 91r-108r contain excerpts from Eusebius’ HE. F. 91r bears the title: Συναγωγή ἱστοριῶν διαφόρων ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα γεννήσεως τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἐξῆς, τὴν ἁρχήν ἔχουσα ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου λόγου τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Ἡσυχίας Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου.\(^{41}\) As I shall demonstrate below, this heading must have been the original title of the Epitome and should be ascribed to its compiler. In addition to the aforementioned heading, in the margin of f. 91r we find: ἐκλογαὶ καὶ ταῦτα. The last excerpt from Eusebius is followed by a sentence added by the compiler of the Epitome: ἔως τῶν ἱστορεῖ ὁ Ἐυσέβιος.\(^{42}\) Ff. 108r-108v contain excerpts from Gelasius. Ff. 108v-201r transmit excerpts from Theodorus Anagnosta’s HT. An ornamented initial letter (M) on f. 108v marks the beginning of the new section. The first excerpt from the HT in the Athonensis Vatopedinus graecus 286 is excerpt E 5 in the edition by Hansen.\(^{43}\) Finally, ff. 201r-218v bear excerpts from Theodorus Anagnosta’s HE.

---

\(^{35}\)On the codex see Hansen (1995), XXVI-XXVII.

\(^{36}\)Bibliotheca, cod. 222.

\(^{37}\)BHG 1493.

\(^{38}\)CPG 7697.13.

\(^{39}\)CPG 6823.

\(^{40}\)CPG 5208.

\(^{41}\)Collection of various accounts running from the Nativity according to the flesh of our Lord and onwards, it begins with the first book of the Ecclesiastical History by Eusebius (the student) of Pamphilus.

\(^{42}\)Up to these matters Eusebius narrates.

### 4.1.4 Baroccianus gr. 142

Chartac., ff. 292, 165 x 250mm, 40-44, saec. XIV.\(^4^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLIA</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r-9r</td>
<td>Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus</td>
<td>Tabula In Sozomeni Historiam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r-153v</td>
<td>Sozomenus</td>
<td>Historia Ecclesiastica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154v-202v</td>
<td>Euagrius scholasticus</td>
<td>Historia Ecclesiastica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155r—205r</td>
<td>Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus</td>
<td>Tabula In Euagrii Scholastici Historiam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205r-211r</td>
<td>Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus</td>
<td>Opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205r-212r</td>
<td>Flavius Josephus</td>
<td>Antiquitates Judaicae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210v-211r</td>
<td>Flavius Josephus</td>
<td>Josephi vita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212r-224r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Epitome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225r-235r</td>
<td>Theodoretus Cyrrhensis</td>
<td>Historia Ecclesiastica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236r-240r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Epitome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240v-241v</td>
<td>Photius</td>
<td>Bibliotheca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243r-261r</td>
<td>Philostorgius</td>
<td>Historia Ecclesiastica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262r-v</td>
<td>Atticus Constantinopolitanus</td>
<td>Ep ad Cyrillum Alexandrinum(^4^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262v-263r</td>
<td>Atticus Constantinopolitanus</td>
<td>Ep Ad Petrum Et Aedesium Diaconos Alexandrinos(^4^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263r-264r</td>
<td>Cyrillus Alexandrinus</td>
<td>Ep 76 Ad Atticum(^4^7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263r-264r</td>
<td>Cyrillus Alexandrinus</td>
<td>Epistulae (1-92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264r-v</td>
<td>Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagita</td>
<td>Epistulae 1-10(^4^8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264v-265v</td>
<td>Basilius Caesariensis</td>
<td>Epistulae(^4^9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265v-268v</td>
<td>Manuel Charitopulus</td>
<td>Responsiones Canonicae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266r-268v</td>
<td>Germanus Marcutzas III</td>
<td>Opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270r-276</td>
<td>Ius canonicum</td>
<td>Canones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278r-279v</td>
<td>Hippolytus</td>
<td>Syntagma chronologicum(^5^0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279v-280v</td>
<td>Eusebius Caesariensis</td>
<td>Historia Ecclesiastica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{4^5}\)CPG 5652, BHG 0873kb.

\(^{4^6}\)CPG 5653.

\(^{4^7}\)CPG 5376, BHG 873kb.

\(^{4^8}\)CPG 6604-6613.

\(^{4^9}\)CPG 2900.

\(^{5^0}\)BHG 779h-779hd, 1046i.
Due to the removal of some folios, the excerpts from the *Epitome* are preserved in two different parts in the manuscript. Ff. 212r-216r contain excerpts from Eusebius’ *HE* followed by excerpts from Gelasius (f. 216r), and the *HT* ff. 216v-224r. The last Eusebian excerpt is followed by a sentence added by the compiler of the *Epitome*: ἕως τούτων ἱστορεῖ ὁ Εὐσέβιος. Between the Gelasian part and the excerpts from the *HT* a long excerpt from Philip the Side appears (ff. 216r-216v). The excerpt is absent from the other three attestations of the *Epitome*. G. C. Hansen does not exclude the inclusion of the excerpt in the *Epitome* but he has doubts about the original place of it within the *sylloge*.

The excerpts from the *HT* are preceded by a heading: Ἐκ τῶν Σωζομενοῦ, οἷς παρέζευξεν ὁ Θεόδωρος τὰ τοῦ Θεοδωρίτου καὶ Σωκράτους, ἐν οἷς ἐὑρε τινα τῶν δύο ξένον τι παρὰ Σωζομενοῦ ἱστορήσαντα. In the present state of the manuscript the series of excerpts from the *Epitome* is interrupted by excerpts from Theodoret of Cyrus (ff. 225r-235r). The excerpts from Theodorus Anagnosta’s *HE* are transmitted on ff. 236v-240r and they are introduced by a heading, as well: Ἐκλογαὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας Θεοδώρου ἀναγνώστου. In the margin of f. 236v there is a scholion: ἀπὸ φωνῆς νικηφόρου καλλιόστοι τοῦ χανθόπουλου. G. C. Hansen suggests that this part in the Baroccianus gr. 142 could have been dictated by Nicephorus Callistus to the amanuensis or that the codex was copied on Nicephorus’ initiative.

---

51CPG 1302.
52BHG 1049.
53BHG 152k.
54Hansen (1995), XXXVIII.
55Excerpts from Sozomen, which Theodore joined with passages from Theodoret and Socrates, and in which he identified what subject which of the two narrated differently from Sozomen.
56Extracts from the Ecclesiastical History of Theodorus Anagnosta.
57According to Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulos.
58Hansen (1995), XXVII.
Some excerpts from the *Epitome* were placed in the margins of a number of folia in the Baroccianus gr. 142 by a different hand. Nevertheless, they appear to have been copied from the same source just like the excerpts in the text body. G. C. Hansen marks the excerpts transmitted in the margins as B2. The series of excerpts from the *HT* and the *HE* by Theodorus Anagnosta have been handed down with several gaps, which can be identified when comparing the Baroccianus gr. 142 with the Athonensis Vatopedinus graecus 286.

### 4.1.5 The ἀπὸ φωνῆς in the Baroccianus gr. 142

The meaning of the expression ἀπὸ φωνῆς occurring in titles of works of various literary genres has long been debated. Yet, to my knowledge, after M. Richard’s article on how the ἀπὸ φωνῆς should be interpreted by modern scholars, there is not other contribution to the subject. The French philologist showed, through a significant number of examples, that from the 5\textsuperscript{th} to the 8\textsuperscript{th} centuries the phrase ἀπὸ φωνῆς in most cases precedes the name of a Byzantine professor or grammarian and should consequently be interpreted as “d’après l’enseignement oral de” or “pris au cours de”. From the 9\textsuperscript{th} century onwards, by contrast, the ἀπὸ φωνῆς always precedes the name of the author of a work mentioned in the title and it should be interpreted as “de”, “par”, “selon”, “d’après”. M. Richard drew attention to titles preceding works covered by the umbrella term *compilation* literature, as well. He argued that in this sort of writings the ἀπὸ φωνῆς indicates the compiler of the work mentioned in the title. M. Richard presented as examples the *epitome* of Philostorgius’ *HE* ἀπὸ φωνῆς Φωτίου πατριάρχου as well as the *eklogai* from Theodorus Anagnosta’s *HE* ἀπὸ φωνῆς Νικηφόρου Καλλίστου τοῦ Ξανθοπούλου written on f. 236v in the Baroccianus gr. 142. Yet, in my view, a distinction should be made between the two aforementioned works. Photius gives a summary of Philostorgius’ *HE* in

---


\(^{60}\)E 261, 262, 278, 318, 324, 381; cf. Hansen (1995), XXVII.

\(^{61}\)On the excerpts from the *Epitome* missing see Hansen (1995), XXVIII.

\(^{62}\)Richard (1977), 206 and 220. There are few exceptions though: the expression ἀπὸ φωνῆς in the titles of the 6\textsuperscript{th}-century work: Προκοπίου Γαζαίου χριστιανοῦ σοφιστοῦ εἰς τὰ ἁίσματα τῶν ἁισμάτων ἐξηγητικῶν ἐκλογῶν ἐπιτομὴ ἀπὸ φωνῆς Γρηγορίου Νύσης καὶ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας κ.τ.λ. (PG 87(2), col. 1545), and Εἰς τὸν Ἐκκλησιαστὴν Προκοπίου χριστιανοῦ σοφιστοῦ εἰς τὰ ἁίσματα τῶν ἁισμάτων ἐξηγητικῶν ἐκλογῶν ἐπιτομὴ ἀπὸ φωνῆς Γρηγορίου Νύσης καὶ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας κ.τ.λ. (Devreesse (1928), col. 1163) as well as in the title of the 7\textsuperscript{th}-century encomium: Τριγκωμὸν τὸν βίον δηλοῦν τοῦ μακαρίου Παταπίου τέλειον ἀπὸ φωνῆς Ἀνδρέου ἄρχιεπισκόπου Κρήτης (PG 97, col. 1233) should be interpreted as “written by” or “according to”; cf. Richard (1977), 197-199 and 205-206.

\(^{63}\)Richard (1977), 222.

\(^{64}\)Richard (1977), esp. 213-217.

\(^{65}\)Philostorgius, *HE*, 4.
his Bibliotheca and scholarship has long verified that Photius is the actual compiler of the epitome. On the other hand, we now know that the Barocci anus gr. 142 transmits a sylloge of excerpts compiled centuries before Nicephorus Callistus lived, and attested also in other three codices. Nicephorus is not the author of the sylloge. Moreover, the sentence ἀπὸ φωνῆς Νικηφόρου Καλλίστου τοῦ Ξανθοπούλου is repeated in the margin of f. 212v in the Barocci anus gr. 142 as part of the initial title of the work: Συναγωγὴ ἱστοριῶν διαφόρων ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα γεννήσεως τοῦ κυρίου και ἔξης, τῆς ἀρχής ἐχουσα ἀπὸ τοῦ πρῶτου λόγου τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου ἀπὸ φωνῆς Νικηφόρου Καλλίστου τοῦ Ξανθοπούλου. If we accept Hansen’s view that Nicephorus in writing his own chronicle relied on material found in the Barocci anus gr. 142, the codex is likely to depict an intermediary stage in the preparation of his chronicle. In this case, the ἀπὸ φωνῆς is likely to signify that the so-called Epitome was copied in the Barocci anus gr. 142 on Nicephorus’ initiative. We cannot be certain, though. It is also likely that Barocci anus gr. 142 transmits a version of the epitome edited by Nicephorus himself. It is noteworthy that Barocci anus gr. 142 and Athonensis Vatopedinus gr. 286 do not always transmit the same order of excerpts or they transmit a different excerpt while excerpting the same source text (see Appendix II: table VI). The changes may be attributed to Nicephorus Callistus. I should add here that, as shall be shown below (section 4.2), the Epitome contains material that was not originally found in the selected passages. The additional material is recorded in all three manuscripts of the Epitome, though. These insertions are not possible to be attributed to Nicephorus. Regarding insertions occurred in the Barocci anus gr. 142 only, we cannot be certain about the authorship of them.

To conclude, in my opinion, the interpretation of the ἀπὸ φωνῆς in the Barocci anus gr. 142 as “written by” could be misleading. I would suggest that the rendering “according to” signifies better the phrase in this case. For Nicephorus was neither the original compiler of the Epitome nor the rewritter of a new version of it, that would be, a new autonomous text.

4.2 The Epitome as an excerpt collection

This seventh-century assemblage has, so far, only received attention for the passages it transmits. Accordingly, the Epitome has always been studied as a source of the ecclesiastical excerpts included in it. In fact, the Epitome, apart from excerpts from Eusebius, Gelasius and Philip of Side, preserves significant parts of the so-called HT and

---

66Bibliotheca, cod. 40.
the HE by Theodorus Anagnosta, and excerpts from John Diacrinomens’ HE. P. Nautin supported that the Epitome descends from an earlier collection comprising the complete texts of a number of ecclesiastical histories. P. Nautin regarded Theodorus Anagnosta as the author of the aforementioned collection. Moreover, there appears to have been a consensus among P. Nautin, G. Greatrex and B. Pouderon about the content of that compilation.

The label Epitome assigned to the whole assemblage and its connection with a hypothesized earlier collection by Theodorus Anagnosta mirrors, in my view, the concentration of scholars on the content of the Epitome rather than on the structure and composition of the overall assemblage. Moreover, the designation epitome for our 7th-century sylloge could be compatible, to a certain extent, with the abridged form of the incorporated texts, definitely incompatible, however, with the overall structure of the assemblage, for the so-called Epitome is a typical product of the culture of sylloge. The author of this sylloge constructs a new narrative on the basis of a series of excerpts. The arrangement of the excerpts in the Epitome shows that the compiler had initially devised a chronological framework, which, then, enabled him to place the collected passages. The Epitome makes up a unity of chronologically and thematically connected excerpts extracted from a number of different works and acts as a new and autonomous piece of literature. In the following, I argue that the Epitome is not the synopsis of a collection made by Theodorus Anagnosta. In my view, the Epitome is an actual sylloge of excerpts created from different and separate sources. To argue this, I shall show that the initial title of the Epitome, as transmitted in the manuscript tradition, must be assigned to the excerptor of the Epitome, and that the structure and the format of the Epitome explain the origin of the actual sylloge.

To begin with, the Epitome itself transmits its material under the following titles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ath. Vat. 286 and Barocc. gr. 142</td>
<td>Συναγαγὴ ἱστοριῶν διαφόρων ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα γεννήσεως τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἔξις, τὴν ἀρχήν ἐξουσία ἀπὸ τοῦ πρῶτον λόγου τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου.</td>
<td>Eusebius, HE and Gelasius, HE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In P. Nautin’s view, the compilation comprised the HE by Eusebius of Caesarea with the addition of the history by Gelasius of Caesarea, the so-called HT (a compilation by Theodorus Anagnosta based on the histories by Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret) and the HE by Theodorus Anagnosta covering the period 439-518 AD; cf. Nautin (1994), 218-224 and 229-30; Greatrex (2014b), 10-11; Pouderon (1998), 170-171. On the HT see Blaudeau (2006), 518; Treadgold (2007), 170.
Collection of various accounts running from the Nativity according to the flesh of our Lord and onwards, it begins with the first book of the Ecclesiastical History by Eusebius (the student) of Pamphilus.

| Barocc. gr. 142 | Ἐκ τῶν Σωζομενοῦ, οἷς παρέξευξεν ὁ Θεόδωρος τὰ τῶν Θεοδωρίτου καὶ Σωκράτους, ἐν οίς εὑρε τινὰ τῶν δύο ξένων τι παρὰ Σωζομενοῦ ἱστορήσαντα. Ἐκ τοῦ πρῶτου βιβλίου. | Theodorus Anagnosta, HT |
|                 | Excerpts from Sozomen, which Theodore joined with passages from Theodoret and Socrates, and in which he identified what matter which of the two narrated differently from Sozomen. |                |

| Barocc. gr. 142 | Ἐκλογαὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας Θεοδώρου ἀναγνώστου. Βιβλίον πρῶτον. | Theodorus Anagnosta, HE |
|                 | Selections from the Ecclesiastical History by Theodorus Anagnosta. First Book. |                |

| Paris. suppl. gr. 1156 | Ἰωάννου τοῦ Διακρινομένου δοσα Ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ σποράδην ὡς ἀναγκαστέρα παρεξέβαλον. | John Diacrinomenus, HE |
|                      | John Diacrinomenus, all that I found scattered in his work and necessary to be excerpted. |                |

P. Nautin has argued that the initial heading (Συναγωγὴ ἱστοριῶν διαφόρων...τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου) was the original title of the collection put together by Theodorus Anagnosta, which, in Nautin’s view, is the unique source used by the Epitome. Nautin interprets the word Συναγωγὴ in the title as the gathering and arrangement of complete historical texts, the first of which was the HE by Eusebius of Caesarea. P. Nautin believes that Theodorus included Eusebius’ entire work in a collection because (a) Theodorus refers to a similar intention of compiling a collection of complete ecclesiastical histories in the survived prologue to his own HE, and (b) Theodorus mentions Eusebius of Caesarea in the preface, shortly before mentioning Socrates,

---

71The prologue has been handed down to us through the codex Marcianus gr. 344, ff. 1-13; Hansen (1995), 1. The codex, in fact, transmits only Books 1 and 2 of what is known as the Historia Tripartita.
Sozomen and Theodoret, and (c) excerpts from the HT, nominally assigned to Theodorus Anagnosta, are part of the Epitome as well.\textsuperscript{72}

Nevertheless, Theodorus’ HE does not begin with Eusebius (as the Epitome does) but with Theodorus’ HT. In addition to this, the prologue in the codex Marcianus is preceded by the following heading: Θεοδώρου ἀναγνώστου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐκκλησιαστικής ἱστορίας Βιβλίον α’.\textsuperscript{73} P. Nautin explains these inconsistencies by surmising the existence of two manuscripts for the entire hypothetical Theodorus’ collection; one containing Eusebius’ work and one containing the rest of the collection.

I would like to note that there is no such reference to Eusebius of Caesarea in the preface implying that Theodorus included Eusebius’ work in a collection.\textsuperscript{74} On the contrary, Theodorus’ use of the term, σύνταξιν, in identifying both his own and Eusebius’ history in the prologue, shows that Theodorus regards himself as a continuator of Eusebius, not only in terms of content but in method and literary format, as well.\textsuperscript{75} The term σύνταξις stresses the creation of a structure out of the collected sources. Theodorus, at this point, reveals his method in compiling his own history. Furthermore, Eusebius’ excerpts in the epitome are followed by passages from Gelasius.\textsuperscript{76} Theodorus does not mention Gelasius in his prologue. If Theodorus had really composed a collection comprising a number of ecclesiastical histories, he should also have mentioned Gelasius as one of Eusebius’ continuators.\textsuperscript{77}

The title in the Marcianus confirms that Theodorus was the author of an HE and the content of the Marcianus bears out that the HT was part of it.\textsuperscript{78} The excerpts from the HT, by contrast, are introduced in the Epitome by a different title: ‘Εκ τῶν Σωζομενοῦ...τι παρὰ Σωζομενοῦ ἱστορίας Θεοδώρου ἀναγνώστου. And the excerpts from the HE are introduced by the heading Ἐκλογαὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας Θεοδώρου ἀναγνώστου. The very last fact means that the compiler of the Epitome draws on two different sources when extracting Theodorus’ HT and HE, respectively. This could also be an indication that the two parts of the work circulated at some point independently from one another.

\textsuperscript{72}Nautin (1994), esp. 233-243.

\textsuperscript{73}The Ecclesiastical History by Theodorus anagnosta in Constantinople. First Book.

\textsuperscript{74}Delacenserie (2016), 70-75.

\textsuperscript{75}Εὐσεβίου τοῦ θαυμασιωτάτου τοῦ ἑπίκλην Παμφίλου κεκμηκότος περὶ τὴν συλλογὴν τῶν ἀνέκαθεν τὰς τουαίτας ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ὑποθέσεως λογίων ἄνδρων συγγεγραφότων, οὐ μόνον λέγω τῶν παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς φιλοσοφησάντων, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρ’ Ἕβραϊς, καὶ τήνδε τὴν ἱστορικὴν σύνταξιν ποιησαμένου ἄχρι τοῦ εἰκοστοῦ ἐτῶν τῆς φιλοχρίστου; Hansen (1995), 1. See also the translation of the passage in Delacenserie (2016), 69-70.

\textsuperscript{76}There is a disagreement as to the authorship of these excerpts; see Van Nuffelen (2002), 621-640. See also section 4.4.

\textsuperscript{77}Delacenserie (2016), 70-75.

\textsuperscript{78}The existence of the title in the prologue signifies also that Theodorus did not write a continuation to the work of an earlier historian; Nautin (1992), 164-170.
P. Nautin also supported that Book 1 of Theodorus’ *HE* in the *Epitome* corresponds to Book 5 of the original *HE* by Theodorus. With regard to this proposition of Nautin’s, I have two points to make: (a) Theodorus does not himself name any Book 5 in his *HE* and (b) even if we accept Nautin’s argument, the fact that Book 5 of the *HE* occurs as Book 1 in the manuscript transmission of the *Epitome* once again bears out the evidence that the excerptor of the latter must have relied on two different sources. Each source contained only one of the two texts.

Accordingly, the *Epitome* is made up of collections of selections. One should ask why then it is not labelled as such in the title (e.g. ἐκλογή, ἐκλογαί). To my mind, the initial title in the *Epitome* (Συναγωγή ἱστοριῶν διαφόρων...τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου) must be assigned to the excerptor. For the term συναγωγή itself entails the notions of συλλογή and ἐκλογή. In fact, συναγωγή points to the organisation of material accumulated (συλλογή) through the process of selection (ἐκλογή). The term συναγωγή fits in with the manner by which knowledge is transmitted through our text.

Turning to our text, the crucial question to be raised should be as to why the term epitome should be assigned to the title of the work by contemporary scholars. In its first edition by J. A. Cramer, the work bears the title ΄Εκλογαὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας. In fact, in the Byzantine period, the term ἐκλογή was used to identify both, a single selected excerpt and an entire compilation of passages. The term also occurs in the plural, ἐκλογαί, as in the title, ἐκλογαί ἀπὸ διαφόρων λόγων, or in the title of the Sophist Sopater’s work as transmitted by Photius: ἐκλογαὶ διάφοροι ἐν βίβλοις ἰβ. The ἐκλογαί, on both occasions, means the collections of selections. In the case of the so-called *Epitome*, we have nothing less than a conflation of selected passages, such as in the ἐκλογαὶ ἀπὸ διαφόρων λόγων and Sopater’s case. In what follows, I shall show that the initial title (Συναγωγη ἱστοριῶν διαφόρων (...) ἱστορίας Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου) as well as the following headings in the *Epitome* point to the working method of the culture of sylloge.

In order to understand better what the Byzantines meant by συναγωγή, one should pay attention to the common use of the words συναγωγή, συλλογή and ἐκλογή in their works produced through processes of compilation. Photius, for instance, in his *Bibliotheca* refers to the fifth-century *Lexicon* of Helladius by using the term συναγωγή, but when he
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79See also section 1.1.1.
80Cramer (1839), 87-114.
81See n. 9 in chapter 1.
82*Bibliotheca*, cod. 161.
83Signes Codoñer, 69-70, n. 28.
84Photius’ *Lexicon*, another work of his, was composed through the process of compilation and bears the title λέξεων συναγωγή κατά στοιχεῖον; cf. Theodoridis (ed.) (2013).
comes to compare it with the lexicon of Diogenianus, he uses the term συλλογή for the latter:

Ἀνεγνώσθη λεξικόν κατά στοιχείον Ἑλλαδίου, ὃν ἴσε με λεξικών πολυστιχώτατον. Οὐ λέξεων δὲ μόνον ἡ συναγωγή, ἀλλʼ ἐνίστε καὶ κομματικά τινων χαριεστάτων λόγων καὶ εἰς κάλου πολλάκις σύνθεσιν ἀπαρτιζομένων. Πεζοῦ δὲ λόγου ἐστὶ τὸ πλείστον τῶν λέξεων, ἀλλʼ οὐχὶ ποιητικοῦ, ὥσπερ ἡ Διογενιανὸς ἐκπονηθείσα συλλογή. ⁸⁵

Shortly afterwards, however, Photius identifies Helladius’ Lexicon as both, συλλογή and συναγωγή. Specifically, in Bibliotheca, cod. 158, Photius refers to a συναγωγή of words and clauses compiled by Phrynichus the Arabian and he ends up that “many of these are to be found in the συλλογή of Helladius, but there they are dispersed throughout the συναγωγή”. ⁸⁶

Interestingly, Photius describes as συναγωγή the lexicon of Boethus as well as the content of a collection of chronicles and a list of Olympian victors:

Ἀνεγνώσθη δʼ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τεύχει καὶ Βοηθοῦ λέξεων πλατωνικῶν συναγωγή κατά στοιχείον, πολλῷ τῆς Σιμώνιου συναγωγῆς χρησιμώτερον. ⁸⁷

Ἀνεγνώσθη Φλέγοντος Τραλλιανοῦ, ἀπελευθέρων τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος Ἀδριανοῦ, ὀλυμπιονικῶν καὶ χρονικῶν συναγωγῆς. ⁸⁸

In the sixth century, Procopius, the Christian sophist and rhetorician from Gaza, composed two catenae, on the Ἀισιμα Ἀισιμάτων and on the Ἐκκλησιαστὴν, respectively. ⁸⁹

The titles of the two works are worth mentioning: Προκοπίου Γαζαίου χριστιανοῦ σοφιστοῦ εἰς τὰ Ἀισιματα τῶν Ἀισιμάτων ἐξηγητικῶν ἐκλογῶν ἐπιτομὴ ἀπὸ φωνῆς Γρηγορίου Νῦσης καὶ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας ⁹⁰ κ.τ.λ., and Εἰς τὸν Ἐκκλησιαστὴν Ἑλλαδόπτου Προκοπίου χριστιανοῦ σοφιστοῦ εἰς τὰ Ἀισιματα τῶν Ἀισιμάτων ἐξηγητικῶν ἐκλογῶν ἐπιτομὴ ἀπὸ φωνῆς Γρηγορίου Νῦσης καὶ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας κ.τ.λ.⁹¹ Procopius’ works consist of a series of extracts from the

---

⁸⁵Read the Lexicon of Helladius, arranged in alphabetical order. It is the most comprehensive of the lexicons that I know, the collection consisting not only of words, but also of some most agreeable short clauses, which frequently become perfect members. The words are for the most part taken from prose writers, not from the poets, like the compilation of Diogenianus; cf. Bibliotheca, cod. 145.

⁸⁶Παλλὰ δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι τῶν λέξεων εὑρεῖν συλλογή, ἀλλʼ ἐκεῖ μὲν διεσπαρμένα ἐν τῷ πλήθει τῆς συναγωγῆς; cf. Bibliotheca, cod. 158.

⁸⁷Read in the same volume the List of Platonic Words by Boethus in alphabetical order. It is dedicated to a certain Melant(h)us, and is far more useful than the collection of Timaeus; cf. Bibliotheca, cod. 154.

⁸⁸Read the Collection of Chronicles and List of Olympian Victors by Phlegon of Tralles, a freed man of the emperor Hadrian; cf. Bibliotheca, cod. 97.

⁹⁰PG 87, col. 1545-1780; Devreesse (ed.) (1928), col. 1163.

⁹¹Eπιτομης αἱ ἐπιτομες τῶν Στοιχειων ἡ Συλλογή τας Ἐκκλησιαστικον τας Μελαντων τας Προκοπιου του Χρειαστου του Χριστιανου του Σοφιστου του Κυριλλου του Αλεξανδρειατου του Νυσιου κατα τον Συναγωγην τον Συναγωγην τον Συλλογην τας Συλλογην τοιας τους Χρησιμοτερας Επιτομης τους Φλεγωντος του Τραλλιανου.
Fathers augmented with material written by Procopius himself. The arrangement of the selected citations as well as the added text aim at clarifying parts of the Bible.

Proceeding to the *Geoponica*, a collection of agricultural lore compiled during the 10th century in Constantinople, we notice that the beginning of Book 20 reads as follows:

Τάδε ἐνεστὶν ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ, εἰκοστῇ μὲν ὀψὶν τῶν περί γεωργίας ἐκλογῶν, περιεχόντα δὲ ἰχθύων τροφῆν, καὶ ἐκ διαφόρων τόπων εἰς ἑνα συναγωγήν, καὶ περί θήρας αὐτῶν, καὶ δελεάτων παντοίων συνθέσεως, ἐνεργοῦντων πρὸς ἀλείαν ἰχθύων διαφόρων ποταμίων καὶ νεαρασίων.

The given explanation καὶ ἐκ διαφόρων τόπων εἰς ἑνα συναγωγήν as well as the content itself of the *Geoponica* provide us, lucidly and aptly, with what is meant by the term συναγωγή: that is, a collection of passages excerpted from different works and put together into a single text. In the *prooemium* to the *Geoponica* the same principle is repeated through the use of a derivative of the term συλλογή:

καὶ ἐν τῇ δε τῇ βιβλίῳ, ἐνεργοῦντων πρὸς ἁλείαν ἰχθύων διαφόρων ποταμίων καὶ θαλασσίων.

The *Geoponica* consists of passages taken from a number of earlier collections of agricultural precepts, one among which definitely was the fourth/fifth-century collection of Vindanius Anatolius of Berytus. Photius who read and commented his work in the *Bibliotheca* identifies it as a συναγωγή (gathering) of selected excerpts from other works:

Ἀνεγνώσθη Οὐινδανίου Ἀνατολίου Βηρύτου συναγωγή γεωργικῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων. Συνηθροίσται δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ βιβλίον ἐκ τῶν Δημοκρίτου, Ἀφρικανοῦ τε καὶ Ταραντίνου καὶ Ἀπολληνίου καὶ Φλωρέντιου καὶ Οὐάλεντος καὶ Λέοντος καὶ Παμφίλου, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐκ τῶν Διοφάνους παραδόξων.

As shown, when Photius comes to refer to Sopater’s collection, which was compiled by employing a method similar to that applied to the *Geoponica* or the collection of Anatolius,
the ninth-century Patriarch uses the word ἐκλογαῖ: collections of selections. And Photius goes on as follows:

Συνειλεκται δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ βιβλίον ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ διαφόρων ἱστοριῶν καὶ γραμμάτων.\(^{96}\)

The term συνειλεκται (third person singular of the Present Perfect tense, Passive Voice of συλλέγω) could, here, mean the collecting of works (possibly complete works). Photius, however, goes on to explain:

Τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ἐλλησι μυθολογομένων θεῶν διαλαμβάνει ὁ συνειλεκται ἐκ τῶν Ἀπολλοδώρου περὶ θεῶν γ’ λόγου (Ἀθηναίος δὲ ὁ Ἀπολλοδώρος καὶ γραμματικός τὴν τέχνην). Ὅψις ἐκ τοῦ τρίτου δὲ μόνον ἡ διαλογή αὐτῶ πεποίηται, ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ δ’ καὶ ε’ καὶ θ’, τοῦ α’ πάλιν καὶ ιβ’, ιε’ τε καὶ ις’ καὶ μέχρι τοῦ κδ’. Ἐν ἡ συλλογῇ τὰ τε μυθικῶς περὶ θεῶν διαπεπλασμένα.\(^{97}\)

Photius makes it clear that Sopater had assembled a selection of passages for his own collection. The words διαλογή and συλλογή, used by Photius in his comment on the text, point to the excerpting method used by Sopater.

My last example comes from Photius’ comment on Gelasius of Cyzicus’ Historia Ecclesiastica. When Photius refers to Gelasius’ compositional technique, he writes:

ὥν τὴν μνήμην ἔχοντα, καὶ ἔξετέρων γραμμάτων ὅσα χρήσιμα συναγείροντα, τὴν ἱστορίαν συντάξαι.\(^{98}\)

I would like to draw attention to the use of the word συναγείροντα (past participle of the συνάγω). The term foregrounds the creation of a structure out of the selected pieces (ἐξ ἔτέρων).

From the above, it becomes evident that terms, such as συλλογή, ἐκλογή and συναγωγή, were often used by compilers indiscriminately. It is also apparent that the term epitome should be reserved for the summary process, since it represents a category of rewriting a text rather than a conflation of different texts into a single entity. The examination of the headings preserved in the manuscript tradition of the Epitome of the 7th century points to the method applied by the compiler. The Epitome of the 7th century, is an ἐκλογή, or a συλλογή or a συναγωγή of different sources through the process of epitomising. The vocabulary transmitted in the headings (Συναγωγή, ἐκ τῶν, Ἐκλογαί) is identical to the one seen in the syllogai catalogued by Photius as well as in a significant number of works compiled on the basis of excerpts.\(^{99}\) Additionally, the excerpts from Eusebius were

---

\(^{96}\)Transl. Wilson (1994), 143: He gathered his material from many different histories and other writings (Bibllotheca, cod. 161).

\(^{97}\)Transl. Wilson (1994), 143: Book 1 discusses the gods of Greek mythology; it is compiled from Book 3 of Apollodorus ‘On the gods’ (Apollodorus was an Athenian and a teacher of literature by profession). But the selection is not made from Book 3 only; it also draws on Books 4, 5 and 9, then 1, 12, 15, 16 and successive books up to 24. He includes in his collection myths about the gods and material from historians (Bibllotheca, cod. 161).

\(^{98}\)Transl. Wilson (1994), 95: With his recollection of this, and by collecting useful information from other sources, he put together his history (Bibllotheca, cod. 88).

\(^{99}\)Odorico (2011a).
arranged under subheadings that indicate which book of the HE each series of excerpts was taken from: ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου βιβλίου (BV), ἐκ τοῦ τρίτου λόγου (BV), ἐκ τοῦ τετάρτου βιβλίου (V), ἐκ τοῦ πέμπτου βιβλίου (B), ἐκ τοῦ ἕκτου βιβλίου (B), ἐκ τοῦ ἐβδομοῦ βιβλίου (B), ἐκ τοῦ ἑβδόμου βιβλίου (B), ἐκ τοῦ ἑβδόμου βιβλίου (B), ἐκ τοῦ ἑβδόμου βιβλίου (B), ἐκ τοῦ ἑβδόμου βιβλίου (B). The subheadings hint at the selection of a number of passages to be embedded into the Epitome. The same holds true for a subheading introducing passages from John Diacrinomenus in the Baroccianus gr. 142. As already noted, the excerpts from John Diacrinomenus are preceded by a title only in the Parisinus gr. 1555a. Nevertheless, a marginal note on f. 239v in the Baroccianus gr. 142 reads as follows: ἐκ τοῦ α΄ λόγου καὶ ταῦτα.

To conclude, the compiler of the sylloge put together excerpts selected from different sources, namely from Eusebius’ work, Gelasius’ history, a source only containing the first part of Theodorus’ HE (i.d. Historia Tripartita), another source only containing the second part of Theodorus’ HE, John Diacrinomenus’ HE, and an unidentified chronicle (i.d. the anonymous series of excerpts). The text should be seen as a product of the culture of sylloge. The Epitome is an example of literature compiled by processes of compilation. In what follows, I shall discuss the structure of the Epitome as it is transmitted in the four extant manuscripts.
4.3 The structure of the Epitome

It has become clear by now that it is impossible to arrive at any definite conclusion as to the size of the original Epitome. The data provided by the content of the four manuscripts transmitting parts of the Epitome are the following:

Table 27: the Epitome in the four extant manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epitome</th>
<th>Parisinus suppl. gr. 1156</th>
<th>Parisinus gr. 1555a</th>
<th>Athonensis Vatopedinus graecus 286</th>
<th>Baroccianus gr. 142</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts from Eusebius’ HE</td>
<td>ff. 7r-9v</td>
<td>ff. 91-108</td>
<td>ff. 212r-216r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts from Gelasius’ HE</td>
<td>f. 9v</td>
<td>ff. 108r-108v</td>
<td>ff. 216r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts from Philip the Side’ Historia christiana</td>
<td>ff. 216r-216v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts from the HT</td>
<td>ff. 9v-15v</td>
<td>ff. 108v-201r</td>
<td>ff. 216v-224r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts from Theodorus Anagnosta’s HE</td>
<td>ff. 26r-27r</td>
<td>ff. 15v-20r</td>
<td>ff. 201r-218v</td>
<td>ff. 236v-239v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts from John Diacrinomenus’ HE</td>
<td>ff. 28r-29v</td>
<td>f. 20r</td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 239v-240r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous series of excerpts</td>
<td>ff. 20v-21v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Epitome as it has been handed down in the Parisinus gr. 1555a comes immediately after excerpts from Flavius Josephus’ Antiquitates Judaicae (ff. 5v-7r). Interestingly, a similar sequence occurs in an other manuscript transmitting the Epitome, namely, the Baroccianus gr. 142. Ff. 205v-211r of the Baroccianus gr. 142 contain excerpts from Flavius Josephus’ Antiquitates Judaicae and Vita. Nevertheless, Josephus should not be taken as part of the original Epitome: the excerpts from Josephus in the Parisinus gr. 1555a are preceded by the name: Ἐὐσταθίου Ἐπιφανέως Συρίας. Moreover, the content of the Josephus-excerpts have nothing to do with the chronological arrangement of the excerpts of the Epitome.¹⁰⁰

As the initial title of the Epitome (Συναγωγή ἱστοριῶν διαφόρων...τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας Ἐυσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου) indicates, the first part of the sylloge consisted of excerpts from Eusebius’ HE. De Boor was the first to notice that excerpts from Eusebius had been supplemented with texts not originally derived from his HE. De Boor published his

¹⁰⁰The same in Hansen (1995), XXVII.
findings in an article in 1888. The concatenation of excerpts from Eusebius’ HE shall be discussed in detail in section 4.4. The Eusebian part is followed by excerpts, the attribution of which to Gelasius of Caesarea is disputed. To begin with, de Boor argued that the excerpts which come immediately after Eusebius in the Epitome must be assigned to the Historia christiana by Philip the Side. P. Nautin and G. C. Hansen supported that the text must be assigned to Gelasius of Caesarea (4th c.). By contrast, P. Van Nuffelen argued that the series of excerpts ensuing Eusebius in the Epitome is, originally, derived from an author of the 5th century. Van Nuffelen runs counter to the traditional view that Gelasius of Caesarea wrote a church history, which then served as unacknowledged source for Rufinus and Socrates. Van Nuffelen, by contrast, showed that the extant excerpts in the Epitome must postdate Rufinus and Socrates and are thus wrongly attributed to Gelasius. The excerpts from the text of the so-called ps.-Gelasius are not preceded by any heading in the manuscript transmission of the Epitome. As noted, in the Baroccianus gr. 142, ps.-Gelasius is supplemented with a passage from Philip the Side. It is impossible to say if this passage was the only one excerpted from Philip the Side in the Epitome. The excerpt in the Baroccianus gr. 142 deals with the Christian school (διδακτείον or Ἀκαδημαϊκή σχολή) of Alexandria. The passage names the prominent figures that taught at the school during the first centuries of Christianity. Philip the Side is followed by excerpts from Theodorus Anagnosta’s HT and HE. The excerpts, which are introduced by two different headings in the Baroccianus gr. 142, appear to have been excerpted from two distinct sources. The excerpts from the HE are augmented with passages taken from the HE by John Diacrinomenus. The Athonensis Vatopedinus graecus 286 does not contain any passages from John Diacrinomenus. The codex ends the arrangement of excerpts abruptly with an excerpt from Theodorus Anagnosta’s HE: μακεδόνιος ἀσκητικός ἦν καὶ ιερός ως ύπό Γενναδίου τραφείς, οὗ καὶ ἀδελφιδοὺς, ως λόγος, ύπήρχεν. The last part of the Epitome comprises a series of eighteen anonymous excerpts which, chronologically, bring the sylloge down to the year 610. These excerpts were published by Cramer. Excerpt 16 lists

101 De Boor (1888), 169-171. The additions were republished in Nautin (1994), 219-220.
102 De Boor (1888), esp. 173.
105 See section 4.1.4. The excerpt was published by Hansen (1995), 160.
106 See section 4.2. In the Athonensis Vatopedinus graecus 286 the excerpts from the HE come after those from the HT without any distinctive sign.
107 This is excerpt E 458 in the edition by G. C. Hansen.
the popes from Vigilius to Boniface IV. The latter was Pope from 25 September 608 to his death in 615.

**Table 28: the Epitome in G. C. Hansen’s edition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epitome</th>
<th>Parisinus suppl. gr. 1156</th>
<th>Parisinus gr. 1555a 4-5 (p. 158-159)</th>
<th>Athos Vatopedi 286 1, 3-6 (p. 158-159)</th>
<th>Baroccianus 142 p. 160</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts from Gelasius’ <em>HE</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2, 6 (p. 158-159)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt from Philip the Side’s <em>Historia christiana</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts from the <em>HT</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts from Theodorus Anagnosta’s <em>HE</em></td>
<td>477-496, 520-524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts from John Diacrinomensus’ <em>HE</em></td>
<td>E 525-561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


4.4 The *Epitome* and the HE of Eusebius of Caesarea

The manuscript transmission of the *Epitome* only leaves space for speculation about the accurate content of it. Nothing can be safely said about how much of the genuine collection has been handed down to us. Yet by combining the extant excerpts of the assemblage in the four codices, we can come to a number of verifiable conclusions about the structure, composition and function of it. The focus of this section relies on the use of Eusebius’ *HE* by the seventh-century *Epitome*. Regardless of how much more Eusebian-excerpts were initially included in the *Epitome*, the textual transmission of the *sylloge* permits us to study and explore the working method of the excerptor and the function of the *sylloge*. In what follows, I put forward what the transmission of the Eusebian-excerpts reveals as to a) the relationship of the manuscripts of the *Epitome*, b) the textual additions by the compiler, and c) the working method applied in the *sylloge*.

4.4.1 The relationship between the manuscripts of the *Epitome*

According to P. Nautin, the Baroccianus gr. 142 (B) as well as the Athonensis Vatopedinus graecus 286 (V) depend on a common copy of the *Epitome*, different from the one that the Parisinus gr. 1155a (P) and the Parisinus supp. gr. 1156 (M) descended from.\(^{112}\) Hansen’s view deviates partially from Nautin’s: Hansen indicates the common source of B and V as β. Yet, he found some common readings between BV and P. In Hansen’s view, the similarities could be explained by the existence of the version α, which both β and P (and its prototype M) come from. Though the textual comparison of the Eusebian-excerpts of the *Epitome* provides us with a more complicated picture, it verifies Hansen’s view.

The *Epitome* as preserved in P transmits eighteen excerpts from Eusebius’ work, covering chronologically the period from Christ’s birth down to the reign of Maximinus II Daia (311–313 AD). In the present state of M, the prototype of P for Theodorus Anagnosta’s *HE* and John Diacrinomenus’ *HE*, the Eusebian-excerpts are missing. B and V add a significant number of excerpts.\(^{113}\) The *Epitome* as preserved in B transmits ninety-seven excerpts from Eusebius, covering chronologically the period from Christ’s birth down to Constantine’s victories against the emperors Maxentius and Licinius. V contains 74 Eusebian-excerpts covering the same time span as B.\(^{114}\) In the following, I shall look into the Eusebian-excerpts preserved in PVB. In ten cases, the three codices transmit a

---


\(^{113}\)A few of these fragments have been published by de Boor and Nautin; de Boor (1888), 169-171; Nautin 1994, 219-221. See also below section 4.2.

\(^{114}\)On the common passages in the three codices see Appendix II: table VI.
common excerpt from Eusebius’ work. 115 The numbering of excerpts is that given in my edition of the entire first part of the Epitome in the appendix (Appendix I: text V) of the thesis.

a) V and B share the following significant mistakes: E 1,7 καὶ ἐτάφη P: om. VB; E 6,28 Χριστοῦ P: Κυρίου B: om. V; E 33,5 ἡμῶν P: ἡμᾶς VB; E 78,30 Ἱππολύτου: Ἰπποκράτους VBP.

b) V transmits the following significant mistakes: E 6,28 τῆς ἀρχῆς BP: om. V; E 7,1 χρόνῳ BP: om. V | Κύριος BP: Χριστός V; E 33,3 ἀπόστολον καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴν BP: Θεολόγον V; E 78,29 τοῦ PB: τῶν V; E 78,30 ἐπισκόπου PB: ἐπίσκοπον V; E 98,12 Νικομηδείας ΒP: Νικομηδίου V | πλήθει BP: πλήθη V; E 98,13 ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις γεγενημένου BP: γενομένου ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις V; E 99,18 κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν BP: εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν V; E 99,23 μάρτυρας BP: μαρτυρίας V; E 103,3 Ἑρκούλιος BP: Ἑρκούλιος V; E 103,4 μαραίνομενος BP: κατεχόμενος V.

c) B transmits the following mistakes: E 1,4 μὴ VP: μα’ B; E 1,7 ιθ’ VP: ιθ’ B; E 6,26 ἔτει BP: ἔτος B; E 7,1 ἐπετέλει BP: ἔτελει B; E 33,2 δεύτερος BP: δεύτερον B; E 33,3 ἐποίησε BP: ἐποίη B; E 33,5 τῶν ἀνδρῶν BP: τοῦ ἀνδρὸς B; E 78,30 τὰ BP: τοῦ B; E 78,31 ἐπισκόπου BP: ἐπισκόπον V; E 98,13 ἐμπρησμοῦ BP: ἐμπυρισμοῦ B; E 98,14 κατ’ αὐτῶν BP: om. B; E 99,18 ἐμαρτύρησεν BP: ἐμαρτύρησαν B; E 104,7 ἄλλα VP: om. B | αὐτοῦ BP: αὐτὸν B.

d) P transmits the following significant mistakes: E 6,26 ιβ’ BP: δωδεκάτῳ V: δὲ δεκάτῳ B; E 33,7 ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἀλλὰ ἀναγκαῖα ΒP: om. P; E 40,2 χιλιοντατερίδα B: χιλιοντατερίδα P; E 106,17 πάνδεινα V: πάνδεινον P.

e) P and V share a number of significant mistakes: E 78,29 Βηρύλλου BP: Βηρύλλου V; E 78,31 Ζεφυρίνου B: Ζέφυρον V; E 103,1 Ἐκ τοῦ έννάτου βιβλίου: om. PV; E 103,3 δς καὶ B: om. PV.

f) B and P share the following significant mistakes: E 12,32 εἰς: ἔνα BP; E 13,32 βασιλεύσαντα: βασιλεύσαντος BP; E 39,24 δεδικαιωμένον: δὲ δικαιωμένον BP; E 46,23 βορᾶ: βορρᾶ BP.

The results of the comparison between the shared passages in B, V, and P can be summed up as follows: we identify: a) 2 instances in which VB have a common reading against P, b) 19 instances in which BP have a common reading against V, c) 14 instances in which PV have a common reading against B, and d) 3 instances in which B, V, and P transmit a different reading from each other. The aforementioned results do not verify Nautin’s view that B and V are copies from a template different from the one that P comes

115In 42 cases an excerpt is only contained in B and V. In four cases an excerpt is only transmitted in P and B. In a single case, an excerpt is only preserved in P and V. Most of the variants are orthographical mistakes occurred in P. The different readings are found in the apparatus of the edition of the excerpts in the Appendix I: text V.
from. Hansen's view of the existence of a version of the *Epitome*, (α), used by the prototype of B and V, namely (β), as well as by the prototype of P seem to be more tenable. The stemma in Hansen's view is as follows:

```
    Epitome
       / \  
      α   β
     / \   / \
    M   V  B  P
```

### 4.4.2 Passages added to the selected Eusebian text

The study of the *Eusebian*-passages in P, B, and V confirms de Boor's discovery, namely that the excerpts from Eusebius transmitted in the *Epitome* include material that is not originally found in Eusebius’ *HE*. Table 10 contains all the passages written by the compiler himself and added to the selected *Eusebian* text. As already mentioned, a number of these passages have already been edited by de Boor. Nautin republished de Boor's edition and he accompanied it with a translation in French. De Boor's catalogue of excerpts includes Excerpts 5 (B), 12 (B), 31 (B) = 26 (V) = 4 (P), 36 (B) = 30 (V) = 5 (P), 39 (B) = 33 (V), 46 (B), 47 (B) = 38 (V), 48 (B), 84 (B), and 85 (B). I augment his selection here by adding even more passages that must have been excerpted from a source other than Eusebius’ *HE*. The additional material must be attributed to the excerptor of the *Epitome*, since the insertions are similar to those occurred throughout all the source texts of the *Epitome*. The excerptor inserts into his source texts information on writings that Eusebius does not mention himself.

---

116 De Boor (1888), 167-184.
117 G. C. Hansen points out that though Theodorus Anagnosta rarely make changes in his source texts (Theodoret, Socrates and Sozomen), the excerptor of the *Epitome*, by contrast, intervenes in Theodorus’ text more actively by adding data on a number of canons and epistles; Hansen (1995), XXXVII-XXXVIII.
Table 29: passages added to the selected Eusebian text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epitome</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>(V)</th>
<th>(P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 1</td>
<td>Exc. 1</td>
<td>Exc. 1</td>
<td>Exc. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ δὲ τι’ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἐτάφη καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἀνελήφθη.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 5</td>
<td>Exc. 5</td>
<td>Exc. 1</td>
<td>Exc. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἢν δὲ ὁ Ἀφρικανὸς ἀπὸ Ἕμμαοῦς τῆς κώμης τῆς ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ, ἐν ἦν οἱ περὶ Κλεδᾶν ἐπορεύοντο, ἦτος ὅστος δίκαιος πόλεως λαβοῦσα κατὰ προσβείαν Ἀφρικανοῦ Νικόπολις μετωνομάσθη.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 6</td>
<td>Exc. 6</td>
<td>Exc. 3</td>
<td>Exc. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔπηροτεεῖν πρὸ τριῶν ἐτών τῆς ἁρχῆς τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 7</td>
<td>Exc. 7</td>
<td>Exc. 3</td>
<td>Exc. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Αριστοτέλης ἐπετέλεσε τά διασωμάτα, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἐως τοῦ θείου σταυροῦ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 8</td>
<td>Exc. 8</td>
<td>Exc. 4</td>
<td>Exc. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ἱωάννης τὸν Κανδάκην βαπτίζων τὸν Αἰθίοπα οὐκ ἦν ἀπόστολος (…) Κανδάκην δὲ φησὶ πρῶτον ἐξ ἐθνῶν βαπτισθῆναι.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 10</td>
<td>Exc. 10</td>
<td>Exc. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Φίλιππος οὗ τὸν Κανδάκην βαπτίζων τὸν Αἰθίοπα οὐκ ἦν ἀπόστολος (…) Κανδάκην δὲ φησὶ πρῶτον ἐξ ἐθνῶν βαπτισθῆναι.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 11</td>
<td>Exc. 11</td>
<td>Exc. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Φίλιππος “στόμα λαμπάδων”, Ἡρωδιάς “ἀπατωμένη”, Ἡρωδης “δερματίνη δόξα” κατὰ Πιέριον.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 12</td>
<td>Exc. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπὶ Φήστου σὺν τῇ ἁδελφῇ Βερενίκῃ Παῦλον τὸν ἅγιον ἀπόστολον κρίνας εἰς Καισάρειαν. καὶ τούτων αἱ ἀποδείξεις πρόδηλοι παρὰ τῷ Ἰωσήφῳ καὶ τῶν ἀπόστολων ταῖς Πράξεσι.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 33</td>
<td>Exc. 31</td>
<td>Exc. 26</td>
<td>Exc. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ λόγῳ τῶν εἰς τὸ Πάσχα ἐνίσταται ὅτι Παῦλος εἶχε γυναῖκα καὶ ταύτην τῷ θεῷ διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνεθετο, τῇ πρὸς αὐτὴν κοινωνίᾳ ἀποταξάμενη.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 38</td>
<td>Exc. 36</td>
<td>Exc. 30</td>
<td>Exc. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν τῷ Πάσχα πολὺ ἐνίσταται ὅτι Παῦλος ἐγενότατα ἢ τῷ θεῷ διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνέθετο, τῇ πρὸς αὐτὴν κοινωνίᾳ ἀποταξάμενος.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 39</td>
<td>Exc. 37</td>
<td>Exc. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν τῷ ἀγίῳ ἀποστόλου Παῦλου.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 42</td>
<td>Exc. 39</td>
<td>Exc. 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ Πιέριος δὲ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ λόγῳ τῶν εἰς τὸ Πάσχα πολὺ ἐνίσταται ὅτι Παῦλος ἐγενότατα ἢ τῷ θεῷ διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνέθετο, τῇ πρὸς αὐτὴν κοινωνίᾳ ἀποταξάμενος.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 49</td>
<td>Exc. 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ἀπό Παπίας ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ λέγει ὅτι Ἰωάννης τῷ Θεολόγῳ καὶ Ἰάκωβος δὲ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνηρέθησαν.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Επιτομή (B)</th>
<th>(V)</th>
<th>(P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 50</td>
<td>Exc. 47</td>
<td>Exc. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παπίας ὁ εἰρημένος ἱστόρησεν ως παραλαβὼν ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων Φιλίππου, ὃτι Βαρσαβᾶ ὁ καὶ Ἰοῦστος δοκιμαζόμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπίστων ἰδίᾳ ἐχίδνης πιὼν, ἐν ὅννυματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπαθῆς διεφύλαξη, ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα θαύματα καὶ μάλιστα τὸ κατὰ τὴν μητέρα Μαναήμου τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσαν &lt;καί&gt; περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντων, ὃτι ἔως Ἀδριανοῦ ἔζων.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 51</td>
<td>Exc. 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ὅ δὲ Χρυσόστομος ἐν τῇ α΄ ὑμιλίᾳ τοῦ δευτέρου τμήματος τῆς α΄ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῆς λέγει ὅτι καὶ &lt;ὁί&gt; ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναστάντες ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ οἱ πρὸ αὐτῶν πάντες ἀπέθανον.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 52</td>
<td>Exc. 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ὅν καὶ τὸν κατάλογον Εὐσέβιος ἐποίησατο.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 58</td>
<td>Exc. 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰερομόναχος ὑμεῖς καὶ τὸν κατάλογον παρέθετο Εὐσέβιος τὰ κατὰ Ναυάτον γράφων.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 92</td>
<td>Exc. 54</td>
<td>Exc. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἦντινα στήλην κατέβαλεν ὁ Παραβάτης.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 96</td>
<td>Exc. 84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ὅ δὲ Πιέριος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ λόγῳ τῶν εἰς τὸ Πάσχα ἐνίσταται.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 97</td>
<td>Exc. 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ὅτι Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος γυναίκα εἶχε καὶ αὐτήν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καθιέρωσεν τῆς πρὸς αὐτὴν κοινωνίαν ἀποταξάμενος, ἐνέτυχον δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐτέροις σπουδάσμασι πλείσσον ἀναγκαίοις καὶ μάλιστα τῷ περὶ τῆς θεοτόκου καὶ τῷ εἰς τὴν ἀρχήν του Ὠσε. Θεόδωρος δὲ τὶς συνηγοροῦν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρεία γράψας δι’ ἐπὸν ἐν τρισκαιδεκάτῳ λόγῳ φησὶν ὃτι καὶ Πιέριος Ἰσίδωρος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ἐμαρτύρησαν καὶ ναὸν ἔχουσιν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ μέγιστου. ἐν δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τῷ εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ ἀγίου Παμφύλου αὐτὸς ὁ Πιέριος πλείστα ὑφέλησεν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 99</td>
<td>Exc. 87</td>
<td>Exc. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περὶ ὧν ζητητέον, εἰ ἀριθμοῦνται εἰς μάρτυρας.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epitome</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 101</td>
<td>Exc. 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 103</td>
<td>Exc. 90</td>
<td>Exc. 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 104</td>
<td>Exc. 91</td>
<td>Exc. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 113</td>
<td>Exc. 97</td>
<td>Exc. 74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the passages quoted above the following remarks can be made:

1) excerpts 1 E, 6 E, 7 E, 33 E, 38 E, 78 E, 99 E, and 103 E are included in all three manuscripts. As noted, B, V, and P are likely to depend on a common version of the Epitome. Exc. 86 E is transmitted by both, 77 B and 50 V. The additional sentence is only found in 77 B, though. Exc. 104 E is handed down by all three manuscripts: 91 B, 64 V, 17 P. The augmented passage by the compiler of the Epitome is only found in 91 B and 64 V.

2) 7 excerpts from de Boor’s catalogue are nominally assigned to three obscure authors of the 2nd and the 3rd centuries: Papias (46 B, 47 B = 38 V, 48 B),\(^ {118}\) Hugesippus (31 B = 26 V = 4 P) and Pierius (12 B, 39 B = 33 V, 84 B, 85 B).

3) Exc. 5 B transmits two pieces of information; a) Cleopas walked (from Jerusalem) to Emmaus, a village in Palestine, and b) Emmaus, the village in Palestine, assumed the name Nicopolis, when the historian Africanus was its ambassador. None of the information mentioned above is included in Eusebius’ HE. Cleopas appears in Luke (24, 13-27) and Eusebius quoted Luke 24, 13 in two other writings, namely, the Onomasticon\(^ {119}\) and the Supplementa ad quaestiones ad Marinum.\(^ {120}\) Interestingly, the notice on the older name of Nikopolis reoccurs, in a totally different context, in the part of the Epitome bearing excerpts from the HT: Ἐν Νικοπόλει τῆς Παλαιστίνης τῇ ποτὲ Ἐμμαοὺς πηγή ἐστιν παντοῖς ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀλόγων ἱάσεις παρέχουσα, ἐν ᾧ λόγος τὸν κύριον ἐξ ὀδυσσείας τὸς πόδας ἀπονύψασθαι.\(^ {121}\) The passage in the HT is originally derived from Sozomen’s HE V 21,5-22,1. Sozomen does not make any reference to Africanus’ office either. The same

---

\(^ {118}\) The E 48 = B 45 = 37 V is a fragment from Papias transmitted by the HE of Eusebius; cf. Eusebius, HE 3, XXXIX.1-2, XXXIX.4.

holds true for the Latin version of Sozomen’s *HE*, the compilation by Cassiodorus.\(^\text{122}\) It is Jerome’s Latin translation of Eusebius’ *Chronicon*,\(^\text{123}\) the Armenian translation\(^\text{124}\) of it, the *Chronicon paschale*\(^\text{125}\) and Georgius Syncellus’ *Ecloga chronographica*\(^\text{126}\) that transmit a passage close to exc. 5 B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 30: the origin of 5 E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ἐνδὲ ο</em>*=&quot;In&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐρευνω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παλαιστίνης, ἐν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή οἱ περὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κλεόπαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπορεύοντο,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὴς ὄστερον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δίκαια πόλεως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπεσταλμένου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἑλληνικὸς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ιουλίου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νικόπολις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρεσβεύσαμένου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μετωνομάσθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νικόπολις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νικόπολις</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the passage occurs in the Armenian translation of Eusebius’ *Chronicon*, the text recorded in Jerome and the *Chronicon paschale* are literally identical. The notice on the old name of Nicopolis must be attributed to Eusebius’ *Chronicon*. All three texts, Jerome’s translation, the compiler of the *Chronicon paschale* and Syncellus do not include the remark about Cleopas’ attempt to reach Emmaus (Luke 24, 13), though. Interestingly,

\(^{122}\) Cf. Cassiodorus, *HE* VI.42. I am indebted to Dr. Emerance Delacenserie for this remark.

\(^{123}\) Helm (ed.) (1956).


\(^{126}\) Masshammer (ed.) (1984); Adler – Tuffin (edd.) (2002).
Syncellus seems to be familiar with the passage in Luke. This can be inferred by the phrase: περὶ ἧς φέρεται ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐαγγελίωις in Ecloga chronographica 439, 16. The notice that Emmaus was Africanus’ hometown is missing in Jerome, the Chronicon paschale and Syncellus’ chronicle, as well. The information on Africanus’ origins is unique. The Suda, instead, calls him a Libyan and a fragment from Africanus’ Cesti in the Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 412 transmits a controversial sentence about Africanus’ descent: τὴν τ’ ἐξαερὴν σύμπασαν ὑπόθεσιν ἀνακειμένην ε[ὔ]ρήσεις ἐν τε τοῖς ἀρχείοις τῆς ἀρχαίας π[α]τρίδος κολων[ιάς] [Α]λιάς Καπιτωλίνης τῆς Παλαιατίνης κάν Ὕση τῆς Καρίας. According to this fragment, Africanus was originally from the Roman Near East. Jerusalem was given the name Colonia Aelia Capitolina after the refounding of the city under the Roman emperor Hadrian. If this is the case, the notice that Ἦν δὲ ὁ Ἀφρικανός ἀπὸ Ἐμμαοῦς τῆς κώμης τῆς ἐν Παλαιατίνῃ (5 B) is incorrect. It is impossible to know where the compiler of the Epitome drew the mistaken remark about Africanus’ hometown from. It is tempting to think that, as far as exc. 5 B is concerned, Georgius Syncellus and the compiler of the Epitome made use of a common source. As already mentioned, a passage recording that the city of Nicopolis was initially called Emmaus is inserted in the part of the Epitome bearing excerpts from the HT. Africanus is absent there. The very last fact suggests that the two parts in the Epitome did not rely on a single text, as Nautin and Hansen support.

4) In 8 B = 4 V, the mention of Berenice, Agrippas II’s sister, alludes to the Act. 25, 13-14 and Acts 26, 1-2. Berenice is not mentioned in Eusebius’ HE whatsoever. The possibility that the name of Agrippas II’ sister is an addition by the compiler can by no means be excluded.

5) Exc. 11 B = 8 V transmits that Candace, a man of Ethiopia, was promptly baptised in some nearby water by Philip the Evangelist. Both elements occur in the Act. 8, 26-40. Eusebius, instead, does not give the name of the Ethiopian man and records that the Ethiopian received from Philip by revelation the mysteries of the divine word.

6) 101 E nominally assigns the information that Lucian the Martyr was buried at the city of Helenopolis to Eusebius’ Chronicon. Helenopolis was formerly called Drepana and

127Ἀφρικανός, ὁ Σέκτος χρηματίσας, φιλόσοφος, Ἀλίβις, ὁ τοὺς Κεστοὺς γεγραφὼν ἐν βιβλίοις κδʹ; cf. Suda, α 4647 Ἀφρικανός.

128And you will find my proposed passage in its entirety deposited in the archives of the former homeland, Colonia Aelia Capitolina of Palestine, and in Nysa of Caria; cf. Wallraff – Scardino – Mecella – Guignard (edd.) (2012), 31. J. R. Vieillefond saw this passage as an evidence of Africanus’ Jewish origin. His theory has generally been rejected. On Vieillefond’s interpretation of this passage see Wallraff – Scardino – Mecella – Guignard (edd.) (2012), XII-XIII.

129M. Wallraff, in his edition of Julius Africanus’ Cesti, includes Georgius Syncellus’ testimony on Africanus’ descent. Nevertheless, M. Wallraff appears to be unaware of the existence of exc. 5 in the Epitome as preserved in the Baroccianus gr. 142.

130Eusebius, HE 2, 1.13.
was given the name Hellenopolis by the emperor Constantine (reign 306-337) to honour his mother Helena. Jerome and the *Chronicon paschale*, once again, transmit a blatantly identical passage on the re-foundation of Drepana, an event that took place in the year 327. The dating of the re-foundation of Dremana in 327 by Jerome makes it impossible that the passage originally derived from Eusebius’ *Chronicon*, the last edition of which was completed in 325 AD. Interestingly, the passage on Drepana occurs in Theophanes’ *Chronographia*, as well. Theophanes agrees with Jerome’s chronology and the *Chronographia* appears to follow Jerome’s text up to the year 346. Since Theophanes’ text contains more information than Jerome’s, R. W. Burgess concluded that the two chroniclers made use of a common source for the events from 325 up to 346 AD.

---

**Table 31: the origin of 101 E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λέγει δε ἐν τοις Χρονικοῖς κανόσιν ὁ Εὐσέβιος ὃ ἐν Ἑλενούπολει τῆς Βιθυνίας κεῖται ὁ ἅγιος.</td>
<td>Drepanum Bithyniae civitatem in honorem martyrís</td>
<td>Δρεπάνον ἐπικτίσας ὁ βασιλεὺς Κωνσταντῖνος ἐν Βιθυνίᾳ εἰς τιμήν τοῦ ἅγιου μάρτυρος Λουκιανοῦ ὁμώνυμον τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ Ἑλενόπολιν κέκληκεν.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τῷ δ’ αὐτῷ ἔτει καὶ Δρεπάναν ἐπικτίσας εἰς τιμήν Λουκιανοῦ τοῦ ἐκείσε μάρτυρος ὁμώνυμον τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ Ἑλενόπολιν κέκληκεν.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R. W. Burgess postulated that the passage in common comes from the so-called *Continuatio Antiochensis Eusebii*, that is, an anonymous continuation of Eusebius’ *Chronicon*, written in Greek and covering the years 325-350. In fact, the passage in question records

---

131 According to Procopius, Drepana was the birthplace of Helena; cf. Procopius, *De aedificiis* 5.2.1-5. The renaming of the city is also attested in Eusebius’ *Vita Constantini* 4,61.1; Ammianus Marcelinus, *Res Gestae* 26,8.1; Malalas, *Chronographia* 13,12; Socrates, *HE* 1,17. On Helena’s hometown see also Drijvers (1992), 9-19.


133 The shared passages between Jerome and Theophanes are also found in a significant number of chronicles written in Greek (e.g. *Chronicon paschale*), Syriac and Arabic. In all of them, the common passages must derive from a single source, now lost. See also the list of chronicles which made use of the now lost source in Burgess (1999), 116-117.

134 Burgess (1999), esp. 113-143. R. W. Burgess attempted to reconstruct the now lost text of the *Continuatio* by relying on textual parallels between chronicles that made use of the *Continuatio*, namely Jerome’s *Chronicon*,.
two events. It connects the restoration of Drepana with the martyrdom of Lucian: Constantine had restored the city in honour of Lucian the martyr. Theophanes’ information that Lucian martyred in Drepana (τοῦ ἐκεῖσε μάρτυρος) is actually not true. Lucian was tortured and executed in Nicomedia. His dead body was then brought to Drepana and was buried there. The martyrdom and burial of Lucian at Drepana happened in 313, and Constantine’s re-founding of the city took place in 327. The latter, as noted, is unlikely to have been included in Eusebius’ Chronicon. As far as the note on Lucian is concerned, it is absent in the Latin as well as the Armenian translation of Eusebian’s Chronicon. It is impossible to know whether the phrase was recorded in Eusebius’ original work. The notice is not attested in any of the chronicles we know that relied on Eusebius; it only occurs in the historical context of the renaming of Drepana in texts that drew on the Continuatio. The most likely explanation we can come up with is that the Epitome drew on the Continuatio, as well. The compiler of the Epitome has might been unaware of the fact he used a continuation to Eusebius’ chronicle, though. This is logical if we think that the Continuatio exhibits the shame phrasing, wording and structure with Eusebius’ Chronicon. It is also possible that the Continuatio circulated together with the Chronicon without any distinction between the texts whatsoever.

4.4.3 The redaction of the Eusebian part

The aim of the section is to identify how a Byzantine compiler consciously selected, excerpted, put together and organized material from earlier texts in order to form a coherent collection of historical excerpts. The study of the content of the Epitome generates marked results in respect to the excerpting method of its compiler: the deconstruction of texts and their reconstruction in a new context. In particular, the

Theophanes’ Chronographia, the so-called Chron. 724, the Chronicon paschale, Michael the Syrian’s chronicle and the so-called Chron. 1234; cf. Burgess (1999), 150-177. According to R. W. Burgess, the author of the Continuatio Antiochensis Eusebii was a Nicene; cf. Burgess (1999), 126. The fact that he accepts the deposition of Athanasius (339 AD) suggests that the author of the Continuatio has probably been pro-Arian. J. Reidy (2015), 471-487, by contrast, identifies the author with Eusebius of Emesa. Such speculation is to be resisted; cf. Van Hooft – Van Nuffelen (2017).

135On Lucian the Martyr see Downey (1974), 337-342.
136Eusebius’ HE 8, XIII.2; 9, VI.2; PG 114, col. 408 (Vita Luciani).
137Jerome, De Viris Illustribus 77: Passus est Nicemediae ob confessionem Christi sub persecution Maximini sepulusque Helenopoli Bithyniae. Philostorgius, HE 24,23-27, records that the city of Helenopolis was founded by Helena because in this place Lucian was buried: ἐτί δὲ Λουκιανὸς ὁ μάρτυς ἐκεῖσε τύχοι μετὰ τὸν μαρτυρικὸν θάνατον ὑπὸ δελφῖνος ἐκκομισθείς. Yet, Philostorgius uses as source the Vita Luciani (PG 114, col. 397-416); cf. Bidez (1981), XCII-XCIV and CXLVII-CLI.
138On the date of Helena’s death see Drijvers (1999), 13 and 73-76.
139Philostorgius for the section on Lucian relied on the Vita Luciani; see above n. 137.
content and arrangement of the Eusebian-excerpts reveal the three procedures of redacting an excerpt collection; a. reading of the whole source text and selection of passages, b. rewriting of the source text, and c. composition of a new unity. With regard to the Eusebian-excerpts, the rewriting of the selected passages involved changes in terms of their structure and content. The changes consist in a. replacing of words with others that explain the text better b. re-arranging of passages, and c. textual additions.

Upon careful examination of the excerpted passages it turns out that their synthesis in the Epitome was based on the principles revealed in the prooemium to the EC as well as seen in the contents of other contemporary or later collections of excerpts. These principles are: selection (ἐκλογή), brevity (συντομία) and accuracy (ἀκρίβεια). Likewise, we know from other collections that the excerptor had to select historical material according to certain precise themes. Successful selection in terms of themes would determine the tie between the various parts throughout the collection. In what follows, I put forward a number of instances of the aforementioned alterations in format and content of the excerpts in the course of the redaction of the Epitome. I shall confine myself to considering the 18 excerpts from the Epitome as preserved in P (see Table 32). 11 out of 18 excerpts in total in P are also found in B and V. 4 out of the 18 excerpts in P are included in B, 2 out of the 10 are found in V and just a single excerpt in P is not transmitted in any of the rest manuscripts of the Epitome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epitome (E)</th>
<th>Barocc. gr. 142 (B)</th>
<th>Ath.Vat. 286 (V)</th>
<th>Paris. gr. 1555a (P)</th>
<th>Eusebius’ <em>HE</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HE 1, V.1-2, X.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HE 1, IX.2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HE 1, X.1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25, 26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HE 3, XVII.1, XVIII.1, XX.1-5; Hegesippus fr.3 de Boor 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>HE 3, XV.3-6; fontem non inveni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>HE 3, XVII.1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>HE 3, XVIII.1-2, XVIII.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>HE 4, X.1, XI.2, XI.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>HE 5, V.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HE 6, XX.1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>HE 7, XVII.1, XVIII.1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>HE 7, XXV.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>HE 7, XXVII.1-2, XXVIII.1, XXIX.2, XXXI.6, XXXII.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>HE 8, VI.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>HE 8, III.1, XI.2, XII.3, XII.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>HE 8, XIII.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64,65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>HE 8, XIII.12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>HE 8, XIV.1-2, XIV.5, XIV.7, XVI.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *Epitome* begins with the chronological calculation of Christ’s birth, baptism, crucifixion, resurrection and ascension (excerpt 1 E). This account takes up the first three excerpts of the *sylloge* in BVP. I would like to draw attention to the last sentence of the first excerpt: τῷ δὲ ιό’ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἔτάφῃ καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἀνελήφθη. The sentence sums up the content of the following two excerpts in the *Epitome* and, therefore, it makes up a short introduction, composed by the compiler himself, who combined a few words of the original text. It should be remembered that the compilers of the *EC* and the *Excerpta Anonymi* often altered the beginning of a text in the same way.

Excerpt 6 E erroneously records that Pilate was given the administration of Judea in the tenth year of Tiberius’ reign. But Pilate was appointed procurator of Judea in the twelfth year of the reign. The mistake in the *Epitome* must have been caused in the transmission of the text. The copyist of P is likely to have misread the manuscript he was using. The *Epitome* adds that Pilate’s appointment took place three years before Christ’s baptism and the following excerpt reports that the baptism occurred in the fifteenth year of Tiberius’ reign. The compiler’s addition at that point is crucial for the clarity of the passage since it corrects the chronological reckoning of the events; Pilate was given the administration of Judea in the twelfth year of the reign of Tiberius.

In excerpt 7 E the intervention on the part of the compiler consists in re-arranging the passages as well as in replacing words with others that explain the text better. Let us have a look at the original context of the passage. Eusebius first quotes the Apostle Luke explaining that Jesus completed the whole time of his teaching while Annas and Caiaphas were high priests. Immediately after this quotation, Eusebius copies verbatim a passage from Josephus’ *Antiquitates Judaicae* giving the names of the four high priests appointed after Annas and before Caiaphas. The compiler of the *Epitome*, instead, puts the passage taken from Josephus first and concludes with Luke’s words. The rearrangement of the passages indicates that the compiler had first read through the text, and then made a copy of the selected passages he wanted to include in the *Epitome*. The draft copy made it easier for him to employ his selections independently. Finally, Eusebius transmits that the Romans entrusted the high priesthood to the ἄλλοι, which in the text means different men. In the *Epitome*, by contrast, the ἄλλοι has been substituted by the phrase οἱ Ἑνδάιοι, which makes the text more precise. The inclusion of the οἱ Ἑνδάιοι suggests, once again, the familiarity of the compiler with the broader context of the text he finally extracted.

---

141The three excerpts are taken from the second half (sections V-X) of the first book of Eusebius’ *HE*. The BV transmit more excerpts taken from this part of Eusebius’ work. On the excerpts transmitted in the BV but not in P see Appendix II: table VI.
142See, for example, the cases in the *Excerpta de legationibus*, 29 and the *Excerpta Anonymi* 29,1-13.
143Eusebius also gives τὸ δωδέκατον ἕτεος; cf. Eusebius, *HE* 1, IX.2.
144ἐπιτροπεύειν πρὸ γ ἐτῶν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ θείου τοῦ Χριστοῦ βαπτισμάτου.
145P. Nautin’s argument is that the mistake must be due to the amanuenses, since the expression τῷ δωδεκάτῳ ἕτεοι could easily sound like τῷ δὲ δεκάτῳ ἕτεοι; cf. Nautin (1994).
Table 33: 7 E and Eusebius’ HE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 E</th>
<th>HE 1, X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐν ψ χρόνῳ ὁ Κύριος ἐπετέλει τὰ</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τοῦτων δὴ οὖν, κατὰ τὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θαύματα, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος</td>
<td>εὐαγγελισθῆν ἢς πεντεκαδέκατον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἕως τοῦ θείου σταυροῦ καὶ τῆς</td>
<td>Τιβέριου Καίσαρος ἄγοντος, (...) Φησίν δὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναστάσεως. τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἐνιαύσιον</td>
<td>αὐτὸν ἢ θεία γραφὴ τὸν πάντα τῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρὰ 'Ρωμαίων οἱ ἱσουαὶ ἐνεχειρίζοντο,</td>
<td>διδασκαλίας διατελέσαι χρόνων ἐπὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἕν τῷ Ι' ἤτε τῷ Τιβέριου Ἀννας ἰεράτευσε.</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεῖς Ἀννα καὶ Καϊάφα, δηλοῦσα ὅτι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ δὲ ἴς Ἀσμαήλος ὁ Φαβί καὶ τῷ ἰζ' Ἐλεάζαρος</td>
<td>δὴ ἐν τοῖς μεταξὺ τῆς τοῦτων ἔτειν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ τοῦ Ἀννα καὶ τῷ ἰπ' Σίμων ὁ τοῦ Καμίθου,</td>
<td>λειτουργίας ὁ πᾶς τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τῷ ἰθ' Ἰώσηπος ὁ καὶ Καϊάφας, ὡς</td>
<td>συνεπεράνθη χρόνος, (...) ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰστορεῖ Ἰώσηπος, ὡς εἶναι δῆλον ὅτι</td>
<td>Ἠρωμαίκων ἤγειμόνων ἄλλοτε ἄλλοι τῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λουκάς τὸ ὅλον κήρυγμα γεγονέναι ἐπὶ</td>
<td>ἀρχιερωσύνην ἐπιτρεπόμενον, οὐ πλεῖον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχιερείως Ἀννα καὶ Καϊάφα, διὰ τῶν ἄκρων</td>
<td>ἐξους ἐνὸς ἐπὶ ταύτης διετέλουν. ἰστορεῖ δ'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
transmitted in all three codices (BVP). In fact, B transmits a longer text: ἀναφέρει δὲ ὁ Ἡγήσιππος καὶ τὰ ἀνόματα αὐτῶν, καὶ φησὶν ὅτι ὁ μὲν ἐκαλεῖτο Ζωκίρ, ὁ δὲ Ἰάκωβος. Ἰστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἀναγκαία.

It is noteworthy that such additions on the part of the compiler of the Epitome are frequent throughout the entire sylloge of excerpts. Virtually all additions concern sources the compiler used supplementarily in the Epitome. G. C. Hansen and P. Nautin agree that the passages added to the Epitome should be assigned to the compiler of the Epitome. Excerpt 5 P is, likewise, a textual intervention on the part of the compiler of the Epitome. 5 P reads as follows: εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα εὐαγγέλια ψευδή τὸ κατὰ Αἰγυπτίους, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς δώδεκα, καὶ κατὰ Βασιλείδην. The text is absent in Eusebius. The compiler of the Epitome must have relied on a different source, at this point. In the HE 4, VII, Eusebius only refers to the leaders of two heresies: Saturninus and Basilides. In B and V the excerpt 5 P appears at the end of a passage excerpted from Eusebius, but is absent in the Parisinus. The passage in B and V deals with epistles written by heretical figures and circulated under the names of apostles. P contains only what seems to have been written by the compiler of the Epitome himself. The absence of the Eusebian excerpt in P must not necessarily be attributed to the hypothesis that it descends from a copy of the Epitome different from the one that B and V come from. Besides, P transmits only a small portion of the series of excerpts from Eusebius’ HE.

Excerpts 39 E and 40 E are concerned with two heretical movements, the heresy of Ebionites and that of Cerinthus, respectively. In both excerpts, the original text is transmitted in the Epitome shortened and simplified. In excerpt 39 E the phrase τοῦ μὲν ἀποστόλου has been replaced by the sentence τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Παύλου. The substitution, like the one in excerpt 7 E, makes the passage lucid. The name of the apostle is easily inferred from the general context of the original text.

Heresies and heretical figures appear to be the compiler’s main interest, thematically. The theme of heresies is the focal point of Book 3 in Eusebius’ HE. Book 3 contains three chapters, each of which deals with a heresy; the heresy of Ebionites, the heresy of Cerinthus and the heresy of the Nikolaitans respectively. At this point, B is, once again, most helpful in our effort to establish the contents of the Epitome. B 39 = V 33 transmits an excerpt taken from the last part of Eusebius’ Book 3. In the excerpt the apostles are tested by the prospect of marriage. This subject matter refers to the beliefs of the heresy of the Nikolaitans. Accordingly, it turns out that the Epitome, in its original form, contained excerpts on all three heretical movements mentioned in Eusebius.

---

146See above section 4.4.2.
147G. C. Hansen and P. Nautin, however, see the so-called Epitome as a summary of Theodorus Anagnosta’s collection of historical works in their entirety; Nautin (1994), 219-223; Hansen (1995), esp. XXXVII-XXXIX.
148Eusebius, HE 3, XXV.3-6.
149Eusebius, HE 3, XXX.1-2.
Excerpt 54 E is thematically connected to the two preceding excerpts. Excerpt 54 E is concerned with the heretical teachings by Valentinus and Cedro. The end of the original Eusebian passage (HE 4, X) was singled out and moved to the beginning of excerpt 54 E, serving as prefatory material to it. Thus, the compiler introduces us, first, to the two heretic teachers and then he excerpts the following Eusebian section (HE 4, XI) and briefly records their teachings. Again there is nothing different from the method applied in the Excerpta Anonymi and the EC.

A similar intervention on the part of the excerptor occurs in excerpt 64 E of the Epitome. The passage deals with a certain Alcibiades who used to partake solely of bread and water. The martyr Attalus, however, persuaded him to partake of everything without restraint and give thanks to God. The beginning of the passage in the Epitome reflects, once again, the compiler’s method in synthesizing his work. The passage begins with the statement that Alcibiades was one of the martyrs in France. The information derives from the end in Eusebius’ original passage. Such internal changes suggest that the compiler worked on a copy of the entire passage.

Table 34: 64 E and Eusebius’ HE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>64 E</th>
<th>Eusebius, HE 5, III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἀλκibiάδου τινός τὸν ἐν Γαλλίᾳ μαρτύρον ἐγκρατευομένου πολὺ καὶ μηδέποτε μεταλαμβάνοντος πλὴν ἄρτου καὶ ὕδατος, τούτο δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ πειρωμένου ποιεῖν, ἀπεκαλύφθη Ἀττάλῳ τῷ μάρτυρι ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ, μετὰ τὸν ἐν τῷ ἀμφιθεάτρῳ πρῶτον ἄγωνα, κατειπεῖν τινας ὅτι οὐ καλὸς ποιεῖ Ἀλκibiάδης μὴ χρώμενος τοῖς κτίσμαι τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἄλλοις τύποις σκανδάλου γενόμενος, ἃν ἀκούσας Ἀλκibiάδης, πάντων μεταλαμβάνων, ἡμυχαρίστηται τῷ Θεῷ.</td>
<td>(2) Ἀλκibiάδου γὰρ τινὸς ἐξ αὐτῶν πάνυ ἀχύμηρον βιοῦντος βίον καὶ μηδενὸς ὠλος τὸ πρῶτον μεταλαμβάνοντος, ἀλλ’ ἡ ἄρτῳ μόνῳ καὶ ὕδατι χρωμένου πειρωμένου τε καὶ ἐν τῇ εἰρκτῇ ὤτῳ διάγειν, Ἀττάλῳ μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον ἄγωνα ὅν ἐν τῷ ἀμφιθεάτρῳ ἔνυσθην, ἀπεκαλύφθη ὃτι μὴ καλὸς ποιεῖ ἡ Ἀλκibiάδης μὴ χρώμενος τοῖς κτίσμαι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἄλλοις τύποι σκανδάλου ύπολειπόμενος, (3) πεισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἀλκibiάδης πάντων ἀνέδην μεταλαμβανεὶ καὶ ἠμυχαρίστητε τῷ θεῷ οὐ γὰρ ἀνεπίσκεπτοι χάριτος θεοῦ ἔσαν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγων ἢν σύμβουλον αὐτοῖς, καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὡδι ἐχέτω (... (5) ἐκτελοῦμεν πίστιν παρὰ πολλοῖς τοῦ κάκεινους προφητεύειν παρεῖχον καὶ δὴ διαφωνίας ὑπαρχοῦσας περὶ τῶν δεδηλωμένων, αὕθις οἱ κατὰ τὴν Γαλλίαν ἀδελφοὶ τὴν ἰδίαν κρίσιν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐυλαβῆς καὶ ὀρθοδοξότατην ὑποτάττουσιν, ἐκθέμενοι καὶ τῶν παρ’ αὐτοῖς τελειωθέντων μαρτύρων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excerpt 78 E refers to the library at Aelia set up by Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem. In the original text, Eusebius admits that he used material found in the library in composing his own history. Eusebius reports the names of several writers he drew from. The compiler of the Epitome transmits Eusebius’ report of the valuable writings he discovered in the library in Jerusalem. Such a quotation would certainly reinforce the reliability of the Epitome.

Excerpt 92 E represents the story of a woman who found relief from her disease at the hands of the Saviour. Our compiler specifies that the story took place in Paneion, which is a piece of information derived from an earlier part of the Eusebian text. The compiler’s intention was to clarify the text and make it more intelligible.

Excerpt 93 E condenses into a short passage of five lines two sections of the HE. The passage transmits Dionysius’ view on the authorship of the Apocalypse. Eusebius, through a long chapter, transmits almost verbatim a long extract from Dionysius’ work, in which Dionysius presents opinions of several others on the authorship of the Apocalypse, while justifying his own slant on the matter. According to Dionysius the Apocalypse of John the Divine could have been written by someone called John, other than the Evangelist.

Excerpt 94 E is made up of passages taken from several sections of Book 7 of Eusebius’ HE. Two of the passages were taken from HE 7, XXXII. In the Loeb Classical Library edition by L. Kirsopp the section covers twenty pages.150 Excerpt 94 E is not the only excerpt from HE 7, XXXII originally to be included in the Epitome, though. B transmits a second excerpt from the same Eusebian section. The extract in B deals with Pierius of Alexandria and Meletius of Pontus151.

Excerpts 98 E and 99 E are concerned with the persecution under the emperor Diocletian. Eusebius’ Book 8 deals with the persecutions of Christians and narrates the martyrdoms of several known bishops. Excerpt 98 E constitutes a reference to the martyrdom of Anthimus the bishop of Nicomedia. The compiler of the Epitome supplements the excerpt with a statement made up of passages taken from different parts of Book 8. The added text informs us that during the persecution under Diocletian countless Christians were murdered: ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Διοκλητιανός Χριστιανόν τοῦτο πεπραχέναι, διὰ τὸν ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ κατ’ αὐτῶν διωγμὸν σωρηδὸν κατ’ ἀγέλας τὰς Χριστιανῶν μυριάδας ἀνείλεν. The addition is a recapitulation of what Eusebius describes throughout Book 8 of his HE. The insertion of brief passages summarising the original Eusebian text is typical of the method of the compiler of the Epitome.

Excerpt 99 E opens by repeating the statement of the preceding passage: Διοκλητιανός φρικωδέστατον κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἥγειρε διωγμὸν καὶ πολλὰς μυριάδας Χριστιανῶν κατὰ πάντα

---

151 Eusebius, HE 7, XXXII is devoted to the most conspicuous churchmen of Eusebius’ age. The major part of the section is concerned with the Canons of Pascha by Anatolius. Eusebius quotes verbatim a long passage of the Canons.
τόπον ἄνειλεν. This is an indication that the two passages were excerpted, copied and re-edited separately and were then put together by the compiler. All instances in the Epitome discussed so far bear out that the summarising was done simultaneous with the excerpting. What follows the opening statement is, once again, a gathering of passages from different parts of Book 8. Excerpt 99 E reports the martyrdom of Adauctus and the story of a woman who threw her children and herself into the river in order to avoid the tortures by the soldiers. The passage closes with a question raised by our compiler himself, whether such kinds of death can be counted amongst the martyrdoms of Christians. It is noteworthy that E 99 respects the original sequence of excerpts in Eusebius’ HE. What follows is excerpt 99 E. The corresponding passages in Eusebius are given in the parenthesis:

99E: παντοίας κατὰ τῶν μαρτύρων ἐπινοήσας βασάνους (HE 8, III.1) ἐν ὦς καὶ μεθ’ ὅν ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἀδακτος μάγιστρος. ἐφ’ ὦ γέγονε κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν (HE 8, XI.1), τὸ τῆς γυναικὸς, τῆς βίῳ καὶ γένει καὶ κάλλει σώματος περιβοήτου. Ὕτις σὺν δυσὶ θυγατράσι παρθένοις, κάλλει καὶ συνεσεὶ διαφθαρῆς, μετὰ πολλὰς φυγάς συνεκείσα φόβῳ τοῦ μὴ διαφαραθήναι αὐτάς τὴν σωφροσύνην, (HE 8, XII.3) ἐστὶν σὺν ταῖς θυγατράσιν ἐρριψε κατὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ (HE 8, XII.5). περὶ ὅν ἰητητέον, εἰ ἀριθμοῦνται εἰς μάρτυρας.

Excerpt 103 E recounts the bad end that Diocletian had in comparison with the glorious, successful and happy life of Constantius presented in excerpt 104 E. Exc. 106 E is a brief summary of the following section of Eusebius’ text, namely, the section XIV of Book 8. Excerpt 106 E refers to the tyrannical reigns of Maxentius and Maximin.

4.5 General conclusions on the Epitome

The study of the compositional structure and method of the so-called Epitome suggests that the work is not descended from a single collection comprising the complete texts of a number of church histories. The Epitome, instead, is a sylloge of excerpts extracted from different and separate sources. As I showed, the initial heading is congruent with the working method and compositional principles applied in the sylloge and it is likely that the heading was added by the excerptor himself. The manuscript transmission of the Epitome does not allow us to arrive at any tangible conclusion as to the exact size of the original sylloge, though. The examination of the excerpted passages from Eusebius’ HE revealed the three steps of redacting an excerpt collection; a) reading and selection, b) re-editing, and c) composition. The study of the working method in the Epitome lead to the following deductions: a) similar to the structure detected in the Excerpta Salmasiana, the excerptor of the Epitome made a careful selection of thematically connected passages and placed them in a predetermined chronological framework, b) in consonance with the arrangement of material in all the other collections of historical excerpts examined in
this thesis, the *Epitome* retains the original series of excerpts, and c) the excerptor of the *Epitome* intervenes in the text by employing the same strategies as detected in the *EC*, the *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *Excerpta Salmasiana*. 
Chapter 5  Excerpta Planudea

A compilation of passages taken from a number of profane and religious texts and transmitted under the name of Maximus Planudes is known under the conventional titles Συναγωγή and Excerpta Planudea.¹ In particular, the Συναγωγή comprises excerpts from classical geographers and philosophers, historians of the late antique and middle Byzantine period as well as Christian writings. This chapter 1) surveys the manuscript transmission of the Συναγωγή, 2) examines the content and structure of the collection, and 3) undertakes a close analysis of the excerpts on Roman history included in the Συναγωγή.

5.1  Manuscript transmission

5.1.1  The codices

The Συναγωγή has been fully transmitted through five manuscripts, namely the Laurentianus Plut. 59,30 (13th/14th centuries), the Neapolitanus gr. 165 (14th century), the Vaticanus Palatinus 141 (14th/15th centuries) the Vaticanus gr. 951 (15th century) and the Parisinus gr. 1409 (14th/15th centuries).

¹On the sylloge of excerpts made by Maximus Planudes see Boissevain (1895), CXI-CXXIII; Wünsch (1898), L-LIX; Diller (1937), 296-301; Wendel (1950), 2232-2236; Gallavotti (1987), 125-126; Pérez Martin (1997), 77.
5.1.1.1  Laurentianus Plut. 59,30 (= L)

Bombyc. (ff. 1-103) et chartac. (ff. 104-346), saec. XIII-XIV.\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLIOS</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r-103v</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Excerpta Planudea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104r-142v</td>
<td>Didymus Alexandrinus</td>
<td>Fragmenta in Proverbia⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142v-146v</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Locutiones populares collectae⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146v-148v</td>
<td>Philostratus Flavius</td>
<td>Epistulae⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148v-149r</td>
<td>Diogenianus</td>
<td>Proverbia⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149r-151r</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Epistulae⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151r-157r</td>
<td>Libanius</td>
<td>Epistulae ad Basilium magnum⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151r-157r</td>
<td>Basilius Caesariensis</td>
<td>Epistulae ad Libanium sophistam⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157v-159v</td>
<td>Libanius</td>
<td>Monodia de templo Apollinis Daphnae¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160-346r</td>
<td>Libanius</td>
<td>Orationes¹¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In its current condition, L is an acephalous composite codex.\(^1²\) It consists of three distinctive codicological units differing in material and in hand. As far as the dating of L is concerned, scholars agree that the different units were created between the late 13th and early 15th centuries\(^1³\) and that the codex is not written by Planudes' hand.\(^1⁴\) The first

---

\(^2\)On the codex see Bandinni (1768), 549-553; Wünsch (1898), LIII-LIV; Bühler (1987), 127-130; Sotirodis (1989), 202-203; Ferroni (2011), 327-334.
\(^3\)On the text see CPG 2552; Bühler (1987), 126-135.
\(^4\)See Piccolomini (1879), 321-330; Kurtz (1886).
\(^5\)Kayser (1871), XIV.
\(^6\)CPG 177-180.
\(^7\)Foerster (1927), 223.
\(^8\)CPG 2900.d.
\(^9\)Foerster (1929), 476-488.
\(^1⁰\)Foerster (1903), 417.
\(^1¹\)Foerster (1929), 476-488.
\(^1²\)The first folio is missing. On the term composite codices see Nyström (2009), 42-48.
\(^1³\)Diller (1937), 297; Bühler (1987), 127; Ferroni (2011), 327-328.
\(^1⁴\)Diller (1937), 297; Perez-Martin (1997), 77-80.
unit of L consists of the ff. 1-103, made up of thirteen quaternions of oriental paper. And is written by a scholarly hand dated to the late 13th century. This part contains the Συναγωγή in its entirety. Perez-Martín identified the scribe of the first part of L (ff. 1-103v) with Leon Bardales, a disciple of Maximus Planudes. In Perez-Martín’s view the hand in L is also identical with the hand traced in the Laur. Conv. Soppr. 71, the Vatic. gr. 253, 258, 1950, the Cant. Add. 1732, part of the Vind. Phil. Gr. 21 and the Ambr. C 235.

5.1.1.2 Neapolitanus gr. 165 (= N)

Chartac., ff. 238, 308 x 233mm, II. 42, an. 1325.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLIOS</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r</td>
<td>Various unidentified passages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v</td>
<td>Gregorius Nazianzenus</td>
<td>Ad Themistium epist. 38 et epist. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r-2v</td>
<td>Gregory Nyssenus</td>
<td>Epist. 2 De iis qui adeunt Hierosolyma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Idyllium (vv. 1-270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5r-92v</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Excerpta Planudea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93r-140v</td>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td>(Vita Euripidis, Hecuba, Orestes, Phoinissae, Troades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141r-196v</td>
<td>Sophocles</td>
<td>(Vita Sophoclis, Ajax, Electra, Oedipus tyrannus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196v</td>
<td>Joannes Tzetzes</td>
<td>De Differentia Poetarum, (ed. Gaisford II, 1823, 12, l. 22-14, l. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196v</td>
<td>Proclus</td>
<td>Vita Hesiodi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197r-197v</td>
<td>Isaac Tzetzes</td>
<td>Vita Hesiodi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198r-214v</td>
<td>Hesiodus</td>
<td>Opera et dies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215r-236v</td>
<td>Theocritus</td>
<td>Vita Theocrit and Idyllia 1-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second unit is dated to the 14th century. It comprises ff. 104r-159v made of western paper. The second unit contains proverbs by Zenobius, by Maximus Planudes and by Diogenianus as well as epistles by Maximus Planudes and by Libanius. The third unit is dated to the 14th-15th centuries. It is made up of ff. 160r-346r made of oriental paper. The third unit transmits orations by Libanius; Bühler (1987), 127-140.

The now lost beginning of the codex contained excerpts from the Varia historia (Ποικίλη Ἱστορία) by Aelian; cf. Ferroni (2011), 327.


PG 37, col. 80; PG 37, col. 60.

PG 46, col. 1009-1016.
This is a miscellaneous codex, which is dated shortly after L and written in a calligraphic hand. The text of the Planudean sylloge is found on ff. 5r-92v. In the upper left margin on f. 5r, the Συναγωγή is preceded by the syllable μαξ, which is the abridgment for Μάξιμος.

5.1.1.3 Vaticanus Pal. 141 (= Pal)

Chartac., ff. 378, 210 x 145 mm, II. 35-37, saec. XIV-XV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLIOS</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2v-4r</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Stichera et canones in s. Diomedem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r-5r</td>
<td>Manuelis Philae</td>
<td>Versus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5r-83r</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Epistulae et Epigrammata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83v-90r</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Comparatio hiemis et veris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90r-117v</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Laudatio SS. Petri et Pauli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117v-118r</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Epigrammata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118r-136r</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Encimium in S. Diomedem m. Nicaeae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136v</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Epigramma in s. Diomedem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136v</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Tetrastichon in novercam suam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136v</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Canon in S. Demetrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137v-138v</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Idiomela in S. Mocium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138v-139r</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Epigrammata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139r-140r</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Precationes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140r-140v</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Στίχοι ἐπιτάφιοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140v</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Στιχηρὰ σταυροθεοτοκία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141r-150r</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Oratio in sepulturam Christi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150r-285r</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Excerpta Planudea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285r-288r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Oracles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288r-378r</td>
<td>Georgius Lacapenus</td>
<td>Epimerismi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The codex is dated in the third decade of the 14th century and written in a calligraphic hand. The Συναγωγή by Maximus Planudes is transmitted on ff. 150r-285r. The full title of

---

22Diller (1937), 297.
the sylloge by Maximus Planudes is transmitted in Pal: Συναγωγή συλεγείσα ἀπὸ διαφόρων βιβλίων παρὰ τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιστάτου καὶ τιμιωτάτον ἐν μοναχὸς κυροῦ Μαξίμου τοῦ Πλανούδην πάνω ωφέλιμος. L. Ferroni, repeating E. Piccolomini’s suggestion, finds it unlikely, on the grounds of the structure of the Συναγωγή, that this heading was the original title of Planudes’ sylloge of excerpts. In the following I cast doubt on this, supporting that the title fits the format and structure of the Συναγωγή.

5.1.1.4 Vaticanus gr. 951 (= V)

Chartac., ff. 260, II. 29-30, saec. XV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLIOS</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r-8v</td>
<td>Heraclitus rhetor</td>
<td>Allegoriae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r-152v</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Excerpta Planudea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152v-156v</td>
<td>Michael Psellus</td>
<td>Τῶν Ψελλοῦ ἐξήγησις τῶν Χαλδαϊκῶν ῥητῶν Χαλδαϊκῶν λόγιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157r-169v</td>
<td>Michael Psellus</td>
<td>Ἐξήγησις τῶν Χαλδαϊκῶν ῥητῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169v-213v</td>
<td>Hermes Trismegistus</td>
<td>Ἐρμοῦ τοῦ τρισμεγίστου. Λόγοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213v-214r</td>
<td>Brevis textus incerti auctoris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220r-260r</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Capita de caritate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V is a miscellaneous codex dated to the second half of the 14th century. The Συναγωγή is transmitted on ff. 9r-152v under the heading: Μαξίμου μοναχοῦ τοῦ Πλανούδη συναγωγή εκλεγείσα ἀπὸ διαφόρων βιβλίων· πάνυ ωφέλιμος. The title is similar to the one found in V. The title is a later addition, though. Diller attributes the insertion of the title to a 17th-century cataloguer of the Vatican Library. Ff. 214v-219v in V were left blank.

---

26On the codex see Wünsch (1898), LII; Canart – Peri (1970), 516; Sotiroudis (1989), 206-207; Ferroni (2011), 337-338.
27O’Meara (ed.) (1989), 126-144. The text halts abruptly on f. 152v.
30PG 90, col. 959-1073.
31Ferroni (2011), 337. Wünsch dates the codex to the 16th century; cf. Wünsch (1898), LII.
32Diller (1937), 297.
5.1.1.5  

Parisinus gr. 1409 (= Par)

Chartac., ff. A-D + 161, 210 x 140mm, ll. 22-38, saec. XIV.33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLIOS</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r-134v</td>
<td>Maximus Planudes</td>
<td>Excerpta Planudea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135v-139r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Proverbia Greco-barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139r-140r</td>
<td>Pythagoras</td>
<td>Carmen aureum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Aenigmata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140v</td>
<td>Iulianus Flavius Claudius</td>
<td>Versus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140v-141r</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Oracula varia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141v-143v</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Narratio utilis de Christi ordinationene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144r-145v</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Opusculum de providentia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146r-158v</td>
<td>Plutarchus</td>
<td>Ad Pollianum epistula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158v-159v</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Incipit: Ἐπεὶ Διπλοβατότης Κερασφόρος, πατρός Ὀνοδήμου, μητρός Ἐκάβης, φυλῆς Τραγωνίτιδος. Desinit: μὴ παρατρέπειν τὴν δεδομένην τῷ τῶν φαιλοβίων κοινώς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159v-160v</td>
<td>Joannes VI Cantacuzenus</td>
<td>Incipit: Μεθεκὸν κι ἀμέθεκτον τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες. Desinit: τὸ δὲ τῇ πρὸς τὴν οὐδίαν, καὶ μίαν καὶ δύναμιν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161r-161v</td>
<td></td>
<td>Officia Magnae Ecclesiae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is an acephalous codex dated to the end of the 14th or the beginning of the 15th centuries.34 It was copied by Manuel Phralites.35 The Συναγωγή by Maximus Planudes is found on ff. 1r-134v.36 F. 135r was left blank. The texts transmitted by ff. 158v-159v and ff. 159v-160v are not mentioned in the inventory by H. A. Omont. L. Ferroni does not identify them, either. After inspection of the codex, I concluded that the text on ff. 159v-160v is actually a collection of passages from an epistle sent by the emperor John VI Cantacuzenus (reign 1347-1354) to Paul, the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople since 1366.37 The text on ff. 158v-159v is very close to a legal text attributed to the Cardinal

---

33On the codex see Omont (1886), 39; Wünsch (1898), LII-LIII; Sotiroudis (1989), 207-209; Ferroni (2011), 336-337.
34Wendel considers Par coeval to Pal; cf. Wendel (1950), 2232-2236. Wünsch dates the codex between the 14th and 15th centuries; cf. Wünsch (1898), LIII.
35Diller (1956), 90; Gamillscheg (1989), 351.
36Ferroni was the first to notice the incorrect description of the Συναγωγή in the Par. gr. 1409 by Omont. Ferroni corrected the description of the Συναγωγή in Ferroni (2011), 336-337.
37The text of the epistle can be found in Tinnefeld – Voordeckers (1987), ep. 5.
Isidore, a fervent supporter of the union between the Churches of East and West (1385-1463). If this is the case, the passage in Par is likely a later insertion.

### 5.1.2 The relationship between the manuscripts of the Συναγωγή

According to A. Diller, L was the archetype of the other four manuscripts transmitting the sylloge by Maximus Planudes, because a) L does not bear scribal mistakes which appeared in the rest of the codices and b) marginal notes of L were copied by the scribes of the other four manuscripts. C. Wendel holds a different view, without explaining his proposition, though. According to C. Wendel, the L must not be taken as the archetype of the other manuscripts. L. Ferroni shares A. Diller’s view that L, N, V, Pal, and Par stem from a single source and that L is the older and best manuscript transmitting the Συναγωγή. In his view, however, there are many cases in which L contains a reading different from the rest of the manuscripts of the Συναγωγή. L. Ferroni’s results were based on an examination of the part of the Συναγωγή containing Plato. Nevertheless, further research needs to be done on the matter, since the instances L. Ferroni presents are mainly orthographical variants between the L and the rest of the codices. Besides, L. Ferroni’s conclusions are only based on a single part of the Συναγωγή. L. Ferroni also argued that N and Pal are dependent on a common text and that V is not copy of any of the rest of the manuscripts. Both points exclude that L was the archetype of the other codices. It should also be noted that the text transmitted in L has been subjected to textual corrections. Moreover, a number of notes and headings were inserted into the margins of the codex. It cannot be ruled out that the hand, which corrected the text in L in terms of grammar and vocabulary and added the marginal notes, was identical with the hand that had copied the entire Συναγωγή in the manuscript. In line with A. Diller’s and L. Ferroni’s view, in what follows, I treat L as the best witness to Planudes’ Συναγωγή.

Three more codices transmit parts of the Συναγωγή: the Ottobonianus gr. 345 (16th century), the Vaticanus Pal. gr. 209 (y. 1463) and the Palatinus Heidelb. gr. 129 (15th/16th centuries). Excerpts from the Συναγωγή in the Ottobonianus gr. 345 show significant

---

38See the text that is entitled Τὸ ψήφισμα in Mercati (1926), 163-165. G. Mercati published the text transmitted on f. 188 in the codex Vaticanus gr. 914.
39Diller (1937), 297.
40Wendel (1950), 2232.
43Piccolomini (1874), 112.
44On the codices see Roberto (2005b) CIX; Ferroni (2006), 99-109. On the Ottobonianus gr. 345 see also Wünsch (1898), LII. On the Vaticanus Pal. gr. 209 see also Wünsch (1898), LIV.
textual similarities with the Vaticanus Palatinus 141. Ff. 263r-266r of the Vaticanus Pal. gr. 209 contain a small number of excerpts from the \textit{Συναγωγή}. The excerpts were copied by Isidore Ruthenus. The text on ff. 263r-266r is likely to derive from the \textit{Συναγωγή} as it is preserved in the Vaticanus gr. 951. Finally, ff. 90r-97r of the Palatinus Heidelb. 129 transmit excerpts copied probably from L.

5.1.3 \textbf{Maximus Planudes}

Maximus Planudes was born in Nicomedia around 1250. After the reconquest of 1261, he resided in Constantinople where he taught grammar, mathematics, harmonics and rhetoric. Planudes embraced monastic life around the year 1283. He stayed at the monastery of Chora before he moved to the monastery of Christ Akataleptos by 1299. Planudes is considered one of the most prolific scholars of the Palaeologan renaissance. Surviving manuscripts from his \textit{scriptorium} reveal his manifold literary interests: poetry, epistolography, philosophy, geography, astronomy, geometry, proverbs.

\footnote{Diller (1937), 297.}
\footnote{Diller (1937), 297, n. 1. Isidore Ruthenus was an erudite scholar of the 15th century with a special interest in astronomy, mathematics, geography and medicine. On manuscripts copied by Isidorus Ruthenus see Mercati (1926), 1-105.}
\footnote{Diller (1937), 297.}
\footnote{Diller (1937), 297.}
\footnote{On Maximus Planudes life and literary activity see also Wendel (1950), 2202-2253; Constantinides (1982), 66-89; Wilson (1983), 230-241; Mergiali (1996), 34-42.}
\footnote{Constantinides (1982), 68-71.}
\footnote{Planudes copied a series of poems by Gregory of Nanzianus in the codex Laurentianus Plut. 32,16; cf. Bandini (1768), 143-15; Fryde (2000), 234. On the codex see below n. 65.}
\footnote{Planudes compiled a collection of his own letters. The collection, comprised 121 letters, addressed to Andronicus II and other important figures of his time; cf. Leone (ed.) (1991).}
\footnote{Apart from excerpts from Plato which were included in the \textit{Συναγωγή}, Planudes himself copied passages from \textit{Crito} and \textit{Phaedo}; Hunger (1961), 151-152; Turyn (1972), 214.}
\footnote{Excerpts from Strabo's \textit{Geographica} and Pausanias' \textit{Graeciae descriptio} were inserted into the \textit{Excerpta Planudea}. Planudes edited, also, Ptolemy's \textit{Geographia}, dated to the 2nd c. AD. On the codices on Ptolemy's text owned by Planudes see; Fryde (2000), 253-257.}
\footnote{Planudes was concerned with Aratus' \textit{Phaenomena}, an astronomical poem, dated back to 3rd c. BC.}
\footnote{Planudes edited partially the \textit{Arithmetica} by Diophantos (3rd c. AD); cf. Tannery (1895), 125-255. An arithmetical treatise by Planudes was edited by Allard (ed.) (1981).}
\footnote{Ff. 142v-146r in the Laurentianus Plut. 59.30 transmit a collection of proverbs compiled by Planudes himself.}
rhetoric, \(^5^8\) grammar, \(^5^9\) sermons, \(^6^0\) biography, \(^6^1\) and historiography. \(^6^2\) He also knew Latin and translated into Greek Cicero’s *Somnium Scipionis*, Macrobius’ commentary on it, Boethius’ *De consolatione philosophiae* and Ovid’s *Heroides* and *Metamorphoses*. \(^6^3\) Maximus Planudes died in Constantinople around 1305. The *Συναγωγή* was composed at the end of the 13\(^{th}\) century.

A number of manuscripts has been identified as copies from Planudes’ scriptorium copied under his supervision. Diller regards the first part of L (containing the *Συναγωγή*) as written in the scriptorium of Maximus Planudes too. \(^6^4\) Other manuscripts attributed to Planudes’ scriptorium are: the Laurentianus Plut. 32,16 (a codex written in several hands, one of which is Planudes’) \(^6^5\) and the Laurentianus Plut. 59,1. The latter contains works by Plato and it is written in two hands. Bianconi sees Maximus Planudes as one of the two scribes of the codex. \(^6^6\)

In addition to the aforementioned codices, there are six surviving codices written in Planudes’ own hand: 1) The Marcianus 481, dated in 1301. The codex contains the *Anthologia Planudea* (Ἀνθολογία διαφόρων ἐπιγραμμάτων) by Maximus Planudes and the *Paraphrasis sancti evangelii Joannei* (Μεταβολὴ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην ἁγίου εὐαγγελίου) by Nonnus of Panopolis. \(^6^7\) 2) The Ambrosianus 157, dated in 1292/1293. \(^6^8\) 3) The Ambrosianus C 126, dated in 1294/1295. The codex was partially written by Maximus Planudes, whereas

---

\(^5^8\) Planudes compiled a rhetorical collection, comprising passages from Hermogenes and Aphonius; cf. Fryde (1996), 360. See also the discussion on Planudes’ grammatical notes, which are preserved in the Laurentianus 55.7, in Fryde (2000), 216-217 and 246-248.

\(^5^9\) Planudes’ interest in linguistics is reflected on his two treatises on this subject, the *Dialogus de grammatica* and the *Dialogus de verborum constructione*, respectively. The *Dialogus de grammatica* is partly edited in Robins (1993), 203-209. The Par. gr. 2667 transmits a lexicon attributed to Planudes; cf. Fryde (1996), 384.

\(^6^0\) The Laurentianus 56.22, dated after the death of Planudes, bears a sermon on the Burial of Our Lord, Jesus Christ, two homilies on saints Peter and Paul and an other one of saint Diomedes, patron of his home town, Nicomedia; cf. Fryde (2000), 263.

\(^6^1\) Planudes edited Plutarch’s *Vitae Parallelae* as well as a miscellany of Plutarch’s philosophical and rhetorical writings, known as *Moralia*. On the *Moralia* see Irigoin – Flacelière (1987) and Garzya – Giangrande – Manfredini (1988).

\(^6^2\) See below section 5.3.

\(^6^3\) On the Latin works translated by Planudes into Greek see Fryde (2000), 257-261.

\(^6^4\) Diller (1937), 297-301.

\(^6^5\) Turyn (1972), 31-39. On the codex see also Kugeas (1909), 106-108. The codex contains a considerable number of Greek verse texts (Hesiod, Apollonios of Rhodes, Theokritos, Moschos of Syracuse, Nikander, Oppian of Cilicia, Oppian of Apamea, Gregory of Nanzianus), excerpts from the so-called Theosophia, a collection of oracles compiled by the Neoplatonist Porphyry in the 5\(^{th}\)/6\(^{th}\) centuries, and a small number of epigrams. The *Dionysiaca* by Nonnos of Panopolis, covering a large part of the codex (ff. 9r-173r) were copied by a student of Planudes and revised by Planudes himself; cf. Fryde (2000), 235.

\(^6^6\) Bianconi (2005), 397-398.

\(^6^7\) Turyn (1972), 90-96.

\(^6^8\) Turyn (1972), 78-81.
part of the codex was copied by John Zarides, one of the most prominent students of Planudes.\textsuperscript{69} 4) The Vaticanus Reginenses gr. 132 and 133, both dated to the early 14\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{70} And 5) The Vaticanus gr. 1340, which contains Aristotle’s \textit{Rhetorica} (Ῥητορική). The codex was executed by Planudes himself in collaboration with John Zarides.\textsuperscript{71}

### 5.2 Content and structure of the \textit{Συναγωγή}

The \textit{Συναγωγή} by Maximus Planudes, as it has been handed down to us in the extant manuscripts, begins with excerpts from two classical geographers, namely, Strabo’s \textit{Geographica} (Γεωγραφικά) and Pausanias’ \textit{Graeciae descriptio} (Ἑλλάδος περιήγησις). Specifically, ff. 1r-19v in L transmit 344 excerpts from Strabo.\textsuperscript{72} The excerpts are not introduced by any heading and each excerpt begins with the word ὅτι. Diller was the first to note that Planudes made use of the Parisinus gr. 1393, a codex containing the \textit{Geographica} in its entirety.\textsuperscript{73}

Strabo is followed by 154 excerpts from Pausanias. The arrangement of the Pausanias excerpts in L begins abruptly without any title on f. 19v and runs up to f. 30r. Planudes extracted passages from the entire work by Pausanias. In the margins of L the headings of the books of the \textit{Graeciae descriptio} are in the same hand as the text body: κορινθιακά (21v), λακωνικά (22r), μεσσηνικά (22r), ἠλιακά (23r), ἀχαικά (26v), ἀρκαδικά (27r), βοιωτικά (28v), λοκρικά (29r). Except for a few slight differences, the headings are congruent with those transmitted in the best manuscripts of Pausanias’ \textit{Graeciae descriptio}, all dated, however, after L (Marcianus gr. 413, Laurentianus 56-11 and Parisinus gr. 1410).\textsuperscript{74} Interestingly, the title of Book 1 of the \textit{Graeciae descriptio} is missing in both, that is, in Planudes’ \textit{Συναγωγή} and the best codices of Pausanias.\textsuperscript{75} It seems very likely that the three aforementioned codices of Pausanias derive from the codex that Planudes used for his \textit{Συναγωγή}.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{69}Turyn (1972), 81-87.
\textsuperscript{70}The Vaticanus Reginenses gr. 132 is in Planudes’ hand; cf. Wilson (1978), 390. The Vaticanus Reginenses gr. 133 is written in the same hand; Ferroni (2011), 332.
\textsuperscript{71}Pérez Martin (1997), 76. On the codex see also Pérez Martin (1996).
\textsuperscript{72}S. L. Radt used the Planudean excerpts from Strabo in his edition of the \textit{Geographica}; Radt (ed.) (2002).
\textsuperscript{73}Diller (1397), 297-298. On the Parisinus gr. 1393 see Sbordone (1963), XXVII-XXVIII.
\textsuperscript{74}The three codices transmitting Pausanias’ work contain ἠλιακῶν α, β, ἀγαθακῶν and ψωκικά λοκρῶν ὄσολὼν; Diller (1956), 90-91. On the manuscripts of Pausanias’ \textit{Graeciae descriptio} see Diller (1957), 169-188.
\textsuperscript{75}Only the codex Matrit. 4564, which contains only a small part of the \textit{Graeciae descriptio}, transmits ἀττικά as heading for Book 1; Diller (1956), 90.
\textsuperscript{76}Diller (1937), 298-299; Diller (1956), 90-91; Ferroni (2011), 329.
Ff. 30r-32r in L transmit 44 excerpts on the Roman Republic from Romulus to Lucullus. In L they were inserted without any heading. Except for the first five excerpts, they are assigned to John of Antioch.77

Ff. 32r-47v in L contain 291 passages on Roman imperial history taken from the epitome of Cassius Dio by John Xiphilinus (269 excerpts), from Paeanios’ historical work (18 excerpts) and from an unidentified chronicle now lost (4 excerpts).78 Chronologically, the excerpts run from Lucullus to Gratian. The excerpts come immediately after the 44 excerpts on the Roman Republic and f. 32r does not bear a sign that the compiler changes his source at this point. On the upper margin on f. 35r in L a heading occurs. The marginal reads as follows: ἡ ὁ Ξιφιλίνος ὁ ἀδελφόπαις Ἰωάννου τοῦ πατριάρχου τὴν ἐπιτομὴν τοῦ δίωνος πολλῶν ἐποίησατο βιβλίων ἐπὶ μιχαήλ αὐτοκράτορος τοῦ δούκα.79 The same heading is also found in the Parisinus gr. 1409.80 The sentence was extracted from Xiphilinus’ Epitome.81

What follows is a brief extract from the De mundo (Περὶ Κόσμου), the author of which remains unknown.82 The De mundo has been, falsely, transmitted under the name of Aristotle. This is the reason why the author of the work is usually referred to as Ps.-Aristotle. The text takes up ff. 47v-48r in L and is followed by a brief passage from Plato.83 This passage takes up f. 48r in the Laurentianus. In the left margin of f. 48r, next to the excerpt, the heading πλάτωνος occurs.

Ff. 48r-50v in L transmit a series of anonymous philosophical excerpts, etymologies and riddles.84 The excerpts exhibit textual similarities with passages in the De natura animalium (Περὶ ζῴων ἰδιότητος) by Aelian,85 in Athenaeus’ Deipnosophistae (Δείπνοσοφισταί),86 in Aristotle’s Historia animalium (Τῶν περὶ τὰ ζώα ἱστοριῶν),87 and in

77See table 36 and table 37. On these excerpts see below section 5.3.1.
78See table 38.
79John Xiphilinus, the nephew of John Xiphilinus the Patriarch, compiled an epitome out of the many books of Dio, during the reign of Michael Doukas.
80The marginal was omitted in N, Pal and V; cf. Diller (1937), 299.
82The dating of the De mundo is disputed. It must have been written between the second half of the 1st century AD and the first half of the 2nd century AD; Forster (1914), preface.
83Leges, II, 661 D. 1-5, and 661 A 7-661 C 5.
84These excerpts were published by E. Piccolomini; cf. Piccolomini (1874), 150-160. E. Piccolomini divided the excerpts (69 in total in L) into four thematic categories: philosophy, paradoxigraphy, etymology and enigmas; Piccolomini (1874), 149.
85Excerpts 2, 31, 32, 35, 37 in Piccolomini (1874) correspond to Aelian, De natura animalium, 6.1, 4.22, 4.23, 4.21, 7.5, respectively.
86Excerpts 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 30 in Piccolomini (1874) correspond to Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae, 10.9, 10.13, 7.102, 9.58, 10.73, 10.75, 10.84, respectively.
87Excerpt 26 in Piccolomini (1874) corresponds to Aristotle, Historia animalium, 9.40 (624b).
Dio Chrysostom’s *Oration* 64. Some of the excerpts show similarities with the *Aristarchus et Callithea* (κατὰ Ἀρίστανδρον καὶ Καλλιθέαν ἐννέα λόγοι) and the *Breviarium Chronicum* (Χρονική Σύνοψις) by Constantine Manasses.

Ff. 50v-52v in L contain 27 excerpts from various texts attributed to Synesius (ca 370-413 AD), a Neoplatonist who became bishop of Ptolemais in Pentapolis some years before he died. In particular, the excerpts were extracted from *Epistulae 1* and 131 as well as from the works *Dio, sive de suo ipius instituto* (Δίων, ἢ περὶ τῆς καθ’ ἑαυτὸν διαγωγῆς) *Encomium calvitii* (Φαλάκρας ἐγκώμιον), *De Providentia* (Περὶ πρόνοιας) and *De insomniis* (Περὶ ἐνυπνίων). The text in L is not accompanied by any title written in the body text. In the left margin on f. 50v, next to the first passage from Synesius, the word *συνεσίου* is written.

Ff. 52v-59r in L transmit passages from the *De Mensibus* by John Lydus. The text is not preceded by a heading. In the left margin on f. 52v, next to the first passage from John Lydus, the heading *Ἰω(άννου) Λυδοῦ* occurs. The *De Mensibus* survived only in fragments. The excerpts preserved in the *Συναγωγή* by Planudes are unique.

The excerpts from John Lydus are followed by a concatenation of anonymous excerpts (ff. 59r-74v in L) taken from various unidentified Christian writings. The beginning of the first excerpt reads as follows: Τριήμερος γέγονε ἡ τοῦ κυρίου ἀνάστασις. A number of notes are written in the margins: f. 59v: ἀπὸ κανόνων, f. 60r: ὁ διάβολος, f. 60v: ἀσμα ἀσμάτων, f. 71r: βασιλείου, f. 71v: χρυσοστόμου. A number of the excerpts have been safely assigned by L. Ferroni to Hermas’ *Pastor* (Ποιμήν τοῦ Ἑρμᾶ), a literary work dating back to the 2nd century.

The anonymous excerpts are followed by passages taken from Plato. In L, the Plato-section is marked by an initial in red ink projecting into the left margin on f. 74v. In particular ff. 74v-94v transmit passages from Plato’s tetralogies I to VII, supplemented...
with excerpts from the spurious Platonic dialogues. According to E. Piccolomini and A. Diller, Maximus Planudes made use of a single codex containing Platos’ dialogues, namely, the 13th-century codex Parisinus gr. 1808. L. Ferroni, by contrast, showed that the Parisinus gr. 1808 was not the only manuscript on which Planudes drew for his section on Plato. Some readings in L point to other Platonic apographa.

The last part of the Συναγωγή is made up of a second concatenation of excerpts taken from Christian authors (ff. 95r-103v). This series of excerpts in L (and in N) is not introduced by any title. The first passage comes immediately after the last excerpt from Plato without any indication of a change of source. Pal and Par, instead, transmit the title περὶ τῶν ἄζυμων, written in red ink. In V the heading βλασφημίαι κατὰ λατίνων was added by a later hand. The first excerpt of the series reads as follows: ὅτι τὰ ἄζυμα θόντες πρῶτα μὲν ιουδαϊκῶς καὶ νομικῶς ἑορτάζειν.

It should be noted that a) in N the second series of passages from Christian authors is followed by passages taken from George Cedrenus. The excerpts from George Cedrenus (ff. 83v-85r) are not transmitted in L as part of the Συναγωγή by Maximus Planudes, and b) ff. 85r-85v in N (see table 35) transmit passages on a number of oracles found also in the Laurentianus Plut. 32,16 (f. 379), as part of an anthology of epigrams. The text is also contained in the Pal. Since N and Pal are possibly copies from a common exemplar (see above 5.1.2) different from the one that L comes from, it seems more likely that the Συναγωγή ended with the series of passages from Christian authors and that at some point it was expanded with the two aforementioned sets of passages attested in N and Pal.

---

99 The following texts, though transmitted under the name of Plato, are most likely not Plato’s: Alcibiades ii, Alcibiades i, Hipparchus, Meno, Amatores, Theages, Clitophon, Demodocus, Sisyphus, Eryxias, Axiochus. Some of the spurious Platonic dialogues have been included in the Platonis Opera in the Oxford Classical Texts collection; cf. Duke (1995-1999).

100 Piccolomini (1874), 162-163; Diller (1983), 255.


102 The passages belong to the so-called Theosophia Tubingensis. The text is an epitome, dated between the 8th and the 13th centuries, of books 8-11 of the work Περὶ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως compiled probably in Alexandria at the end of the 5th century. The passages were edited in Wolf (1856), 231-240, 173-186. On the oracles preserved in N and V see Gallavoti (1987), 3-16. On the Theosophia Tubingensis see Erbse (1995). On the Laurentianus Plut. 32,16 see Bandini (1768), 141-146; Turyn (1972), 32-39.
Table 35: content and structure of the Συναγωγή

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laur. pl. 59,30</th>
<th>Neap. gr. 165</th>
<th>Paris. gr. 1409</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r-19v</td>
<td>5r-18v</td>
<td>1r-26v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19v-30r</td>
<td>18v-27r</td>
<td>26v-44r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30r-32r</td>
<td>27v-33r</td>
<td>Manassæs, Breviariurn Chronicum; Paeanius, Breviariurn ab urbe condita; John of Antioch, Historia chronicæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32r-47v</td>
<td>33r-42r</td>
<td>Xiphilinæus’ Epitome; Constantine Manassæs, Breviariurn Chronicum; Paeanius, Breviariurn ab urbe condita;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47v-48r</td>
<td>42r-42v</td>
<td>Ps.-Aristoteles, De mundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48r</td>
<td>42v</td>
<td>Plato, Leges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48r-50v</td>
<td>42v-44v</td>
<td>Aelianus, De natura animalium; Athenææus, Deipnosophistææ; Aristoteles, Historia animalium Dio Chrysostom, Oration 64; Manassæs, Aristarchus et Callithea; Manassæs, Breviariurn Chronicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50v-52v</td>
<td>44v-46r</td>
<td>Synesius, Epistule 1 and 131; Dio, sive de suo ipsius instituto; Encomium calvitii; De Providentia; De insomnii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52v-59r</td>
<td>46r-51r</td>
<td>John Lydus, De mensibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59r-74v</td>
<td>51r-63r</td>
<td>Anonymous excerpts from Christian authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74v-94v</td>
<td>63r-78v</td>
<td>Platonius, Euthyphro; Apologia Socratis; Critios; Phaedro; Cratylus; Theaetetus; Sophistæ; Politicus; Parmenides; Philebus; Symposium; Phaedrus; Alcibiades i; Alcibiades ii; Hipparchus; Theages; Charmides; Laches; Lysis; Euthydemus; Protagoras; Gorgias; Meno; Hippias maior; Hippias minor; Ion; Menexenus; De iusto; De virtute; Demodochus; Sisyphus; Eryxias; Axiochus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95r-103v</td>
<td>78v-83v</td>
<td>Anonymous excerpts from Christian authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83v-85r</td>
<td>Excerpts from George Cedrenus (PG 121, col. 440 B 5-452 C 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85r-85v</td>
<td>Theosophia (16 oracula)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 The excerpts on Roman history in the Συναγωγή by Maximus Planudes

In what follows, the focus lies on the passages on Roman history included in the Συναγωγή by Maximus Planudes. In particular, I shall consider a) the original derivation of the selected passages, b) the source text which the Συναγωγή drew from, c) the working method applied by Maximus Planudes, and d) the political function served by the sequence of excerpts in Planudes’ Συναγωγή.
5.3.1 The origins of the passages on Roman history

Ff. 30r-32r in L transmit 44 excerpts on the Roman Republic, inserted without any heading to precede them. Chronologically, they run from Romulus to Lucullus. Initially, A. Mai erroneously attributed them to Cassius Dio. But C. Mommsen noted in 1872, that this was mistaken. C. Mommsen conjectured that John of Antioch was the original author of the excerpts in the Συναγωγή. Indeed, H. Haupt’s research on this part of the Συναγωγή corroborated C. Mommsen’s view. H. Haupt concluded that a) excerpts 5-44 come from John of Antioch, b) excerpts 1-2 derive from the chronicle by Constantine Manasses, and c) excerpts 3-4 derive from Paeanius’ translation of Eutropius’ Breviarium. A few years later, the discovery of the codex Athonensis Iviron 812 by Sp. Lambro corroborated that all the 44 excerpts come from the chronicle by John of Antioch, except for the first 4 excerpts. Excerpt 5, as S. Kugeas showed, is a passage compiled by Planudes himself by merging a passage from John Lydus’ De magistratibus with a notice from John of Antioch’s Historia chronica. In fact, Planudes intervenes twice in the De magistratibus: a) he simplifies the οἱ κήνσον μὲν τὴν ἀπογραφὴν τῶν ἀρχαίων by changing the phrase into κήνσος γὰρ ἢ τοῦ πλῆθους ἀπαρίθμησις and b) he contaminates the Lydian text with the phrase ὁ δὲ δικτάτωρ εἰσηγητὴς, which derives from John of Antioch.

The series of excerpts on Roman history was first published by U. P. Boissevain, who attributed excerpts 6-44 to John of Antioch. S. Mariev, in his edition of John of Antioch’s chronicle, considered the series of excerpts on the Roman Republic as deriving from John, but for the first four excerpts. S. Mariev considered also excerpt 5 as a passage of the Historia chronica. Roberto, in his own edition of John of Antioch, included excerpt 2, as well. In fact, excerpts 1 and 2 show resemblances with the Breviarium Chronicum by Constantine Manasses (ca 1130 - ca 1187): cf. table 36.

---

103 Mai published the series of excerpts on Roman history as it is contained in Pal and V; cf. Mai (1827), 527-555.
104 Mommsen (1872), 82-91.
105 Haupt (1879).
106 Kugeas (1909), 126-146. On the Athonensis Iviron 812 and Kugeas’ inspection of it see section 5.3.2.1.
107 Kugeas (1909), 134.
108 That the registration of capital is called census; cf. Bandy (1983), 128.
109 Fr. 32,15 Mariev; fr. 80,1,7-8 Roberto. The text in the De magistratibus reads as follows: τὸν καλούμενον δικατάωρα, ἀντὶ τοῦ μεσοβασιλέα; cf. Bandy (1983), 54; τούτων καὶ μόνων τῶν δικατατόρων, ἢ τοι μεσοβασιλέων; cf. Bandy (1983), 6. In Roberto’s view, such a contamination on the part of Planudes, indicates the importance of John of Antioch as a historian of the Roman Republic; Roberto (2005b), CVI.
110 It should be noticed that U. P. Boissevain published the excerpts transmitted in Pal and V; Boissevain (1884); Boissevain (1895), CXI-CXIV and CXIV-CXXIII.
111 Mariev (2008).
112 Roberto attributes excerpt 2 to John of Antioch, on the grounds of the fact that the excerpt shows similarities with Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who was one of the main sources of John of Antioch’s; Roberto (2005b), CXI.
Table 36: the *EPL* and Manasses’ chronicle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPL 1 (Laurentianus Plut. 59,30, 30r)</th>
<th>Manasses, <em>Breviarium Chronicum</em> 1620-1631</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ότι Ρωμύλος ἐπὶ τοῦ Πάλλαντίου τὸ τῆς μελλούσης ἕξεσθαι Ρώμης σχήμα διαγράφων ταύρον δαμάλει συνέζευξε, τὸν μὲν ταύρον ἔξω πρὸς τὸ πεδίον νεύοντα τὴν δὲ δαμάλιν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν, συμβολικῶς διὰ τούτων εὐχόμενος τοὺς μὲν ἀνδρᾶς φοβεροὺς εἶναι τοῖς ἔξω, τὰς δὲ γυναίκας γονίμους καὶ πιστὰς οἰκουροῦς. εἶτα βύλων λαβὼν ἐξώθην ἐσώ ῥίπτει τῆς πόλεως, εὐχόμενος ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων τὰ ταύτης αὔξειν.</td>
<td>ὁ γοῦν Ἐρωμύλος παρελθὼν ἐπὶ τίνα πολίχνην, ἀπὸ τοῦ κτίστου Πάλλαντος Παλάτιον κληθεῖσαν, τὸ σχῆμα τὸ τῆς πόλεως ἔκεισε διαγράφει, ἀρρενα ταύρον κατεπρον καὶ δάμαλιν συζεύξας, ὥν ὅ μὲν ταύρος ἔσω ἔξω πρὸς τὸ πεδίον, ἡ τοῦτο συζυγοῦσα δὲ δαμάλιν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν, συμβολικῶς δ’ ἐπήχυσε Ἐρωμύλος διὰ τούτων τοὺς ἀνδρᾶς μὲν τοῖς ἔξωθεν γίνεσθαι φρικαλέους, τὰς δὲ γυναίκας ἐσώθην γονίμους χρηματίζειν, πιστὰς μενούσας, οἰκουροὺς καὶ φύλακας τῶν ἔνδον. ἔπειτα βύλων τῇ χειρὶ λαβὼν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξω ἔνδον ῥίπτει τῆς πόλεως, εὐχόμενος ἐπαιξείν τὰ πράγματα τῆς πόλεως ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἄλλων.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPL 2 (Laurentianus Plut. 59,30, 30r)</th>
<th>Manasses, <em>Breviarium Chronicum</em> 1671-1681</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ότι ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ θεμελίων ὀρυσσεμένων ναοὺ κεφαλῆς νεοσφαγοῦς ἀνθρώπου εὐρέθη λευθρωμένη πρὸς ὅπερ Τυρρηνός μάντις ἔφη τὴν πόλιν κεφαλήν πολλῶν ἐθύνων ἐξεσθαι, πλὴν δὲ οἴματος καὶ σφαγῶν. κάντευθεν ὁ Ταρπήιος λόφος μετωνομάσθη Καπιτωλίνος.</td>
<td>τοῦτοι ναὸν οἰκοδομεῖν ἐν Ῥώμῃ βουληθέντος βόθρευμα μὲν ὠρύσσετο θεμέλωσον ὑπογαίες, τῆς δ’ ὁρυγῆς ἐπὶ πολὺ τὸ βάθος προϊόντος εὐρέθη κάτω κεραλη νεοσφαγοῦς ἀνθρώπου, αἶμα θερμὸν καὶ νεφών χεύμον οἰκνύσαι καὶ πρόσωσιν παρεμφερές ἕχουσα τοὺς ἐμπνοοῦς ὅπερ μαθῶν ἐν Τυρρηνός δόκιμος τερασκότος ἔφη τὴν πόλιν κεφαλῆς πολλῶν ἐθύνων γενέσθαι, πλὴν διὰ ξίρους καὶ σφαγῶν καὶ λιμνασμῶν αἴματων. ἐντευθέν ὁ Ταρπήιος μετωνομάσθη λόφος ἐκ τῆς τονισῆς κεφαλῆς Καπιτωλίνος λόφος.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

113 The *Suda* transmits a text very close to the *EPL*; cf. *Suda* K 341 Καπιτώλιον.
That the excerpts do not come directly from Manasses was proved by G. Sotiriadis.¹¹⁴ S. Kugeas reaffirmed G. Sotiriadis’ assertion and argued further that Planudes and Manasses made use of a common source; a chronicle written in prose. Manasses not only used the chronicle but also versified it.¹¹⁵ Accordingly, S. Kugeas sees those two passages as parts of a chronicle, traces of which can be found in Manasses, in Cedrenus, in the anonymous compiler of the *Exc.Salm.II* and in other Byzantine chronicles.¹¹⁶ De Boor was the first to postulate the existence of such a chronicle, now lost, used by the entire *Exc.Salm.II*.¹¹⁷

Excerpts 3 and 4 are safely attributed to Paeanius’ translation of the *Breviarium Historiae Romanae* by Eutropius (table 37).

**Table 37: the EPL and Paeanius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPL 3 (Laurentianus Plut. 59,30, 30r)</th>
<th>Paeanius, <em>Breviarium ab urbe condita</em> I.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὤτι σημεῖον τὸ μιλίον λέγεται: χιλιάς βήμασι συμμετρούμενοι μιλία καὶ τὰ χίλια.</td>
<td>μίλια καλοῦσιν αὐτὰ ῥωμαῖοι τὰ χίλια γὰρ βήματα οὔτως ὀνομάζουσι, τοσούτους βήμασι συμμετρούμενοι τὸ σημεῖον.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPL 4 (Laurentianus Plut. 59,30, 30r)</th>
<th>Paeanius, <em>Breviarium ab urbe condita</em> I.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὤτι δύο κατὰ τοὺς ῥωμαίους Δύο δὲ ἦσαν οὕτωι καὶ ἔτησιοι, ὡστε, κἂν προεχαρίζοντο ὅπατοι. ὡς ἄν συμβαίνῃ τὸν ἔτερον φαύλον εἶναι, καταφεύγειν ἐπὶ τόν ἔτερον ἐπειδὴ τὸν ἔτερον.</td>
<td>Δύο δὲ ἦσαν οὕτωι καὶ ἔτησιοι, ὡστε, κἂν προεχαρίζοντο ὅπατοι. ὡς ἄν συμβαίνῃ τὸν ἔτερον φαύλον εἶναι, καταφεύγειν ἐπὶ τόν ἔτερον.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 45 marks a change in the primary source used by Planudes, namely John of Antioch. More specifically, ff. 35r-47v in L contain 291 passages on Roman imperial history taken from: a) the *epitome* of Cassius Dio by John Xiphilinus (269 excerpts), b) Paeanius (18 excerpts), and c) the now lost chronicle also used by Manasses (4 excerpts).

---

¹¹⁴G. Sotiriadis’ argument runs counter to H. Haupt’s (1879), 291-297; cf. Sotiriadis (1888), 51-52.
¹¹⁵Kugeas (1909), 135.
¹¹⁶Kugeas (1909), 136.
¹¹⁷See section 3.3.2.
Table 38: excerpts 45-328 in the Laurentianus Plut. 59,30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts 45-119</td>
<td>last year of the Roman Republic to the first years of the Principate</td>
<td>Xiphilinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 120</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Lost chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts 121-125</td>
<td>from Augustus to Tiberius</td>
<td>Xiphilinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 126</td>
<td>on Tiberius</td>
<td>Lost chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts 127-128</td>
<td>on Tiberius</td>
<td>Xiphilinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 129</td>
<td>on Tiberius</td>
<td>Lost chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts 130-250</td>
<td>on Tiberius up to Titus</td>
<td>Xiphilinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts 251-255</td>
<td>on Titus</td>
<td>Paeanius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts 256-263</td>
<td>on Titus</td>
<td>Xiphilinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts 264-267</td>
<td>on Traian</td>
<td>Paeanius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts 268-273</td>
<td>on Traian and Hadrian</td>
<td>Xiphilinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 274</td>
<td>on Hadrian</td>
<td>Paeanius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts 275-325</td>
<td>from Hadrian to Sardanapal</td>
<td>Xiphilinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 326</td>
<td>Maximian</td>
<td>Paeanius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 327</td>
<td>Constantine Chlorus</td>
<td>Paeanius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt 328</td>
<td>Gratian</td>
<td>Lost chronicle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpts 264-267, which derive from Paeanius, are only transmitted in L and Pal and were published by U. P. Boissevain.\textsuperscript{118} One excerpt, which is labelled excerpt 83 in Mai’s edition, is not transmitted in L.\textsuperscript{119} The excerpt is on the life of Caligula and derives from Flavius Josephus’ Antiquitates Judaicae.\textsuperscript{120} Possibly, the excerpt is a later addition and should not be counted among the excerpts on Roman history in the Συναγωγή.

To sum up, Maximus Planudes, for the section on Roman history, drew primarily from John of Antioch and Xiphilinus. Planudes enriched the sequence of excerpts on Roman history with excerpts from Paeanius and a lost chronicle, traces of which can be encountered in Manasses and other Byzantine texts from the middle Byzantine period. Table 38 shows that the inclusion of the augmented passages possibly served to fill historical gaps in the primary arrangement of excerpts.

5.3.2 The source of the Συναγωγή: an earlier corpus on Roman history?

The significance of the codex Athonensis Iviron 812 in identifying the excerpts transmitted in the Συναγωγή has already been mentioned. The discovery of the codex by Sp. Lambros corroborated that excerpts in the Συναγωγή must be attributed to John of

\textsuperscript{118}Boissevain (1884), 15.
\textsuperscript{119}The passage is transmitted in Pal.
\textsuperscript{120}Antiquitates Judaicae 19,204; cf. Kougeas (1909), 137.
Antioch. In addition to this, the content of the Athonensis Iviron 812 led Sp. Lambros to support that excerpts on Roman history in the Συναγωγή must have been drawn from an earlier corpus on Roman history compiled by Planudes himself. In what follows, I will present the codex Athonensis Iviron 812 and provide a brief overview of earlier surveys of the relationship between the excerpts transmitted in the Συναγωγή and the Athonensis Iviron 812.

5.3.2.1 The codex Athonensis Iviron 812

Chartac., ff. 301, 253 x 165 mm (210 x 120 mm), 32-35 (excerpts from Paeanius); 255 x 170 mm (196 x 120 mm), 30 (excerpts from John of Antioch); 225 x 175 mm (208 x 120), 24-28 (excerpts from Xiphilinus), saec. XIV.\(^{121}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLIOS</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r-2v, 7r-10v, 15r-92r</td>
<td>Paeanius</td>
<td>translation of the <em>Breviarium</em> by Eutropius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r-6v, 11r-14v</td>
<td>John of Antioch</td>
<td>excerpts from <em>Historia chronica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92r-98v</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>excerpts from a work, which Lambros named <em>Περὶ τοῦ Καίσαρειού γένους</em>(^{122})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff. 99r-301v</td>
<td>Xiphilinus</td>
<td>epitome of Cassius Dio’s <em>Historiae Romanae</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the folia in the Athonensis Iviron 812 are severely damaged to the extent that the text is barely legible. Due to this fact, the observations and remarks made by Sp. Lambros and S. Kugeas on the codex are indispensable for our research. The Athonensis Iviron 812 is written in four different hands. According to P. Sotiroudis, the oldest hand is the one that copied the excerpts from Paeanius and the acephalous text titled *Περὶ τοῦ Καίσαρειού γένους* by Lambros. The excerpts from John of Antioch, from Xiphilinus as well as ff. 208 and 215 were all copied in different hands.\(^{123}\)

5.3.2.2 The Συναγωγή and the codex Athonensis Iviron 812

The section on Roman history in the Συναγωγή by Planudes consists of excerpts from 1) Paeanius 2) John of Antioch 3) Xiphilinus and 4) an unknown chronicle. The Athonensis Iviron 812 consists of excerpts from the same texts, except for the unknown chronicle.

---

\(^{121}\) On the Athonensis Iviron 812 see Lambros (1900), 228; Sotiroudis (1989), 159-164; Roberto (2005b), CXII-CXV; Mariev (2008), 20-21; Pérez Martin (2015), 179-189.

\(^{122}\) The text is concerned with the genealogies of Roman emperors from Gaius Octavius to Nero. The author of the text remains anonymous. Sp. Lambros dated the text at the beginning of the 2nd century AD; Lambros (1904), 139. Kugeas (1909), 138. Kugeas (1909, 138, n. 6) supported that these excerpts come from the section *Περὶ Καίσαρέων* of the EC.

The so-called *Περί τοῦ Καισαρείου γένους* was mistakenly inserted between the excerpts from Paeanius and Xiphilinus by one of the copyists of the Athonensis Ivron 812. It is impossible to know whether the Athonensis Ivron 812 also contained parts of the same lost chronicle used by Planudes, because the Athonite codex is mutilated both, at the beginning and at the end. The congruence in content between the Athonensis Ivron 812 and the series of excerpts on Roman history in the *Συναγωγή* is striking, though. S. Kugeas found that excerpts in the *Συναγωγή* exhibit significant textual similarities with excerpts in the Athonensis Ivron 812. Moreover, passages from the Athonensis Ivron 812 correspond literally with the *EV* 17 and *EV* 18 from John of Antioch. Depending on this evidence, S. Kugeas showed that a) the *Συναγωγή* definitely transmits passages from John of Antioch and b) all the excerpts on ff. 3r-6v and ff. 11r-14v in the Athonensis Ivron 812 belong to John of Antioch too.

After scholars have come to the conclusion that the excerpts in the *Συναγωγή* could safely be attributed to John of Antioch, the next question remained open was whether Planudes made direct use of John of Antioch’s chronicle or not. To U. P. Boissevain and G. Sotiriadis it seemed likely that Planudes drew from a *sylloge* of excerpts taken from John of Antioch. In G. Sotiriadis’ view, the *Συναγωγή* and the Athonensis Ivron 812 drew on a different tradition. This view was contradicted by S. Kugeas’ textual comparison between the *Συναγωγή* and the Athonensis Ivron 812. S. Kugeas found that excerpts in L on both the Roman Republic (excerpts from John of Antioch) and the Roman Imperial period (excerpts from Xiphilinus and Paeanius), bear significant textual similarities with excerpts in the Ivron 812. Despite the textual similarities, S. Kugeas was not convinced that the Athonensis Ivron 812 was a direct copy from the *Συναγωγή*. Indeed, there are textual variations between the Athonensis Ivron 812 and the *Συναγωγή*, which do not support an immediate dependence of the Athonensis Ivron 812 on the *Συναγωγή*.

---

124Kugeas (1909), 138-139.
125In particular, seven excerpts (37-43) correspond to passages in the Athonensis Ivron 812: *EPL* 37 = 17,10 Lamb.; *EPL* 38 = 20,5 Lamb.; *EPL* 39 = 21,16 Lamb.; *EPL* 40 = 25,24 Lamb.; *EPL* 41 = 26,24 Lamb.; *EPL* 42 = 28,9 Lamb.; *EPL* 43 = 30,3 Lamb.; cf. Kougeas (1909), 128-132.
126See Appendix I: text VI.
127Sotiriadis (1888), 51; Boissevain, Cas.Dio. v.I, praef. CXII.
128Sotiriadis (1888), 51.
129It is certain that the Athonensis Ivron 812 is dated shortly after Planudes’ death. The excerpts from John of Antioch preserved in the Athonensis Ivron 812 were first published by Sp. Lambros; cf. Lambros (1904), 13-31. Emendations and additions to the text were published by Sp. Lambros in Lambros (1904), 244, 495-498; Lambros (1905), 240-241, 503-506; Lambros (1906), 124-126; see also Mariev fr. 98 and Roberto fr. 145.1-3. On the excerpts from John of Antioch see also Walton (1965), 236-251.
130Kugeas (1909), 141. Diller argued in favour of a direct relationship between the two manuscripts, as well. According to him, the Athonensis Ivron 812 is a copy from a Planudean manuscript, though; cf. Diller (1937), 299.
textual congruences indicate that the common excerpts between the Συναγωγή and the Athonensis Iviron 812 derive from a manuscript which was either the archetype of the Athonensis Iviron 812 or a codex stemming from the same archetype as the Athonensis Iviron 812.\textsuperscript{131}

Furthermore, S. Kugeas attempted to reconstruct the manuscript now lost which served as source for the Συναγωγή and from which the Athonensis Iviron 812 possibly is an exact copy. He conjectured that the lost manuscript must have contained texts on Roman history only, written by Paeanius, John of Antioch, Xiphilinus and perhaps an unknown chronicle used by Manasses and other Byzantine authors.\textsuperscript{132} Such a collection could only have been made after the 11\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{133} S. Kugeas conjectured Maximus Planudes himself as the compiler of this collection and he argued that the excerpts on Roman history in Planudes’ Συναγωγή must be passages extracted and re-edited from the manuscript of the aforementioned collection.\textsuperscript{134} The assiduous research carried out by P. Sotiroudis on the subject confirmed S. Kugeas’ assertion on the Planudean authorship of the manuscript used as source for the Συναγωγή.\textsuperscript{135}

Finally, S. Kugeas ascribed the presence of excerpts 1-5 at the beginning of the series (excerpts that are not from John of Antioch) to the fact that the manuscript used by Planudes was mutilated.\textsuperscript{136} That is why Planudes attempted to fill the gap in the deficient manuscript of John of Antioch’s in his possession by drawing on a) an unknown chronicle (excerpts 1-2), b) Paeanius (excerpts 3-4) and c) John Lydus (excerpt 5).

\subsection*{5.3.3 Excerpting John of Antioch and Xiphilinus}

The establishment of the textual relationship between the Συναγωγή and the Athonensis Iviron 812 enables us to study and comprehend the excerpting method applied by Planudes in the section on Roman history of the Συναγωγή.

a) John of Antioch

As already mentioned, the first part on Roman history in the Συναγωγή is mainly made up of passages taken from John of Antioch. A large number of excerpts in the Συναγωγή are unique and thus essential for the reconstruction of the chronicle by John of Antioch as transmitted through the EC, the Suda, the Ex═Salm.I and the Athonensis Iviron 812. The

\textsuperscript{131}Kugeas (1909), 142. Pérez Martin (2015) 181-186 identified Planudes’ handwriting in the margins of Athonensis Iviron 812. This led Pérez Martin to argue that Planudes’ Συναγωγή drew directly from the Athonensis Iviron 812. The matter merits further investigation.

\textsuperscript{132} The mutilated Athonensis Iviron 812 is not helpful on that.

\textsuperscript{133} The epitome of Dio by Xiphilinus was prepared by order of Michael VII Doukas (1071-1078).

\textsuperscript{134} Kugeas (1909), 144-146.

\textsuperscript{135} Sotiroudis (1989), 163-164.

\textsuperscript{136} Kugeas (1909), 136.
passages in the *Suda* derive from the *EC*, whereas as shown above, the *Συναγωγή* derives from John of Antioch as survived in the *Athonensis Iviron 812*-tradition; most likely from the archetype of *Athonensis Iviron 812*. The textual comparison of the two passages common to the *EC* and the *Athonensis Iviron 812* (see Appendix I: Text VI) demonstrates a) that the author of the archetype of the *Athonensis Iviron 812* had direct access to the chronicle by John of Antioch, and b) the *Athonensis Iviron 812* contains a text impressively close to the *EC*, which, in turn, makes it seem likely that the *Athonensis Iviron 812* is probably an exact copy of its archetype.

Given these facts, in studying the excerpting method of Planudes, it would be safer to rely on a comparison between the *Συναγωγή* with both, the *Athonensis Iviron 812*, as well as the *EC* tradition of John of Antioch. In particular: a) sixteen excerpts from John of Antioch in the *Συναγωγή* are also found in the *Suda*, which reflects the *EC* tradition,\(^{137}\) and b) seven Planudean excerpts from John are also transmitted in the *Athonensis Iviron 812*;\(^{138}\) c) three of the latter excerpts are also included in the *Suda* and d) three Planudean excerpts from John of Antioch are preserved in the *EC*.

---

\(^{137}\)See Mariev (2008), esp. 8*-13*.

\(^{138}\)See n. 125.
Table 39: the EPL in the Athonensis Iviron 812, the Suda, and the EC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPL</th>
<th>Athonensis Iviron 812</th>
<th>Suda</th>
<th>EC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (fr. 32 M)</td>
<td>Δ 1112, Δικτάτωρ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (fr. 21 M)</td>
<td>Β 451, Βουολούσκοι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (fr. 41 M)</td>
<td>Φ 184, Φεβρουάριος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (fr. 22 M)</td>
<td>Λ 491, Λίβερνος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (fr. 45 M)</td>
<td>Τ 791, Τορκουάτος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (fr. 47 M)</td>
<td>Κ 2070, Κορβίνος = Κ 1307, Κελτοί = Α 1685, Ἀμύσσειν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (fr. 46 M)</td>
<td>Μ 105, Μάλλιος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (fr. 50 M)</td>
<td>Ά 3375, ‘Απολαβώντες + Ζ 191, Ζυγώ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 (fr. 60 M)</td>
<td>Φ 5, Φαβρίκιος = Α 3566, Ἀποστυγούντες</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 (fr. 64 M)</td>
<td>Ρ 126, ‘Ρήγουλος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 (fr. 73 M)</td>
<td>Α 2452, Ἀννίβας ὁ Καρχηδώνιος οὔτως ἐκαλεῖτο</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 (fr. 83 M)</td>
<td>Π 1371, Περεύς Μακεδών</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 (fr. 91 M)</td>
<td>Β 396 Ὁρίανθος = Ε 2241, Ἑπίβολος</td>
<td></td>
<td>EI 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 (fr. 98.7 M)</td>
<td>p. 118.3-120.6 M</td>
<td>Σ 1337, Σύλλας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 (fr. 98.11 M)</td>
<td>p. 126.1-11 M</td>
<td>Γ 212, Γεφυρίζων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 (fr. 98.12 M)</td>
<td>p. 128.6-11 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 (fr. 98.19 M)</td>
<td>p. 136.9-16 M</td>
<td>Σ 1337, Σύλλας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (fr. 98.21 M)</td>
<td>p. 140.2-142.6 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>EV 18 (p. 172,3-173,9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 (fr. 98.21 M)</td>
<td>p. 144.1-7 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>EV 18 (p. 172,3-173,9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (fr. 98.23 M)</td>
<td>p. 146.15-17 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon closer examination of the common passages in the aforementioned works, we come to the following particular conclusions about Planudes’ excerpting method: Planudes’ intervention in the original text is restricted to a) textual additions, b) to the replacing of words with others that explain the text better, and c) to textual omissions.

199The numeration of the excerpts in the parenthesis is the one given by Mariev (2008) in his edition of John of Antioch.
Planudes resorted to the aforementioned strategies to solve the problem of inadequate contextualization resulting from taking a passage out of its original textual context. Let us see how the strategies play out in passages excerpted from John of Antioch.

To begin with, the beginnings of *John of Antioch*-excerpts in the Συναγωγή deviate in vocabulary and syntax from the texts transmitted both in the *Suda* and in the Athonensis Ivron 812. In fact, the opening of each excerpt always sums up the context of the respective passage in the *Suda* and the Athonensis Ivron 812. The rest of the Planudean excerpts, correspond in general but not without exceptions to the text as preserved either in the *Suda* or the Athonensis Ivron 812. To give but a number of examples, the *EPL* 35 is an excerpt included in both, the *EC* and the *Suda*. The opening sentence of the *EPL* 35 ("Ὅτι Σκηπίωνος μαχομένον τοῖς Ἴβηρισι") serves to introduce us to the historical context of the passage, presented in detail at the beginning of the excerpt in the *EC* (*EI* 22). What follows in the *EPL* 35 is textually very close to the text in both, the *EI* 22 and the *Suda* Β 396. *EPL* 39 represents a similar case. The "Ὅτι Ῥωμαῖοι κατὰ τὴν πρὸς τὴν Μιθριδάτου στρατιάν μάχην εἰς φυγήν ἐπράτησαν" gives a summary of what precedes in the text of Athonensis Ivron 812. The rest of the *EPL* 39 is copied verbatim from the original John of Antioch. The closing sentence in the *EPL* 39 (καὶ τῶν πολεμίων ἐκράτησαν) epitomises the last part of the text in the Athonensis Ivron 812. The same strategy is detected in passages from the Συναγωγή preserved in the *Suda* only (see above table 39). To cite but some instances, the first sentence in *EPL* 11 sums up the context of the first half of the *Suda* Τ 791. The rest of the *EPL* 11 coincides verbally with the entry in the *Suda*. The introductory statement "Ὅτι Βαλλερίου μέλλοντος ἡγεμόνι τῶν Κελτῶν μοναμαχεῖν" in *EPL* 13 summarises the first half of the *Suda* Κ 1307. *EPL* 22 is identical with the *Suda* Φ 5 but for the first two lines, which are abbreviated in the Συναγωγή. *EPL* 25 transmits a text that is contained in the *Suda* Ρ 126. Its beginning and the ending of the *EPL* 25 are summaries of the equivalent parts in the *Suda*, but the rest is preserved.

Notwithstanding this clear pattern, the case of *EPL* 12 should be indicative of the caution with which to examine the relationship between the Συναγωγή and the *Suda*. The whole passage in the Συναγωγή is a shortened version of the *Suda* Λ 491, even if the structure was not changed. There is a difference in vocabulary, though: the συνιόντος and the καρποῦταν are words not present in the *Suda*, pointing either to a different tradition or additions on the part of Planudes himself. The same holds true for *EPL* 10. *EPL* 10

---

140 All passages are published in Appendix I: text VII.
141 See Appendix I: table VII.
142 That when Scipio fought against the Iberians.
143 That the Romans, in the face Mithridates’ army, fled during the battle.
144 And they prevailed over their enemies.
145 That Valerius who is about to fight in single combat against the Gallic leader.
summarises the text in the *Suda* Φ 184, with the exception of the last sentence, which is literally transmitted in the *Suda*, as well: καὶ τὸν ἐπώνυμον αὐτοῦ μὴν παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐκολούθωσεν. As can be seen in Appendix I: text VII, *EPL* 37, *EPL* 38 and *EPL* 40 transmit passages from John of Antioch, preserved in both the Athonensis Iviron 812 and the *Suda*. It is noteworthy that the beginning of *EPL* 38 (‘Ὅτι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὰ Μιθριδάτου φρονήσαντας Σύλλας πολιορκία παραστησάμενος’) epitomises the first half of the respective passage in the Athonensis Iviron 812. *EPL* 40 presents a shortened version of the text in the Athonensis Iviron 812 and the *Suda* Σ 1337 by omitting a significant part of the original text.

The vocabulary that Planudes uses when summarising the original text, is not always transmitted in the entries of the *Suda*, but it is difficult to assign such additions to Planudes himself. Table 39 shows that we are in the fortunate position of having three excerpts from John of Antioch that were transmitted in the Συναγωγή, the Athonensis Iviron 812 and the *Suda*, two excerpts preserved in the Συναγωγή, the Athonensis Iviron 812 and the EC, and one excerpt found in the Συναγωγή, the *Suda* and the EC, respectively. As shown in the Appendix I, text VII, each deviation between the Συναγωγή and the EC tradition (including the *Suda*) comes through the Athonensis Iviron 812 tradition. I cite two examples: a. in *EPL* 38 the word πανωλεθρίᾳ in the phrase πᾶσαν ἐδέησε μικροῦ πανωλεθρίᾳ διαφθείραι τὴν πόλιν is likewise transmitted in the Athonensis Iviron 812, but it is absent in the respective passage in the *Suda*: ἐδέησε μικροῦ διαφθείραι τὴν πόλιν, and b. the case of the *EPL* 40 = Athonensis Iviron 812 (fr. 98.19 M) = *Suda* Σ 1337 is revealing. The text in Planudes is obviously derived from the Iviron tradition as the occurrences of the σπάσα σαι and τὴν indicate.

Finally, there are excerpts in the Συναγωγή preserving a text better than the one surviving in the EC tradition of John of Antioch. *EPL* 16 transmits a text longer than the one recorded in the *Suda*. In fact, the beginning of the Planudean passage helped the last two editors of John of Antioch to restore the text of two entries in the *Suda*, namely, the *Suda* A 3375, 21-23 and the Z 191 Ζυγῷ. The ending of the *EPL* 16 is only recorded in the Συναγωγή. Similarly, *EPL* 27 and *EPL* 33 appear to enrich passages from John of Antioch transmitted in the *Suda* in terms of content. The phrases τοῖς οἴκοι καὶ κατὰ τὸν πάτριον νόμον περικειμένοις in the *EPL* 27 are absent in the *Suda* A 2452. The same holds true for the sentence καὶ πέρα τοῦ συνήθους recorded only in the *EPL* 33.

---

146 The month named after him was also shortened in comparison with other months; cf. Mariev (2008), 55.
147 I would like to note that the text in the Athonensis Iviron 812 is strikingly close to the one in the *Suda*. Once again this indicates that the archetype of Athonensis Iviron 812 contained the original by John of Antioch’s in its entirety and that the Athonensis Iviron 812 must be an exact copy of its archetype.
148 That after the Athenians sided with Methridates, Sulla was prompted to besiege (the city).
149 Almost destroying the city completely; cf. Mariev (2008), 127.
150 Appendix I: table VII.
151 See Roberto (2005b), CXI.
b) Xiphilinus

The second section on Roman history comprises passages from the *Epitome* of Cassius Dio by John Xiphilinus, excerpted by employing a method similar to the one applied to the chronicle by John of Antioch. The compiler keeps to the narrative sequence within each passage. The content and structure of the passages survive unaltered. The text was copied, in the main verbatim, from the original. Changes on the part of Planudes consist in omissions and simplifications.

The following table provides us with the text of two of excerpts from Xiphilinus. In *EPL* 45 the sentence "Ὅτι Λουκούλλου τά Τυγρανόκερτα πολιορκοῦντα" makes up a short introduction, composed by Planudes himself, who combined a few words from the original text. The beginning of the text is altered in *EPL* 47 in the same way: the "Ὅτι Καίσαρ μὲν τὸν δῆμον ἔξ ἀρχῆς ἑθεράπευε" is compiled by Planudes on the basis of words taken from the original text.

| Table 40: Xiphilinus’ *Epitome* in the *EPL* |  |
| Ὅτι Λουκούλλου τὰ Τυγρανόκερτα πολιορκοῦντα | Δούκουλλος δὲ Λούκιος κατὰ τοὺς καιροὺς τούτους τοὺς τῆς Ἀσίας δυνάστας Μιθριδάτην τε καὶ Τιγράνην τὸν Ἀρμένιον πολέμῳ νικήσας καὶ φυγομαχεῖν ἀναγκάσας τὰ Τυγρανόκερτα ἐπολιορκεῖ, καὶ αὐτὸν ἄριστον τῆς τοξείᾳ καὶ τῆς νάρθῃ κατὰ τῶν μηχανῶν χειρισμένη δεινῶς ἐκάκωσαν, ἀσφαλτῶδες δὲ τὸ φάρμακον τούτο, καὶ διάπυρον οὕτως ὡσθ’ ὡσις ἀν προσιέμην, πάντως αὐτὰ κατακαίειν, οὐδ’ ἀποσβέννυται ὑπ’ οὕθενος ὤγρου ραδίως, ἐκ τούτου δὲ ὁ Τιγράνης ἀναθάρρησας τοσαύτῃ γειρὶ στρατοῦ ἠλάσεν ὡστε καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων τῶν ἑκεῖσε παρόντων καταγελάσας. Λέγεται δὲ οὖν εἰπέτιν <ὥς> ἐπὶ τῶν πολεμήσοντων ἠκοιν, ὄλγοι εἰ δὲ προσβεύσοντες, πολλοὶ παρεῖν. | Ὅτι Λουκούλλου τὰ Τυγρανόκερτα πολιορκοῦντα, Τιγράνης τοσαύτη χειρί κατ’ αὐτὸν ἠλάσεν, ὡστε καὶ τῶν Ἐρωμαίων καταγελάσαι καὶ εἰπεῖν ὡς εἰ μὲν πολεμήσωντες ἢκοιν, ὄλγοι, εἰ δὲ προσβεύσοντες, πολλοὶ παρεῖν. |

---

52When Lucullus besieged the city of Tigranocerta.
To sum up, the process of redacting the Συναγωγή was based on compositional principles seen in earlier collections of historical excerpts. Planudes retained the language and style of the original text, respected the original sequence of excerpts and aimed at brevity and accuracy. The analysis of single excerpts on Roman history in L showed that Planudes was familiar with the issue of flawed contextualization caused by the excerpting method. It became manifest that in re-editing selected passages from John of Antioch and Xiphilinus, Planudes resorted to the same strategies as earlier compilers of excerpt collections: a) addition of an introductory sentence into the excerpts. The insertion was made up of material from the original text, b) omissions, and c) substitution of words.

5.3.4 Thematisation\(^{153}\) of history in the Excerpta Planudea

This section considers the literary and political function served by the sequence of excerpts on Roman history in Planudes’ Συναγωγή. In particular, in what follows it shall be shown that Planudes made a conscious extraction of thematically connected historical passages on Roman history. His material selection hints at his aim a) to supply people with moral examples concerning behavioral patterns and, b) to shape cultural and political thinking. These two objectives of Planudes will be discussed in the following by focusing on excerpts 1-44, that is, the passages on the Roman Republic.

\(^{153}\)The term is borrowed from Signes Codoñer (2016), 250. J. Signes Codoñer uses the term to identify historical texts in which the material was ordered according to themes. J. Signes Codoñer seems, however, to share A. Nemeth’s assertion that such texts were only produced during Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ reign.
5.3.4.1 Andronicus II

Before presenting my views of the function of the passages on Roman history in the Συναγωγή, a few preliminary considerations are needed. Andronicus II (1282-1328) succeeded his father Michael VIII (1259-1282) to the throne in 1282. He was much more educated than his father but proved to be less competent in military and political affairs. His reign signified what came to be called in histories of Byzantium the beginnings of the decline of the Empire. Militarily, the Empire lost control over most of the cities in Asia Minor. In fact, the situation in Anatolia begun to deteriorate largely during the reign of his father. Michael VIII’s political agenda had been dominated by his desire to unify the Eastern and Western Churches. As a result Michael VIII busied, primarily, himself with the diplomatic negotiations with the West and neglected, to a catastrophic extent, the defenses in Asia Minor. Only shortly before his death, he seems to realise the necessity of paying more attention to Anatolia. His son, Andronicus II, being aware of the plight of the Byzantine lands in the east, passed three years (1290-1293) in Asia Minor striving to strengthen the defenses there. He also attempted to face the situation by appointing members of the imperial family as provincial governors, that is, a sort of semi-independent rulers of parts of the Empire. His policies, partly influenced by western concepts of political power, gave a lot of power to provincial aristocrats who in turn used their strength to avoid paying taxes. The difficult economic situation led Andronicus to a series of economic measures: a) he imposed a new tax, the so-called sitokrithion which was a tax on land paid in kind, b) he eliminated tax exemptions and, c) he reduced the army and the navy. Such retrenchment affected the military capacity of the Empire and made any territorial recovery in the Balkans and in Asia Minor impossible. By the beginning of the 14th century, Asia Minor had been divided into many Turkic emirates.

On the other hand, Andronicus II was much interested in culture and education. Pachymeres and Gregoras’ histories call attention to Andronicus II’s intellectual interests (theological, philosophical and scientific). It is not a coincidence that his circle involved highly educated men, such as Nikephoros Chumnos and Theodore Metochites. Scholars

154 See esp. Laiou (1972), 1-10 and 85-126.
155 After 1304 the Turks controlled virtually all Asia Minor; cf. Laiou (1972), 290; Fryde (2000), 93.
156 In 1255 the Mongols invaded eastern and central Anatolia and caused many Turkic people to gradually spread across western Anatolia; Laiou (1972), 11-31; Gregory (2005), 303.
157 Gregory (2005), 299.
158 On the matter see Vryonis (1971), esp. 403-453.
159 Laiou (1972), 8.
160 Chumnos was a chief minister of Andronikos II for eleven years (1294-1305). He composed significant treatises on philosophy and cosmology. Metochites succeeded Chumnos as chief minister (1305-1328). He wrote on philosophy and astronomy as well as a collection of poems. Metochites was also a patron of the arts. He commissioned the restoration and decoration of the church attached to the monastery of Chora. On Chumnos
active in the Paleologan period were fond of recovering and restoring ancient Greek texts.161 Andronicus II was a generous patron of scholars in Constantinople as well as in other cities. John Pediasimos, Thomas Magistros and Demetrios Triklinios, for instance, are three prime examples of Paleologan scholars who lived and worked in Thessaloniki.162 There is some evidence that, from the end of the 13th century, more people – not necessarily members of aristocratic families – could have access to higher education. If this was the case, the audience for ancient Greek literature would have been broader in the Paleologan period. It is notable, that during Andronicus II’s reign, a considerable number of ancient poetic and prose texts were edited and commented.163 Most of the texts were intended to be used in schooling, since most of the scholars of the Paleologan period were also teachers at schools in Constantinople and in Thessaloniki.164

5.3.4.2 Planudes’ advice literature

Maximus Planudes was among those highly educated men favoured by Andronicus II.165 It is worth mentioning, that the emperor entrusted Planudes with two important diplomatic missions, the first to Cilician Armenia in 1295, and the second to Venice in


161 On the editorial activities of scholars of the Paleologan period see Wilson (1983); Ševčenko (1984), 144-171. Fryde (2000), 144-164 provides us with bibliography on Byzantine editions of ancient Greek literature.


164 During the reign of Michael VIII (1258-1282), George Akropolites, Gregory of Cyprus and George Pachymeres were active as teachers in Constantinople. George Akropolites was in charge of a school of higher education. Gregory of Cyprus presided over a school at the monastery of Akataleptos in Constantinople from 1274 until 1283; cf. Constantinides (1982), 32-34, 59, 64; Fryde (2000), 87-88. Under the reign of Andronicus II, Maximus Planudes, Manuel Holobolos and Manuel Moschopulos taught at schools attached to imperial monasteries in Constantinople. John Pediasimos, Demetrios Triklinios, Thomas Magistros are three Byzantine scholars who lived and taught in Thessaloniki; Constantinides (1982), 54, 68-71, 116-122; Fryde (2000), 297-301.

165 Planudes rediscovered a manuscript containing the Geographia of Ptolemy (2nd c. AD), a fact that was much appreciated by Andronicus II. Planudes prepared and donated the emperor a luxurious copy of the text (Vat. Urbinatus 82); Fryde (2000), 92.
In the year 1294, Michael IX, the son of Andronicus II, was crowned co-emperor.\(^{166}\) The emperor invited Planudes to deliver a panegyric celebrating the coronation. Planudes wrote and delivered his *Basilikos* (Βασιλικὸς λόγος), a political panegyric advocating the rebuilding of the Byzantine military fleet and an aggressive military policy against Byzantium’s enemies. In the *Basilikos*, praise of the new co-emperor is combined with criticism of Andronicus II’s military achievements.\(^{168}\) The text appears a) to provide the new co-emperor with advice on imperial external policy, and b) to disapprove of Andronicus’ decision to dismantle the Byzantine fleet in 1285.\(^{169}\)

Composers of panegyrics aimed at self-promoting as well as at advertising their viewpoints in terms of politics. As D. Angelov showed, rhetoricians of the last decades of the 14\(^{th}\) century were not hesitant to deal with imperial foreign and military policy. Orators were willing to use their speeches in order to voice views on imperial policy.\(^{170}\) Their interest in conveying political messages to their emperors and audiences should be seen against the military and political circumstances of the period. Indeed, parts of their speeches often address the weakness of the Empire to protect its lands in the Balkans and in Asia Minor, and to get rid of the Latins in Constantinople.\(^{171}\) Planudes, as his *Basilikos* reveals, was not an exception to this tendency.\(^{172}\) Yet, the political agenda attested in his political panegyric is also detected in the *Συναγωγή*. The *Συναγωγή* as a whole, no doubt, was meant to advance Planudes’ literary interests. The structure and content of the *Συναγωγή* suggests that it consists of passages selected for teaching.\(^{173}\) Yet, the selective use of passages on Roman history indicates that their source (the collection of historical excerpts which the Roman section in the *Συναγωγή* and the Athonensis Iviron 812 come from)\(^{174}\) targeted a broader readership. For instance, among the target audience of Planudes must also have been literate men fleeing Anatolia to Constantinople at the end of the 13\(^{th}\) century.\(^{175}\) Beside an edifying moral purpose, the section on Roman history bears a veiled criticism on Andronicus II’s external policies. The hypothesis that Planudes

---

\(^{166}\)Planudes did not, finally, take part in the mission to Armenia in 1295; cf. Treu (ed.) (1890), 159. See also in Laiou (1972), 106, n. 84. On the mission to Venice see Pachymeres, III.ix.21, 269-271.
\(^{167}\)Laiou (1972), 50.
\(^{168}\)The text was edited by Westerink (1966), 98-103; (1967), 54-67; (1968), 34-50. Modern scholars classify the text as a political panegyric; Angelov (2003), 55-63. The genre of political panegyric is discussed by Planudes in his commentary on the Hermogenian corpus; Angelov (2006), 168.
\(^{171}\)See for instance the speeches by Planudes, Metochites and Chumnos discussed by Angelov (2006), 161-180.
\(^{172}\)Planudes was well acquainted with rhetoric as well as the political use of panegyrics; Angelov (2006), 177.
\(^{173}\)See Kugeas (1909), 134; Gryde (2000), 221-222 and 245-253; Ferroni (2011), 342.
\(^{174}\)On Planudes’ authorship of the collection see above section 5.3.2.
\(^{175}\)Vryonis (1971), esp. 249-255. Browning mentions that some of them, such as George Karbones, became notable scholars and teachers in Constantinople; cf. Browning (1989), 230-231.
could also aim to convey a political message to the emperor himself cannot be excluded. The case of the Basilikos shows that criticism was also a form of counseling the emperor. The genre of political panegyric was definitely a direct way of giving advice in the context of an encomium.\textsuperscript{176} A panegyric enabled orators to mix praise and counsel. Planudes’s admiration of the abilities of Michael IX, in the Basilikos, reveals Planudes’ hope that the new emperor would be more eager to march the Turks in Anatolia.\textsuperscript{177} And a little further on in the same text, Planudes counsels the emperor to have no confidence in the words of his enemies; the emperor, instead, must prefer warfare to diplomacy in dealing with them.\textsuperscript{178} Planudes voiced similar views on imperial policy in his selection of passages on Roman history. Elements of counsel and political opinion, seen in the Basilikos, were introduced by Planudes in his collection of historical excerpts. Specifically, as shall be shown in the next section, in order to promote his own political agenda and convert the readers to his point of view, Planudes employed rhetorical strategies he borrowed from the genre of political panegyric, namely praise and irony.\textsuperscript{179} Both rhetorical devises enabled Planudes to criticise imperial policy and promote his own political views.

5.3.4.3 The arrangement of excerpts on Roman history

This section argues that the selection of passages on Roman history in the \textit{Συναγωγή} aimed a) to set out the standard arsenal of Roman virtues, and b) to convey messages to the emperor and his entourage about imperial foreign policy. As it shall be shown, the \textit{Συναγωγή} abounds with edifying examples taken from the Republic history. The presentation of the actions of emperors in a period during which a war is taking place is an element that Planudes borrowed from panegyrics.\textsuperscript{180} By stressing imperial wartime virtues, Planudes offered a veiled criticism of the current emperor. The excerpted passages point out the traditional warrior skills of the Romans and highlight the fact that the Romans had always been a warlike people and enjoyed great victories over their enemies. The focus lies in the military successes of Roman emperors and in the glorious past of the city of Rome. For the Byzantines considered the Romans as their honoured ancestors, and Constantinople as the new Rome. It is not a coincidence that in the Basilikos, Planudes stresses the fact that the emperor should regard himself a descendant of the Romans.\textsuperscript{181} What follows in the Basilikos is a laudation of the Romans’ warrior

\textsuperscript{176}Angelov (2003), 58.
\textsuperscript{177}Angelov (2006), 176.
\textsuperscript{178}Basilikos, 44.1226-1230.
\textsuperscript{179}Orators of the Paleologan period resorted heavily to such rhetorical devices. It is noteworthy that Planudes discusses the literary form of the political panegyric in his scholia on Hermogenes; Angelov (2006), 173-174.
\textsuperscript{180}On this aspect of panegyrics see Angelov (2006), 168.
\textsuperscript{181}Basilikos, 61.475-478.
abilities and their victories at war.\textsuperscript{182} Planudes concluded that the Romans have always been disposed towards military actions.\textsuperscript{183} The passages in the \textit{Συναγωγή} make clear that Romans’ superiority over their enemies at war were due to traditional Roman virtues, such as military excellence, strict discipline, and patriotism. Like in the case of the \textit{Basilikos}, the praise of the Romans in the \textit{Συναγωγή} is meant to urge immediate military action on the part of Andronicus II.

a) Praise
To begin with, a considerable number of excerpts are concerned with the virtue of military excellence. The passages praise the edifying conduct of individual Roman emperors or generals. Specifically, \textit{EPL} 6 transmits that Marcius, a brave young Roman soldier, desired only στεφάνῳ καὶ ἵππῳ πολεμιστηρίῳ\textsuperscript{184} as a reward for his deeds. According to \textit{EPL} 10, Camillus was falsely accused of plotting usurpation by a Gallic consul called Februarius. After the truth revealed, Februarios was exiled from the city and καὶ τὸν ἐπώνυμον αὐτοῦ μὴν παρὰ τοὺς ἀλλοὺς ἐκολόβωσεν,\textsuperscript{185} so that future generations will always remember Februarios’ punishment. \textit{EPL} 11 and 12 accentuate the ancient Roman virtue of heroic self-sacrifice. In \textit{EPL} 11, Manlius’ bravery on battlefield is rewarded as follows: καὶ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν ταύτην τοῖς ἀφ’ ἕαυτοῦ κατέληπε μνημείον τῆς ἀριστείας.\textsuperscript{186} \textit{EPL} 12 records that Curtius chooses to sacrifice himself and thus saves the city. For his brave death, he was offered annual heroic rites. A similar case is contained in \textit{EPL} 14: a diviner foretold that if a Roman consul consecrated himself to the chthonic deities,\textsuperscript{187} the Romans would defeat the Latins; Decius, the consul, decided to be the one sacrificing himself, granting the Romans with the victory. \textit{EPL} 15 foregrounds the Roman virtue of strict discipline. The passage records that Manlius ὡς μὲν ἀριστέα ἐστεφάνωσεν his son after the latter defeated a Latin adversary. Shortly afterwards, however, Manlius beheaded his son for disobeying his orders. The episode was meant to show that all the Romans should equally be obedient to their rulers. It should be pointed out that the theme of obedience to the laws of the state reappears in two Platonic dialogues, namely, the \textit{Crito} and the \textit{Phaedo}, copied on Planudes’ commission in the Viennese codex Philos. gr. 21.\textsuperscript{188} The dialogues are copied by Planudes’ collaborators, but for a number of excerpts from the end of both dialogues; these excerpts, dealing with Socrates’ decision to obey the law of the state (and thus to die), were copied by Planudes himself. The very last fact is indicative

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{182}\textit{Basilikos}, 62.529-532.
\item \textsuperscript{183}\textit{Basilikos}, 61.472-475. The Romans were not primarily traders like the Phaenicians and not farmers like the Egyptians; \textit{Basilikos}, 62.259-538.
\item \textsuperscript{184}A garland for valour and a warhorse; cf. Mariev (2008), 33.
\item \textsuperscript{185}The month named also after him was shortened in comparison with other months; cf. Mariev (2008), 55.
\item \textsuperscript{186}And he bequeathed this name to his descendants as a memento of his bravery; cf. Mariev (2008), 57.
\item \textsuperscript{187}Mariev (2008), 59-61.
\item \textsuperscript{188}On the Vind. Philos. gr. 21 see Hunger (1961), 151-152; Turyn (1972), 214; Menchelli (2014), 193-204.
\end{itemize}
of the importance Planudes assigned to the value of law. Indeed, he was much interested in the subject of the ruler who devotes his entire life to the service of the state and of his citizens. It is not a coincidence that the Συναγωγή includes the Leges and that Planudes opted to translate into Greek Cicero’s Dream of Scipio, a dialogue that was meant to underscore the Roman virtues of justice, bravery and devotion to the service of the state. The selection of passages conveying edifying messages complies with Planudes’ literary interests in general. It should be noted that, when copying poems by Gregory of Nanzianus in the Laurentianus Plut. 32,16, Planudes made a selection of only those verses bearing a moral message. Moreover, Planudes’ willingness to furnish the reader with behavioural paradigms becomes evident in his choice to edit the Lives of the Illustrious Greeks and Romans of Plutarch.

A second group of excerpts aimed to emphasise the glorious past of the Roman Republic. Eleven excerpts (EPL 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 13, 36, 37, 40, 43) are dealing with oracles and divine signs relating to the foundation of Rome as well as the glorious future that the city was about to enjoy. The passages underline a) the distinguished role Rome was destined to play in world history, and b) confirm that such miracles could only take place in Rome. Three further excerpts (EPL 4, 5, 26) deal with Roman institutions. In 10 out of 44 excerpts the center of gravity is military successes of the Roman past. In EPL 16, Rome repudiated a shameful agreement made by a number of captive Roman consuls. EPL 17 narrates the superiority of the Romans over the Etruscans. EPL 19 highlights the military capacity of Roman army. EPL 20 and 21 convey a laudation on the bravery of the Romans on the battlefield, as well. In EPL 20, Pyrrhus admires τὸ φοβερὸν τοῦ ἔτι διασωζόμενον and the fact that ἐναντία πάντες ἔφερον τραύματα. Pyrrhus wishes that he had had such soldiers as allies. In EPL 21, Cineas, a rhetor and envoy, reports to Pyrrhus that all the Romans were just as virtuous as the Greeks believed him (Pyrrhus) to be. EPL 30, 31 and 35 depict the magnitude of the Roman state under Scipio. In EPL 30, Scipio managed to bring the whole of Iberia under his control by an upright policy towards its

189 On f. 48r in L and f. 42v in N; see above section 5.2.
190 On Cicero’s text see Büchner (1976).
192 On Plutarch see Flacelière (1993).
193 This is in line with the thought taken up by the Byzantines concerning the exceptional character of Constantinople, that is, the New Rome. Constantinople became the city where the plan of God was always represented through miracles and omens. This scheme had been inherited from the Roman Empire, whose Byzantium was the continuation. On the subject see Odorico (2011b), 33-47.
194 The fierce expression still preserved on their faces; cf. Mariev (2008), 69.
195 That they all bore frontal wounds; cf. Mariev (2008), 69.
196 Mariev (2008), 69.
Inhabitants. In EPL 31, Scipio refused to take hostages from the defeated Iberians, because τὸ γὰρ τοι πιστὸν ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις ἔχειν ὅπλοις. In EPL 35, Scipio refused to reward the Iberian consuls who murdered Virianthus, an Iberian enemy of the Romans: Roman customs do not dictate praise for plots against generals committed by their subordinates. EPL 32 and 38 refer to military successes of the Romans: their victory over Perseus, the last king of the Macedonians (EPL 32), and the conquest of the city of Athens by Sulla (EPL 38).

b) irony

The second rhetorical device by which Planudes voiced his opinion about important political matters was irony. There is sufficient evidence that orators of the Paleologan period, often, opted to commend a virtue, which an emperor lacked. The rhetorical device of irony was familiar to the courtly audience of the time. Planudes inserts into his Συναγωγή excerpts dealing with Romans’ adversaries. In three cases (EPL 23, 24, 27) the focus of the excerpt lies on the military successes on the part of the Carthaginians. In EPL 23, Xanthus the Spartan helps the Carthaginians to destroy the Roman army. In EPL 27, the Carthaginian general Hannibal, wanting to show his countrymen the extent of his victory over the Romans, sent to Libya three Attic medimni full of golden rings, which he had stripped as spoils from men of equestrian and senatorial rank. In the EPL 24 Planudes excerpts a passage on the construction of triremes by the Carthaginians and on how the Carthaginians are getting prepared for war: the entire city joins the preparation. The authorities melt down statues and take the wood-work of private and public buildings in order to construct the triremes; women cut and offer their hair, which is reused in constructing war machines. Given the praise of the Romans throughout this section, such a favourable depiction of a barbarian people in the aforementioned passages is striking.

To my mind, the praise of both, the Romans and the barbarians, serves the same function, namely, that of criticizing Planudes’ contemporary imperial policies under the reign of Andronicus II. The passages must be read against the current historical circumstances: the destruction of the military fleet by Andronicus II and the unsuccessful negotiations on the marriage of the future emperor Michael IX to the daughter of the titular emperor of Constantinople Philip I of Courtenay, Catherine of

197 Mariev (2008), 92.
198 He held his own military force to be sufficient guarantee; cf. Mariev (2008), 93.
199 Mariev (2008), 99.
200 On irony see Kennedy (1983); Magdalino (1993); Angelov (2003), 70-71.
201 Angelov (2003), 70-71.
202 Mariev (2008), 81.
203 Mariev (2008), 73.
204 Andronicus II decided to dismantle the Byzantine military fleet after the death of Charles of Anjou, the King of Sicily, in 1285; Ahrweiler (1966), 374-378. On Charles of Anjou’s hostile foreign policy against Byzantium see Dunbabin (1998), esp. 89-98.
Courtenay. The marriage was meant to ensure that the Latins would not seek to reconquer Constantinople in the future. EPL 24 depicts the significance the Carthaginians assigned to the construction of a fleet: τοὺς μὲν ἀνδριάντας πρὸς τὴν τοῦ χαλκοῦ χρήσιν συγχωνεύσαντες, καὶ τὴν ξύλωσιν τῶν τε ιδίων καὶ δημοσίων ἐργῶν πρὸς τὰς τριήρεις καὶ τὰς μηχανὰς μετενεγκάμενοι, ἐς τὰ σχοινία ταῖς τῶν γυναικῶν κόμαις ἀποκειραμέναις χρησάμενοι. Andronicus II’s military policy is quite a contrast to the Carthaginians’ zeal for making triremes in the shortest time. Indeed, the political context of the end of the 14th century sheds light on the advisory function of the text. The failure of a marriage alliance with the West necessitated the construction of a new Byzantine fleet. The fact that Asia Minor was constantly under the Turkish threat required a more offensive military policy towards them. The last general to strive to rid the Turks from Asia Minor was Alexios Philanthropenos in 1294. Byzantium’s defenses in the Balkans and the Epiros were collapsed and the lands were under constant raids, as well. In 1292, Michael Tarchaneiotes Glabas, a general under Andronicus II, launched a campaign in Epiros. The expedition was initially successful. The Byzantine army reached Ioannina, but failed to seize the city. The selective use of passages transmitted in the Συναγωγή reflects the severe problems the Empire was dealing with at the end of the 14th century. In my opinion, Planudes appears to offer counsel to the emperor in the form of criticism. Interestingly, it was during the 1290s – the period when the Συναγωγή was composed – that rhetoricians extensively employed their speeches as a form of counseling the emperor. There are speeches transmitted from that period, which appeal not to the emperor, but to his advisers or to the people in attendance.

To conclude, passages on Roman history included in the Συναγωγή transmit historical paradigms which a) stress the superiority of the Romans over their opponents, and b) criticise contemporary social and political situation. In this section, I argued that Planudes’ selection of excerpts on the Roman Republic was meant to urge military action on the part of the emperor. Planudes, as a master in rhetoric, resorted to the political usage of court oratory. The sequence of excerpts in the Συναγωγή fulfills the same political function and objective as his Basilikos, a political panegyric addressed to

---

205 The negotiations for the marriage took place after the coronation of Michael IX as co-emperor in 1294; Pachymeres, II.iii, 269-272. Finally, in 1301 Catherine of Courtenay married Charles of Valois, brother of the King of France Philip IV; see Laiou (1972), esp. 48-56.

206 By melting down statues to gain the bronze, by reusing the wood-work of private and public buildings for the triremes and war engines and by using clippings of women’s hair for the ropes; cf. Mariev (2008), 73.

207 Alexios Philanthropenos revolted against the emperor in 1296. The rebellion was unsuccessful and Alexios was blinded. Though Planudes was a close friend of his, he did not fall into disfavour; Laiou (1978), 89-99.

208 Laiou (1972), 40; Nicol (1984), 37-42.

209 See for instance the speech by Nikephorus Choumnos in Laourdas (1955), 290-327. See also the two speeches composed by Demetrios Kydones, PG 154, col. 961-1008, 1009-1039; cf. Angelov (2006), 166.
Andronicus II and his son. The highlight of traditional imperial virtues, through his selection of texts in the Συναγωγή, was intended to be prescriptive. The hortatory and didactic elements in his collection of excerpts aimed to present military offensive action as a general imperial policy. These elements do not serve the spirit of self-promotion. Planudes reads history in the light of contemporary concerns. The section on Roman history does not just accumulate historical knowledge of a particular subject matter. The concatenation of excerpts by Planudes serves a) to supply the reader with moral examples, and b) to shape cultural and political thought. From this perspective, the section on Roman Republic in the Συναγωγή represents an other way of writing history.

Table 41: the selection of excerpts on the Roman Republic by Planudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPL 1</th>
<th>On the Palatine, the place where Romulus decided to found Rome.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPL 2</td>
<td>On an omen predicted that Rome would become the capital of many nations. The city legend starts with the recovery of a human skull when foundation trenches were being dug for the Temple of Jupiter at Tarquin’s order. The word for head in Latin is <em>caput</em> and the place was given the name Capitoline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 3</td>
<td>On the Capitoline Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 4</td>
<td>On the number of consuls that the Romans used to elect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 5 (fr.32M)</td>
<td>On the offices of δικτάτορ, εισηγητης, πραίτορ, κήνσορ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 6 (fr.21M)</td>
<td>On Marcius’ generosity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 7 (fr.34M)</td>
<td>On a Roman custom: one of the Vestal Virgins was buried alive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 8 (fr.40M)</td>
<td>Romans who had found refuge in the Capitol got saved by a miracle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 9 (fr.42M)</td>
<td>On the Sibyll’s oracle about the great future of the Capitol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 10 (fr.41M)</td>
<td>The punishment of Februarius for laying that Camillus was aiming at usurpation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 11 (fr.45M)</td>
<td>On Manlius’ bravery on battlefield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 12 (fr.22M)</td>
<td>On a Sibylline oracle and Curtius’ death. He was offered heroic rites annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 13 (fr.47M)</td>
<td>On a divine sign and how Corvinus took up his name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 14 (fr.48M)</td>
<td>On Decius’ bravery and philopatria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 15 (fr.46M)</td>
<td>Manlius beheaded his own son for disobeying him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 16 (fr.47M)</td>
<td>On Roman policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 17 (fr.54M)</td>
<td>On the superiority of the Romans over the Etruscans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 18 (fr.55M)</td>
<td>A geographical reference to the Tiber.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 19 (fr.57M)</td>
<td>On Roman strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 20 (fr.58M)</td>
<td>On the bravery of the Romans at war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL 21 (fr.59M)</td>
<td>On the bravery of the Romans at war.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

210 Speeches court, instead, were meant to serve self-advancement; cf. Angelov (2006), 168.
5.4 Conclusions

After studying the manuscript tradition of the entire Excerpta Planudea and presenting their content and structure, I focused on the sequence of excerpts on Roman history. As regards their origin, they are excerpts from John of Antioch, Paeanius, Xiphilinus and a now lost chronicle also used by Manasses. I have further argued that the passages on Roman history are drawn from an earlier collection of historical passages, which had probably been compiled by Maximus Planudes himself. It probably comprised a larger number of excerpts taken from the same authors as the ones preserved in the Excerpta
Planudea. Regarding his working method when excerpting passages from John of Antioch and Xiphilinus, Planudes used a series of strategies already detected in earlier syllogai of excerpts, namely the Epitome, the Excerpta Anonymi, the Excerpta Salmasiana, and the Excerpta Constantiniana. Finally, regarding the literary and political function of the excerpts, Planudes made a conscious selection of thematically connected historical passages on Roman history, centred on the Roman military excellence and the glorious past of the Roman Republic. Its political aim was to recommend to the emperor a militaristic policy towards the enemies of the Empire.
Chapter 6  Collections of historical excerpts as a specific locus for (re)writing history

This chapter argues that the four excerpt collections should be understood as historiography, and studied next to chronicles and histories as part of Byzantine historiography. In fact, excerpt collections have very rarely, so far, been seen as autonomous pieces of literature. Their importance as works in their own right has been obfuscated by their anonymity and the underestimation of their originality. As a result, scholars usually study them as tools to transmit historical material but not as histories in their own right. This is illustrated by the fact that no history of historiography includes them as autonomous pieces of historical writing, next to histories and chronicles.

This, inevitably, raises the issue of how modern scholarship has thought about Byzantine genres of historiography. In fact, over the last two decades, the generic theory imposed by K. Krumbacher, H. G. Beck and H. Hunger has been modified and enriched by contemporary Byzantinists.¹ According to H. G. Beck, classicizing histories a) cover a limited period of time, b) use a continuous narrative of thematically connected events, and c) are written in classical Greek.² Chronicles, by contrast, a) cover the history of the world (from creation to the time of the chronicler), b) are structured chronologically, and c) are written in colloquial language. Though, recently, scholars have started to view fixed generic boundaries as posing constraints in our understanding of how and why Byzantines wrote history,³ the traditional division of Byzantine historical writing into histories and chronicles has never been seriously challenged. P. Magdalino in his contribution to the Oxford History of Historical Writing admits the necessity of generic categories. The examples he gives, illustrate the freedom with which late antique and

¹K. Krumbacher was the first to distinct between histories and chronicles. His theory of the monk’s chronicle was proved to be wrong, though. See especially Beck (1965), 196-197. H. G. Beck’s view was repeated by H. Hunger (1978), 252-254. K. Krumbacher’s views of historical writing were recently discussed by P. A. Agapitos (2015), 1-52.
²Beck (1965), 196-197.
Byzantine historians handled traditional historical genres, though. As a consequence, current discussions of genre are often inconclusive. J. Signes Codoñer, for instance, suggested that the rigid classification of historical texts based on their language, content and structure could be hazardous if not ill-fated. More significantly, he noted that compilations of thematically connected passages should also be seen as a third way of structuring historical narrative.

In what follows, I shall first present the classification of Byzantine historical writing as suggested by J. Signes Codoñer. Then, I shall show how the generic criteria suggested by him play out in collections of historical excerpts. I shall argue, in particular, that collections of historical excerpts merit to be seen as a distinct type of texts for the following reasons. First, they show linguistic and stylistic uniformity. Historical collections avoid using classicizing language and tend to turn their source text into a simpler Greek. Second, collections of historical excerpts share compositional methodologies and textual borrowings among historical collections link them as a distinct genre. This indicates the awareness of their compilers that they belonged to a common tradition of historical writing. Third, collections of historical excerpts represent a distinct approach to the past. Their compilers represented history according to themes. The isolation of thematically connected passages, the rewriting of them and their re-arrangement in a new receptacle altered significantly the meaning the passages had conveyed in their original textual environment.

6.1 J. Signes Codoñer’s classification of Byzantine historical writing

In this section, I shall briefly set out the criteria proposed by J. Signes Codoñer for analysing and classifying byzantine historiography. His criteria are based on the list of characteristics of types of historical writings for the period of 900 AD-1400 AD made by P. Magdalino. By collating P. Magdalino’s and J. Signes Codoñer’s propositions, the criteria

---

6Signes Codoñer (2016), 251.
7Signes Codoñer (2016), 250 and 253.
8As discussed in chapter 1 it is only after the 4th century that the copying-pasting technique takes on significance as cultural expression. The reasons are to be sought to the emergence of Christianity and to theological disputes that had arisen for the first centuries of its domination. This is what P. Odorico attempted to define with the concept of culture of sylloge. See also in Van Nuffelen (2015), 15.
9Signes Codoñer (2016), 233-250.
10Magdalino (2012), 223.
to classify historical writings could be summed up in the following: 1) the linguistic and stylistic register of the text and the intended readership, 2) the period of time that the text covers and consequently the kind of sources the author was based on and, 3) the narrative structure. Those writing history in Late Antiquity and the Byzantine period were much flexible in merging the above criteria, a fact that poses obstacles in forming rigid categories of historical writing.

J. Signes Codoñer divides historical texts into three main categories: instrumental, derivative, and original works. He labels instrumental works those texts intended for a later use by chroniclers in compiling their works. Such texts were lists of rulers, catalogues of patriarchs and chronological tables. The category includes the Chronicon paschale and Nicephorus’ Chronographia brevis.11 J. Signes Codoñer calls derivative those works that were summaries of earlier texts. The category contains Nicephorus’ Breviarium historicum, Psellos’ Chronographia, Symeon Logothete’s Chronicon (version B), Ps.-Symeon’ Chronographia, John Skylitzes’ Synopsis historiarum and John Zonaras’ Epitome historiarum. The category seems to have been formed on the basis of the working method applied to these texts rather than the way the material is arranged.12 Yet, the rewriting process (in the form of summary or interpolation of the source text), which, according to J. Signes Codoñer, is the main characteristic of this category, is definitely involved in the last category too, namely original works. The category original works contains texts dealing with contemporary history (written in classical Greek and relied on autopsy) as well as works concerned with history of the past (written either in learned Greek or in simpler Greek and based on written sources). The category includes Syncellus’ Ecloga chronographica, Theophanes’ Chronographia and George the Monk’ s Chronicon, who structured their works chronologically, along with the EC, the DT, the DAI and the DC, whose material is obviously arranged thematically. One could also say that the DT, DAI and DC are not histories by genre. They can only be seen as secondary historical sources for regions and people surrounding Constantinople or for internal affairs in the capital, just like hagiography can be employed as a marginal or alternative source of information for important individual figures or foreign lands.13 Besides, it is only the EC that consist of earlier historical texts.

11On the Chronicon paschale as an open data collection see also Gastgeber (2016).
12See also section 1.2.2.
13In recent years, studies have suggested the necessity in viewing texts that are not considered historiographical in the strict sense of the term as historical approaches to events or individuals figures. Rhetorical writings, lives of patriarchs and historical biographies (Vita Basili, Alexias) are, occasionally, either referred to as historical witnesses or classified as histories. On the Vita Basili see n. 134 in chapter 3. On the Alexias see Reinsch – Kambylis (edd.) (2001).
It becomes evident that J. Signes Codoñer’s classification of the texts into the three aforementioned categories does not always correspond to the three criteria for classifying Byzantine historiography. This problem led J. Signes Codoñer to foreground criterion 3 (the narrative structure). J. Signes Codoñer attributes three types of literary structures in middle Byzantine period-historical writing: chronological, narrative and thematic structure. In fact, J. Signes Codoñer’s classification of Byzantine historical writing corroborates the changing nature of Byzantine literature. In addition, texts themselves and manuscripts were not stable entities but subject to modifications. Contemporary demands as well as personal and social goals played a marked role in authorial choices in terms of content and structure. Indeed, individual choice, politics and social conditions are likely to have led writers to the merging of traditional methods of writing history or to the inclusion of alien features into historiography. This is now seen in positive terms. Concepts such as originality, innovation and change have been increasingly substituted to classical tradition and imitation in scholarship over the last

---

14 R. Macrides considers the chronological span covered as the most consistent difference; Macrides (2016), 258-259.


17 Byzantine historians were eager to import changes into the literary tradition because they addressed a medieval audience, which differed significantly from the audience of Antiquity; cf. Magdalino (2012), 227. See also Neville (2016), 265-276; Signes Codoñer (2016), esp. 233-235 and 250-253; Scott (2018). Burgess and Kulikowski, by contrast, appear strictly adherent to the idea that a text should perfectly fit within a specific tradition of historical writing in order to be labeled as such. In Burgess and Kulikowski’s view, Eusebius’ chronicle is the unique representative of the genre in the Greek language. After Eusebius, chronicles appeared only in Latin, on the basis of which Burgess and Kulikowski define the genre in Late Antiquity. They finally argue that after Eusebius, it was only the anonymous author of the Chronicon paschale and Theophanes who wrote a proper chronicle. The rest are either universal breviaria (Malalas, George the Monk, Nicephorus, Symeon the Logothete, Ps-Symeon, Cedrenus, Glycas, Zonaras, Manasses) or compact epitomes (Nicephorus’ Χρονογραφικόν σύντομων, Σύνοψις Χρονική, Χρονικὸν ἐπίτομον). Things, instead, become less complicated when they come to treat what in modern histories of Byzantine literature is referred to as histories. In line with them, Burgess and Kulikowski find that Zosimus, Procopius, Agathias, Menander and Theophylact wrote classicizing narrative histories; Burgess and Kulikowski (2016), 93-117. See now R. Scott’s criticism to R. W. Burgess and M. Kulikowski in Scott (2018). R. Scott defends the use of the term chronicle for a group of writings produced after Malalas.

18 The influence of rhetoric should be mentioned here. Those writing history had passed through rhetorical schools and got training to write not only history. Some of them had evidently written texts of different genres (e.g. Procopius and Agathias). On the matter see especially Markopoulos (2003), 184-185; Holmes (2003), 187-199; Mullet (2010), 227-238; Kaldellis (2014), 115-130. As J. Signes Codoñer notices, a number of recent publications are disposed to put aside any categorization of historical writings and focusing, instead, on the reliability or unreliability of the events they narrate. Truthfulness came, thus, to set a distinctive line between attempts to transmit historical facts and attempts to distort them; Kaldellis (2016), 293-306; cf. Signes Codoñer (2016), 250.
decade.\textsuperscript{19} Yet, such originality is hidden creatively behind the mask of tradition.\textsuperscript{20} It turns out that criteria in terms of style, language and structure can help us understand Byzantine historical writing insofar as we do not too rigidly adhere to them, for Byzantine writers did not do this either. From this perspective, I find J. Signes Codoñer’s attempt to classify historical texts by their literary structures to be going in the right direction. One could say that there are even cases in which the structure within the same historical work changed. This is the case, for instance, with book 18 of Malalas’ Εκλογή τῶν χρονικῶν\textsuperscript{21} or Symeon Logothete’s Chronicon, which adopts a different narrative structure when it comes to deal with contemporary events.\textsuperscript{22} Provided that texts should be viewed and assessed as a whole, I see J. Signes Codoñer’s prioritization of the structure-criterion over the language and the use of sources as being particularly essential.

In what follows, I put forward how the criteria of J. Signes Codoñer can be observed in historical collections of excerpts too. We shall see that they exhibit a series of common characteristics, which identify them as a distinct body of literature, and which highlights their proximity to works traditionally ranked as historiographical. The body of texts, which I will examine, consists of the so-called Epitome of the Seventh Century, the Excerpta Constantiniana, the Excerpta Anonymi, the Excerpta Salmasiana, and the Excerpta Planudea.

6.2 Literary features in Byzantine collections of historical excerpts

6.2.1 Language, style, function

A significant number of historical texts in Late Antiquity and the Byzantine period were written in classical Greek. Byzantinists label them as classicizing histories. The authors of these texts preferred the use of long periods and complex syntax as well as direct speech and rhetorical devices. Such histories usually dealt with recent past and contemporary events and their authors relied on autopsy or oral witnesses. Things are not so consistent, though. There are historical texts written in classical Greek, which deal with the past and, therefore, resort extensively to earlier written sources. These texts cannot be called universal chronicles; they are not concerned with the distant past (e.g.

\textsuperscript{19}Ljubarski (1998), 5.
\textsuperscript{20}Papaioannou (2013), 20.
\textsuperscript{21}This is the title transmitted in the manuscript tradition of Malalas’ text. Nevertheless, his work is labelled as Χρονογραφία in modern editions and bibliography. This happens, probably, because that is what is called by John of Damascus in the 8th century; cf. Burgess and Kulikowski (2016), 94.
\textsuperscript{22}Magdalino (2012), 225.
from creation or Adam) and the events are not presented chronologically.\textsuperscript{23} In turn, texts usually labeled as universal chronicles by Byzantinists were written in a simpler Greek. Their authors preferred short periods and simpler syntax. These historical texts, running from the creation down to the time of the author, made an extensive use of written sources and aimed at being as concisely as possible. A number of chronicles was compiled on the basis of passages excerpted from earlier chronicles. The excerpted passages were often re-edited and re-written before their inclusion into the new text. The material was organized and arranged in chronological order; the approach to chronology can vary from chronicle to chronicle, though.\textsuperscript{24}

Let us have a look at our group of texts. Collections of historical excerpts consist of a series of passages culled from earlier historical texts. The study of their structure and methodological principles in the previous chapters revealed that 1) the excerpted passages underwent changes in vocabulary and syntax – the excerptors, at times, felt the necessity to substitute words that were out of use with others that would make the passage more intelligible and palatable to the reader –, 2) the excerptors respected the sequence of passages in the original text, and 3) they were aware of the lack in context when a passage was extracted from a whole unit. Consequently, they applied a number of strategies to tackle this problem: a) additions or omissions of text, b) re-arrangement of words, and c) repetition of words or phrases. In chapter 2, we saw that the compiler of the \textit{Excerpta Anonymi} often broke the intended alphabetical order of excerpts in order to make their content clearer. He occasionally inserted brief statements justifying his choices as to the selection of excerpts. This strategy is detected in other collections of excerpts too. When excerpting Eusebius, the compiler of the \textit{Epitome} adds statements of his own, which clarify the content and explain the text better. To give but one example, an insertion by the compiler in \textit{E} 33 reads as follows: \textit{ἀναφέρει δὲ ὁ Ἡγεσηππος καὶ τὰ ὄνόματα αὐτῶν καὶ φησιν ὅτι ὃ μὲν ἐκαλεῖτο Ζωκήρ, ὁ δὲ Ἰάκωβος (...) ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἀναγκαῖα.}\textsuperscript{25} In addition to this, compilers of historical collections quite frequently composed phrases by combining a few words of the original text: such phrases served the role of a brief introduction for a series of excerpts and provided the reader with the historical context. Chapter 5 showed that Maximus Planudes has been particularly prone to this strategy. Yet, compilers’ aim at maintaining the narrative sequence and at accuracy aligns with statements occurred in the \textit{prooemium} of the \textit{EC}. As noted, compilers

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{23}This is the case with Genesius’ \textit{Regum Libri Quattuor} and \textit{Theophanes Continuatus}. The compositional features of the latter were treated by J. Signes Codoñer, who classifies it as \textit{history of the (recent) past}; Signes Codoñer (2016), 235-250.

\textsuperscript{24}Ljubarski (1998), 11-12.

\textsuperscript{25}Hegesippus records their names too. And he says that one was called Zoker and the other Jacob (...) He narrates other things that are trustworthy too.
\end{flushleft}
of excerpt collections tended to correct the excerpted text when the meaning was not clear. We have seen in chapter 2 that when excerpting the Parastaseis, the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi often needed to alter words in the source text by others that clarified the content better. The same strategy was detected in in the three syllogai of excerpts constituting the Excerpta Salmasiana, in the Epitome when excerpting Eusebius’ HE, and in the Excerpta Planudea when excerpting John of Antioch and Xiphilinus.

Linguistic as well as stylistic simplifications and corrections may imply that collections of historical excerpts addressed a wide audience. We see that historical excerpt collections share similarities with Byzantine universal chronicles in terms of language and use of sources. Chronicles were meant for a wider public too, and chapter 1 of this thesis made clear that a chronicle could be an aggregation of different excerpts. The method used, for instance by George the Monk, is identical to the one used by the compiler of the EC or the Excerpta Anonymi. What set the last two apart from Georges’ Chronicon is the distinct structure through which the excerpts are presented in an excerpt collection (see below section 6.2.3) and the different function.

Collections of excerpts exhibit a multiplicity of functions. The possibility that they could serve didactical purposes and were used in schooling can by no means be excluded. As shown in chapter 1, the word διδασκαλία occurs in a comment by the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi when excerpting John Lydus’ De Ostentis: ‘Ως ἀν δὲ μὴ ἔτελη ἢ ἡ περὶ κεραυνῶν διδασκαλία, δεῖ καὶ περὶ καιρῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τόπων διαλαβεῖν.’ The phrase identifies compiler’s practical as well as didactical purposes. As discussed in detail in chapter 1, similar requirements are highlighted in the prooemium of the EC. As noted the rest of the historical collections are not preceded by any prooemium. Their practical aims are traced in their selection of material, though. The collection on Roman history by Planudes has been transmitted as part of his Excerpta Planudea, a sylloge of passages on a variety of themes. The content and structure of the entire Excerpta Planudea indicates that they were intended to be used for teaching at schools as well.

The thematic homogeneity that characterizes the collection of historical passages by Planudes, the Excerpta Salmasiana, the Excerpta Anonymi, and the Epitome indicates that

---

26See section 3.5.
27See section 4.4.3.
28See section 5.3.3.
30See section 1.2.2.
32So that the elucidation of thunderbolts will not be incomplete, the seasons and the places (concerning thunderbolts) need to be treated.
33See Kugeas (1909), 134; Fryde (2000), 221-222 and 245-253; Ferroni (2011), 342.
such collections could just teach readers moral lessons through a series of historical paradigms, or as they definitely accumulate historical knowledge they would help the reader search for a subject matter he was particularly interested in. Such intention is also explicitly stated in the proemium of the EC. This is certainly not a role that chronicles were destined for, as chronicles recorded a series of thematically unrelated events presented in a strict chronological order. Yet, the accumulation and transmission of the memory of the past is definitely a role served by historical writing in general.

Collections of excerpts could, finally, function as an intermediate stage in the process of compiling a chronicle based on citation. These collections were depositories of material intended for the private use of the compiler. Theophanes in the preface to his Chronographia refers to a sylloge of passages used by Syncellus in compiling his Ecloga chronographica. It is now accepted that the Theophanes Continuatus and Genesius drew on a preparatory dossier of sources now lost. Another such collection representing an intermediate stage to a final work is the codex Parisinus gr. 1336, which dates to the 11th century and is the exact copy of a codex created in the 10th century now lost. The codex Baroccius gr. 142 can be considered as a further example of such collections. As noted in chapter 4, marginal notes in the codex are likely to indicate that Nicephorus Callistus have edited parts of the Epitome in order to use them later on in compiling his own chronicle.

6.2.2 Period covered and use of sources

Regarding the period of time covered, all texts of our group dealt with the distant past and relied on earlier written sources. Besides, chapter 1 which examined how an excerpt collection was redacted identified common steps and procedures in the process of redacting a sylloge of historical excerpts. The redaction of a collection of historical excerpts involved the following procedures: reading and selection, editing, and composition.

The so-called Epitome of the 7th Century (as shown in chapter 4) is a sylloge of excerpts extracted from different historical writings, notwithstanding the title assigned to it by modern scholarship. In particular, the Epitome comprises excerpts from Eusebius of

---

34There should be collections where the material to be exploited later, was first gathered. That is what is meant by the word συλλέξαντες used by Cedrenus in the proemium of his work; cf. Odorico (2013), 382.
35τὴν τε βίβλον ἣν συνέταξε καταλέλοιπε καὶ ἀφορμὰς παρέσχε τὰ ἐλλείποντα ἀναπληρῶσαι; cf. Theophanes, Chronographia, 4.1-2.
37On the codex see Odorico (2013), 382-384.
38See esp. section 4.1.5.
39See esp. sections 4.2 and 4.4.
Caesarea, Gelasius of Caesarea and Theodorus Anagnostes as well as excerpts from John Diacrinomenus and Philip of Side, and a series of anonymous fragments. The study of the Eusebian excerpts of the Epitome (chapter 4) revealed that its compiler augmented the passages taken from Eusebius’ HE with a) passages extracted from other writings by Eusebius, b) material taken from a variety of ecclesiastical writers of the 3rd and 4th centuries AD (Papias, Hegesippus, Pierius, and c) phrases compiled by the compiler himself.

The major enterprise of the 10th century, the EC, are made up of collections consisting almost entirely of excerpts from ancient and Byzantine historians, compiled under the auspices of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. In particular, the EC transmit excerpts from twenty-six historiographers from the 5th century BC to the 9th century AD. The excerpts have been singled out and grouped thematically under fifty-three subject-categories. As noted, the prooemium preceding each of the Constantinian collections as well as the content of the surviving collections reveal the method used, that is, the process of excerpting as well as the extent of intervention in the selected pieces on the part of the excerptors.

It is now accepted that the practice of selecting, copying, synthesizing and presenting material was widespread during the 10th century, when the Excerpta Anonymi were compiled. The Excerpta Anonymi are dated to the second half of the 10th century. The Excerpta Anonymi excerpted a considerable number of historical works as well as earlier collections of late antique historiography. Thematically, the excerpted passages in the Excerpta Anonymi deal with prophecies and oracular powers hidden in statues and dreams as well as with geography and ethnography. The compiler of the collection remains anonymous and the work is not accompanied by any preface. As mentioned, the compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi enriched the concatenation of excerpts with his own comments, which contain information regarding his working method.

The Excerpta Salmasiana, in the form they have been handed down to us, represent a compilation of three distinct collections of excerpts: the Exc.Salm.I and II plus the Agathias-collection make up a sylloge of excerpts like those compiled in Byzantium. The Exc.Salm.I consists of excerpts taken from John of Antioch’s Historia chronica. The passages run from the period from the Exodus to the 5th century BC. The Exc.Salm.II consists of passages from Malalas, Cassius Dio and an anonymous late antique source on the events of the 3rd and 4th centuries. The Agathias-excerpts were exclusively extracted from Agathias’ Historiae, which was concerned with events took place during the Reign of Justinian. The exact date of the Excerpta Salmasiana is difficult to be established. Scholarship appears to agree to a dating between the ninth and the eleventh centuries.

---

40 On the date and the content of the collection see section 2.1.
41 See 2.3.
Finally, the Συναγωγή by Maximus Planudes comprises excerpts from classical geographers and philosophers, historians of Late Antiquity and the middle Byzantine period as well as Christian writings. As shown in chapter 5, the passages on Roman history come from an earlier collection of excerpts compiled probably by Planudes himself. These passages are taken from Paenius (late 4th century), John of Antioch (first part of the 7th century), Xiphilinus (second half of the 11th century) and a unidentified chronicle now lost which also served as source for Manasses’ chronicle. The passages run from the foundation of Rome to the reign of Gratian (Roman emperor from 367 to 383).

It becomes evident that there is coherence to the use of sources in collections of historical excerpts. Their compilers never relied on autopsy, which is an essential feature of classicizing histories. From this point of view, excerpt collections show, once again, affinity with Byzantine universal chronicles, which were dependent on written sources too. It is worth mentioning that collections of historical excerpts quite often drew on earlier excerpt collections. The Excerpta Anonymi probably made use of material gathered in the first place by the compilers of the EC: the Excerpta Anonymi possibly drew on Constantinian collections on geography and on political prophesy. As shown in chapter 2, it cannot be excluded that the author of the Excerpta Anonymi may have had direct contacts with the excerptors of Constantine VII or was part of the intellectual circle around the emperor. In the same chapter (section 2.4.4) I showed that the Excerpta Anonymi relied also on a collection of excerpts by Cassius Dio and Peter the Patrician. It is highly likely that the same collection on Roman history was used by the Exc.Salm.II (excerpts 44-65), which exhibit similarities with the Excerpta Anonymi in content and ideology, a fact that would lead to a dating for the Excerpta Salmasiana to the mid-10th century. Chapter 3 also showed that a collection of excerpts from Malalas’ Chronographia stands behind the initial part of the Exc.Salm.II (excerpts 1-43). Chapter 4 showed that the codex Baroccianus gr. 142 transmits parts of the so-called Epitome as edited by Nicephorus Callistus in the 13th century. Chapter 5 confirmed S. Kugeas’ assertion that the section on Roman history in the Excerpta Planudea is made up of passages (Paenius, John of Antioch, Xiphilinus and a now lost chronicle) taken from an earlier collection on Roman history that was possibly compiled by Planudes himself. I also showed that the codex Athonensis Iviron 812 transmits a sylloge of historical passages which were copied from the same source as the section on Roman history in the Excerpta Planudea. Finally,
excerpts from John of Antioch preserved in the Athonensis Iviron 812 are identical to passages preserved in the EC.\textsuperscript{46}

It may be said that the aforementioned intertextual borrowing links collections of historical excerpts as a distinct and recognizable genre. And it is worth noting that R. Scott refers to intertextual borrowing among chroniclers as a proof for the continuation of chronicle-writing in Byzantium.\textsuperscript{47} Indeed, chronicles drew quite often on earlier chronicles only, which indicates that their authors were aware of the fact they were composing their works within the chronicle tradition.

\textbf{6.2.3 Structure}

Let us consider the last criterion: the selected narrative framework within which the material is placed. On the basis of the historical texts preserved, J. Signes Codoñer was able to distinguish the following narrative structures: 1) a continuous narrative of thematically connected events: the narrative is thematically developed rather than chronologically; 2) a chronological structure: the narrative is formed by unrelated events put together in chronological order and the final text is a sequence of micro-narratives arranged chronologically; and 3) a thematic structure: this is what J. Signes Codoñer called \textit{thematisation} of history.\textsuperscript{48} The historical material is arranged according to subject matters.

Our group contains texts all constructed according to number 3. The contents of the collections examined in this thesis indicate that their compilers made a heedful selection of thematically connected passages. The selection criteria were shaped by a combination of causes: cultural and literary trends, contemporary circumstances, ideological restrictions, individual interests. The selection and arrangement of material play a crucial role here. For the originality of works composed by processes of compilation is to be approached through their structure. What makes the receptacle of selected texts an independent piece of literature is the new concatenation of excerpts in it. The \textit{EC}, the \textit{Excerpta Anonymi}, the \textit{Excerpta Salmasiana}, the \textit{Epitome}, and the section on Roman history in the \textit{Excerpta Planudea} were compiled on the basis of selected passages synthesized by their compilers into a new sequence. Chronology does not play any particular role in the selection of passages. The fact that the compilers of excerpt collections respect the sequence of passages in the original texts, at times, creates the impression of a chronological order.

\textsuperscript{46}See section 5.3.2.2.
\textsuperscript{47}Scott (2018).
\textsuperscript{48}Signes Codoñer (2016), 250.
In the case of the *Excerpta Anonymi*, thematic arrangement and alphabetical order were combined. Yet, in chapter 2, I presented cases in which the compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* breaks the alphabetical order in favour of the thematic grouping. The compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* at times inserted brief statements outlining his aim at maintaining thematic coherence and narrative sequence. The passages he extracted from the *Parastaseis*, Herodotus, Appian, Cassius Dio, Procopius and John Lydus concerned ethnography as well as omens and political prophesy. The group of passages corresponding to letter B, in particular, begin with excerpts from Procopius’ *De Bellis* and Cassius Dio’ *Historiae Romanae* on Britta and on peoples inhabiting the island. Unlike in Procopius and in Cassius Dio, the description of peoples and places in the *Excerpta Anonymi* does not aim to supplement descriptions of fights. The *Excerpta Anonymi* are not concerned with the sequence of events recorded in Procopius and Cassius Dio, either. In the *Excerpta Anonymi*, the excerpts are parts of a sequence of passages on the subject matter of barbarian peoples surrounding Byzantium and on the otherness of non-Byzantines. As discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.5.2), the excerpts assumed a new meaning in the *Excerpta Anonymi*. In the new receptacle, the passages witness to a period in which the transformative power and civilising influence of the Byzantine Empire had been restricted. The new circumstances are reflected in the selection of excerpts as well as omissions and distortions of passages on the part of the compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi*. The same section (letter B) in the *Excerpta Anonymi* contains a series of Cassius Dio-excerpts on Roman emperors. The passages deal with the decision by certain Roman emperors to ignore dreams that envisage their death. The *Excerpta Anonymi* intentionally omitted any further information on emperors’ reign transmitted in the original text. For the *Excerpta Anonymi* aimed at the accumulation of passages dealing with their particular themes, namely ethnography and omen.

The *Excerpta Salmasiana*, as mentioned already, comprises three *syllogai* of excerpts. Each of them was constructed on the basis of a series of excerpts connected thematically. The content and arrangement of the excerpts reveal a principle of selection rather than a copying at random and it can, therefore, be inferred that the excerpts were put together with the intention of structuring a narrative. The *Exc.Salm.I* (excerpts from John of Antioch) exhibits an interest in Greek and Egyptian mythological accounts. The *Exc.Salm.II* (excerpts from Malalas, Cassius Dio, Leoquelle) deals with signs and oracles as well as Euhemeristic interpretation of the Greek and Egyptian mythology. The final part of the *Excerpta Salmasiana* is made up of excerpts on ethnography and geography taken from Agathias’ *Historiae*. Agathias’ historical work aimed to narrate the Frankish invasion of Italy in the 560’s, the Lazic war in the Caucasus, and Belisarius’ last campaigns. Nothing of the aforementioned themes appear in the *Excerpta Salmasiana*, though. When excerpting Agathias, the compiler of the *Agathias*-part constantly leaves out the historical framework. The passages in the *Excerpta Salmasiana* were extracted from Agathias’ digressions on the Franks and on the Sassanians, respectively. Chapter 3 (sections 3.4.1-
3.4.2) showed how the selective use of excerpts and the new sequence of them in the *Excerpta Salmasiana* changed their meaning. In the new receptacle, excerpts on ethnography sketch out the traditional cultural distinctiveness between Romans and barbarians in order to reinforce the geographical and political frontiers already in place. In this way, the *Excerpta Salmasiana* represented Agathias’ history in a different light.

The so-called *Epitome* is made up of a sequence of passages dealing with heresies and martyrs. The *Epitome* was compiled in a period in which authoritative religious texts (such as the Scriptures, Church Fathers’ writings, Acts of Councils) were used extensively in a variety of works composed by processes of compilation: *florilegia*, *quaestiones et responsiones*, *catenae*, saints’ lives, and homilies.* These texts were products of the polemical literature of the age: they engaged in dogmatical disputes between religious groups in Constantinople, in particular between the Imperial Christian Church and supporters of Monothelitism. Yet, the *Epitome* consists of a series of collections of excerpts extracted from a number of ecclesiastical texts. Ecclesiastical history as a specific subgenre of historical writing narrated the development of the early Christian Church as well as reflected on prominent bishops, heretical figures, theologians and martyrs. Ecclesiastical history stopped being written in Greek after the 6th century. Yet, the history of early Christianity and the establishment of the Church never stopped to interest Byzantine writers. The *EH* by Eusebius, for instance, continue being used, adapted and copied by chroniclers throughout the Byzantine millennium. The aim of ecclesiastical historiography was to engage in dogmatical disputes, to celebrate Christianity as well as establish local or religious groups too. Chronicles that drew on ecclesiastical historiography appeared to have served similar goals. Theophanes and George the Monk, for instance, both celebrated the triumph of Orthodoxy by writing a chronicle. From this point of view, chronicles can be construed as vehicles of imperial ideology. The inclusion of excerpts from ecclesiastical histories in the 7th-century *Epitome* does serve similar goals. What separates the *Epitome* from chronicles is the different time span they cover and the structure through which the selected passages were presented.

The *Excerpta Planudea* preserve two series of excerpts on Roman Republic and Roman imperial history, respectively. Both series go back to an earlier collection of excerpts by Planudes. The excerpted passages deal with Roman virtues on battlefield by recording exceptional deeds on the part of Roman emperors and officials. The passages highlight

---

49 See section 1.2.1.
50 Cameron (1996a), 250-276.
51 On the development of ecclesiastical history in Late Antiquity see De Vore (2015), 19-49; Van Nuffelen (2017a).
52 The reasons for the breakdown of ecclesiastical historiography have long been a subject of analysis. The traditional view is that the genre had nothing to serve in a Christianized Empire; Van Nuffelen (2017a).
53 Ecclesiastical histories were considered an authoritative account of the period of early Christianity; cf. Van Nuffelen (2017a).
54 Van Nuffelen (2017a).
the glorious Roman past and supply contemporary readers with moral examples. Chapter 5 (3.4) showed that Planudes made a selective use of passages on Roman history in order to propagate political opinions: he recommends a militaristic imperial policy towards the enemies of the Empire.

6.3 Conclusion

In the foregoing, I have considered how the classification-criteria proposed by J. Signes Codoñer and P. Magdalino play out in collections of historical excerpts. The conclusion to be drawn is that collections of historical excerpts represent a specific group within historiography. In fact, the works examined in this thesis share linguistic, methodological and structural principles, which make them a distinct body of texts. In our group of texts, the material was thematically extracted from a variety of earlier historical works. The extent to which compilers re-edited the selected passages differs among the four texts. The compilation process in historical excerpt collections was determined by similar principles and methods, though: a) accuracy, b) brevity, c) retaining the sequence of the original narrative. The examination of single excerpts from each of the collections revealed identical strategies by the compilers in dealing with the lack of context emerged by the copying-pasting technique: a) deletions and insertions b) substitutions of words for others that explained the text better. I also have argued that the selection of material in collections of historical excerpts was shaped by contemporary ideology as well as personal interests and intentions. We saw that omissions and alterations in the course of the redaction of the Excerpta Anonymi point to political attitudes and the perception of the world current in the period they were compiled. Their compiler appears to serve the dominant imperial policy of the time. Passages on ethnography in the Agathias-part of the Excerpta Salmasiana mirror similar preoccupations and politics. In the 13th century, the collection of passages on Roman history by Planudes was meant to counsel the emperor Andronicus II. From this perspective, the collections of historical excerpts presented and examined in this thesis not only contain history, as scholars usually tend to think, but they are histories themselves. For collections of historical excerpts served the role of history, as manifested in traditional historical genres, that is, in classicizing histories and universal chronicles: a) to preserve the memory of the past, b) to supply people with examples concerning behavioral patterns, and c) to shape cultural and political thinking. From this point of view, collections of historical texts merit to be considered as cultural forms in their own right and part of Byzantine historiography.
Appendix I: Texts

I. The six Procopian excerpts on ethnography in the Excerpta Anonymi

a) Excerpt 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procopius, De bellis 8.20.4-9</th>
<th>Excerpt 1 = Excerpta Anonymi 23.12-23.26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (4.) Βριττία νήσος ἐπὶ τούτοῦ μὲν τὸ Ὀκεανοῦ κεῖται. τῆς ἡμέρας οὖ πολλῷ ἀποθέν, ἀλλ’ ὄσον ἀπὸ σταδίων διακοσίων καταντικρὺ τῶν του Ἡρίου ἐκβολῶν μάλιστα. Βρεττανίας δὲ (5.) καὶ Θούλης μεταξὺ ἐστιν, ἐπεὶ Βρεττανία μὲν πρὸς δυσνότά που κεῖται ἤλιον κατὰ τῆς Ἱσπανίας τὰ ἔσχατα χώρας, ἀμφὶ σταδίους οὐχ ἤσον ἢ ἐς τετρακισχιλίους τῆς ἡπείρου διέχουσα. Βριττία δὲ ἐς τῆς Γαλλίας τὰ ὁνεῖθαν, ἃ δὴ πρὸς Ὀκεανὸν τεταμῆμα, Ἱσπανίας δηλονότι καὶ (6.) Βρεττανίας πρὸς βορράν ἄνεμον. Θούλη δὲ, ὡσα γε ἀνθρώπως εἰδέναι, ἐς Ὀκεανοῦ τοῦ πρὸς τῇ ἄρκτῳ τὰ ἔσχατα κεῖται, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἀμφὶ Βρεττανία καὶ Θούλη ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν μοι λόγως ἔρρήθη. Βριττίαν δὲ τὴν νῆσον ἔθνη τρία πολυανθρωπότατα ἔχουσι, βασιλεύς τε εἰς αὐτῶν (7.) ἐκάστῳ ἐφέστηκε. καὶ ὄνοματα κεῖται τοῖς ἔθεσεν τούτοις Ἀγγίλαι τε καὶ Φρίσσονες καὶ οἱ (8.) τῇ νήσῳ ὅμώνυμοι Βρίττωνες, τοσοῦτον δὲ ἡ ὄσον τῶν ἔθνων πολυανθρωπία φαίνεται οὖσα, ὡσα ἀνὰ πᾶν ἐτος κατὰ πολλοὺς ἐνθένδε μετανιστώμενοι ξῦν γυναιξὶ καὶ παισὶ ἐς Φράγγος (9.) χωροῦσιν. οἱ δὲ αὐτοῦς ἐνοικίζουσιν ἔς γῆς τῆς σφετέρας τὴν ἐρημοτέραν δοκοῦσαν.
ἐῖναι, καὶ ἀπ’ (10.) αὐτοῦ τὴν νῆσον προσποιεῖσθαι φασιν. ὡστε ἁμέλει οὐ πολλῷ πρότερον ὁ Φράγγων βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ πρεσβείᾳ τῶν οἱ ἐπιτηδείων τινὰς παρὰ βασιλέα Ἰουστινιανὸν ἐς Βυζάντιον στείλας ἄνδρας αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν Ἀγγίων ξυνέπεμψε, φιλοτιμούμενος ώς καὶ ἢ νήσος ἤδε πρὸς αὐτὸ ἄρχεται. τὰ μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὴν Βριττίαν καλουμένην νῆσον τοιαῦτα ἔστι.

Excerpt 2

Procopius, De bellis 8.20.2-4 and 18

(2.) Οὔφαρνοι μὲν ὑπὲρ Ἡστρον ποταμὸν ἱδρύνει, διήκουσι δὲ ἄχρι ἐς ὦκεανὸν τὸν ἄρκτόνοι καὶ ποταμὸν Ἡρίνον, ὅπερ αὐτοῖς τε διορίζει καὶ Φράγγος (3.) καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἔθνη, ἀ ταύτη ἱδρύεται. οὗτοι ἄπαντες, ὡσοὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἁμφὶ Ἡρίνον ἐκατέρωθεν ποταμὸν ὕκηντο, ἱδίου μὲν τινὸς ὅνοματος ἐκαστοὶ μετελάγχανον, ἐπὶ κοινῆς δὲ Γερμανοὶ (4.) ἐκαλοῦντο ἄπαντες. (18.) Οὔφαρνοι δὲ καὶ Φράγγος τοῦτο μόνον τοῦ Ἡρίνου τὸ ὕδωρ μεταζύ ξούσιν, ὡστε αὐτοὺς ἐν γειτόνων μὲν ὡς πλησιαίτατα ὡς καί ὑμῖν.

Excerpt 3

Procopius, De bellis 8.20.23-24

(23.) τίμιον γὰρ οὖτω τοῖς ἑκείνης ἀρχικῶν ὑπογραφήν πολλῷ μόνον παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἑκείνης ἡμετεροτοπίας ἐπὶ προσέγας τοῦ Ἐριγοῦ, (24.) δοκεῖ ποιημένη γυνὴ, τὰ μὲν οὖν πρώτω πέμφας πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπὶ προσβείᾳ τῶν οἱ ἐπιτηδείων τινὰς ἀνεπιχυρανότο ὑπὸ δὴ ὑβρίσειν ἐς αὐτὴν ἑνεκα, οὗτο ποιημένην οὕτε τὰ ἄλλα εἰργασμένην εἰς (25.) αὐτὸν ἄχαρι.
Excerpt 4

Procopius, De bellis 8.20.29-31

(29.) ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἵππον ὁ τι ποτέ ἐστιν ἐπιστασθαί σφίσι ἐξουμάινει, ἐπεὶ ἵππον ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νήσῳ οὐδὲ ὡσα κατ’ εἰκόνα θεώνται. οὐ γὰρ ποτε τὸ τζῶν τοῦτο ἐν γε (30.) Βριττία γεγονός φαίνεται, εἰ δέ ποτε αὐτῶν τισὶν ἐπὶ πρεσβεία ἡ ἄλλου του ἕνεκα Ῥωμαίους ἢ Φράγγους ἢ ἄλλω τῷ ἵππῳ ἔχοντι ἐπιχωριάσσαθαι ἐξουμαίνει, ἐνταῦθα τε ἵππους ὁχεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς ἐπάναγκες εἰς, ἀναθρόσκειν μὲν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς οὐδεμιᾷ μηχανή ἔχουσιν, ἔτεροι δὲ αὐτοὺς μετεωρίζοντες ἄνθρωποι ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους ἀναβιβάζουσιν, ἀπαλλάσσοντας τε βουλομένους ἐνθένδε αὖθις (31.) αἴροντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κατατίθενται. τὰ οὖν οὐδὲ Ὕδαρνοι ἐπετάσαι εἰσίν, ἀλλὰ πεζοὶ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀπαντες, οὗτοι μὲν οὖν οἱ βάρβαροι τοιούτῳ εἰσί.

Excerpt 5

Procopius, De bellis 8.20.42-58

(42.) Ἐν ταύτῃ δὲ τῇ Βριττίᾳ νήσῳ τείχος ἐδείχμαντο μακρὸν οἱ πάλαι ἄνθρωποι, δίχα τέμνον αὐτῆς πολλὴν τινα μοίραν τοῦ δὲ τείχους ὃ τε ἀὴρ καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶ (43.) τὰ ἀλλὰ πάντα ὀσοὺς ὁμοίως ἔρ’ ἐκάτερα ἐστί. τὰ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ τείχους πρὸς ἀνίσχοντα ἢλιον εὔξεια τὰ ἄρεων ἐστὶ συμμεταβαλλόμενη ταῖς ὡραῖς, ἥδροις μὲν μετρίως (44.) ἀλεείνη, ψυχείν δὲ χειμώνος καὶ ἄνθρωποι μὲν πολλοὶ ὄρκοντα κατὰ ταύτα βιοτεύοντες τοῖς ἄλλοις ἄνθρωποις, τὰ τε δένδρα καρποῦ ἐν ἐπιπεδείᾳ γινομένοις ὡραίοις ἀνθέει, τὰ τῇ λήξῃ τῶν ἄλλων οὐδὲν (45.) καταδεέστερον τέθηλεν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ὕδασιν ἡ χώρα ἐναβρυνομένη διαρκῶς φαίνεται. πρὸς δόντα δὲ πάν τοῦναντίον, ὡστε ἀμέλει αὐτρώπῳ μὲν οὖν ἡμιώριον ἐν τῇ Βριττίᾳ τοῖνυν οἱ παλαιοὶ ἄνθρωποι ἐδείχμαντο τείχος, δίχα τέμνον αὐτῆς πολλὴν μοίραν. τοῦτο τοῦ τείχους ὃ ἀὴρ καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἀλλὰ πάντα ὀσοὺς ὁμοίως ἔρ’ ἐκάτερα ἐστίν. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πρὸς ἀνατολήν εὔξεια τὰ ἄρεων ἐστὶ συμμεταβάλλομενη ταῖς ὡραῖς, καὶ ἄνθρωποι πολλοὶ οἰκοῦσι κατὰ ταύτην βιοτεύοντες ἢσα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἄνθρωποι καὶ τὰ δένδρα καρποῦ ὡραίοις βρίθονται καὶ τὰ λήξα. πρὸς τὴν δύσιν δὲ τὸ ἐναντίον, ὡστε οὖν ἡμιώριον ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπῳ ἔκεισε βιώναι. ἔχεις δὲ καὶ ὅρεις καὶ ἄλλων ηθῶν παντοδαπά γένε ὑπάρχουσιν. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄνθρωπος, εἰ ἀμείψει τὸ τείχος ὑπερβάς, εὐθυωρὸν ἀποθνήσκει, ὅ
δυνατόν ἔστιν ἐνταῦθα βιώναι, ἐχις δὲ καὶ ὄφεις ἀνάρθησι καὶ ἄλλων θηρίων παντοδαπὰ γένη διακεκλήρωται τὸν χώρον ἐκεῖνον. (46) καὶ, τὸ δὴ παραλογώτατον, οἱ ἐπιχύρωιοι λέγουσιν ώς, εἰ τις ἄνθρωπος τὸ τέχος ἀμείβας ἐπὶ θάτερα ίοι, εὔθυωρὼν θνήσκει, τὸ λοιπὸν τῶν εἰς ἄεραν ὡς ἡκίστα φέρων, τοὺς τε θηρίοις ἐνθάδε ιοῦσιν ὁ θάνατος εὐθὺς ὑπαντιάζων (47) ἐκδέχεται. ἐνταῦθα δὲ μοι γενομένῳ τῆς ἱστορίας ἐπάναγγελοις ἔστι λόγῳ μυθολογία ἐμφερεστάτου ἐπιμνησθῆναι, ὡς δὴ μοι οὔτε πιστὸς τὸ παράπαν ἔδοξεν εἶναι, καίπερ αἰεί πρὸς ἄνδρῶν ἐκφερόμενος ἀναρίθμης, οὐ δὴ τῶν μὲν προσαμομένων αὐτοῦργοι, τῶν δὲ λόγων αὐτήκοις ἰσχυρίζοντο γεγονέναι, οὔτε παρίτεος παντάπασιν, ὡς μὴ τα γε ἀμφι Βριττία τῇ νήσῳ ἀναγραφόμενος ἀγνοιας τινὸς τῶν τῇ δὲ ἐμπαθέντων διηκέως ἀπενέγκωμαι δοξαν. (48) λέγουσιν οὖν τὰς τῶν ἀποβιοῦντων ἄνθρωπων ψυχὰς ἐς τοῦτο αἰεὶ διακομίζεσθαι τὸ χώριον ὄντινα δὲ τρόπον, αὐτίκα δηλώσω, σπουδαίοτάτα μὲν ἀπαγγελλότων ἀκηκούσων πολλάκις τῶν τῇ δὲ ἄνθρωπων, ὡς οὖν ἐντὸς δὲ τινὰ δύναμιν ἀποκεκρίσθαι νεενομικῶς τὰ θρυλλούμενα. παρὰ τὴν ἀκτὴν τοῦ κατὰ τὴν Βριττίαν ὦκεανοῦ νῆσον κώμας παμπληθῆς ζυμβαίνει εἶναι. οἰκίοι δὲ αὐτὰς ἄνθρωποι σαφενεύντες τε καὶ γῆν γεωργοῦντες καὶ ἐπ᾽ ἐμπιστον ναυτιλλόμενοι ἐς τήν τῆς νῆσον, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα Φράγγων κατήκουσιν, φόρον μέντοι ἀπαγογήν οὐπόποτε παρασχομένοι, ύφεσιμένοι αὐτοῖς ἐκ παλαιοῦ τοῦ διὸ τοῦ ἄνθρωπος, ὑπορρύγια τινῶς, ὡς φασιν, ἐνεκα, ἢ μοι ἐν τῷ παρόντι (50) λελέξεται. λέγουσιν οἱ ταύτῃ ἄνθρωποι ἐκ περιπτοπῆς ἐπικεῖσθαι τὰς τῶν ψυχῶν παραπομπάς σφισιν. δὸς οὖν τῇ ἐπιγενησμονῇ νυκτὶ ἐς τὸ ἐπιτίθεμα τούτο οὖν τῇ ἐπιγενησμονῇ λοιμῶδες | τοῦ ἀέρος μὴ φέρων, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλου μέρους, λέγω δὴ τοῦ δυστικοῦ, εἰ θηρίον πρὸς τὸν ἔτερον χώρον ἀπέλθοι εἰς τὸν εὐκρατον, παρ᾽ αὐτὰ ἀποθνήσκει, ἐνταῦθα δὲ μοι γενομένῳ τῆς ἱστορίας ἐπάναγγελοις ἐστὶ λόγῳ τινος μυθολογία ἐμφερεστάτου ἐπιμνησθῆναι, ὡς δὴ μοι οὔτε πιστὸς τὸ παράπαν ἐδοξεν εἶναι, καίπερ αἰεί πρὸς ἄνδρῶν ἐκφερόμενος ἀναρίθμης, οὐ δὴ τῶν μὲν προσαμομένων αὐτοῦργοι, τῶν δὲ λόγων αὐτήκοις ἰσχυρίζονται γεγονέναι, οὔτε παρίτεος παντάπασιν, ὡς μὴ τα γε ἀμφι Βριττία τῇ νήσῳ ἀναγραφόμενος ἀγνοιας τινὸς τῶν τῇ δὲ συμπαθιόντων διηκέως ἀπενέγκωμαι δοξαν. λέγουσιν οὖν τὰς τῶν ἀποβιοῦντων ἄνθρωπων ψυχὰς ἐς τοῦτο αἰεὶ διακομίζεσθαι τὸ χώριον ὄντινα δὲ τρόπον, αὐτίκα δήλοσω, σπουδαίοτάτα μὲν ἀπαγγελλότων ἀκηκούσων πολλάκις τῶν τῇ δὲ ἄνθρωπων, ὡς οὖν ἐντὸς δὲ τινὰ δύναμιν ἀποκεκρίσθαι νεενομικῶς τὰ θρυλλούμενα. παρὰ τὴν ἀκτὴν τοῦ κατὰ τὴν Βριττίαν ὦκεανοῦ νῆσον κώμας παμπληθῆς ζυμβαίνει εἶναι, οἰκίοι δὲ αὐτὰς ἄνθρωποι ἰσχυρίζηται καὶ γεωργοὶ καὶ ἐμποροὶ, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα Φράγγων κατήκουσιν, φόρον δὲ μὴ τελόντες διὰ τὴν ὑπογόγιαν, ὡς λέγουσιν ἐστὶ δὲ αὐτή, λέγουσιν ἐκ περί τροπῆς ἐπικεῖσθαι τὰς τῶν ψυχῶν παρασώματα αὐτοῖς, δὸς οὖν τῇ ἐπιγενησμονῇ νυκτὶ ἐς τὸ ἐπιτίθεμα τοῦ τής ὑπογόγιας διαδοχής ἤτον ἐστὶν, οὐτοὶ ἐπειδὰν συσκοτάζῃ, εἰς τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν ἀναχωροῦντες καθεύδουσιν, προσδέχομαιν τὸν συναγωγὰ τοῦ πράγματος, τῇ νυκτὶ δὲ τῶν θυρῶν αὐτῶν ἀρασσομένων αἰσθάνονται, φωνῇ δὲ τίνος ἀκούοσιν ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοὺς συγκαλούσις. αὐτοὶ δὲ τῶν στρωμῶν.
ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιτίθενσι τούτῳ τῇ τῆς ὑπογραφής διαδοχῆς ἱερὸν ἐστίν, οὗτοι δὴ ἐπειδὴν τάχιστα ξυσκοτάζῃ, ἐς τὰς οἰκίας τὰς αὐτῶν ἀναχωροῦντες καθεδύουσι, προσδεχόμενοι τὸν συναγωγή (51.) τοῦ πράγματος, ἀωρὶ δὲ τῶν νυκτῶν τῶν μὲν θυρῶν σφίσιν ἀρασσομένων αἰσθάνονται, φωνῆς δὲ τινὸς ἀφανοῦς ἐπαύσατον ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον τῶν νυκτοῦ ξυγκαλούσης. (52.) αὐτοῖ τε ὀκνήσει οὐδεμιᾷ ἐκ τῶν στρωμάτων ἐξανιστάμενοι ἐπὶ τὴν ἤλιον βαδίζουσιν, οὐ ξυνιέντες μὲν ὁποία ποτὲ ἀνάγκη αὐτούς ἔς τοῦτο ἐνάγει, ἀλλ’ ὤμως (53.) ἀναγκαζόμενοι. ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἀκάτος παρεσκευασμένας ὄρσοι ἐρήμους τὸ παράπαν ἄνθρώπων, οὐ τὰς σφετέρας μεντοί, ἀλλ’ ἔτερας τινὰς, ἐς ΄ς δὴ ἐσβάντες (54.) τῶν κωπῶν ἀποτοναι. καὶ τῶν βάρεων αἰσθάνονται ἄθρομον μὲν ἐπιβατῶν πλῆθει, ἄχρι δὲ ἐς σανίδας τε ἄκρας καὶ τῶν κωπῶν τὴν χώραν τῷ ὑσθίῳ βεβαπτισμένων, ἄποδεουσαν τε τοῦ ὑδάτος ὡσον ὦδέ δάκτυλον ἐνα, αὐτοὶ μέντοι ὀὐδένα θέωνται, ἀλλὰ καὶ μίαν ἐρέσοντες ὤραν ἐς τὴν Βριττίαν καταίροι. (55.) καίτοι ταῖς ἀκάτος ἦν καὶ ταῖς αὐτῶν ἰδίαις ναυτίλλονται, οὐχ ἵστοις χρώμενοι, ἀλλ’ ἐρέσοντες, ἐς νύκτα τε καὶ ἡμέραν μόλις ἐνταῦθα διαπορθεύονται ἐς τὴν νῆσον δὲ καταπλεύσαντες ἀποφορτιζόμενοι ἀπαλλάσσονται αὐτίκα δὴ μάλα, τῶν βάρεων σφίσι κούφων γινομένων ἐκ τοῦ αἰφνιδίου κάτ’ τοῦ ὑσθίου ἐπαιρομένων ἐν τε τῷ ὑδάτι καταδυομένων ὀὖδέν τι ἄλλο, (56.) πλὴν γε δόσα ἐς τὴν τρόπιν αὐτήν. καὶ αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπων ὀὖδένα ὀρῶσιν ὡστε ἐξυπέλοντα ὡστε ἀπαλλασσόμενον τῆς νῆσος, φωνῆς δὲ ἀκούσειν τινὸς ἐνθένδε φασί τοῖς ὑποδεχόμενοις ἀπαγέλλειν δοκοῦσης πρὸς ὄνομα τῶν συμπεπλευκτῶν αὐτοίς ἐκαστὸν, τὰ τὰ ἀξιώματα ἐπιλεγούσης οἷς αὐτῶν ἀνιστάμενοι ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν βαδίζουσιν. οὐκ εἰδότες ποία ἀνάγκη αὐτοὺς ἔς τοῦτο ἀνάγει, ὤμως ἀναγκαζόμενοι. ἐνταύθα ἀκάτος παρεσκευασμένας ὄρσοι κενὰς ἀνθρώπων, οὐ τὰς ἰδίας, ἀλλ’ ἔτερας τινὰς, ἐν αῖς εἰσελθόντες τῶν κωπῶν ἀποτοναι, καὶ αἰσθάνονται τῶν πλοίων βαρυουμένων ἐκ πλῆθους ἐπιβατῶν, μέχρι δὲ τῶν ἄκρων τῶν σανίδων βεβαπτισμένα βλέπουσα τὰ πλοία, ἄποδεουσών τοῦ ὑδάτος ὡσον δάκτυλον ἐνα, ὀὐδένα δὲ ὀρῶσιν μίαν δὲ ὤραν ἐρέσοντες εἰς τὴν Βριττίαν καταίρου. καίτοι ἦν καὶ τὰς ἰδίαις ἀκάτος πλέονσάν, οὐχ ἵστοις χρώμενοι, ἀλλ’ ταῖς κώπαις ὡς νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν μόλις διαπορθεύονται. καταπλεύσαντες δὲ τῇ νῆσῳ ἀποφορτιζόμενοι ἀπαλλάσσονται, ἐν τῷ ὑδάτι καταδυομένων, ὀὐδενὸς ἄλλου, πλήν τῆς τρόπιν. καὶ αὐτοὶ μὲν ὀὐδένα ἀνθρώπων βρωσίν ὡστε συμπλέοντα, ὡστε τῆς νῆσος ἀπαλλασσόμενον, φωνῆς δὲ ἀκούσουσα τοῖς ὑποδεχόμενοις ἀπαγέλλουσαν πρὸς ὄνομα συμπεπλευκτῶν αὐτοίς ἐκαστον, τὰ τὰ ἀξιώματα ἐπιλεγούσης οἷς πρὸς ἔχρωντο καὶ πατρόθεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακαλούσης, ή δὲ καὶ γυναικὲς συμπλεύσαν, τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀποστοματίζουσα τὰ συνόμα αἰὲς συνεβίωσαν.
πρώην ἐχρώντο καὶ πατρόθεν (57.) αὐτοὺς ἀνακαλοῦσις. ἢν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ξυνιοπορθευσάμεναι αὐτοῖς τύχωσι, τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀποστοματίζουσι τὰ ὀνόματα οἵστερ ξυνοικοῦσαι ἐβίων, (58.) ταῦτα μὲν οὖν οἱ τῇ δὲ ἀνθρώπων ξυμβαίνειν φασίν. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν πρότερον λόγον ἐπάνειμι.
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| (11.) Τῶν δὲ Οὐάρνων ἀνήρ τις ὑπολύρων πρότερον, Ἑρμηγίσκλος ὄνομα, ἤρχεν. ὥσπερ τὴν βασιλείαν κρατώσας διὰ σπουδῆς ἔχων, τὴν Θευδιβέρτου ἁξιολογηθῇ τῶν Φράγγων ἄρχων τυχήματα γυναῖκα γαμεῖν ἐποιήσατο. (12.) τετελευτήκει γάρ αὐτῷ ἔναγχος ἢ πρότερον ξυνοικοῦσα γυνή, παῖς ἐνός γενομένη μήτηρ, ὅπερ καὶ ἀπέλπη τῷ πατρὶ Ἐραδίγιον ὄνομα, ὡς δὲ ὁ πατὴρ παρθένου κόρης, γένους Βριττίας, ἐμνήστευσος γάμον, ἤσπερ ἁδελφός βασιλεὺς ἦν τότε Ἀγγίλων τοῦ ἔθνους, χρήματα μεγάλα τῷ τῆς μνηστείας αὐτῆς διδυμωσίς λόγω. (13.) οὗτος ἀνήρ ξὺν Ὀδάγρος τοῖς λογισμῶταῖς ἐν χωρίῳ τῷ ἱππεύομένος οἴνον τινα ἐπί δένδρου τε καθήμενον (14.) εἶδε καὶ πολλὰ κράζοντα. εἶτε δὲ τοῦ ὄρνιθος τῆς φωνῆς ξυνεῖς εἶτε ἀλλὰ μὲν τὶ ἐξεποιητάμενος, ξυνεῖνα δὲ τοῦ ὄρνιθος μαντευομένου τερατευσῶμεν, τοῖς παρούσιν εὔθες ἐφασκέν ως τεθησίητε τεσσαράκοντα (15.) ἡμέραις ὕστερον. τοῦτο γάρ αὐτῷ τὴν τοῦ ὄρνιθος δηλοῦν πρόρρησιν. “Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν προορόμενος” ἔρχετο ὅπως ὡς ἀσφαλέστατα ξύν τῇ ἀπραγμοσύνη βιώσεσθε, τοῖς τῷ Φράγγοις ἐς κήδους συνῆλθον, γυναῖκα ξυμβαίνειν τῇ ἐμὸι ξυνοικοῦσαν ἐπαγαγόμενος, καὶ τῷ παῖδι τῷ
ὁ πατριός μητρυὶ βούλεται παιδαὶ ἔτος δύναμις ἰβάρεως ἢ βουλομένοις ὑμέρων, ἡμεῖς δὲ αὐτὴν, ἐπειδὰν ἀφίκωμαι τάχιστα ἐς τὸ μέτρον τοῦ βίου, (17.) τύχη ἀγαθῆ κατακυροῦντες διαπεραίνετε. οἶμα τοῖνος Οὐάρνοις ἐξνοίσεεν τὴν κηδεῖαν ἐς Φράγγους (18.) μᾶλλον ἡ ἐς τοὺς νησιώτας ποιεῖσθαι. Βρίσκειο μὲν γὰρ οὖδὲ ὅσον ἐπιμίγγυσθαι ύμῖν οἰοὶ τέ εἰσιν, ὅτι μὴ ὑφε τε καὶ μόλις Οὐάρνοι δὲ καὶ Φράγγοι τοιτὶ μόνον τοῦ Ἱῆνου τὸ ὦδωρ μεταξὺ ἐσοῦν, ὡστε αὐτοῦς ἐν γειτόνων μὲν ὡς πλησιάται ὄντας ύμῖν, ἐς δυνάμεως δὲ κεχωρηκός μέγα τι χρήμα, ἐν προείρω ἔχειν εὖ ποιεῖν τε ύμᾶς καὶ λυμαίνεσθαι, ήνίκα (19.) ἂν αὐτὸς βουλομένοις εἰ, λυμανύσθαι δὲ πάντως, ἢ μὴ τὸ κήδος αὐτοῖς ἐμπόδιον ἔσται. βαρεία γὰρ φύσει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ύπερβάλλουσα αὐτοὺς τῶν πλησιοχώρων δύναμις γίνεται καὶ πρὸς ἀδικίαν ἐτοιμότητα, ἐπεὶ γείτονι δυνατῷ ῥάδιον ἐπὶ τοὺς πέλας (20.) οὔδὲν ἀδικοῦντας ἐκπορίζεσθαι πολέμου αἰτίας. ὅτε τοῖνος ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει, παρείσθω μὲν ύμῖν τοῦ παιδός τοῦ νησιώτις μηνητῆ χρήματα πάντα, ὡσ παρʼ ἡμῶν κεκοιμημένη τοῦτο ὅ ἐνεκα ἐτυχε, τῆς ὦβρεως ἀπενεγκαμένη μισθόν, ἢ νόμος ἀνθρώπων ὁ κοινὸς βούλεται: Ῥάδιγης δὲ ὁ παῖς ἐξοικείζεσθω τῇ μητριᾷ τὸ λοιπὸν τῇ αὐτοῦ, καθάπερ ὁ πάτριος ἡμῖν ἐφίσο νόμος. (21.) ὃ μὲν ταῦτα εἰπὼν τῇ τεσσαρακοστῇ ἀπὸ τῆς προρρήσεως ἡμέρᾳ νυσίς τῆς πεπρωμένην ἀνέπλησεν. ὁ δὲ τοῦ Ἐρμηγίσκλου ύϊς, Οὐάρνων τὴν
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| (4.) The island of Brittia lies in this part of the ocean not far from the coast, being about two hundred stades off and approximately opposite the mouth of the Rhine, and between the islands of Britain and Thule (5.) For while Britain lies to the west about in line with the extreme end of Spain, separated from the continent by a distance which at the least is about four hundred stades, Brittia is towards the rear of Gaul, that side namely which faces the ocean, being, that is, to the north of both Spain and Britain (6.) And Thule, as far as men know at any rate, is situated towards the extremity of the northern ocean. But the description of Britain and of Thule has been set down by me in the preceding narrative. The island of Brittia is inhabited by three populous nations (7.) each having one king over it. And the names of these nations are Angili, Frissones, and Brittones, (8.) the last being named from the island itself. And so great appears to be the population of these nations that every year they emigrate thence in large companies with their women and children and go to the land of the Franks (9.) And the Franks allow them to settle in the
part of their land which appears to be more deserted, (10.) and by this means they say they are winning over the island. Thus it actually happened that not long ago the king of the Franks, in sending some of his intimates on an embassy to the Emperor Justinian in Byzantium, sent with them some of the Angili, thus seeking to establish his claim that this island was ruled by him. Such then are the facts relating to the island that is called Brittia.
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<tr>
<td>(2) The Varni dwell beyond the Ister River, and extend as far as the northern ocean along the river Rhine, which separates them from the Franks and the other nations who dwell in that region. (3.) Now among all these nations which in ancient times dwelt on both sides of the Rhine river each people had its own particular name, (4.) but the whole group was called in common Germans. (18.) For the men of Brittia, on the one hand, are not even able to join forces with you except after a long and difficult journey, while the Varni and Franks, on the other hand, have only yonder water of the Rhine between them.</td>
<td>Closer to the Franks are the Varni rather than the Britons, because the Britons inhabit the land Hiouvernia whereas only the Rhine separates the Varni from the Franks, who are named Germans by the ancients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>(23.) For so highly is virtue regarded among those barbarians, that when merely the name of marriage has been mentioned</td>
<td>And the virtue is in so high esteem among them that even if someone abandons a woman merely engaged to, that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
among them, though the fact has not been accomplished, the woman is considered to have lost her maidenhood. (24.) First, then, she sent an embassy to him of some of her kinsmen and inquired for what reason he had insulted her, though she had neither been unfaithful nor done him any other wrong.
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**Procopius, De bellis 8.20.29-31**

(29.) And this is not merely because they are unpracticed in horsemanship, but the fact is that they do not even know what a horse is, since they never see so much as a picture of a horse on that island; for it is clear that this animal has in no time lived island in Brittia. (30.) And whenever it happens that some of them on an embassy or some other mission make a visit among the Romans or the Franks or any other nation which has horses, and they are there constrained to ride on horseback, they are altogether unable to leap upon their backs, but other men lift them in the air and thus mount them on the horses, and when they wish to get off, they are again lifted (31.) and placed on the ground. Nor, in fact, are the Varni horsemen either, but they too all march on foot. Such, then, are these barbarians,
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(42.) Now in this island of Brittia the men of ancient times built a long wall, cutting off a large part of it; and the climate and the soil
and everything else are not the same on the two sides of it. (43.) For to the east of the wall there is a salubrious air, changing with the seasons, being moderately warm in summer and cool in winter. (44.) And many people dwell there, living in the same fashion as other men, and the trees abound with fruits which ripen at the fitting season, and the corn-lands flourish as abundantly as any; (45.) furthermore, the land seems to display a genuine pride in an abundance of springs of water. But on the west side everything is the reverse of this, so that it is actually impossible for a man to survive there even a half-hour, but countless snakes and serpents and every other kind of wild creature occupy this area as their own. And, strangest of (46.) all, the inhabitants say that if any man crosses this wall and goes to the other side, he dies straightway, being quite unable to support the pestilential air of that region, and wild animals, likewise, which go there are instantly met and taken by death. (47.) Since I have reached this point in the history, it is necessary for me to record a story which bears a very close resemblance to mythology, a story which did not indeed seem to me at all trustworthy, although it was constantly being published by countless persons who maintained that they had done the thing with their own hands and had heard the words with their own ears, and yet it cannot be altogether passed over, lest, in writing an account of the island of Brittia, I gain a lasting reputation for ignorance of what takes place there. They say, then, that the souls of men who die are always conveyed to this place. And as to the manner in which this is done, I shall presently explain, having many a time heard the people there most earnestly describe it, though I have come to the conclusion that every other kind of wild creature of other serpents. But even if a man crosses and gets over the wall, he dies instantly, being unable to bear the infectious air. And if from the other side, I mean from the west side, a serpent flees to the other place, the temperate one, it dies at once. Since I have reached this point in the history, it is necessary for me to record a story which bears a very close resemblance to mythology, a story which did not indeed seem to me at all trustworthy, although it was constantly being published by countless persons who maintained that they had done the thing with their own hands and had heard the words with their own ears, and yet it cannot be altogether passed over, lest, in writing an account of the island of Brittia, I gain a lasting reputation for ignorance of what takes place there. They say, then, that the souls of men who die are always conveyed to this place. And as to the manner in which this is done, I shall presently explain, having many a time heard the people there most earnestly describe it, though I have come to the conclusion that
the tales they tell are to be attributed to some power of dreams. (49.) Along the coast of the ocean which lies opposite the island of Brittia there are numerous villages. These are inhabited by men who fish with nets or till the soil or carry on a sea-trade with this island, being in other respects subject to the Franks, but never making them any payment of tribute, that burden having been remitted to them from ancient times on account, as they say, of a certain service, which will here be described by me. (50.) The men of this place say that the conduct of souls is laid upon them in turn. So the men who on the following night must go to do this work relieving others in the service, as soon as darkness comes on, retire to their own houses and sleep, awaiting him who is to assemble them for the enterprise. In the night they are conscious of a knocking at their doors and hear a voice calling them together for their task. And they rise from their beds and walk to the shore, not understanding what necessity leads them to do this, nevertheless compelled. There they see skiffs fully prepared with no men in them, not their own skiffs, but a different kind, in which they embark and lay hold of the oars. (53.) And they are aware that the boats are burdened with a large number of passengers and they see that they are wet by the waves to the edge of the planks, having not so much as one finger’s breadth above the water, however they themselves see no one, but after rowing a single hour they put in at Brittia. And yet when they make the voyage in their own skiffs, not using sails but rowing, they with difficulty make this passage in a night and a day. Then when they have reached the island and have been relieved of their burden, they sink no further in the water than the keel itself. And they do not see any man either sitting in the boat with them or departing from the boat, but they hear a voice make announcement to those who take the souls in charge as each name is called of the passengers who have come over with them, telling over the positions of honour which they formerly held and calling out their fathers’ names.
day. Then when they have reached the island and have been relieved of their burden, they depart with all speed, their boats now becoming suddenly light and rising above the waves, for they sink no further in the water than the keel itself. (56.) And they, for their part, neither see any man either sitting in the boat, but they say that they hear a kind of voice from the island which seems to make announcement to those who take the souls in charge as each name is called of the passengers who have come over with them, telling over the positions of honour which they formerly held and calling out (57.) their father’s names with their own. And if women also happen to be among those who have been ferries over, they utter the names of the men to whom (58.) they were married in life. This, then, is what the men of this country say takes place. But I shall return to the previous narrative.
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(11.) The Varni, not long ago, were ruled by a man named Hermegisclus. He, being eager to strengthen his kingdom, had made the sister of Theudibert, ruler of the Franks, his wedded wife. (12.) For his previous wife had died recently, having been the mother of one child, Radigis by name, whom she left to his father; and he sought a marriage for this child with a maiden born in Brittia, whose brother was then king of the nation of the Angili, and had given her a large sum of money (13.) because of his wooing. Now this man, while riding with the most notable of the

**Excerpt 6 = Excerpta Anonymi 25.25-26.4**

I remember also about ocular practice. The Varni are a British nation, and Hermegisclus was their king having a son named Ragidis. Hermegisclus’ wife died, he married to the sister of Theudibert, ruler of the Franks. This Hermegisclus, while riding with the most notable of the Varni, saw a bird sitting in a tree and croaking loudly. He immediately told those with him that he would die forty days later. And he ordered him [his son] to be married to his own stepmother, the sister of Theudibert, and to abandon his lawful wife, who was from the Britons. And
Varni in a certain place, (14.) saw a bird sitting in a tree and croaking loudly. And whether he really comprehended the bird's vice, or, possessing some other knowledge, simply made a mysterious pretence of comprehending the bird's prophesy, he at any rate immediately told those with him (15.) that he would die forty days later. For this, he said, was revealed to him by the pronouncement of the bird. “Now I”, he said, “making provision that you should live most securely and at your ease, have related myself with the Franks by taking from their country the wife who is now my consort, and I have bestowed Brittia upon my son by betrothal. (16.) But now, since I expect to die very shortly, and, as far as this wife is concerned, I am without issue male or female, and my son furthermore is still unwed and without his bride, come now, let me communicate my thought to you, and, if it should seem to you not without some profit, do you, as soon as I reach the term of my life, put upon it the seal of your approval (17.) and execute it. I think, then, that it will be more to the advantage of the Varni to make the alliance by marriage with the Franks (18.) than with the islanders. For the men of Brittia, on the one hand, are not even able to join forces with you except after a long and difficult journey, while the Varni and Franks, on the other hand, have only yonder water of the Rhine between them, so that they, being very close neighbours to you, and having achieved an enormous power, have the means ready at hand both to help you and to harm you whenever they wish; (19.) and they will undoubtedly according to the prediction he died on the fortieth day.
harm you if the said marriage alliance shall not prevent them. For men naturally find a neighbouring state’s power, when it surpasses their own, grievous and a most ready cause of injustice, for a powerful neighbour may with comparative ease secure causes of war against his neighbours who are doing no wrong. Since, then the facts are these, let the island girl (20.) who has been wooed for this boy be given up by you, and all the money which she has received from us for this purpose, let her retain as remuneration for the indignity, as the common law of mankind has it; but let my son Radigis be married to his own stepmother thenceforth, just as our ancestral law permits us”.
III. The Agathias-excerpts transmitted in the Codex Vaticanus graecus 96

f. 104r 1. <Oi> νῦν λεγόμενοι Φράγγοι, Γερμανοὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκαλοῦντο. δῆλον δὲ- ἀμφι

RHὸν γὰρ ποταμὸν οἰκοῦσί καὶ τὴν ταύτη ἤτερον, ἔχουσι δὲ καὶ Γαλλίαν τὰ

πλείστα. 2. ὅτι οἱ Αλαμαννοὶ ἔχουσιν εἰσὶν ἄνθρωποι καὶ μιγάδες, καὶ τοῦτο ὑπάτα ἐν εἰς

αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ ἐπικοινωνία. 3. Αλληγέρνος τὸς Λόθοος ἤηγεμών τοσοῦτον ἢ

ἄριστος ἐπὶ τοξικῇ ὡστε εἰ ἐπαφήκη βέλος, κάν εἰς λίθον τὸν εἰς ἔνεπεν ἢ εἰς

ἐτερόν τι ἀτέραμον, διεφρήγετο ἃτα τῆς τῆς ρύμης. Παλλᾶδὸν γοῦν, ὶρμαμον στρατηγεῖν, βαλῶν ἄν τοῦ τείχους διαμαζόταν στὸν ἄνδρα διεπρόνεσθήν ἀυτῷ θάρακι καὶ ἀσφάλιοτο

4. ὁπόσον τῆς ἐλλείπειν ταχυδαίας καὶ αὐτόν, 5. ὑφίκετο τὸ τείχος καὶ καταλιπάτθαιν, συκελίς καὶ καλανάγραις ὑπὸ τοίο κλεισιν. 6. ὅτι αἱ Ἀλπεῖς

τὸ δὸς ἐν μέσῳ Ῥωσίας τῆς χώρας καὶ Λυμερίας ἄνευ. 7. ὅδε πως ἂρα αὐτῷ ἔξει ὑπάρχῃ ἀπαντᾶ ἤθελιν. 8. σοὶ καὶ ἀδήλητοι. 9. ὁπόσον τοῦ δήμου φίλερι καὶ

παλλιμβῶλον. 10. τοὺς οἱ πόρους καὶ παραφάγειν. 11. οἱ Φράγγοι ὁπόσον ἂν ἐν

ἐκόντες ἐν ἐνθεοῦ ἐν εἰ ἔμεν ἐνθεοῦ, πολέμιον γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸ πῦρ, σφηκώτα ὅπο ὑπὸ τοῦ κρύσου αἰεὶ. ἔχουσι γὰρ πρὸς τοῦτο οἰκεῖοι τῷ δυσχείμερον

πατρίδα κεκτήσεται. 12. ὁπότε ἐπαθάτες ἐνυπνιασμοῦ καὶ ἀγερώχου καὶ ὅν ὧν

ἄτακτα ἐξάλλεσθαι καὶ σκηνήτα, ἀλλὰ τὰς τοῦ ἐντεύχεισες καὶ ἀναστραφεῖς τῇ πείρᾳ

πεπαθαδειμένον. 13. Ναρσής ὁ στρατηγοῖς μέλλουν ἢ ἕξει συγκαλεῖ τοῖς πολεμίοις ναὶ, ἔμειν ἐρουλός τῆς τῶν ἐνπολεμίων ἠγέλη αὐτῷ ἄπεπνυίων τοῦ αὐτοῦ

οἰκεῖτα, ἐπέσερε, καὶ τοῦ τοῦ πῦρ πόρως ἀποσκευάζομεν διὰ τοῦ τοῦν

f. 104v ἔρονλον ἐκεῖνον ἀνταποκτεῖναι, συνέμιξε καὶ κατά κράτος τοῦ ἐρθῆρος ἔτροπόσατο. 14. οἱ τὴν αἰτῶν τοῦ σεσειρόμενοι αναδεικτήσας τῶν εἰς ἔλεγχον

ζήρας τε καὶ λεγώδης, ὑπὸ τὰς γλαφυρὰς τῆς γῆς εἰργομένας καὶ τῷ ἡ

diαπνεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τὰς γλαφυρὰς τῆς γῆς εἰργομένας καὶ τῷ μὴ

ἐτροπώσατο. 15. Ἔρουλον ἐκεῖνον ἀνταποκτεῖναι, συνέμιξε καὶ ἐπέσερε, καὶ τὸ τοῦ φόνου

μόσος ἀποσκευασμένος διὰ τοῦ τοῦν

25 ἔθει. Παλλάδιον γοῦν, ἐπεὶ ἐρουλός τῶν ἐπαθήτων ἲς ἐπαθήτων ὑπὸ τὴν ἐρευνήσεισας ὑπὸ τῆς τῆς κατωλίσθαινε. 16. οἱ νῦν λεγόμενοι Λαξοί, Κύλχη τὸ παλαιὸν ἐνομαζότον- εἰς δὲ Αἰγυπτίων ἀποκοιτε. Ἐσσώστριος

βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου πάσαν κατεστραφάμενον τὴν Ἀσίαν, καὶ ἀπομοιασθεὶ ἐνταιδία του ὁμίλου καταλιπάττων. 16. τὸ φούριον τῶν Ὁλλάρνα κατὰ Λατίνων διάλεκτον χυτροπόλια ἐρμηνεύεται.
...
καὶ σκοπούμενων. 30 τὸ μηχάνημα οὶ σπαλίων πλέγμα ἐστὶν ἐκ λόγων ἐς ὀροφής τίπον στεγάνον τε τῇ πυκνώσει καὶ ἀμφιμεροῖς τοῦ ὑπερχόμενον. δέρρεις δὲ ἦπερθεν καὶ διήθερας ἐπιβάλλοντες πάντοθεν περικάλυπτουσι τὸ μηχάνημα τοῦ μᾶλλον ἐρμώον εἶναι καὶ ἀποκρούει τὰ βέλη. ἢ ἀνάθες ἤ ἐνδόν ἐν τῷ ἀσφαλεὶ ὑποκρυπτόμονοι αἱροὺσι τε αὐτῷ ὀφανῶς καὶ ἢ βούλονται διακομίζουσιν. ἐπειδὰν δὲ πῦργῳ τυχὸν προσειχεῖτ, τότε δὴ νερθὲν ἐκεῖνοι τὴν προσκεμίαν γὴν ἀνορύκτοντες καὶ τὸν χοῦν ἀνυμόμοιν ἀποχημούσι τὰ θεμέλια, καὶ εἰτα μοχλοῖς τε καὶ σφύραις ἐνδεξεῖστατα πλήττοντες κατασεισοῦ τὴν οἰκοδομίαν. 31. ὑ σ τὸν ὑπὸν χρεμετίσμος καὶ τῶν ἀσπίδων ὁ πάταγος καὶ τῶν θωράκων αἱ συντρίψεις τὸν χοῦν ἀνιμῶμεν ἀπογυμνοῦσι τὰ θεμέλια, καὶ εἶτα μηδενὸς αὐτῷ προσισταμένου, ἢ ἀπαλλαγῆναι. δέρρεις δὲ ὕπερθεν καὶ διφθέρας τῇ πυκνώσι καὶ ἀμφηρεφὲς τῷ ἐκατέρωθεν τὰ πλευρὰ ἐς τὰ κάτω ἐφιεμένων.


1 τὸν: τὸν add. V: delevi 33 φραγγόν: v.l. μπ
톈 τὸ τῶν Σεγεστανῶν ἔθνος
35 ἀνακαχλάζοντος ἀτμὸς ἐπῆρτο καὶ φλόγα ἐξῆψε μεγάλην. αὐτίκα δὲ τοῦ ὕδατος διαθερομένου καὶ ἀφανεῖ καταστησάμενος πῦρ ἐνῆκε σφοδρὸν ὑπὸ τοὺς τῶν λεβή ἀνιόντα καὶ γυμνῇ προσψαύειν τῇ ὀροφῇ κατὰ τὸ παρεῖκον, καὶ τῇ βύρσῃ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀπειλημμένον ἐνέπηξε ταῖς δοκοῖς τὰ ἀπολήγοντα καὶ ἐς τὸ ἀκριβὲς ἐνεπερόνησεν, ὡς καὶ τὸν τὴν στεφάνην περιβεβύσθαι, δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς σκυτίνους ἔξωθεν μεγάλου πάτον ἐποίησε. βουλόμενος δὲ αὐτὸν Ἀνθέμιος ἀντιλυπεῖν, τοιάδε ποιεῖ· λέβητας ἱατρικῆς δαημονεστάτω. ἀδελφὸς τούτου Μητρόδωρος γραμματικὸς ἄριστος γέγονε· Ὀλύμπιος ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ἀρνησάμεναι τὴν βασιλεία, καὶ λαβὼν πάλιν ἐπατεμεῖται, πιστεύσαντες τῇ γαστρὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ μητρὸς τὴν κίδαριν περιθέντες, ἡ ἵππος· μαντευσαμένων δὲ ἐπεὶ γέγονεν ὡς τοῖς μάγοις εἰκάζοντες, ὑιοῖ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλείς, ἡνίκα ἔθνους μεγάλου κρατήσουσι, τοὺς μὲν τοῦ Ἀνθέμιος ἐγγὺς κατῴκει Ζήνωνος τινὸς ὁ τῆς Ἑσπέρας βασιλεὺς ἀπηλάθη τῆς καταβλάπτων αὐτὸν ἐπάνω τῆς ὀροφῆς τοῦ οἴκου Ἀνθέμιου δατος ἐμπλήσας διακριδὸν ἔστησε πολλαχοῦ τοῦ δωματίου πάλιν ἐπατεμεῖται, τις τοῦ δωματίου ἀσθμήνας ἐλέχθη, τὸ μέγατον ἀσθμήνας ἐξ ὑπεραμαθής, τῇ ἀρχῇ ἡγεμονίαν ἀπονέμουσι μνήμης ἕκατι καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ τροπαίῳ μεγαλαυχίας.
καὶ πεποικυμένος· οὐκ ἔχον δὲ ὅπῃ διαχριθείη, ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐλούς ἀνείρπε καὶ τῇ στενότητι πιεζόμενος ἀνεφρέτο βιαστήρεν ἐως τῇ στέγῃ προσπαθηκών ἐνδελεχέστατα ἐδόθησαν ἀπασαν καὶ διέδειλαν, δόσων ὑποτρέμειν ἡρέμα καὶ διατηρητέγενα τὰ ἐξούλα. ὁ δὲ Ζήνων εἰς τὸ πάλαιτον ἀπελθὼν ἤρότα τοὺς ἐκεῖ εἰ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤσθάνθησαν τοῦ σεισμοῦ. οὐ δὲ «εὐφήμει ἀνθρώπω» ἐξελέγει καὶ «ἀπαγε» καὶ «μὴποτε γένοιτο». 48. οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῦτο ἀλλὰ καὶ κατήστρεψε καὶ κατεβρύστησε τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ζήνωνος τὸ δωμάτιον. δίσκον γὰρ τινα ἐσσύρμου δίκην ἐσκευασμένον καὶ ἡρέμα ὑποκολαύνομενον ταῖς τοῦ ἥλιου ἀντερεῖδον αὐγαῖς ἐνεπιμέλη τῆς ἀγιλῆς· καὶ εἶτα μετάγον ἔρ’ ἐτερα πολλὴν ἅθροιν αὐτοῦ κατηκόρτιζε λαμπηδόνα, ὡς ἀπάντων ἕρ’ οὐς ἄν φέροιτο ἀμβλύνεσθαι τὰς ὅψεις καὶ σκαρδαμύττειν· συντρίψας δὲ τινας καὶ ἀντιτύπιας συμμάτων βαρυχρυστῶν ἐπινοῶν κτύπους ἀπετέλει σφοδροὺς καὶ βροντοῦδες, ὡς ἐκεῖνον μόλις γοῦν διαγνόντα ὁπόθεν ἔκαστα γίνεται, προκαλινδεθήσατο τοῦ βασιλείου καὶ κατηγορεῖν Ανθέμιοι ὡς ἀδίκου. ὥστε ἀμέλει καὶ χάριν τι ὑπ’ ὀργής ἀνεφθεῦρετο ὡς οὐχ ὅλον τε αὐτὸν μόνον τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἁμαρτιάς ἔκζωσε· ὁ Ζήνων. 50. οὕτως ὁ Ανθέμιος ἦ ὁ καὶ τοῦτο κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην ἐκκλησίαν οἰκοδομημένον ἔκκαστα μηχανησάμενος καὶ δημιουργήσας. 51. ὑπὸ σεισμοῦ ἀποβεβληκότος τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Σοφίας τῆς ὁροφῆς μεσαίτατον, Ἰσίδωρος ὁ νέος καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ μηχανικοὶ τῷ πρότερον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀναθεωρήσαντες σχῆμα, τὴν μὲν ἔφαν τε καὶ ἐσπερίαν ἀγία δότων πᾶνα κατὰ χάραν μενεὶν ἀρήκαν, τῆς δὲ ἀρκτῆς καὶ νοτίας τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρτῶματος οἰκοδομήν πρὸς τὰ ἐνδόν παρατείνεσιν καὶ εὐρυτέραν ἡρέμα ποιησάμενον, ὡς μᾶλλον ἀρμοδιότατα ταῖς ἀλλαίς ἐξονθευκόμεναι καὶ ἀρμολογεῖν τὴν ἰσόπλευρον ἁρμονίαν, περιστετελεῖ ταύτη διέδυναν τὴν τοῦ κενώματος ἁμετρίαν καὶ ὑποκλέιεν βραχον τις τῆς ἐκτάσεως μέρος, ὁπόδον ἐπερώμηκες ἀπετέλεσον σχῆμα, οὐτὸ τε ἐπ’ αὐτῶν ἡράσαν πάλιν τὸν ἐν μέσῳ ὑπερανέχοντα εἶτε κύκλων εἴτε ἠμισφαίριον βουλάτο τὶς καλέειν καὶ γέγονεν εἰκότως ἐντεῦθην ιδιότερος μὲν καὶ ἐπεξίστροφος καὶ πανταχύθην τῇ γραμμῇ ἐξησαύρειν, στενότερος δὲ καὶ διότενης καὶ οὖς οὐχ οὕτω λιὰν ἐκκλήτητεν τοὺς θεωμένους ὡς πᾶλαι, πολλὴ δὲ ὅμως πλέον ἐν τῷ ἀσφαλεί βεβηκέναι.
ἐπὶ Ἰουστινιανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως σὺν Οὔννοις ἑπτακισχιλίοις διαβὰς τὸν Ἴστρον Ζαβεργὰν ἐγγὺς τῆς βασιλίδος ἔφθασε λεηλατῶν τὰ μεταξὺ, ἅτε μὴ στρατιᾶς που φρουροῦσης· ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ βασιλέων {εἰς} ἥξακοσίας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας μαχίμων ἀνδρῶν ὁ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐκορυφοῦτο στρατός· Ἰουστινιανὸς δὲ μόλις εἰς ἐκατόν καὶ πεντήκοντα περιέστησεν. ὥστε μηδὲ δύνασθαι ἥξαρκεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς Δασκάλης καὶ Αρμενίας καὶ Ἰσπανίας. λογισάμενος γὰρ τὴν δαπάνην τῶν τοσσοῦτον χιλιάδον δέν ἐκρίνε μᾶλλον ὅτι ἄλλων δώρων συμβάλλειν ἄλληλοις τούς τόν ἐδών ἄρχοντας, ἢν αὐτός μὲν μὴς τοσσοῦτα δαπανᾶ εἰς τὸν στρατὸν μὴ ὤχλεῖται πέμπων κατ᾽ αὐτῶν, ἤτερος δέ τις αἰτιοὶ φθορᾶ γίνοιτο, ὃ δῆτα τέως ἐποίησεν τὸ Ἴστρον Οὔννοις. ἔγραψε γὰρ πρὸς ἕνα τῶν ἀρχόντων, ὅτι «τῷ κρεῖττον ὑμῶν πέπομφα δῶρα· καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν σὲ οἰόμενος εἶναι τὸν κρεῖττονα διὰ σὲ τοῦτο ἔγραψα, ἐπειδὴ δὲ τις ἄφειλε ταῦτα βίᾳ λέγων ἐκεῖνος εἶναι κρεῖττον. σπουδάσας οὖν δεῖξαι ὅτι σὺ πάντων ὑπερέχεις, καὶ λάβε τὰ ἀφαιρέθντα τιμωρησάμενος αὐτὸν κατὰ λόγον. εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσῃς, εὐδηλῶν ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐστιν ὁ μείζων, καὶ πάντως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκεῖνο προσκεισόμεθα, καὶ σὺ στερηθῆς τοσσοῦτον. ταῦτα μαθὼν ὁ Ὁνδοῖς ἐκρότησε πόλεμον κατὰ τῶν ὅμοιτων καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ πολὺ μαχόμενα ταῦτα τὰ ἐδών ὑπ᾽ ἄλληλους ἀπώλοντο.

52. ἐπὶ Ἰουστινιανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως σὺν Οὔννοις ἑπτακισχιλίοις διαβὰς τὸν Ἴστρον Ζαβεργὰν ἐγγὺς τῆς βασιλίδος ἔφθασε λεηλατῶν τὰ μεταξὺ, ἅτε μὴ στρατιᾶς που φρουροῦσης· ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ βασιλέων {εἰς} ἥξακοσίας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας μαχίμων ἀνδρῶν ὁ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐκορυφοῦτο στρατός· Ἰουστινιανὸς δὲ μόλις εἰς ἐκατόν καὶ πεντήκοντα περιέστησεν. ὥστε μηδὲ δύνασθαι ἥξαρκεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς Δασκάλης καὶ Αρμενίας καὶ Ἰσπανίας. λογισάμενος γὰρ τὴν δαπάνην τῶν τοσσοῦτον χιλιάδον δέν ἐκρίνε μᾶλλον ὅτι ἄλλων δώρων συμβάλλειν ἄλληλοις τούς τόν ἐδών ἄρχοντας, ἢν αὐτός μὲν μὴς τοσσοῦτα δαπανᾶ εἰς τὸν στρατὸν μὴ ὤχλεῖται πέμπων κατ᾽ αὐτῶν, ἤτερος δὲ τις αἰτιοὶ φθορᾶ γίνοιτο, ὃ δῆτα τέως ἐποίησεν τὸ Ἴστρον Οὔννοις. ἔγραψε γὰρ πρὸς ἕνα τῶν ἀρχόντων, ὅτι «τῷ κρεῖττον ὑμῶν πέπομφα δῶρα· καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν σὲ οἰόμενος εἶναι τὸν κρεῖττονα διὰ σὲ τοῦτο ἔγραψα, ἐπειδὴ δὲ τις ἄφειλε ταῦτα βίᾳ λέγων ἐκεῖνος εἶναι κρεῖττον. σπουδάσας οὖν δεῖξαι ὅτι σὺ πάντων ὑπερέχεις, καὶ λάβε τὰ ἀφαιρέθντα τιμωρησάμενος αὐτὸν κατὰ λόγον. εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσῃς, εὐδηλῶν ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐστιν ὁ μείζων, καὶ πάντως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκεῖνο προσκεισόμεθα, καὶ σὺ στερηθῆς τοσσοῦτον. ταῦτα μαθὼν ὁ Ὁνδοῖς ἐκρότησε πόλεμον κατὰ τῶν ὅμοιτων καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ πολὺ μαχόμενα ταῦτα τὰ ἐδών ὑπ᾽ ἄλληλους ἀπώλοντο.

52.1 ἐπὶ – 18 ἀπώλοντο: Historiae 5.11.6; 5.13.4; 5.13.7-8; 5.24.2-7; 5.25.3-5

IV. Commentary on the Agathias-excerpts

1. <Oi> νῦν λεγόμενοι Φράγγοι, Γερμανοὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκαλοῦντο: the identification is drawn from Procopius (De bellis 5.11.29). Theophact Simocatta’s account runs counter to Procopius and Agathias’ identification: Φράγγοι δὲ ἄρα οὕτω τῇ νεωτέρᾳ γλώττῃ κατονομάζονται (Theophylact Simocatta, Historiae 6.3.6). Agathias gives no hint about the sources he drew on for his ethnographic digression on the Franks; cf. Cameron, (1970), 39. In Cameron’s view, Agathias must have made no use of any written source on the Franks. The use of oral sources seem more likely. His informant may have been a member of Narses’ staff; Cameron (1970), 40. There is also the possibility that Agathias drew his information on the Frankish affairs from the embassy of King Sigibert to Constantinople in 571; cf. Cameron (1968), 133-134.

2. Ἀλαμανοὶ: the passage in the Exc.Salm. is extracted from Agathias’ ethnographical digression on the Alamanni (Historiae 1.6.3-1.7.7). This fragment displays the compiler’s interest in etymology. According to Agathias, the Alamanni follow the Franks in matters of government and differ from them only in religion: the Alamanni are pagans (Historiae 1.7.1). Agathias, however, believes that frequent contacts with the Franks would help them abandon paganism (Historiae 1.7.2). Av. Cameron sees the excursus on the Alamanni as deliberately inserted by Agathias in order to explain the unsuccessful invasion of the Frankish-Alamanni into Italy in 554. They failed because the Alamanni were sinful in contrast to the virtuous Byzantines; cf. Cameron (1970), 54. Agathias mentions the source of the short passage on the etymology of the Alamanni, namely Asinius Quadratus. The reference, however, was not included in the Agathias-part. On the Alamanni in general see Drinkwater (2007).

2. ξύγκλυδές εἰσιν ἄνθρωποι καὶ μιγάδες: unlike Agathias, the compiler of the Exc.Salm. had no interest in a comparison between the Franks and the Alamanni in terms of their way of life. Thus, he differs from Agathia’s positive treatment of the Franks. Accordingly, the compiler of the Exc.Salm. only extracts a notice on the origin of the name of the Alamanni by emphasising the fact that the Alamanni were a dark-skinned people. It should be noticed that Procopius (De bellis 4.6.5-14) correlated their darker skin with negative moral characteristics and when he portrays the Epthalitai favourably he puts emphasis on their white skin and on the fact that they were not as ugly as the other Huns (De bellis 1.3.2-7). The conclusion to be drawn is that the compiler of the Exc.Salm. reinforces the traditional distinction between Romans and barbarians.

3. Ἁλίγερνὸς τις Γότθος: a Gothic military figure, brother of Teias (Historiae 1.8.6), the last king of the Goths (552-553). Procopius (De bellis 8.34.19) records, mistakenly, that
Aligern was the brother of the Gothic King Totila (541-552). Agathias appears to be well-informed on Aligern as he also knows his father’s name, namely Fritigern (Historiae pref. 31 and 1.20.1). During the siege of Cumae by the Byzantines, Aligern killed Palladius, a Roman official highly respected by Narses (Historiae 1.9.2-4). Aligern finally ceded Cumae to Narses in early 554 (Historiae 1.20.3).

3. Παλλάδιον: Palladius was a high-ranking official (καὶ ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις ταξιάρχοις ἔτέλει; cf. Historiae 1.9.4) highly esteemed by Narses (Historiae 1.9.3). It is notable that Narses’ name is omitted in the Exc.Salm.

4. ὁπόσον τῆς ὕλης ταχυδαές καὶ αὔον: excerpts 4 and 5 are taken from Agathias’ account of the siege of Cumae. Both passages present Narses’ plan of besieging the fortress. Narses’ name has not been transmitted in the Exc.Salm. Throughout the Historiae, Agathias uses two terms for forests, namely ὑλη and νάπη.

5. ὑφίζανεν τὸ τεῖχος: Cumae was one of the two most strongly fortified towns described by Agathias (the other one was the fortress of the Misimians, called Siderun for this reason (Historiae 4.16.4). The wall of Cumae had been built on top of a hill surrounded by towers and castellations (πύργοι, ἐπάλξεις, μεταπύργια, προμαχεῖνες; cf. Historiae 1.8.3, 1.9.2, 1.10.3).


6. Τουσκίας τῆς χώρας: Tuscany was under the rule of the Goths when Narses arrived in Italy (Historiae 1.1.6).

6. Αἰμιλίας: at the time of Narses’ campaign in Italy, Emilia was in the possession of the Goths (Historiae 1.15.7). Agathias names, erroneously, the Alps as the natural border between the neighbouring regions of Emilia and Tuscany (Historiae 1.11.3): the two regions were separated by the Apennine mountains; to the north the River Po formed Emilia’s border with the district of Venice (Historiae 1.11.3, 2.3.2).

7. ὧδε πως ἄρα αὐτῷ ἐξ οὕριας ἀπαντᾷ ἔθει: the phrase is originally a comment by Agathias upon Narses’ success in restoring order in southern Italy. The passage has been included in the Agathias-part without the name of the Byzantine general. On various occasions of battles or sieges Narses resorted to special strategical tricks. Beside the one used in the course of the siege of Cumae (Historiae 1.10.1-9), Narses made use of a Hunic stratagem in a fight against the Franks (Historiae 1.22.1-5). On the effectiveness and efficacy of the Byzantine generals see Ringrose (2006), 345.
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8. σῶι καὶ ἄδηλητοι: excerpts 8 and 9 are extracted from Agathias’ account of the ruse used by Narses to capture Lucca. Nevertheless, Narses’ name is not inserted in the Agathias-part.

10. τύρσεις οἱ πύργοι καὶ προμαχόνες: excerpt 10 is a passage from Agathias’ account of the siege of Lucca by Narses (Historiae 2.18).

11. Φράγγοι οὔποτε ἂν ἔκοντες <εἶναι> ἐν θέρει διαμαχόσαντο, πολέμιον γὰρ αὐτοῖς τὸ πνῖγος, σφριγῶσθι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ κρύους ἀεί: the passage makes a brief ethnographical description of the Franks. They cannot bear the heat and they prefer to fight in the winter as they are well adapted to cold conditions. It should be noticed that Procopius, in his account of the Moors (De bellis 4.6.5-14), draws an analogy between being primitive and having the ability to endure difficult conditions.

12. Ίππου ἐπιβάς εὐηνιωτάτου καὶ ἀγερώχου: the passage is originally a description of Narses’ horse, which was obedient, well-trained and experienced in fights (Historiae 1.21.5). Narses’ is not referred to in the excerpted passage.

14. οἱ τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ σεισμοῦ ἀναθυμιάσεις τινὰς εἶναι λέγοντες ξηράς τε καὶ λιγνυώδεις: Agathias’ account on the earthquake of 551 (Historiae 2.15-17) and of 557 (Historiae 5.3-9). For the complex moral strategy of Agathias’ earthquake accounts see Kaldellis (1999). Agathias’ account of the earthquake of 551 was used as a model by Attaliates in his account of the earthquake of 1063; cf. Attaliates, Historia, 90.

15. Κόλχοι τὸ παλαιὸν ὄνομα: the passage complies with the compiler’s interest in the origins of peoples. In fact, the excerpt represents the view that the Colchians descended from the Egyptians. Agathias (Historiae 2.18.5) claims that this account is found in Diodorus Siculus (Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca historica 1.55.4-5) and in many other ancient writers. Herodotus (Historiae 2,104) records a similar story and Agathias probably had him in mind. A little further on, Agathias appears to keep himself aloof from the issue of the Colchians’ origins: οἱ δὲ ὄν ἐὰν ἔτε Λαξοὶ ἔτε Κόλχοι (Historiae 2.18.4-6). On the Colchians see Braund (1994).

16. τὰ Ὀλλάρια κατὰ Λατίνων διάλεκτον χυτροπώλια ἐρμηνεύεται: the plain called Chytropòlia was located seven stades distant from the fortress of Telephíς (Historiae 2.20.5). Telephíς was a φρούριον καρτερόν τε καὶ ἐχυρώτατον (Historiae 2.19.2), in which the Byzantine general Martin was stationed with his army. The plain was given the name Chytropòlia due to the pottery market there. The plain was initially called Ollaria from
the Latin word *olla*, which in Greek gives Chytropolia. On the fortifications in the reign of Justinian see Foss – Winfield (1986), 7-13.

17. ἔρημα καὶ ἀκάλυπτα τὰ σώματα καταλείπουσι: excerpts 17-22 in the *Agathias*-part derive from the first of the two aforementioned Agathias’ excursus on Persia. In particular, excerpt 17 deals with illegal Persian burial customs, a practice which is also mentioned by Herodotus (*Historiae* 1.140), Plutarch (*Artaxerxes* 18) and Procopius (*De bellis* 1.12.4, 2.24.2). On the custom in general see Russell (1982), 561-563.

18. Σεμίραμις ἡ Ἀσσυρία: excerpts 18-19 refer to the habit of the Persians to commit incest. On Semiramis see Nagel (1982). As Av. Cameron noted, the episode of Semiramis as well as that of Parysatis (excerpt 18) originate in Ctesias (*FGrHist* 688, F 14 and F 16); cf. Cameron (1969-1970), 92-93.


20. ἄγρια καὶ ἐρμονόμα: the brief passage is extracted from Agathias’ account of a Persian festival, in which noxious animals, regarded to belong to Ahriman (see excerpt 21), were killed. That this was considered a religious duty becomes manifest in the Zoroastrian religious literature; cf. Cameron (1969-1970), 98-99. Plutarch (*De Iside et Osiride*, 46) refers to the ritual as well. On the attitude of Byzantines to the Manichaeans views in Late Antiquity see Cameron (2003), 481-482.


21. Ἀριμάνη: Ahriman or Angra or Aŋra Mainyu in the Avestan language; cf. Duchesne – Guillemin (1984), 670-673. For the Greeks it was the equivalent of Hades as the Greek grammarian Hesychius of Alexandria transmits Ἀρειμάνης; ὁ Ἅιδης, παρὰ Πέρσαις (*Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, 7116 Ἀρειμάνης). Aristotle (fr. 6), Diogenes Laertius (*Vitae philosophorum* 1.8) Damascius (*De principiis* I.323), Eudemus (fr. 150) and Plutarch (*De Iside
et Osiride, 46) all record Ἀρειμάνιος. On Ahriman see Duchesne – Guillemin (1953); Shaked (1967), 227-234; Boyce (1975), 243-246; Boyce (1982), s.v. Angra Mainyu.

21. Ὅρμισδάτην: Ohrmazd or Ahura Mazda in Avestan was a supreme deity in Zoroastrianism; cf. Duchesne – Guillemin (1984), 670-673. The name occurs as Ὠρομᾶζης in Arist.Fr.6; Eudemus, fr. 150; Diogenes Laertius, Vitae philosophorum 1.8; Damascius, De principiis 1.323. Ὠρομᾶζης occurs in Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride, 46. On Ohrmazd see Duchesne – Guillemin (1953); Kuiper (1976), 25-42.

22. The excerptor of the Agathias-part seems to have no interest in forming a chronological account of the Persian kingdoms, which appears to be the primary goal of the two excursus on Persia in Agathias. Accordingly, the entire Agathias’ subsection of the Persian kingdoms is absent in the Agathias-part. In fact, excerpt 22 introduces us to the Sassanian dynasty by transmitting the birth-story of the founder of the dynasty, Ardasher I. Instead of proceeding with the presentation of other members of the dynasty, the compiler keeps to the original narrative sequence and excerpts whatever is relevant to Persia. Accordingly, excerpt 22 is ensued by a series of excerpts dealing with Persian customs and beliefs still alive during the reign of Chosroes. Ardasher’s successor, Sharpur I, only appears in excerpts 38 and 39. Furthermore, the compiler overlooks the six subsequent members of the Sassanian dynasty and inserts two passages dealing with Sharpur II (excerpts 41, 42).

22. Πάβεκός τις ἀνήρ Πέρσης ἄσημος (...) ἐπεξενώθη Παβέκῳ: excerpt 22 contains an account of Ardashir’s conception. Papak was the father of Ardasir, the founder of the Sassanian dynasty. The dynasty was named after Sassan, though. Agathias version differs from that found in Islamic literature (e.g. Tabari, I, p. 813) in which Papak is the son of Sassan. Agathias’ account is not based on the Annals but echoes a popular tradition; cf. Cameron (1969-1970), 109. On the various versions about Ardasir’s parentage see Frye (1988), 298-299.


23. καταπίοι τὸν Σταγειρίτην: Chosroes was thought to have read Aristotle and Plato translated in Pahlavi. Chosroes is also described as a philosopher-king by John of Ephesus (HE, VI.20). It appears that it was widely believed among educated Romans that the Sassanian kings took great interest in Greek philosophy: Eunapius, for instance, presents Sharpur II as being attracted to philosophy (Eunapius, Vitae sophistarum 6.5.1-10). See also McDonough (2010), 55-66.
23. ὁ Παιανιεύς: the Παιανιεύς refers to the orator Demosthenes. According to Aeschines (In Ctesiphontem, 171), Demosthenes’ father belonged to the deme of Paeania: τούτῳ πατήρ μὲν ἦν Δημοσθένης ὁ Παιανιεύς.1 Agathias repudiates that Chosroes was a well-educated and well-read king. Agathias’ arguments are a) that it was impossible to translate the deep meanings of the Greek philosophical works into the barbaric language of the Persians and b) that Chosroes’ barbarous upbringing would prevent him from understanding philosophy. On the different views of the value of philosophical translations between Theodoret and Agathias see Ševčenko (1964), 228.

23. τὸν Ὀλλόρου: the son of Olorus, that is, the historian Thucydides; θουκυδίδην τὸν Ὀλόρου (Thucydides, Historiae 4.104.4). Thucydides’ father belonged to the Athenian deme of Halimous but he also owned gold mines in Thrace.

24. βώμαξ καὶ ἐμπληκτος: this is how Uranius, a pseudo-philosopher who managed to gain Chosroes’ trust, is referred to by Agathias. Uranius’ name is not recorded in the Agathias-part along with the two aforementioned abusive epithets. Thus, both negative apppellations appear to accompany Chosroes. The compiler is aligned with the typically Byzantine, scornful attitude towards the Sasanian emperor. Agathias’ contemptuous view on Chosroes becomes manifest when dealing with his philosophical interests (Historiae 2.28.1-3). Procopius is similarly tendentious (De bellis 2.9.8-9, 2.11.26; Anecdota 18.26ff.).

25. The passage is also recorded in the Suda, π 2251. The seven philosophers were forced to abandon Athens after the closure of the school by Justinian in 529 (Malalas, Chronographia, 451). They returned to Athens after 532; cf. Cameron Al. (2015), 223. Simplicius wrote many commentaries on several philosophers (see PLRE iiib, 1153). On Damascius see Goulet (1994), 541-593. Priscianus is the author of an epitome of Theophrastus’ On Sense-Perception and of a treatise containing answers to philosophical issues raised at the court of Chosroes during his exile in Persia. The latter survives only in a Latin translation. The attribution of a commentary on Aristotle’s On the Soul to Priscianus rather than to Simplicius is disputed; see Hadot (2002), 159-199. Eulamius (Εὐλάμιος; cf. Agathias, Historiae 2.30.3) is transmitted as Εὐλάλιος in the Vaticanus graecus 96 and the Suda π 2251.

26. μὴ θάπτε τὸν ἄθαπτον, ἔα κυστὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι. γῆ πάντων μήτηρ μητροφθόρον οὐ δέχετ’ ἄνδρα: excerpt 26 turns back to the Persian practice of not burying the dead. The two hexameters are found in Anthologia Graeca IX 498. They have, similarly, been included in the ES, p. 14 of the EC.

---

1His father was Demosthenes of Paeania.
27. πῶς ἐν πίθῳ τὴν κεραμείαν φιλεργεῖν: Excerpt 27 makes up a comment on the military ambitions of the Persians. Agathias is using this figurative phrase to anticipate a certain degree of criticism on the part of his readers. The compiler of the Agathias-part has excerpted the passage from its original context and put it immediately after the passage on the Persians’ burial customs, thus producing a passage with a different meaning: it is now the Persians who aspire to run before they can walk.

28. Ὀνόγουρις: Ἀρχαιόπολις or Ὀνόγουρις; excerpt 28 concerns the origins of the name of the fort of Onoguris. According to Agathias, Onoguris was a fort set up by the Persian general Mermeroes in the district of Archaeopolis and used as a hostile base against the Byzantines (Historiae 2.22.3 and 4.9.6). On the use of the ancient name Onoguris by Agathias see Cameron Av. – Cameron Al. (1964), esp. 320.

29. τίς ύμων ἀποδέξοιτο: the brief phrase in the Agathias-part is an extract from the speech given by Aeetes, a Colchian, in the aftermath of the Byzantines’ defeat at Onoguris; the battle is recounted by Agathias (Historiae 3.6.12-7.11). Before the battle, the king of the Lazi, called Gubazes, who had refused to offer military aid, was killed by two Byzantine generals (Historiae 3.4.5-6). After the Byzantine defeat, Aeetes delivered a speech to encourage the Colchians to defect to the Persians by reminding them of the unjust end of Gubazes. A. Kaldellis considers Aeetes and the entire episode fictitious and invented by Agathias himself; cf. Kaldellis (2003), 297-298.

30. ὁ σπαλίων: excerpt 30 is a detailed description of the wicker roof, a siege machine used by the Romans during the siege of the fort of Onoguris. The passage was copied verbatim in the Suda (Σ 901 Σπαλίωνος). The excerpt in the Agathias-part was extracted from Agathias’ description of the preparation of the Byzantines to march against Onoguris (Historiae 3.5.9-11).

31. καὶ ἀγριον ἀνέπλεκον ἤχον: excerpts 31-34 deal with the siege of the town Phasis by the Persians and the way in which their fighting men fled precipitately. In particular, excerpt 31 makes up a brief ethnographical description concerning the Persian cavalry’s attitude during the siege of the town of Phasis.

35. στρατεύται κοῦφοι καὶ εὐσταλεῖς κατὰ τοὺς Ἰσαύρους: excerpt 35 is a brief ethnographical description of the army of the Isaurians. In Byzantine literature the Isaurians are represented as marauders who live by banditry. In the 4th century, John Chrysostom makes a reference to the Isaurian raiders (epist. Θ’, Epistulae ad Olympiadem, epist. 1-17): ἀπαγγέλλονται ἄθροον ᾿Ισαύρων πλήθος ἐπειροῦν κατατρέχοντες τὴν Καισαρείαν χώραν καὶ τινὰ κώμην μεγάλην ἐμπρήσαντες καὶ τὰ ἐσχάτα διαθέντες. Amm. Marcellinus (Res Gestae 27.9,6-7) also refers to them as raiders who devastate cities of Asia Minor. In the 5th
century, Priscus (fr. 10, p. 242, Blockley) mentions that the Romans were also afraid of the Isaurians, whose banditry was reviving. The same tendentious representation of the Isaurians is found in a passage, originally derived from Candidus, in John of Antioch (fr. 229 ed. Mariev = EI 90).

36. εἰστήκεσαν ἀναυδοὶ καὶ ἀδόνητοι: the passage is an extract of the episode narrating the attempt of the Romans to take over the Misimian fortress of Siderun (Historiae 4.17.1-20.9). The passage points out the discipline and smartness of the Romans in the course of the siege.

37. Ἰωάννης δὲ ἦν εἷς τῶν ὑπὸ Ἰουστῖνον τὸν στρατηγὸν τεταμένων: John the Lybian was one of the aides of Justin’s, son of Germanicus. (Historiae 4.21.5).

38. Σαβὼρης ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεύς: excerpts 38-43 are extracted from Agathias’ second excursus on Persia. It is primarily a representation of the Sassanian kings. The original section is a chronological account of the Sassanian dynasty from Ardasher I to Chosroes I as reported to Agathias by Sergius (Historiae 4.30.2-4). Agathias also includes material from Procopius, stories from his own reading (e.g. the accounts of Semiramis, Parysatis, and Smerdis) his comments and deductions; cf. Cameron (1969-1970), 76.

38. Βαλλεριανὸς ζωγρία ἑλὼν ἀπέδειρεν ἀπ’ αὐχένος ἄχρι ποδῶν: excerpts 38 and 39 reveal Sharpur I’s cruelty. In particular, excerpt 38 transmits that Valerian was flayed by Sharpur I. Agathias calls Sharpur I twice wicked (Historiae 4.23.7, 4.24.2) and once bloodthirsty (Historiae 4.23.7). The compiler of the Agathias-part confines himself to excerpt the flaying of Valerian (excerpt 38) and the pillage of Cappadocia (excerpt 39) without transmitting those designations for Sharpur I. Agathias appears to follow the tradition first found in Lactantius (De mortibus persecutorum 5.2), according to which Valerian was killed by being flayed alive; Eusebius (Vita Constantini IV.11 and Constantini imperatoris oratio ad coetum sanctorum 24.2) is aligned with the Christian version that have persecutors of Christians die fitting deaths. The same version is recorded by Orosius (VII.27). Peter the Patrician transmits the same kind of death for Valerian (EL 12, 393.10-394.17). In Peter’s history, the center of gravity is not, by contrast, in the anti-Christian acts of Valerian. Peter, instead, emphasises the abominable way of Valerian’s death and the rising indignation against the Persians. From this point of view, Peter’s account is closer to that of Agathias, in which Valerian’s repugnant end serves to intensify the hostile depiction of Sharpur. Finally, Valerian is portrayed in fulsome terms in the Scriptores Historiae Augustae (Script. Hist. Aug. Gallen.1, Valer. 4-5).
39. τοσούτους φόνους εἰργάσατο: excerpt 39 speaks of the violent and savage pillage of Cappadocia by Sharpur’s army; see excerpt 38. According to Av. Cameron, the passage does probably not derive from the Annals; cf. Cameron (1969-1970), 140.

40. Οὐαραράνης: this is Bahram III, son of Bahram II, who ruled for four months. On Bahram III see Klíma (2012), 514-522.

40. τὸν ἐαυτὸν ὑιὸν Σεγανσανὸν ᾑομᾶς: excerpt 40 refers to the Persian custom not to slaughter its people whenever a Persian king captured its territory: the Persian king deposed the defeated king and bestowed the title of the enslaved kingdom on his own son. On the custom see Herzfeld (1924), 42ff; cf. Cameron (1969-1970), 143. Likewise, the son of Sharpur, Vahram IV, was given the title Kermanshah after Sharpur subdued a nation named Kerman (Historiae 4.26.2). Agathias compares the Persian custom to the Roman practice of some, by which a general assumed a new name after the name of a nation he had subdued (Historiae 4.26.2).

40. τὸ τῶν Σεγαστανῶν ἔθνος κατεδουλώσατο: the Sagestani were subdued by Bahram II. On the people of Sagestani see Rawlinson (1873), 272-294.

41. Σαβὼρ ὁ Πέρσων βασιλεὺς: excerpt 41 deals with the fate of king Sharpur II: he had been designated king while his mother was still carrying him. The passage is read within the context of the Exc.Salm.II 75. The latter informs us that Narseh had three more sons by an other wife. The first, called Adhirnarseh (Ἀδαρνάσης), became king after Narseh’s death but he was soon deposed. The second son was blinded (by Sharpur II) and the third, called Ormisdas, was held in jail. Ormisdas managed to escape with the help of his mother. The same story is found in Zosimus (Historia nova 2.27.1-3) and Ammianus (Res Gestae XVI 10.16). Narseh’s legitimate heir to the throne was, according to Agathias (Historiae 4.25.1), Hormizd II. There is nothing in Agathias as to whether Hormizd II had a son or not. According to Tabari, Hormizd did not have any son; cf. Cameron (1969-1970), 144. The Persian throne was inheritable by the kings’ sons, in principle. But not without exception: Ardashir acceded to the throne after killing Artabanus (Historiae 2.26.2). Zamasp assumed the throne on conspiracy against Kavad but his accession was considered legal as he also was a son of Peroz (Historiae 4.28.2).

41. τοῖς μάγοις προενέγκοντες: Agathias had already emphasised how important the Magi were deemed in Persia in the 6th century (Historiae 2.26.5). On the prominent role of the Magi in Persia see Neusner (1966), 169-178.

42. Σαβὼρ: excerpt 42 informs us that Sharpur II reigned for seventy years (from 309 to 379 AD). He was the longest reigning monarch of the Sassanian dynasty (224-651 AD).
The passage present the congruences between Zeno’s troubles and those of Persian kings: the deposition of Cavadh I, his escape from prison, his flight to the Hephtalites, his return to Persia and his ascension back to the throne. Julius Nepos had a similar fate as well. The first revolt against Zeno took place in 475/6 when Illus managed to dethrone the emperor. The second revolt against Zeno occurred in 484. On Julius Nepos see PLRE II, 777-778; Kazhdan (1991), 1081. Malchus and Candidus treated his reign and deposition (Bibliotheca, cod. 78 and cod. 79).

Kavadh I succeeded Valash, Peroz’s brother, to the throne. On Cavadh I’s reign see Altheim – Stiehl (1953); Crone (1991), 21-42; Wiesehöfer (2009), 391-409. Peroz was the son of Yazdegard II. Peroz succeeded his brother, Hormizd III. Agathias records Peroz’s campaign against the Ephalites, during which Peroz died (Historiae 4.27.3-4). On Peroz see Schippmann (2012), 631-632.

Agathias’ text is very close to that of Procopius (De bellis 1.5.7-9). The place is also mentioned in the Oriental sources; cf. Christensen (1936), 307.

Procopius (De bellis 1.6.10) is the source of the passage in Agathias. On the reliance of Agathias on the Khvadhaynamagh tradition for the passage see Cameron (1969-1970), 158.

Agathias records Νεφθαλίται (Historiae 4.27.4). The term was reproduced by Stephanus Byzantius 2 the Strategicon 3 and the Suda (v 277 Νεφθαλίται). The lectio ΄Εφθαλίται occurs in Procopius (De bellis 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.4.3, 1.7.1). Photius, in his entry on the 6th-century historian Theophanes of Byzantium, used ‘Εφθαλίται 4 too (Bibliotheca, cod. 64). Similarly, the EC, when excerpting Menander, transmit ΄Εφθαλίται (κατά πόλεις ή που ἁρα κατά κώμας άκουν οἱ ‘Εφθαλίται). 5 Symeon Metaphrastes’ version of the Martyrium sanctorum Christi martyrum et confessorum Guriae, Samonae et Abibi refers to the ‘Εφθαλίται as an exasperated and barbaric people (PG 116, col. 145). Procopius (De bellis 1.3.2-7) describes the Ephthalitai as a white-skinned people that are not so ugly as the other Huns. On the Ephthalitai see Ghirshman, R. – Ghirshman, T. (1948), 115f.

---

2Νεφθαλίται, έθνος κρατήσαν τῆς Εω, ώς Ἰώσηπος, καὶ θηλυκῶς Νεφθαλίτις; cf. Ethnika, 473.
3τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ ἐχρήσαντο Νεφθαλίται κατὰ Περόζου βασιλέως Περσῶν; cf. Strategicon, 4.3.1.
4Εφθαλάνου δὲ τοῦ ‘Εφθαλίτων βασιλέως; cf. Bibliotheca, cod. 64.
5Excerpta de legationibus, 452.
44. Excerpt 44 is a brief notice taken from Agathias’ description of the earthquake that struck Constantinople in 557 (Historiae 5.3.1-9). On the date of the earthquake see Malalas, Chronographia, 488; Theop. AM 6050. According to Agathias many amazing events occurred in course of the night of the earthquake (Historiae 5.3.9).

45. Excerpt 45 is extracted from Agathias’ account of Anatolius’ death. Anatolius was the only member of the senate (he was a curator domus divinae) who lost his life during the earthquake of 557 (Historiae 5.3.10).

46. Ανθεμίῳ τῷ μηχανικῷ: excerpt 46 deals with Anthemius of Tralles, an engineer or architect by profession (Procopius, De aedificiis I 1.24, 1.50; Agathias, Historiae 5.6.3). He wrote a work entitled Περὶ παραδόξων μηχανημάτων. He was summoned to Constantinople (Historiae 5.6.6) and commissioned by Justinian I to design the Hagia Sophia, after the earlier church on the site had burned down in 532 during the Nika Revolt (Agathias, Historiae 5.9.2; Paul. Silentiiarius, 552-555). He was already dead when Constantinople was struck by the high magnitude earthquake of May 7, 558 (Agathias, Historiae 5.9.4). On Anthemius see Huxley (1959).

46. ἄδελφος <τούτου> Μητρόδωρος (...) Ὀλύμπιος ἄδελφος (...) Διόσκορός τε καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος: Anthemius’ brothers were similarly outstanding in their fields: Metrodorus was an eminent grammatikos, who, together with his brother Anthemius, was summoned to Constantinople by Justinian; Olympius was a famous advocate (Historiae 5.6.5); Dioscorus and Alexander were prominent doctors. Dioscorus practised his profession in Tralles, where he died. Alexander, instead, relocated to Rome (Historiae 5.6.5). Alexander is the author of the Therapeutica, the Περὶ ἑλμίνθων and the Περὶ ὀφθαλμῶν (the works were edited by Theodor Puschmann, Alexander von Tralleis, I-II, Vienna, 1878-1879). Agathias’ description of Anthemius’ family exhibits affinities with Herodotus’ account of Cleobis and Biton; cf. Cameron (1970), 61.

46. Τράλλεις ἡ πόλις: the native town of Anthemius. Agathias is likely to have passed Tralles on his way back from Alexandria; cf. Cameron (1970), 8.

47. Ζήνων: a Constantinopolitan rhetorician and advocate. He was closely acquainted with the emperor Justinian (Historiae 5.6.7).

47. λέβητας μεγάλους ὑδατος ἐμπλήσας διακριδὸν ἔστησε πολλαχοῦ τοῦ δωματίου (...) ὅσον υποτρέμειν ἥρεμα καὶ διατετριγέναι τὰ ξύλα: excerpt 47 is an account of a
The mechanical trick that Anthemius played on Zeno, a Constantinopolitan rhetorician and his next-door neighbour. The account of Anthemius’ steam machine is an allusion to the Aristotelian theory about the cause of earthquakes. According to Aristotle, the cause of earthquakes lies in exhalations trapped in cavities within the earth. Agathias resorts, similarly, to Aristotle’s theory when dealing with the earthquake that hit Egypt (Historiae 2.15.9). Agathias is likely to have become familiar with Aristotle’s theory through the works of John Philoponus; Cameron (1970), 113-114. On the impact of Aristotle’s theories on Late Antiquity see Lehmann (2013).

48. ο ού μόνον δὲ τοῦτο: Excerpt 48 records an other trick played by Anthemius on Zeno.

51. Ἰσίδωρος ὁ νέος: excerpt 51 accounts the reconstruction of the dome of the Hagia Sophia, which had collapsed during the earthquake of 558. Isidore of Miletus (Ἰσίδωρος ὁ Μιλήσιος; cf. Procopius, De aedificiis II 8.25) or Isidore the Younger (Ἰσίδωρος ὁ νέος; cf. Historiae 5.9.4) along with other architects replaced the destroyed dome. Isidore the Younger was the nephew of Isidore of Miletus. Isidore the Younger designed the new dome to replace the old one destroyed by the earthquake of 558. This second restoration of the church was completed in 532 (John Malalas, Chronographia 495; Theophanes, Chronographia 238,18-19).

52. ἐπὶ Ἰουστινιανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως: excerpt 52 is made up of a number of passages taken from the last part of Book 5 of Agathias’ Historiae. A. Biedl suggested that the closing sentence of excerpt 52 (ταῦτα μαθὼν ὁ Οὐννος ἐκρότησε πόλεμον κατὰ τῶν ὦμοεθνῶν, καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ πολὺ μαχόμενα ταῦτα τά ἐθνή ὑπ’ άλλήλων ἀπώλοντο) is not originally derived from Agathias. His proposition has been refuted by Keydell (1967), XVIII. In fact, the sentence is a shortened version of Historiae 5.25.5. Müller published the entire excerpt 52 in his edition of John of Antioch’s Historia chronica; cf. Müller (1851), 621-622.

52. Ζαβεργάν: Zabergan was the name of the ruler of the Cotrigur Huns. After Zabergan crossed the frozen river Istros with his soldiers, he started planning an attack against Constantinople (Historiae 5.11.6). His soldiers first plundered and ravaged fields as well as towns surrounding Constantinople (Historiae 5.12.4-6). The Cotrigurs put up as an excuse for the attack their hostility with the Utigurs, a rival Hunnic tribe: the leader of the Utigurs, Sandilch, was an ally of the Byzantines and the Utigurs were frequently receiving

---

1On Aristotle’s explanation of earthquakes see Aristotle, Meteorologica 2,365a-366b.
payments from the Byzantine emperor (*Historiae* 5.11.6). The Cotrigurs were finally defeated by the Byzantine army led by the general Belisarius (*Historiae* 5.19.2-20.2).
Συναγωγή ιστοριών διαφόρων ἀπὸ τὸς κατὰ σάρκα γεννήσεως τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἡ ἄρχη ἡ ἐξομήνυσε ἀπὸ τοῦ πρῶτου λόγου τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Ἱστορίας Εὐσέβιο τοῦ Παμφίλου.

1. Τὸ μ' ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας Αὐγούστου Καισάρους, λ' ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας Ἰορδάνου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας, εἰς ἣν ἢ Αἰγύπτιων κατέληξε δυναστεία, ἔτεχθη ἐν Βηθλεέμ τῆς Ἴουδαιας ὁ Ἰορδάνος. ἐβαπτίσθη δὲ τῷ Ιεροσολυμίτου Καισάρους καὶ Κλεοπάτρας, εἰς ἣν ἢν ἤετερον ἐκ οὗτος ἴστηκε καὶ ἀνέστη ἀνέστη ἡ Ἰουδαία. Ἡ ἱερατεία Πομπήιος δὲ ἔτει τῆς 18ος ἡμέρας τοῦ Παμφίλου: ἀπὸ φωνῆς Νικηφόρου ἦν ἢν ἠκούσα τοῦ τῆς 18ος ἡμέρας τοῦ Παμφίλου Κυρίου κατὰ σάρκα γεννήσεως τοῦ Κυρίου. Ἡ ἱερατεία Πομπήιος δὲ ἔτει τῆς 18ος ἡμέρας τοῦ Παμφίλου: ἀπὸ φωνῆς Νικηφόρου ἦν ἢν ἠκούσα τοῦ τῆς 18ος ἡμέρας τοῦ Παμφίλου Κυρίου κατὰ σάρκα γεννήσεως τοῦ Κυρίου.
1. ἐν ὧν χρόνῳ ὁ Κύριος ἐπετέλει τὰ θαύματα, ἀρέσκοντος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτισμοῦ ἐως τοῦ θείου σταυροῦ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως. τὴν ἀρχιερευσθήνην ἐναίσθησαν παρὰ Ρομαίοις οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐνεχείρισαν, ἐν ὃς τὸ ἴερον τοῦ Τιμήριου Ἀνάς ἐφέτευσεν. τὸ δὲ ἵερον Ἀσαμήλης ὁ Φαβί καὶ τὸ ἵερον Ἐλεάζαρος ὁ τοῦ Ἀνα καὶ τὸ ιερὸν τοῦ Καβία, διὰ τῶν ἀκρων τὸ ἵερον ἐδιόλυσαν τοῦ χρόνον διάστημα, ἐρ′ ὡς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἑσταυρώθη, ἐκ τοῦ βασιλεύσαντος ΒΠ (cf. § 57).

5. Σύμον ὁ τοῦ Καμίθου, καὶ τῷ ιερῷ Ισώσης ὁ καὶ Καϊφᾶς, ὡς ἐστειρεῖ Ἰσώσης, ὡς εἶναι δὴν ὁλοκλήρως λουκᾶς τὸ ἵερον κήρυγμα γεγονέναι ἐπὶ ἀρχιερεῖς Ἀνα καὶ Καβία, διὰ τῶν ἀκρων τὸ ἵερον ἐδιόλυσαν τοῦ χρόνον διάστημα, ἐρ′ ὡς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἑσταυρώθη, 8. ὁ τὸν βαπτισθῆναι ἀνέλειν Ηρώδης διὰ Ἑρωδίας τὴν γυναίκα Φίλιππος ύπὸ τοῦ Ηρώδου τοῦ πρώτου. Ἀντίπας λεγόμενος, οὗτος δὲ εἰς ἐξορίσθη εἰς Βἴενναν τῆς Ἑλλάδος σὺν αὐτῇ τῇ Ἑρωδία. ἄλλος δὲ παρὰ τούτους ἑστὶν Ἡρώδης ὁν καὶ Ἀγρίππας καλεῖ Ἰσώσης, ύπὸς Ἀριστοβοῦλος τοῦ Καβία, ἥπερ εἰς τὸν Ἡρώδου τοῦ πρώτου, ὁ ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσιν ἀνέλειν τὸν Ἰακώβον, ως καὶ σκολιοφόροις γενόμενος ἐξεγέρθη. τούτου δὲ ἡ ύπὸ τοῦ Ἀγρίππας ὁ εἰς Φίλιππος σὺν τῷ ἀδελφῷ Βερενίκη Παῦλου τὸν ἄγων ἀπόστολον κρίνας καὶ Καίσαρεν. καὶ τούτοις αἱ ἀποδείεξεις προδόλαθι παρὰ τῷ Ιωσήφῳ καὶ τῶν ἀπόστολων ταῖς Πράξεσιν.

10. Κλάμης εἰς τῇ πρώτῃ τοῖς Ἱσσουπώσεωσιν ἐστειρεῖ ἄλλον εἰς Καράφυν, ὡς οὗ οἱ Πιεὔλος αντέθη εἰς Ἀντούχειν, ὁμογενὸς τοῦ κυριαρχού Πέτρῳ τὸ ἄγω ἀπόστολόν. εἶναι δὲ αὐτὸν ἕνα τῶν ὦ μαθητῶν τοῦ Κυρίου. τὰ διὰ Θαδαδίου πρὸς Ἀβγαρὸν τὸν τοπάρχην ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τὰς ἐκ τοῦ Ἀβγαροῦ πρὸς τὸν Κυρίον ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ λόγῳ φέρονται. Ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου βιβλίου. 10. Πιλάτου γράφαντος Τιμήριο τὰς τε παραδοξοποιοῖς τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν τε ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, καταπληγεῖ τὸν Τιμήριο τῇ συγκλήτῳ ως περὶ Θεοῦ τὸ τοῦ Σοτῆρος ἀνέθετο, τῆς δὲ μη συγκαταθεμενής αὐτῷ ως περὶ Θεοῦ δόγματι, θάνατον ἤπειρλον ὁ Τιμήριος τοῖς κατὰ Χριστιανὸν λέγοις τῇ προτομάρτυρι διακοινεῖ τεταχμένον. Κανδάκην δὲ φησὶ πρῶτων ἐς ἔθνων βαπτισθήναι. 12. Φιλίππος "στύμα λαμπάδων", Ἁρωδίας "ἀπατομενή", Ἡρωδίας "δερματίνη", Ἀγρίππας "ὑδρίην δόξαν", καὶ Θαδαδίας τὸ υπὸ Ιουδαίων συγκαταθεμένος πρὸς Ἀβγαρὸν, εἰς τὸν ο’ μαθητήν ἐν Ἐρωδίας. 13. εἰς τὸν Τιμήριον κβ’ ἔτη τοῦ Ρομαίος βασιλεύευσαν Γάλλος ἐξεγέρθη ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ ἐν τῷ Τιμήριον καὶ τὸν Κυρίον ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ καὶ τὰς ἐκ τοῦ Ἀβγαροῦ πρὸς τὸν Κυρίον ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ λόγῳ φέρονται.
14. σὸν Ἰάκωβον τῷ ἀδελφῷ μὲν τοῦ ᾿Ιωάννου, νεῖδε τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, ἐμαρτύρησε τις, ὁ εἰσερχόμενον Ἰάκωβον παρὰ τῷ Ηρῴδῃ κολασθησόμενον. 15. τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ὀσίων τὸν μάγον καὶ τὴν συνοδίαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ Τύρου πορνήν Ἐλέζην ὄνοματι ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Αντωνίαν ὕπερ ἤμον ἄρπαλογίας ᾿Ιουστίνου. 16. Πέτρου ἐν Ῥώμῃ, 5 γενομένου διὰ τὸν ᾿Ιουστίνον, ἱκανοθείς Μάρκος αὐτῷ, ὡς αἰτθεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων τὸ κατ’ αὐτὸν ἐγγράφην Εὐαγγέλιον, ὡς φησί Κλήμης ἐν τοῖς Ὑποτυπώσεως καὶ Παπίας ὁ ῾Ιεραπόλεως. 17. Φίλιον ἐπὶ Γαϊου εἰς προσβεβαίζει, παρὰ ᾿Ιουδαίους καὶ μέχρι Κλαυδίου διατρίψας, ἐν Ῥώμῃ εἰς ὁμιλίαν ἐλθεῖν τῷ κορυφαίῳ Πέτρου λέγεται. 18. Φήστου τελευτήσας εἰς ᾿Ιερουσαλήμ ἀναρχίας οὐθές, ἀνεύλοιον οἱ ᾿Ιουδαίοι τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰάκωβον, ὡς φησίν Ηγήσατος ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ αὐτῶν Ὑποτυπώσας καὶ ᾿Ιουστίνος ἐν τῷ κ’ τῆς Ἀρχαιολογίας καὶ Κλήμης ἐν τοῖς Ὑποτυπώσεως, μετὰ δὲ Φήστου Ἀλβίνος γέγονεν τῆς ᾿Ιουδαίας ἐπίτροπος. 19. πρῶτος μετὰ Μάρκον τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρειας παρουσίας ἐπίσκοπος Ἀννιανὸς ἐγένετο. 20. Τερτυλιανὸς ὁ Ῥωμαῖος ἰστόρησεν ὡς πρῶτος κατὰ Χριστιανὸν διωγμὸν Ῥώμῃ ἐποίησεν. 21. Γάτος ἕκκλησιστικός ἐνὶ καὶ διονύσιος ὁ Κορίνθιος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίους ἐπίστευεν, ἐν Ρώμῃ ὑπὸ Νέρωνος κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἀνεξακόλουθη, οὕτως αὐτοῦ ἀξίωσας. Παῦλος δὲ, ἀπὸ ᾿Ιερουσαλήμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπικολάσθη ἐν τῷ Ἑλληνικῷ πληρώσας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν Ῥώμῃ σὺν τῷ Πέτρῳ τὸν μαρτυρικὸν ἀνεδόσατο στέφανον, καὶ Πέτρος μὲν ἐπάθη ἐν τῷ Βατικανῷ. Παῦλος δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ Οστείᾳ, ὡς γράφει Γάτος, ἕκκλησιστικὸς ἐνὶ καὶ διονύσιος ὁ Ζεβεδαίος ὑπὸ ὑδαίων, καὶ καὶ τῷ πρῶτῳ τοῦτον τὸν ὑπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας 25 Ἐκ τοῦ τρίτου λόγου.

22. Θωμᾶς ὁ ἀπόστολος εἰς τὰς Πάρθους ἐδίδαξεν, Ἀνδρέας εἰς τὴν Σκυθίαν, ᾿Ιωάννης εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν, πρὸς οὖς καὶ διατρίψας ἐν Εὐφέσῳ ἐτελεύτησεν. Πέτρος δὲ, ἐν Πόντῳ καὶ Γαλατίᾳ, ἐν Βυθνίᾳ τε καὶ Καππαδοκίᾳ καὶ τῇ Ἀσία κυρίας, ὕστερον ἐν Ρώμῃ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἀνεξακόλουθη, οὕτως αὐτοῦ ἀξίωσας. Παῦλος δὲ, ἀπὸ ᾿Ιερουσαλήμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς πληρώσας τό εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν Ῥώμῃ σὺν τῷ Πέτρῳ τὸν μαρτυρικὸν ἀνεδόσατο στέφανον, καὶ Πέτρος μὲν ἐπάθη ἐν τῷ Βατικανῷ. Παῦλος δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ Οστείᾳ, ὡς γράφει Γάτος, ἕκκλησιστικὸς ἐνὶ καὶ διονύσιος ὁ Ζεβεδαίος ὑπὸ ὑδαίων, καὶ καὶ τῷ πρῶτῳ τοῦτον τὸν ὑπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπος γέγονεν Διονύσιος τοῦ τόμῳ Ἐμνημόνευσεν Πέτρος, 30 καὶ Παῦλος Τιμοθέου γράφων ἐμμονεύσεν.
1 24. τὰς ἐπιστολὰς ὡς γεγράφασιν οἱ ἀπόστολοι, ἀναμφιλέκτως οἱ παλαιοί ὡς γνησίας ἐδέξαντο· τὴν Πέτρου πρώτην, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν οὐχ ὡς ἐνδιάθηκαν μὲν, πλὴν καὶ αὐτὴν ὡς χρήσιμον παρέδεξαν. τὸ δὲ τὸν Πράξεων Πέτρου καὶ τὸ ὄνομαζομένον αὐτοῦ Ἑυαγγέλιον τὸ τε Κήρυγμα καὶ τὴν λεγομένην αὐτοῦ Αποκάλυψιν οὐδὲ ὠλοκληρώσαν, τινὲς δὲ καὶ τὴν Παύλου πρὸς Ἐβραίους ἠθέτησαν, οἱ καὶ ὡς πληρωμῆς ἐλέγχοντα. φασὶ δὲ τινὲς καὶ τῶν Ἰωάννου ἐπιστολῶν τὴν πρώτην μόνην γνησίαν εἶναι, καὶ τὴν Ἰακώβου δὲ καὶ Ἰουδὰ ὡς ἁρμόδιαν ός γνησίας. 25. Λουκᾶς τὸ γένος Ἀντισυχέος, τὴν δὲ ἐπιστήμην ἱεροπόρον, τὸ κατ’ αὐτὸν ἐγγραφαὶ Ἑυαγγέλιον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὰς Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων. 26. Τιμόθεου πρῶτος τῆς Ἐφέσου ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐκλήρωσαν. 27. Κρίτης δὲ Τίτος, Διονύσιος δὲ ὁ Ἀρεσπαγίτες πρῶτος Ἀθηνῶν κατέστη ἐπίσκοπος· τοῦτο δὲ λέγει Διονύσιος ὁ Κορίνθου. 28. ἤνικα Τίτος Καίσαρ ἐπορεύθη <εἰς> τὰ Ἑρωσόλυμα, κατὰ θειαν ἀποκάλυψιν οἱ ἐν Ἑρωσόλυμοις χριστιανοὶ εἰς πόλιν τῆς Περαιάς καλωμένην Πέλλαν, προμετέβοντες τὰς τῶν λιμοῦ καὶ τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τῆς στάσεως διέφθαρον συμφοράς. 29. Ἰωσήφος πρὸς τῇ Ἰουδαίκη ἀρχαιολογίᾳ καὶ τοὺς περὶ ἀλωδείας καὶ τοὺς περὶ ἀρχαιότητι ἐγγραφαί, πρὸς Ἀπίανν γραμματικοῖς ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαῖων καὶ τοὺς περὶ αὐτόκρατορος λόγους καὶ ἄτερα ἀξιόλογα, διαβάλλει δὲ Πρίνιον τὸν Τιμερέα ὡς θεοῦ διαγγελόμενον. 30. Συμεὼν ὁ τοῦ Κλοπά δεύτερος μετὰ Ἰακώβου τῆς ἐν Ἑρωσόλυμοις ἐπισκοπῆς προέεισε, Κλέαπτα πάντων τοῦ τοῦτος πατέρα ἀδελφὸν τῷ Ἰωσήφῳ φησιν ὁ Ηγήστυς. 31. Οἰκεπασανασκός μετὰ τὴν ἁλοσίαν Ἑρωσόλυμοι τοὺς πάνταν Ἰουδαίοις ἀναζητηθῆναι προσεδέχασαν, ὡς ἐν μηδεὶς περιπλεπθεὶς παρ’ Ἰουδαίως τῶν ἐν γένος βασιλικοῦ. καὶ τοῦτο ὀρίσι διὰ τὴν πρόφητην. 32. μετὰ Αννιανὸν ἐπίσκοπον Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐγένετο δεύτερος Ἀβιλίος, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ρώμην μετὰ Αἰνών Ἀνέγκλητος γέγονε τὸν δεύτερον δεύτερος καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον Ἀνέγκλητος φήσει, γνήσιον πάντα χαμαστητῆ· φέρεται δὲ καὶ δευτέρα πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν Κορίνθου.
33. Δομετιανὸς οὖς Οὐδεσπεισανοῦ πολλὰ κακὰ εἰς τοὺς ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίος ἐνδείξαμενος, τῆν Νέρωνος νυκτὸς ὁμίτης, δεύτερος κατὰ Χριστιανῶν διωγμὸν ἐποίησε. καθ' ὄν καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴν Ιοάννην ἐν Πάτμῳ περιώρισεν. συντυχὼν καὶ Δομετιανὸς τοῖς οὖς Ἰουῶν τοῦ ἀδέλφου τοῦ Κύριου καὶ γινοὺς τὴν ἁρπατὴν τῶν ἀνδρῶν, τοῦ καθ' ἐμὴν ἐπανάστατο διογμὸν. ἀναφέρει δὲ ὁ Ἡγήσιππος καὶ τὰ ὄνοματα αὐτῶν καὶ φησιν ὅτι ὁ μὲν ἐκαλεῖτο Ζωκήρ, ὁ δὲ Ἰάκωβος, ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἁγαγαγία. 34. Νερώνα μετὰ Δομετιανὸν βασιλεύσαντος, κοινῷ δὸματι πάντες ἐκ τῶν ἑξορίων ἀνεκλήθησαν· μεθ' ὄν καὶ ὁ Θεολόγος Ιοάννης ἐκ τῆς Πάτμου εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ὑπέστρεψεν. 35. πρῶτος δὲ τῆς ἐν Ἀντιοχεία ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐκκλησίαν Εὐδόκιον καὶ κατὰ τοῦτον Ἰγνάτιος καὶ μετ' ἑκείνου Ἰρων. 36. Τριάδων μετὰ Νερώναν βασιλεύσαντος, μέχρι τοῦτο περὶ ὁ Θεολόγος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰοάννης' τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ τριών ἐγγυότερον γραφάντοι εἷ' ἕνα μόνον ἐνιαυτόν τῷ Χορῆρι πραξάντα, Ιοάννης ὁ Θεολόγος τὰ πρὸ τοῦτον ἔγραψεν. 38. πλείστοι τῶν ἀρχαίων τὴν Ιοάννου ἀποκάλυψιν οὐ προσέπταντο· εἴτε τοῦ τοῦ Ἰοάννου ταύτην οἴμενον, τὸ δὲ καθ' Ἐβραίους Εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὸ λέγόμενον Πέτρου καὶ Θωμᾶ καὶ Ματθαία καὶ τὰς Πράξεις Ἰοάννου καὶ Ἀνδρέου τελείως ἀπέβαλλον, αἱρετικῶν τάτα συγγράμματα λέγοντες· εἰς δὲ καὶ ἄλλα εὐαγγέλια γενοῦ· τό κατὰ Αἴγιντος, κατὰ τοὺς δώδεκα, κατὰ Βασιλείδην. 39. τῶν Εβραίων οἱ ἀρέσεις διῆχος δήμητρο· οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν κληρὰν ἀνθρωπον τῶν Κύριον εἰς ἀνδρὸς καὶ τῆς Θεοτοκοῦ λέγειν ἐπόλμον, κατὰ προκοπὴν δεδικασμένον, δείθαι δὲ ἐκατόν ἀνθρωπον τῆς κατὰ νόμον πολιτείας ὡς μὴ ἄν τοῦ δυνατοῦ δίκα ταύτης ἐκ τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν πίστεως σωθῆσαν· ἀλλα δὲ, τῷ αὐτῷ κεκλημένον ὀνόματι, Εὐαγγελίζων μὲν καὶ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος, ὁμώλωσεν τῶν Κύριον, οὐκ ἔτι δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ Θεοῦ Λόγον ἐπίστευσον· ἐχρώντο δὲ μόνῃ καὶ αὐτοῖ τῇ κατὰ τὸν νῦν λατρεία ὁμοίως τοῖς ἄλλοις, τἀς δὲ τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀποστόλῳ Παύλου ἐπιστολὰς ἀπεβάλλοντο, ἁγίου ταυτήν αὐτῶν λέγειν τολμῶντες· ἐχρώντο δὲ μόνῳ τῷ καθ' Ἐβραίων Εὐαγγελίον. Εβραίων δὲ λέγοντα διὰ τὸ εὐτελές τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τὸ πτοχὸν τῆς νοήσεως· Εβραίων γὰρ οἱ πτοχοί Ἐβραίστη λέγονται.
40. Κήρυνθον τὸν αἴρεσιάρχην φησιν ὁ Γάιος πρῶτον εἶπεν ἐπίγειον εἶναι τὴν Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν χιλιοντετραήδα δυσματισχ. τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Αλεξανδρείας καὶ Εὐρημιὰς ὁ Λογισόνου· φασὶ δὲ παραδοῦναι περὶ Κήρυνθον Πολύκαρπον ὅτι ἴδιον αὐτῶν Ἰοάννης ἐν βαλανείῳ λουμιόμενον, ἔφυγεν καὶ ἐξήλθεν, κράζων μήποτε πέσῃ τὸ λαυτρόν, ὄντος ἐπού Κήρυνθου. 41. Νικόλαος ὁ εἰς τῶν ἐπί τοῦ διακόνου ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὴν γυναίκαν ξηλοτυπίας τῆς τῶν Νικολαΐτων προκατήρρισεν πλάνης ὡς φησι ο Κλήμης ἐν τοῦ τῶν Στροματέων. 42. Κλήμης ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ λόγῳ τῶν Στροματέων πρὸς τούς ἀθεοτοῦτα τῶν γάμων μαχόμενος φησιν Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου καὶ Φιλίππου γυναίκας ἐσχηκέναι· ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐδὸμος Στροματεῖ τῆς Πέτρου γυναίκας καὶ μαρτυρίῳ τελευτὴν λέγει, καὶ Πέτρος δὲ ἐν τῷ πρῶτον λόγῳ τῶν εἰς τὸ Πάσχα πολὺ ἐνισταταὶ οτι Παύλους ἔχει γυναίκα καὶ ταυτίνῃ τῷ θεῷ διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνέθετο, τῇ πρὸς αὐτὴν κοινονία ἀποταξαμένους. 43. Πολυκράτης ὁ Ἐφέσιον ἐπίσκοπος Βίκτωρ τῷ Ῥώμαιοι ἐπίσκοποι δη ἐπιστολῆς γέγραφε περὶ τῆς κοιμήσεως Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου καὶ Φιλίππου τοῦ ἐνός τοῦ ἵδι ἀποστόλου, δὲ καὶ θυγατέρας ἐσχεν προφητίδας. Λουκᾶς δὲ ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι ἕνα τῶν ἐπί τῶν διακόνων λέγει τὸν Φιλίππουν, οὗ αἱ θυγατέρας προφητεύουσιν. 44. μετὰ Νέρωνα καὶ Δομετιανοῦ δημοτικῇ κατὰ Χριστιανοῦ γενομένης ἐπαναστάσεως, πλείστοι τοῦ τῷ μαρτυρίῳ στεφάνῳ κατεκομμήθησαν, ἐν ὧν καρφὶ καὶ Σωμέων ὁ <του> Κλεόπας ὁ γεννόμενος μετὰ Ἰάκωβου Ἰεροσολύμων ἐπίσκοπος, ρκ’ γενόμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ, μετὰ πολλὰς βασάνους ἐσταυρώθη, καθα φησιν ὁ Ῥήμησιππος [ἰστορεῖ]. 45. Τραιανὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς προσετάξε τὸν Χριστιανοῦ φύλον μὴ ἐκχθεῖται μὲν, ἐμπεσὼν δὲ κολάζεσθαι, ὡς φησιν Τερτυλλιανός ἐν τῇ ἡσυχίᾳ τῇ κατ’ αὐτῶν. 46. Ἰγνάτιος ὁ θείος ἐκ τοῦ Ὀρηίου ἐν τῇ ἔρημῳ δέσμιος ἄγνεος, δηθεὶς ἐδόθη βορρὰ. ὁ καὶ οὕτω τῶν μαρτυρικῶν ἁγίων τετελεχέν. καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐκκουμήθη. 47. τῇ Παύλῳ πρὸς Εβραίους ἐπιστολῆν πολλοὶ μὲν ὡς οὐκ οὐσαν Παύλου διεβάλλον, οἱ δὲ, τῆς ἀλήθείας ἀντιποιομένους, Παύλου ταυτίνῃ γνησίᾳ εἶναι πιστεύουσιν. φασὶ δὲ ταὐτίνῃ Ἐβραϊστὶ γραφείσαν ἐρμηνευθήναι, ὡς μὲν εἴδει τοὺς, ὑπὸ τὸ Λουκᾶ, ὡς δὲ λέγοντι ἄλλοι, ὑπὸ Κλήμεντος τοῦ Ῥώμης, οὕτως καὶ μᾶλλον ὄφειλον πιστεύεσθαι διὰ τὸ τοῦ θρακητηρὸς τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κλήμεντος ὁμοίων.
48. Παπίας Ισραπέλλνος ἐπίσκοπος, ἀκοῦστή τοῦ Θεολόγου Ἰοάννην γενόμενος. Πολυκάρπον δὲ ἐτάραξε, πέντε λόγους Κυριακὸν λόγων ἔγραψεν· ἐν οἷς ἀπαρίθμησεν ἀποστόλων ποιούμενος, μετὰ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰοάννην καὶ Φιλίππον καὶ Θωμάν καὶ Ματθαίον καὶ μαθητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνέγραφεν Ἀριστούρνα καὶ Ἰοάννην ἔτερον, ὅν καὶ πρεσβύτερον ἐκάλεσεν, ὡς τινὰ σίεσθαι ὅτι τοῦτο τοῦ Ἰοάννου εἶσίν αἱ δύο ἐπιστολαί· αἱ μικραὶ καὶ καθολικαὶ αἱ ἐν οἷς ὄνοματος Ἰοάννου φερόμεναι διὰ τοῦ τοὺς ἀρχαῖους τὴν πρότην μόνην ἐγκρίνειν· τινὲς δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀπακόλουθον τοῦτον πληνῆστεν ἐνόμισαν. καὶ Παπίας δὲ περί τῆς χιλιονταπετίδονα σφάλλεται, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ὁ Εἰρηναῖος. 49. Παπίας ἐν τῷ δεύτερῳ λόγῳ λέγει ὅτι Ἰοάννης ὁ Θεολόγος καὶ Ἰάκωβος δοκιμάζομεν ὅπως ὁ Πολύκαρπος καὶ Ιούστος δοκιμάζομεν ὅπως τῶν ἀπόστολων τὸν ἐξ ἐξής πιὼν, ἐν ὄνοματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπαθὴς διεφυλάχθη, ἵστορει δὲ καὶ ἀλλὰ θαυμάτα καὶ μάλιστα τὸ κατὰ τὴν μητέρα Μαναήμου τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσαν <καὶ> περὶ τῶν ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντων, ὅτι ἐφὼς Αὐδριανοῦ ἔριξον.

50. Ἐκ τοῦ τετάρτου βιβλίου. 51. Ο δὲ Χρυσόστομος ἐν τῇ α´ ὀμηλία του δεύτερου τμήματος τῆς α´ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῆς λέγει ὅτι καὶ <νόμισαν> ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναστάντων ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ οἱ πρὸ αὐτῶν πάντες ἀπέθαναν. 52. Κοδράτος καὶ Αριστείδῆς ἀπολογοῦν ὑπὲρ Χαρακίαν ἐκκόστος ιδία πεποιηται καὶ τῷ βασιλεὶ Αδριανῷ προσκόμισαν. τὸ δὲ Κοδράτου καὶ χρῆσθαι έν οὐδεμίῳ ἐν ἥμαρτον φησίν ὅτι οἱ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντων ἐπὶ χρόνον πλεῖον τῷ βίῳ διέτριβαν, ὡς λέγει καὶ ἐν τῷ τῆς ἡμέρας Κοδράτου φθάσαι. 53. Σίμωνον τὸν μάγον Μενανάρδου διεκδέξατο, γόης τις άνήρ καὶ ἀπατεών, τῷ γένει Σαμαρείτης, δεῖ τοὺς πειθομένους αὐτῷ ἐπὶ γεμτεῖν προσπέρασεν, μη ἀλλος δύσνοσθαι λέγων σωθήναι ὑπεργεινεῖ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐν τούτῳ τῷ βίῳ ζῇν δὲ αἰῶνος. γράφουσι δὲ κατὰ τοῦτο Εἰρηναίος καὶ Ιουστήνος. 54. Οὐαλεντίνος καὶ Κέρδους ἄμφοτεροι ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐγνωρίζοντο. Κέρδους δὲ γένον διδάσκαλος Μαρκιανὸς τοῦ Ποντικοῦ, οὗ τὴν πλάνην διελέγχουσιν οἱ πλείστοι καὶ μάλιστα Εἰρηναῖος ἐν τῷ κατὰ τῶν αἵρεσεων. λέγουσι γὰρ τὸν ὕπο νόμου καὶ τὸν προφητῶν «κεκηρυγμένον» θεὸν μὴ εἶναι Πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἱησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸν μὲν γὰρ γενοκεκθεῖσθαι, τὸν δὲ ἀνείπτετα εἶναι, καὶ τὸν μὲν ἀγαθὸν, τὸν δὲ δύκαιον, ὁτιοῦ δὲ καὶ νυμφῶνα κατασκευάζοις καὶ πνευματικὸν τελοῦσα γάμον, μιμούμενοι, καθά φησιν, πλανώμενοι τὰς ὀφθαλμίας δύναμις βαπτιζοῦσι δὲ λέγουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα ἀγνώστου πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων, εἰς ἀλλήθαια μητέρα πάντων, εἰς τὸν κατελθόντα εἰς τὸν ύδατον 281.
55. Μελίτων ἐπίσκοπος Σάρδεων ἀπολογίαν ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν πεποίητο πρὸς Σεμιρὼν βασιλέα καὶ ἔτερα δὲ πλείστα γέγραψεν ἀξίολογα πσευδάσματα, καὶ μάλιστα τὰ εἰς τὸ Πάσχα τ’, καὶ πρὶν τῶν Προφητῶν καὶ Πολιτείας, καὶ περὶ Ἑκκλησίας, καὶ περὶ Κυριακῆς, καὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου, καὶ περὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ ἄλλα θεομαστὰ ἡ ῥήσις ὑονομάζει Εὐσέβιος. Πολύκαρπος ἐπίσκοπος Σμύρνης μέχρι τούτων τῶν χρόνων περιήλθ, ὡς ἐπὶ Ανικήτου κατὰ τὴν Ρώμην ἐγένετο διὰ τὸ περὶ τὸ Πάσχα ζητήμα, ὡς φησὶ Εὐσέβιος ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ τοῦ κατὰ τῶν αἱρέσεων. λέγει δὲ ὅτι εἰς δύον εἶδον ὁ Μαρκίων τοῦ Πολύκαρπος φησὶ πρὸς αὐτόν “ἐπιγινώσκε ἡμᾶς, ἐκαλέ Πολύκαρπε”, ὁ δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν “ἐπιγινώσκοι”, ἔφη, “ἐπιγινώσκοι τὸν προτότοκον τοῦ Σατανᾶ”. 57. μετὰ Πολύκαρπον τὸν θείον ἐν Σμύρνῃ μαρτυρήσαντα καὶ Μητρόδωρος τὰς διαπραγματεύσεις πρὸς τῇ Μαρκίωνον τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ Πουπλίου τοῦ ἐπίσκοπου, εἰσῆλθαν δὲ καὶ Παλμᾶς περὶ τὸν κατάλογον τοῦ προτότοκον τοῦ Σατανᾶς. 58. Ἱούστινος ὁ ἀπὸ φιλοσοφῶν πλείστα καὶ μνήμης ἀξίας καταλείποντας πσευδάσματα, ὑπὸ τούτον καταλαμβάνει τοῦ προτότοκον τοῦ Σατανᾶς ἀξιόπλοος καὶ παραδόχος πρὸς Πουπλίον καὶ τῷ Ἀρεοπαγίτῳ Διονυσίῳ, ᾗς ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ἀθηνῶν, καὶ Κοδρᾶτος τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν διαδέχεται, πρᾶος ἀνήρ, καὶ πολλοὺς ἐξ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου δέχεται. 59. Ἐπισκόπως οὗ Σευηρίανοι οἱ ἄλλοι πρὸς τὸν Ἀρεοπαγίτον διαδέχεται, πρᾴος ἀνήρ, καὶ πολλοὺς ἐξ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου δέχεται. 60. Διονυσίος ὁ Κορινθίου πλείστα καταλείπει τοῦ Ἀρεοπαγίτου τῆς ἀξιόπλοος καὶ τῆς ἀριστοκράτους πρῶτον τῆς τῶν Ἀρεοπαγίτους διαδέχεσθαι. 61. Τατιάνος Ἰουστίνου μὲν ἱστορίας ἑγένετο τοῦ προτότοκον τοῦ Ἀρεοπαγίτου καὶ τοῦ τῆς ἀριστοκράτους. 62. Τατιάνος Ἰουστίνου μὲν ἱστορίας ἑγένετο τοῦ τῆς ἀριστοκράτους. 63. Τατιάνος Ἰουστίνου μὲν ἱστορίας ἑγένετο τοῦ τῆς ἀριστοκράτους. 64. Τατιάνος Ἰουστίνου μὲν ἱστορίας ἑγένετο τοῦ τῆς ἀριστοκράτους. 65. Τατιάνος Ἰουστίνου μὲν ἱστορίας ἑγένετο τοῦ τῆς ἀριστοκράτους.
62. Ἀπολιναρίου φέρονται σπουδάσματα, καὶ μάλιστα πέντε Πρὸς Ἐλλήνας καὶ Πρὸς Ιουδαίους δύο, καὶ κατὰ Μοντανὸ τὸ τότε ἀρχαμένου ἐκτρέπεσθαι ἀμα ταῖς ἐκαυτοῦ προφήτησιν.

Εκ τοῦ πέμπτου βιβλίου.

63. Φλορίνος Ὁμήρης πρεσβύτερος αἱρετικῆς ἐγένετο, καθ’ οὗ γενναίος γέγραφεν Εἰρηναίος, περὶ οὗ καὶ λέγει ὡς “εἰ έξη Πολλακριμοῦ, εἶπεν ἀν περὶ σοῦ, ὁ Φλορίνη, ἥτα καλε θεῖ, εἰς οίοις με καρποῦς τετηρμάζεις, ἣν τούτους ἀνέχομαι”. συνή τοῦ Φλορίνῳ καὶ ἄλλος αἱρετικός, Βλάστους οὖν ὁμόμι. 64. Ἀλκιβιάδου τινὸς τὸν ἐν Γαλλίᾳ μαρτύρον ἐγκρατευμένον πολὺ καὶ μὴ διέποθετε μεταλαμβάνοντος πλὴν ἄρτου καὶ ὦδατος, τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ πειραμώμονος ποιεῖν, ἀπεκαλύθη Ἀττάλῳ τῷ κύριοι ἐν τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ, μετὰ τὸν ἐν τῷ ἀμφίθεατρῳ πρότον αὐτῷ ἅγωνα, κατεπεί πινα ὦς οὗ καλῶς ποιεὶ Ἀλκιβιάδης μὴ χρώμενος τούς κτίσματος τΟΥ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἄλλοις τούς σκανδάλου γενόμενος, ὅν ἀκούσας Ἀλκιβιάδης, πάντων μεταλαμβάνον, ἠγαρίζετι τῷ Θεῷ. 65. <Λόγος ἔχει> Μάρκου

15 Λυρηλίου βασιλέως Ρωμαίων πολεμοῦντος πρὸς Γερμανοὺς καὶ Σαρμάτας, δύσει τῆς στρατιάς πεζομενής καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κινδυνεύουσας, τούτω εἰς τὴν Μελετήσιν οὕτω καλουμένως λεγενάς, Χριστιανοὺς ὄντας δι’ εὐχής ἐκτενοῦς πρὸς τόν Θεόν γενομένης, τούς μὲν πολεμούς κεραυνοῦ βαλεῖν, ἄμβωρ ἄμε τοὺς ‘Ρωμαίουσ παραμυθήσασθαι’ ἕπερ, ὡς φησὶ Τετρυβλίλλανος, καταπλήξειν τὸν Μάρκον, γράψει τιτῆπαι Χριστιανοὺς παρεκάλεσεν, τὴν δὲ λεγενάδα ἐκ τοῦ ἐργῷ κεραυνοβόλου προσαγερεῖ διά. 66. Ἐρημίας ὁ λουγουνάου πολύ καὶ θεῖα κατακλείουσαι σπουδάσματα ὑπὸ τόν καὶ τὸν καλύγον πλεῖστοι γινόσκουσι. φησί δὲ ότι μετὰ τὴν ἐκ Βαρβαλῶνος ἐπανόδον "Εσώρα τῷ γραμματί Θεός ἔδωκε τό χάριν ἄνθηθεν τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας πάντας ὑπαγορεύει ἀπάντην, ὡς καὶ πρὸς τοὺς σχίμαλτους τυγχάνοντας. 67. Ράδων ὁ Ασιανὸς μαθήτης μὲν εὐεγένεις Τατιανό, ἐγράψε δὲ κατὰ Μαρκίωνος, ἐν οἷς φησὶν ότι ναύτης ἂν ὁ Μαρκίων. γράφει δὲ καὶ κατὰ Ἀπελλάθ μὲν τὸν νόμον καὶ τὰς προφητείας τοῦ ἄγους Πνεύματος ἐξουθενοῦντος, πειθομένου δὲ γυναικεῖς δαμοῦσας, ὅνομάς Φιλομένης, καὶ τὰ ἐκείνης μυθάρια προφητείας ἠγουμένου καὶ δῶο ἀρχάς κατὰ Ἐπεδοκλέαν 14595 5 κατὰ τὰ προφήτας κατὰ Πνευμάτος, κατὰ τὰς προφητείας τοῦ ἄγους Πνεύματος μεταλαμβάνοντος, εἰσηγουμένου. Απολινάριος ὁ <ἐν> Ἰεραπολεῖθει θείος κατὰ Μοντανὸ καὶ τὸν εἰς ἐκείνου λεγομένους ἐγγύς ἠγονίστατο, φησὶ δὲ ότι καὶ Μοντανὸ αὐτὸς καὶ Θεόδοτος καὶ Μαζζίμπαλ από πονηροῦ δαίμονος, ἃς αὐτὸς ἐπιν, βλαψφύρονος νυνθῆσαν. μέμνηται δὲ Απολιναρίου καὶ Μιτιάδου τινὸς γράψαντος κατὰ Μοντανὸ φέρονται δὲ καὶ ἑτερο τοῦ Μιτιάδου συγγράμματα λόγου ᾧ Μαρκίων. ἔγραψε δὲ κατὰ Μοντανὸ καὶ Απολλώνιος τές ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς συγγραφεῖς.
68. τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ <ἐπισκόπων> τῇ ἱδ’ ἀξιούντων ποιεῖν τὸ Πάσχα κατὰ παράδοσιν ἀρχαίαν, περὶ οὓς καὶ Πολυκράτης ὁ Ἐρέσσων δι’ ἐπιστολῆς γραφεῖσθης πρὸς Βίκτωρα τοῦ Ῥώμης ἐνίσταται ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων Ἰωάννου καὶ Φιλίππου τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ κοιμηθέντων τούτου παραλαβεῖν, διασχισμένον Βίκτωρ ὁ Ῥώμης ἀκοινονήσας τοῖς <ἐπισκόποις> ἐν Ἀσίᾳ ἔπεμψεν. Εἰρηναῖος δὲ ὁ Λουγδούνιος γράφει τῷ Βίκτῳ καταγγέλλοντι τῆς προπετείας καὶ οἰκονομεῖ τὸ πράγμα θείως κατὰ αὐτό καὶ τῶν ἐν Γαλλίᾳ τὴν ἀγίαν μᾶλλον Κυριακὴν ἐστάλαξαν προεύθυνόν. ἐν οἷς φησὶ ὅτι τινὲς καὶ περὶ τὸ νηστείαν διαφόρως παρέλαβον· οἱ μὲν γὰρ μίαν μόνην ἦμεραν ἐνήστευσαν, οἱ δὲ δύο, οἱ δὲ καὶ πλείονας, οἱ δὲ τεσσαράκοντα ὥρας μόνας ἡμερινὰς καὶ νυκτερινὰς ὥρας ἀντὶ ἦμεραν νηστεύσαντες, καὶ πάσιν συνεχορήθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἔδειχε χρήσιμαι, μνημονεύει δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐν Ῥώμῃ παρουσίας τοῦ Πολυκάρπου ἐπὶ Ἁνκίτου γεγενημένης καὶ ὅπως παρεχώρησε τῆς τιμῆς καὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ Ἁνίκητος.

69. Θεόδοτος ὁ σκυτεύς πρώτος ἀρχηγὸς τῆς κατὰ Παύλον καὶ Νεστόριον <αἱρέσεως> γέγονεν, δὲ καὶ ἀπεκήρυξε Βίκτωρ ὁ Ῥώμης ἐπισκόπος. μετὰ οὖν Θεόδοτον ὁ Ἀρτέμιος καὶ μετ’ ἐκείνου ὁ Σαμοσατεύς καὶ οὗτοι Νεστόριος ψιλὸν εἰπεν ἄνθρωπον τὸν ἐνανθρωπισάμενα Θεον ἐτέλεσαν. 70. ἐπὶ Ζεφύρινου τοῦ μετὰ Βίκτωρα Νατάλιος τὸς ὁμολογητῆς, ἀναπεσεθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἀσκληπιοδότου καὶ ἔτερου Θεοδότου παραστῆτης, μαθητὴν τοῦ σκυτεύς, ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον εἰπεν τὸν Κύριον ὑπὸ ἄγιον δυνάμεως πληγὰς ἐν νυκτὶ ἔλαβε φοβερὰς καὶ πάσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος ἐπιδείκνυσεν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τῆς ἐκείνου πλάνης διελέγχων τὴν ἄνοιαν.

Ἐκ τοῦ ἐκτοῦ μβλίου.
71. Σευήρος διοικὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἐκίνησεν καὶ πολλοὶ τῷ τοῦ μαρτυρίου κατεκομίσθησαν στεφάνῳ, μάλιστα ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρεια, ἐν οἷς καὶ Λεωνίδης καὶ 25 Ποταμίαν καὶ οἱ παρὰ τοῦ Ὀργένους κατηχηθέντες. 72. Πάντανον διεδέχετο Κλήμης ὁ Στρωματεύς καὶ τοῦ Κλήμεντος φοιτητῆς Ὀργένης ἐγένετο. τοὺς δὲ γε λόγους τοὺς Στρωματεὺς ο Ἀββαίος ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις Σεῦρος τοῦ βασιλέως μετὰ Κύμδον ἐγραφέν. 73. Ἰουδας τις συγγραφέως εἰς τὰς παρὰ τῷ Δανυλ. ἑβδομαδὰς ἐγραφεν, ἡς καὶ τὸν ἀντίχριστον πλησιάσατε τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς ἐκείνοις γέγραφεν.

68.1 τῶν – 13 Ανίκητος: HE 5, XXIII.1, XXIII.3-4, XXIV.1-3, XXIV.12, XXIV.17 69.13 Θεόδοτος – 16 ἐτέλεσαν: HE 5, XXVIII.6, XXVIII.1-2 70.16 ἐπὶ – 21 ἄνοιαν: HE 5, XXVIII.8-9, XXVIII.12 71.23 Σεῦρος – 25 κατηχηθέντες: HE 6, I.1, V.1 72.25 Πάντανον – 28 ἐγραφεν: HE 6, VI.1 73.28 Ἰουδας – 29 γέγραφεν: HE 6, VII.1

74. Νάρκισσος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ἀμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἱεροσολύμων ἐπίσκοποι ἐγρηματίζον. Νάρκισσος δὲ ἦν ἐν τῷ Πάσχα, ἐλαιοῦ μὴ ὄντος, τῆς λυγυρωάς τῆς ἐκκλησίας δὴ ὦδατος σκευασθέναι εἰσφαζόντος ἔλαιον ἀπετέλεσεν. κατὰ τούτοι διαβολῆς παρὰ τινῶν ψευδοκτηρίγορων γενομένης, τρεῖς προσῆχθησαν κάρτοις ών ο μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς κατακαυθήναι, ὁ δὲ τὸ σῶμα πάν κατασαυτῆναι, ὁ δὲ τρίτος τὰς όψεις ἀποτυφλωθῆναι ἱσχυρῶς ἐξομυντο, εἰ τοῦ Νάρκισσου καταγεννηστο. αὐτὸς δὲ, μηδὲν πρὸς τὰς διαβολὰς ἀντιπαρατεξόμενος, διαδρᾶς εἰς ἑρμῆν όργον. οἱ δὲ κατακατηρηθῆναις αὐτὸς ποιήν ἐκατος τὴν ὀρθεθήναι καθ’ ἐαυτῶν ἀποδεδοκασκ. τοῦ στερηθήντος τὰς όψεις πᾶσαν σκαιωρῶν δηλοποιοῦσαν, ἀφανοὺς δὲ γεγονότος τοῦ Νάρκισσου, Δίος ἀντ’ αὐτοῦ χειροτονεῖται. αὐτοῦ δ’ οὖν μετ’ οὐ πολὺ τελευτήσαται. Γερμανίων τὴν ἐπίσκοπην ἀναδέχεται καὶ τούτοι πάλιν διαδέχεται Γόρδιος· ἐφ’ οὐ πάλιν ὁ Νάρκισσος ἀναφανεῖς ἀναγκάζεται παρὰ τὸν ἀδελφόν τὴν προστασίαν ἀναδέξασθαι. παρατούμενον δ’ αὐτὸν καὶ γῆρας βαθὺ προβάλλομεν ἀποκαλύψεις θεία προετρέγατο προσλαβεθαι καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον, εξ’ ἑτέρας παροικίας ὅντα, καὶ εὐχῆς χαίρι τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα καταλαβόντα καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἱσθεν καὶ διακυβερνην. 75. Κλήμεντι τῷ Ἀλέξανδρεῖα δοκεῖ οτι Παῦλου τὴν πρός Ἐβραίους ἐπιστολὴν γνησίων οὖσαν αὐτοῦ, Λουκᾶς <ἡ> Ἐβραίστι γραφεῖς ἡμημενευσεν ἐτροι δὲ Κλήμεντι τῷ Ἱερομαίῳ τὴν ἐρμήνευσι προσάγουσι. 76. Σύμμαχος ὁ εἰς τῶν ἐρμηνευτῶν Ἐβρωναίοι ἦν τὴν ἀξίαν τα κατὰ τούτον τὸν χρόνων ἐγνωρίζετο καὶ διάφορα ἐγγαγα ὑποδάμησιν, ἐν δὲ υπὲρ Ἐβρωναίου κατὰ τοῦ Ἱερωμαίου Ἐυσαγηλίου. ἀπαντα δὲ τῷ Συμμάχῳ ἔλαβεν Ὀργῆς τὸς παρὰ Ἰουλιανος τῶς διαδόχους Συμμάχου. 77. Πορφύριος ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ κατὰ Χριστιανόν λόγῳ διαβάλλει Ὀργῆν ώς Ἀμονίου τοῦ πυροσφόρου μαθητὴν γενόμενων καὶ ὑπ᾿ εἰκόνα μὲν τὰ Ἐλήλων παπαδοθέντα Χριστιανόν γενέθαι εἰς Ἐλήλων. Αμονίου δὲ ὑπένατε ώς ἐκ Χριστιανισμοῦ εἰς Ἐληλισμόν τρεπόμενον. ἀμφότερα δὲ γευδάται. 78. Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Ἰεροσολυμὸς ἐπίσκοπος βιβλιοθήκης κατεσκευάσε πολλῶν βιβλίων συναγωγῆς ποιησάμενον, εἰς δὲ τὰς Ἕδηθιοι τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας τὰς ἀλαβεὶν ὑπὸ ἡρησατον ἐν οἷς ὄνομαστὶ τῶν Βηρύλευ τὸν Βόστρων ἐπίσκοπον σπουδασματῶν ἐνμηθηκα, καὶ τῶν Ἡπολουτων, καὶ Γάιον τὰ κατὰ Ζευρυνήν Ῥωμὴς ἐπίσκοπον Πρός Πρόκλον κατὰ Μοντανόν. 79. Μαμαία ἡ μητὴρ Αλέξανδροῦ του βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων Χριστιανῆς θεοεσπερητῆ ἐτύχανεν καὶ τῶν Ὀργῆς ἐν Ἀντιοχεία διατυπώσας ἑαυτής καὶ πρὸς ἐαυτῆν ἀνήγαγεν τὸν διδαχθῆναι χαίρι τοῦ κατὰ Χριστὸν ἀμητηρίον.
80. Ἰππόλυτος ἐπίσκοπος ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ χρόνῳ συνέταξε τὰ περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα: ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ Εἰς τὴν Ἐξέμερον καὶ Εἰς τὰ μετὰ τὴν Ἐξέμερον καὶ Πρὸς Μαρκίονα καὶ Εἰς τὸ Ἀίσια καὶ Κατὰ πασῶν τῶν αἱρέσεων καὶ Εἰς μέρος τοῦ Ἰσεμήκη καὶ Εἶτα. ποίαις δὲ πόλεις ἔν ἐπίσκοπος οὐ λέγει Εὐσέβιος. (διαδεξαμένους ἤχη πρὸς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἀλέξανδροῦ). 81. Διονύσιος ὁ ὑστερον γενόμενος Ἀλέξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπος τῶν Ὀριγένους μαθητῶν ὑπήρχεν, καὶ Θεόδωρος καὶ Φηρμιλιάνος ὁ γενόμενος πρῶτος Κασιαρείας <τῆς> Καππαδοκίας ἐπίσκοπος. 82. Μαξιμῖνος ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Μαμαια <διαδεξαμένου>, καὶ διακείμενος εὐχέρειας πρὸς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, πολλοὺς Χριστιανοὺς ἔχοντα, διωγμὸν ἤγερε κατὰ Χριστιανῶν.

83. Αφρικανός ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐγνωριζέτο, οὗ φέρεται διάφορα σπουδάσματα καὶ μάλιστα οἱ πέντε λόγοι οἱ χρονικοί, καὶ ἐπιστολήν πρὸς Αριστείδην Περὶ τῆς νομισθείσης διαφορών τοῖς Ἑυαγγελισταῖς ἐν τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ. 84. Φιλίππου ὁ Ρομαίοις βασιλεὺς Χριστιανὸς ὑπήρχε διάπυρος δς καὶ, πιστεύει Φαβίων τῷ ἐπίσκοπῳ Ῥώμης, ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τῶν οἵ περὶ ἐκ τῆς πνευματικῆς ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ παννυχίῳ τοῦ Παύσα. 85. μετὰ Φιλίππου ἐβασίλευσεν Δέκιος, ὁς μισητὸς πρὸς τὸν Φιλίππου τὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν διωρίζοντα ἀνεφρίπτησεν, ἐφ’ οὗ πολλοὶ τῷ μαρτυρίῳ κατεκοσμήθησαν, ἀν ἦσαν Φάβιος ὁ Ῥώμης καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Ἰεροσολύμων. 86. Ναυατὸς προσβυτερός Ῥώμης γενόμενος, εἰς ὑπογραφίαν ἄρθεις, τοῦ κατ’ αὐτὸν προετοιμασμένου ὑόματος ἐν τῇ Ρώμη, ἀποκλείσας, ὡς γε δὴ φέρο, τοὺς παίτερον τὴν μετάνοιαν καὶ μὴ δεχόμενος τοῦτον. Κορνήλιος δὲ, ὁ τῆς Ρώμης ἐπίσκοπος, γράφει κατὰ Ναυατὸν Φαβίων τῷ ἐπίσκοπῳ Ἀντιοχάειας – τοῦ δὲ αὐτῷ Φαβίῳ καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀλέξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπος γράφει κατὰ Ναφάτων, καὶ αὐτὸ ἐπιστολὴν καὶ ἐτέρας πλείστας ἐπιστολάς περὶ μετανοίας καὶ μαρτυρίων, ἄν καὶ τὸν κατάλογον παρεθέτο Εὐσέβειος τά κατὰ Ναυατὸν γράφων, λέγει δὲ Κορνήλιος ὅτι οὐδέ ἐβαπτίσθη καθὼς ἔδω τις Χριστιανοὶ, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ ὑπὸ δαιμόνιον, ἐν κλίνῃ κείμενος περιεχόμενον ἄδικον, καὶ ὃς κατὰ τότε πέραρχεν τὸν νόμον ποιητῷ, ὃ καὶ ἐρωτήσεως χειροτονίᾳ ἐπέβηκε καὶ τοὺς διὶ ἐπάλλητος μεταλαμβάνοντας ὑπ’ αὐτὸ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων ὑπογραφής ὁμολογοῦν ὅτι οὐ κοινονούσι Κορνήλιῳ τῷ ἐπίσκοπῳ Ρώμης. 87. Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀλέξανδρείας γράφει Φαβίῳ τῷ Ἀντιοχαείᾳ περὶ μετανοίας, ἐν οἷς καὶ τῷ Ἀπιστοῦν τὸν ἐπιδύοναι καὶ τῷ δάνατον αὐτοῦ καὶ πός τῶν μυστηρίων μετέλαβε, τὰ ἐσχατα πνεύμων, διηγήματο. Ἐκ τοῦ ἐβδόμου βιβλίου. 88. Δέκιος σφαγέντος σὺν τέκνοις, Γάλλος ἐβασίλευσεν. ἐν τούτοις δὲ Ὀριγένης, εἰδ’ γενόμενος ἐτῶν, ἐτελεύτησε.
Ἀὐ.countermark ὑ相关负责ται Λαοδικείας, ὁ ἐμμέναιος
τὰς ἑπὶ τοῦ ἰδίου οὖκ ἀνέτησε. ἦταν δὲ τοῦ βομεῖν ἐν ὧν ἦταν φυλοὺς προίασ, καὶ πάς ἡ πόσος υπάρχουσιν επιτίθεναι, ἣν τινα στήλην κατέβαλεν ὁ Παραβάτης. 93. ὁ μέντοι Διονύσιος ὡς ἀγίαν μὲν τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν τιμά
καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὑπερβαίνειν δύναμιν κατατίθεται· οὐ πάντως δὲ πείθεται αὐτῶν Ἱσόδουν τοῦ Θεόλογον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπέτρεψεν τὸν ἄφθονον ἔκουσιν εἰς τὸ Θεόλογον, τὰς δὲ αἰτίας δι᾽ ὧν πείθεται αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς <Περὶ ἐπαγγελίων> κατὰ <τοῦ> Νέπτους <ἀρχῆς> διέρχεται. 94. Παῦλος ὁ Σαμοσατείς μετὰ Δημητριανὸν κατέστη
Ἀντισεῖξας ἐπίγγικος καὶ τὴν Θεοδότου καὶ Ἀρτέμιδος ἐκράτησιν ἀφρίσεν. τῆς δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἀναθεΐσεως συνόδου Μαχιὸν ἦν συστητικὴς καὶ προαιρήτως διήλεγεν τὴν τοῦ Σαμοσατέως ἄσβεσιν, καὶ ὡς καθαίρεσις αὐτῶν ἦγεν. οἱ μάλιστα δὲ τῆς συνόδου ταύτης ἐξάρχοντες: Θεόδωρος καὶ Γρηγόριος ἦν ὁ Σωτηριώτης καὶ τὸ τοῦτο ἀκρίβως Αθηνόδωρος καὶ Φιμιλίανδος ὁ Καισαρείας Καππαδοκίας καὶ "Ελενος ὁ Ταρσοῦ καὶ Νικομᾶς Ἰκονίου καὶ Ὑμείσας Ιεροσολύμων καὶ τῆς ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ Καισαρείας Θεότεκνος καὶ Μάξιμος ὁ Βόστριχος καὶ Ανατόλιος ὁ Λαοδικείας, ἐπίσκοπος μέγας καὶ λόγιος, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Πάσχα εἰσίν. Διονύσιος δὲ, ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας, διὰ τὸ ὑπέργειον εἰς παραγενεσθαι ὁκ ἦχθησαν· δι᾽ ἐπιστολῆς δὲ αὐτοῦ κατέβαλε τὸν πολέμιον. 95. Μάνης ὁ κατάρατος ἐν τούτοις τοῖς χρώμοις ἤκραμεν Χριστὸν εὐαγγελιζόμενος καὶ πνεῦμα ἄγων υποκρινόμενος, διὸ καὶ δοῦχα μαθήτης ὡς ἦν ὁ Χριστὸς ἐπηγάγετο καὶ ἐπὶ ἀπάσης ἀφρεώσεις εἰ τὰ κακὰ ἐναράσανας ἐν τῇ Περὶ δοσεὶς εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην εἰσέφηραν· ἤξιον τῶν Μανιαίων ἢ βδελυρίῳ βεβλασθησας ἀφρίσεις, ἐν ὧν ὁ χρόνος μετὰ Διονύσιον Φιλίας γέγονε τῆς Ρώμης ἐπίσκοπος.


96. Πιερίος πρεσβύτερος Αντιοχείας κατά τούτον ἤκμαζε τὸν χρόνον, ἐν δὲ Πόντῳ
Μελέτιος ἐπίσκοπος· ἀνδρὲς εἰς παιδείαν θαυμαστοί. ὁ δὲ Πιερίος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ
λόγῳ τῶν εἰς τὸ Πάσχα ἐνίσταται 97. ὅτι Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος γυναῖκα εἶχε καὶ
αὐτὴν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καθίρωσεν τῆς πρὸς αὐτὴν κοινωνίας
ἀποταξάμενος, ἐνέτυχον δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἱεροσοφίας σπουδάσσας πλείοναν ἀναγκαίους
καὶ μάλιστα τῷ περὶ τῆς ἥξιοκάκου καὶ τῷ εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ Ωσίμη. Θεόδωρος δὲ τῆς
συνηγοροῦν ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρει γράψας δι᾽ ἐπόν ἐν τρισκαίδεκάτῳ λόγῳ φησίν ὅτι καὶ
Πιερίος Ἰσιδώρος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ἐμαρτύρησαν καὶ γιὰν ἐχοῦσιν ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρει
μέγιστον, ἐν δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τῷ εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ ἄγιου Παμφύλου αὐτὸς ὁ Πιερίος
πλείστα ὀφέλησεν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ.

98. Ανθίμος ὁ Νικομηδείας ἐπίσκοπος μαρτυρίῳ τελειοῦται σὺν πολλῷ πλήθει
Χριστιανῶν ἐμπερνημοῦ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις γεγενημένου, ὑπόλαβον ὁ
Διοκλητιανὸς Χριστιανὸς τοῦτο πεπράχθαι, διὰ τό ὄντ’ αὐτοῦ κατ’ αὐτῶν
dιωγμὸν σωφρονὸν κατ’ ἀγέλας τάς Χριστιανών μυρίαδας ἀνεβείς. 99. Διοκλητιανὸς
φρικοδέοτατον κατά Χριστιανὸν ἕγερε διωγμὸν καὶ πολλὰς μυριάδας Χριστιανῶν
cατὰ πάντα τόπον ἀνεβείς παντοτέα κατά τὸν μαρτύρου ἐπινοής βασάνους ἐν
οἷς καὶ μεθ’ ἐν ἐμαρτύρησαν Ἀδακτος μάγιστρος, ἐρ’ οὔ γὲγονε κατὰ τὴν
Ἀντίχειαν, τὸ τῆς γυναῖκος, τῆς βίου καὶ γένει καὶ κάλλει σύμμαχος περιβοήτου, ἢτις
σὺν δυσὶ θυγατράς παρθένοις, κάλλει καὶ συνέσεις διαβοήτους, μετὰ πολλάς φυγὰς
συσχεθείσα, φόβῳ τοῦ μὴ διαφαρμάθηναι αὐτῶν τῇ συφροσύνῃ, εἰσεῖν τὴν σὺν ταῖς
θυγατράς ἔρριψε κατὰ τοῦτο ποταμῷ. περὶ ἐν ζητητίαν, εἰ ἀρνηθοῦσιν εἰς
μάρτυρας. 100. Διοκλητιανὸς μετὰ πλῆθος τὸ ἄριστον τῶν ἑπὶ Χριστοῦ κατὰ
tόπον μαρτυρισμάτων, φειδοὶ δῆθεν τῶν υπηκόων, θάτερον τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν
ἐκάστον κατὰ τὴν προσέκασεν ἐξορύστεσθαι καὶ τῶν σκελῶν τὸ ἐν καταέρχεθαι.
101. Λουκιανὸς Αντιοχείας πρεσβύτερος ἐπὶ Διοκλητιανὸν ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ
ἐμαρτύρησαν. ἀνήρ λόγιος καὶ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἐμπερνητός, λέγει δὲ ἐν τοῖς
Χρυσοκῶν κανάσαν ὁ Εὐσέβιος ὅτι ἐν Ἑλενουπόλει τῆς Βυθνίας κεῖται ὁ ἄγιος. 102.
Ἀσκληπίος τίς ἐγένετο ἐπίσκοπος τῆς κατὰ Μαρκιῶνα πλάνης, ὃς σὺν Πέτρῳ τῷ
μαστωτῷ ἐν Καισαρείᾳ τῆς Παλαιστίνης πυρὶ παρεδόθη διὰ Χριστοῦ. ὁν
συναριθμηθένων Μητροδόρῳ τῷ σὺν Πολυκάρπῳ καὶ ταῖς γυναιξὶ καὶ ἀμφοτέροις
Μαρκιονισταῖς· Ἀρχ. Πρόμος καὶ Ἁλίας, οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι μάρτυρες, ἐν τούτῳ τὸ
χρόνῳ ἐν Ἀσκαλώνι εἰς ἐμαρτύρησαν.
Ἐκ τοῦ ἐννάτου βιβλίου.

103. Διοκλητιανὸς παράφρον ἐγένετο καὶ τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀξίωμα ἀποθέμενος ἰδιοτικὸν σχῆμα ἄκων ἀνέβαθεν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς ὁ Ἐρκούλιος, ὃς καὶ ἀγρόν τὸν βίον μετῆλλαξε. Διοκλητιανὸς δὲ μακρὰ νόσῳ μαρανόμενος ἐδαπανήθη. 104. Κωνστάντινον ὁ Κωνστάντινον πατὴρ εὐσεβῆς ἦν καὶ τὸν ὁυὸν ὁμοίως ἐπαιδεύσεν. καὶ τὸ καθ᾽ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Διοκλητιανὸν διωγμὴν οὐδαμὸς ἐκοινώνησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὅπι αὐτοῦ χριστιάνες ὁδῶς καὶ ἀκολούθως ἐπέτρεπαν καὶ τὸν ἄπαντα βίον εὐδαιμόνως ζῆσας μακρόσχος ἀπέθανεν. ἐπὶ παῦλο Κωνσταντίνο, ὃν καὶ Σεβαστὸν ζὸν ἀνηγόρευσεν, τῆς ἱδίας βασελείας κληρονόμον ἐπέλεπτον ἔλοιστο τοῦτον τῆς πατρίκιας υπάρχειν εὐσεβείας διδάσκει. καὶ Λικινίου δὲ τότε ψήφῳ τοῦ κοινοῦ βασιλείας ἀναδεικνύον, γὰμβρὸς ἐπ᾽ ἀδελφῆς Κωνσταντία τοῦμον Κωνσταντίνον γενόμενος, τῆς δὲ εὐσεβείας καὶ τῆς χριστότητος αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξόν καὶ ἐκφυός. Μαξιμίνου ὁ Γαλλέριος σηπεδόνι καὶ σκωλήκων βορᾶ τὸ σώμα τρυχόμενος προγράμμασι δημοσίους τὸν κατὰ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀνήκε διωγμὸν. 105. Μαξιμίνου τὸ τύραννο φθόνο τῆς Κωνσταντίνου καὶ Λικινίου ἀνηγορεύσεος Κάισαρ τὸ πρότερον τὸν βασιλέα εαυτὸν ἀναδεικνύα. 106. Μαξεντίου υποκρίθη τῆς περὶ ἡμᾶς εὐσεβεῖαν ὅστεν πάνδεια εἰργάσατο- μοιχείας γυναικῶν τῶν ἐν τέλει, φόνος καὶ ἀράπας καὶ τῶν τούτων χειρονο- γοτητίδον καὶ μαντείων μηδὲν πράττον χορίς καὶ ταύτα μὲν ἑν Ὀρέσθη Μαξεντίος. 107. Μαξιμίνου δὲ ἐπ᾽ ἀνατολῆς τὰ μείζονα τοὺτων εἰργάζετο κακά, δύο κακῶν ἀνατολὴν καὶ δύσιν κρατοῦτον, δέκα δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν κατὰ Κωνσταντῖνο διωγμὸν ἀναφερθεισαν. 108. Πέτρος οὐκάρτος Αλέξανδρεῖας καὶ Λουκιανὸς ὁ λόγιος πρεσβύτερος νὸν ἐμαρτήσαναν.
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109. Μαξιμίνου τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς ἐν στήλῃ καθ’ ἠμῶν ἀναγράψαντος ὡς Χριστιανῶν πάντων ἀναφερθέντων, ὡς φετο πάσης εὐθηνίας καὶ εὐκρασίας ἢ Ῥωμαίουν πολιτεία πλησθήσεται: λίμος καὶ λοιμὸς καὶ αὐχμὸς καὶ πᾶν ὅτι ἐστὶ κακὸν εἰπεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μετήλθε, ὅτι καὶ ἥν ἀνάγνωσης φοβερὰ καὶ φρικώδες τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν.

110. Κωνσταντίνος ὁ εὐσεβὴς εἰς τὴν κατὰ τῶν τυράννων διανέστη κατάλυσιν καὶ Μαξέντιος μὲν ἐν Ῥώμῃ κτίννυται ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ πολέμου κραταιοῦ γεγενημένου, ὅτε καὶ τὸ τοῦ στρατοῦ σημεῖον εἰς συμμαχίαν Θεὸς Κωνσταντίνῳ παρέσχετο. Μαξιμίνος δὲ μετ’ ὀλίγον ἐπ’ ἀνατολῇ Λικίνιου, οὔπω μανέντος, ἡττηθεὶς φεύγει. Κωνσταντῖνος δὲ εἰσελθὼν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ νόμους ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν ἀνηγόρευσεν. Μαξιμῖνος δὲ χρονίᾳ νόσῳ δαπανηθεὶς ἐτελεύτησεν.

111. Λικίνιος δὲ, πρὶν ἢ μανῆναι, εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν ἐλθὼν Θεότεκνον καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ γόητας μετὰ πολλὰς βασάνους αἰσχίστῳ θανάτῳ μετῆλθε, ἀναπυθόμενος τὰς γοητικὰς αὐτῶν ἐπινοίας.

Ἐκ τοῦ δεκάτου λόγου.

112. Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ θειοτάτου νόμους καὶ πράξεις ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν πανταχόσε γῆς καταπέμψαντος, τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνην λαβουσῶν, πᾶς τόπον ἐπινίκιον τῷ Χριστῷ ἑώρατον. καὶ Παυλῖνος ὁ Τύρου ἐπίσκοπος πανηγυρικὸν λόγον ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης προσεφώνησε τῷ βασιλεῖ.

113. Λικίνιος, ἐν ὑστέρῳ μανεί, ἐπιβουλὴν Κωνσταντίνῳ τῷ οὕτως αὐτὸν εὐεργετήσαντι κατειργάσατο, καὶ οὐ τοῦτο μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διωγμὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἀνερρίπισεν καὶ ἕτερα δεινὰ καθ’ ἡμῶν ἐπενόησεν τούς τε ἐν στρατείαις Χριστιανοὺς ἀναιρεῖσθαι προσέταξεν· ἐν οἷς καὶ τοὺς ἐν Σεβαστείᾳ μαρτυρήσαντας τεσσαράκοντας λόγος κατέχει κοσμηθῆναι τῷ μαρτυρίῳ. κατὰ Λικινίου κινεῖται Κωνσταντῖνος ἅμα Κρίσπῳ παιδὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτῷ βασιλεύοντι, καὶ Θεὸς τὸν Λικίνιον ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας Κωνσταντίνου καὶ τοῦ Κρίσπου κατέβαλεν. ἕως τούτων ἱστορεῖ ὁ Εὐσέβιος.

### VI. Passages in common between the EV and the Codex Athonensis Iviron 812

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EV 17 (p. 171,15-172,2)</th>
<th>Athenosin Iviron 812 (fr. 98.8 M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*&quot;Οτι αιτιαν τη πολιτικη κινησε παρεγε Γαίος Μάριος, έκτον γεγονος ύπατος, ή μεν γαρ βουλη των υπο του Μιθριδατου νεωτεριθεντων αισθομενη την τε Ασιαν ηδη και την Έλλαδα κατεληφροφως. Κορνηλιον Σουλλαν τον υπατον ηγεμονα τουδε του πολεμου προσεχισατο. έπει δε ουτος κατα την Καμπανιαν συν την πραγαμην διετεριβεν, τον κινηθηνα των συμμαχων πολεμου καθισταμενος, αναιρων δε ιπερ την τησε της ταραχης λειψαν, ο Μαριος επιθυμησας της επι την Ασιαν στρατηλασιας και προσλαβων Σουλπικιον τον δημαρχον, ανδρα μοχθηρων και μετα πας τος ανελευ τον Θεον επαπα, δε συγχωρων αυτος εις τος γινομενος, παρικεν απαθη, και δε αφικομενος αυθης προς τους στρατιωτας και τα πεπραγμενα διεξελων επαγει τη πολει συντεταγμενη την στρατιαν και κρατει των περι τον Μαριον αντιταξαμενων πρωτος τε Ρωμαιων συν οπλος εντος παρελθω εις της πολεως Σουλπικιων μεν τον δημαρχον καταμυσθενην προς το πολεμουντον αποσφατει, Μαριον δε φυγαδα της πολεως ***.</td>
<td>*Αιτιαν δε τη πολιτικη κινησε παρεγε Γαίος Μάριος, έκτον γεγονος ύπατος, ή μεν γαρ βουλη των υπο του Μιθριδατου νεωτεριθεντων αισθομενη την τε Ασιαν ηδη και την Έλλαδα κατεληφροφως. Κορνηλιον Σουλλαν τον υπατον ηγεμονα τουδε του πολεμου προσεχισητο. έπει δε ουτος κατα την Καμπανιαν συν την πραγαμην διετεριβεν, έτι το τον κινηθηνα μικρω προσθεν, ώσπερ ειρηται, των συμμαχων πολεμων καθισταμενων, αναιρων των ήπερ την τησε της ταραχης λειψαν, ο Μαριος επιθυμησας της επι την Ασιαν στρατηλασιας και προσλαβων Σουλπικιον τον δημαρχον, ανδρα μοχθηρων και μετα πας τος το ωμην και ωμητος την τη Ρωμην ταρασσων, βιαζεται πληθει και οπλος την βουλη αυτον αντιταξει το το Μιθριδατη, και τον Σουλλαν απο στρατοπεδου παρωντο και μετα τος τος ανελευ τον Θεον επαπα, δε συγχωρων αυτος εις τος γινομενος, παρικεν απαθη, και δε αφικομενος αυθης προς τους στρατιωτας, και τα πεπραγμενα διεξελων επαγει τη πολει συντεταγμενη την στρατιαν, και κρατει των περι τον Μαριον αντιταξαμενων πρωτος τε Ρωμαιων συν οπλος εντος παρελθω της πολεως, Σουλπικιον μεν τον δημαρχον καταμυσθενην προς το πολεμουντον αποσφατει, Μαριον δε φυγαδα της πολεως έλαυνε.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EV 18 (p. 172,3-173,9)</th>
<th>Athenosin Iviron 812 (fr.98.21 M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*&quot;Οτι ληζαντων των εμφυλων πολεμων φωνι και προγαφαη των επιπαρεων οικων διεδεχατο τη τη Ρωμην, ες παν επεζινοτο το το Σουλλο τοις αντιστασωταις, ως την Μαριων τελευτην ουκ απαλλαγη, αλλα μεταβολη τυραννιδος νομισηθη τη Ρωμαιοις. τα μεν γαρ πρωτα τους εχθρους των τοις πολιτην εκποδιων ποιησασαι διεγνωκως δια πας τος ωμητος επεξειη την τε πολιν και την άλην τη Ιταλιαν, τελευτων δε έστιν ουδε χρηματων ή κτηματων ένεκα επι ωφελεια των έαυτων φιλων διεφθειρεν. Λεγεται γουν Κοιντον άνδρα επιφανη, επεικη τε και σωφρονη, ουδε ετερας μεν γεγονοτα στασεως, αδοκιτως δεν τοις</td>
<td>*Ληζαντων δε ποτε των εφιμερων πολεμων ες παν επεζινοτο το το Σουλλο τοις αντιστασωταις, ως την Μαριων τελευτην ουκ απαλλαγη ως μεν γαρ πρωτα τους εχθρους των τοις πολιτην και ποιησασαι διεγνωκως δια πας τος ωμητος επεξειη την τε πολιν και την άλην τη Ιταλιαν, τελευτων δε έστιν ουδε χρηματων ή κτηματων ένεκα επι ωφελεια των έαυτων φιλων διεφθειρεν. Λεγεται γουν Κοιντον άνδα επιφανη, επεικη τε και σωφρονη, ουδε ετερας μεν γεγονοτα στασεως, αδοκιτως δεν τοις</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ανδρα ἐπιφανής, ἐπιεικῆς τε καὶ σῶφρονα, οὐδέτερας μὲν γεγονότα στάσεως, ἀδοκήτως δὲ ἐν τοῖς προγεγραμμένοις θεασάμενον ἑαυτὸν „οἷοι τάλας“ εἰπεῖν „δἰώκει με τὸ ἐν Ἀλβανοῖς χωρίον“. Καὶ ὅρθως γε Σαλλούστιος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος συγγραφεὺς ἔφη καλοῖς αὐτῶν ἐγχειρήσατο κάκιστον ἐπενημοῦνεν [τὸ] τέλος. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ τὴν Μαρίου καταβαλῶν δυναστεῖαν, ἀνδρὸς ἀρχηθὲν τε χαλεποῦ καὶ ἐπιτείναντος ἐν τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τὴν φύσιν παρέδωκε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τὴν πολιτείαν, θαυμαστὸν ἄν ἦν νῦν δὲ μέτριος τὰ πρῶτα καὶ πολιτικὸς φανείς καὶ δόξαι δημωφελὸς ἤγεμόνος παραχῶν ἐπείδη τῶν ἐναντίων ἐκράτησεν, αὐτὸς ἄντε ἐκεῖνων ἦν, καὶ τυραννίδα φάσκων ἐλάυνεν ἕκ τῆς πόλεως, ἔτεραν εἰσῆγε χαλεπωτέραν. Δικτάτωρα μὲν γὰρ ἀνείπεν εαυτῶν ἐμπλήκτα δὲ καὶ ἀπάνθρωπα ἐξ τοὺς πολίτας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπηκόους ὑπίπτωσεν ἐπὶ πολὺ διεπράττετο, οὐ μὴν ἄλλα οὕτω γε τῇ τύχῃ κατεπίστευσε πρὸς ἀπάσαν αὐτῷ μεταβολὴ δεξιῶς ἐσμοῦν, ὡστε πολλοὺς μὲν ἀνήρηκτος, καινότητα δὲ τοσαυτὴν εἰς τὴν πολιτείαν εἰσενεγκάμενον ἀποθέσατο τὴν ἀνυπεύθυνον ἄρχην καὶ τὸν δήμον ἀυθίς τῶν ὑπατικῶν ἄρχα•<e>ς</e>ς ἀποφηνά κύριον, καίτοι Λεπίδου παρελθείς εἰς τὴν ὑπατείαν διὰ τῆς Πομπηίου περὶ τὸν ἄνδρα πολιτείας προσδοκημένου, ἀνδρὸς θραυστάτου τε καὶ αὐτῷ μᾶλιστα πολεμίου. ἀλλ’ ὄμως ἐν ἰδίῳ τάξει καὶ ἱσορροπίᾳ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐντεύθην ἦν. Ἀποδειχθέντος δὲ ὑπάτου Λεπίδου, χαρίστοι τῷ γεγονότι τὸν Πομπηίον ἱδίων „εὑρετὴν“ ἀρχὴν „τῆς ἱσορροπίας, ὡς νεανία, ὅτι καὶ Κατούλῳ πρότερον ἀνηγόρεας Λεπίδου, τοῦ πάντων ἀρίστου τῶν πολιτῶν τὸν ἐμπληκτότατον· ὥρα μέντοι σιν κοπεῖν, ἀρίστου τῶν πολιτῶν τὸν ἐμπληκτότατον· ὥρα μέντοι σιν κοπεῖν, ὅπως ἵσχυρόν γεγονότα καταγωγία τὸν ἀντίπαλον.“ τοῦτο μὲν οὖν τὸν Σύλλασσα Ὅσπερ ἀπεθέσπισε. Ἔτι· ὄλιγον γὰρ ἐξυβρίσας ἐς τὴν ἄρχην ὁ Λεπίδος πολέμιος κατέστη τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πομπηίον.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>E V 18 (p. 173,10-26)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Athone n ıs Ivron 812 (fr. 98.22 M)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Κινήσεως τε αὕθις ἐμφυλίου γενομένης Ἔβλαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄνυπεύθυνον ἀρχὴν ἢ Ἐρμαίων βουλή προεβάλετο, τῶν γὰρ ἰππέων ἅμα πάντων συμφραζαμένων οὐκ ἁνεκτὸν ἦν τοῖς ἐν τέλει, ὡς μὲν οὖν Σύλλας ἐπὶ τὴν εἰρημένην ἐλθὼν ἀρχὴν σύνθημα τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἐταλίαν ἀνδρᾶσι λαθὼν ἀπαντας τούς τῆς Ἐρμῆς ἔδωκεν, ἑγχειρίδια τα ἄνωτος ἀφίημι κομιζομένους εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν πόλιν προσέταξεν, ὅπηνικα τῆς Ἐρᾶς ἡμέραν πανηγυρίζουσι Ἐρμαίων, ὡς ἄν δὴ ἄυτῶν τοίς τῆς πόλεως ἰππέων ἁπεδία τέρας ἐπεδίδοσθαι. Ὅ μὲν οὖν περὶ τὴν Ἐταλίαν ὄχλος ἐναντία τοῖς στρατιῶταις φρονών κατὰ τὴν ὡρισμένην ἀπήντησεν. Ἀρξάμενος τοις ἐκ τῆς ἐμφυλίου κινήσεως ἅμα τε καὶ τὸν δήμον προσαλαβόμενος πολλοὺς τῶν ἰππέων διεφθείρει. τούτων δὲ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν προτομέων, ὡς Σύλλας βουληθεὶς τὸν ὄχλον τῆς ἐμφυλίου ταραχῆς ἀποστῆσαι, διεσφορίζατο μηνόσεις τινάς ἐκ τῶν πανταχόθεν υπηκόων, βαρβάρων ἐπιδρομάς ἐπιφανεύσας, καὶ εὐθέως ἀναλαβὼν ἀπαντά τα στρατεύματα ἐπιστήμης τούτων κινήσεως ἐκ τῶν παντός πλῆθους τῆς πόλεως ἀπήλλαξεν | Κινήσεως τε αὕθις ἐμφυλίου γενομένης, Ἔβλαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄνυπεύθυνον ἀρχὴν ἢ Ἐρμαίων βουλή προεβάλετο τῶν γὰρ ἰππέων ἅμα πάντων συμφραζαμένων καὶ μᾶλλον ἁρχεῖν ἢ περ ἁρχεῖαι βουλομένων, πολλάκις τε σύν τῇ συγκλήτῳ βουλή ἐς ἐναντίωσιν ἐλθεῖν πειραμένων, οὐκ ἁνεκτὸν ἦν τοῖς ἐν τέλει. Ὅ μὲν οὖν Σύλλας ἐπὶ τὴν εἰρημένην αὕθις διελθὼν ἀρχὴν, σύνθημα τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἐταλίαν ἀνδρᾶσι, λαθὼν ἀπαντας τούς τῆς Ἐρμῆς, ἔδωκεν, ἑγχειρίδια τα ἄνωτος ἀφίημι κομιζομένους εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν πόλιν προσέταξεν, ὅπην νίκα τὴν Ἐρᾶν μητέρα Ἐρμαίων δήμος πανηγυρίζῃ ἀρξεῖαι· αὕτη τε κατὰ τὴν πρώτην ἱανουαρίου μηνός εἰσώθεν ἀγεσθαι ὡς ἄν δὴ ἄυτῶν τούς τῆς πόλεως ἰππέως ἰππέως διαχρήσηται. Ὅ μὲν οὖν περὶ τὴν Ἐταλίαν ὄχλος ἐναντία τοῖς στρατιῶταις φρονών κατὰ τὴν ὡρισμένην ἀπήντησεν. Ἀρξάμενος τοις ἐκ τῆς ἐμφυλίου κινήσεως, ἅμα τε καὶ τὸν δήμον προσαλαβόμενος πολλοὺς τῶν ἰππέων διεφθείρει. τούτων δὲ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν πρατημέων μηνόσεις ἐκ τῶν πανταχόθεν υπηκόων ἢ Ἐρᾶς ἀρίθμοι, βαρβάρων τοῖς ἐπιδρομάς ἀποφαίνεσθαι καὶ τούς ὑπάτους καὶ στρατηγοὺς Ἐρμαίων τὴν ταυτίσαν καταψήδεις τάς χώρας ὑπομιμησκεύσεις. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πλοῦταρχου εἰρήκαμεν. Ὁς δὲ φησι Διδώρος, οὐδὲν τούτων ἀπηγέλθῃ, ἀλλ’ ὁ Σύλλας, βουληθεὶς τὸν ὄχλον τῆς ἐμφυλίου ταραχῆς ἀποστῆσαι, ταῦτα διεσφόρατο. Καὶ εὐθέως ἀναλαβὼν ἀπαντά τα στρατεύματα, ἐπιστήμης τα ἄνωτος στρατηγούς, τοῦ παντός πλῆθους τῆς πόλιν ἀπήλλαξε.
VII. John of Antioch in the EPL,1 the Athonensis Iviron 812,2 the EC, and the Suda
EPL 35

Suda Β 396

ΕΙ 22 p. 66,5-14

Ὅτι Σκηπίωνος μαχομένου τοῖς Ἴβηρσιν οἱ
βάρβαροι τοῦτον δείσαντες ἀποκτείνουσι τὸν αὐτῶν
βασιλέα Βορίανθον. ὧν ἀφικόμενοί τινες πρὸς
Σκηπίωνα ἆθλα παρ’ αὐτοῦ τῶν πεπραγμένων λαβεῖν
ἠξίουν. ὁ δὲ ἀποκρίνεται μηδαμῶς εἶναι Ῥωμαίοις
ἔννομον ἐν ἐπαίνῳ ποιεῖσθαι τὰς κατὰ τῶν στρατηγῶν
τοῖς ἀρχομένοις ἐπιχειρουμένας ἐπιβουλάς.

Βορίανθος: ὅτι βάρβαροί τινες κτείνουσι Βορίανθον
τυραννήσαντα, ταύτῃ προσάγεσθαι τὸν τῶν Ῥωμαίων
στρατηγὸν ἡγούμενοι ἐς εὔνοιαν. καὶ δὴ ἀφικόμενοι τῶν τοῦ
Βοριάνθου αὐθεντῶν τινες ἆθλα τῶν περὶ τὸν ἄνδρα
πεπραγμένων ἠξίουν παρὰ Σκιπίωνος κομίζεσθαι. ὁ δὲ
Σκιπίων ἀποκρίνεται, μηδαμῶς εἶναι Ῥωμαίοις ἔννομον ἐν
ἐπαίνῳ ποιεῖσθαι τὰς κατὰ τῶν στρατηγῶν τοῖς ἀρχομένοις
ἐπιχειρουμένας ἐπιβουλάς.

ὧν μάλιστα πάντων ἕνεκα δείσαντες οἱ βάρβαροι
κτείνουσιν τὸν Βορίανθον τέσσαρα καὶ δέκα Ῥωμαίοις ἔτη
ἐναντία πολεμήσαντα, ταύτῃ προσάγεσθαι τὸν ἡγούμενον
τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς στρατιᾶς ἐς εὔνοιαν αὐτῶν καὶ φειδὼ
λογισάμενοι. καὶ δὴ ἀφικόμενοι τῶν αὐθεντῶν τοῦ
Βοριάνθου τινὲς ἆθλα τῶν περὶ τὸν ἄνδρα πεπραγμένων
ἠξίουν παρὰ τοῦ ὑπάτου κομίζεσθαι οἷς ὁ Σκιπίων
ἀποκρίνεται, μηδαμῶς εἶναι Ῥωμαίοις ἔννομον ἐν ἐπαίνῳ
ποιεῖσθαι τὰς κατὰ τῶν στρατηγῶν τοῖς ἀρχομένοις
ἐπιχειρουμένας ἐπιβουλάς.

EPL 37

Athonensis Iviron 812 (fr. 98.7 M)

Suda Σ 1337

Ὅτι μέλλοντος ἐν Ῥώμῃ τοῦ ἐμφυλίου ἐγείρεσθαι
πολέμου ἄλλα τε πολλὰ Λίβιός τε καὶ Διόδωρος
ἱστόρησαν καὶ ἐξ ἀνεφέλου τοῦ ἀέρος καὶ αἰθρίας
πολλῆς
ἦχον
ἀκουσθῆναι
σάλπιγγος
ὀξὺν
ἀποτεινούσης καὶ θρηνώδη φθόγγον. Καὶ τοὺς μὲν
ἀκούσαντας ἅπαντας ἔκφρονας ὑπὸ τοῦ δέους
γενέσθαι, τοὺς δὲ Τυρρηνῶν μάντεις μεταβολὴν τοῦ
γένους καὶ μετακόσμησιν ἀποφήνασθαι σημαίνειν τὸ
τέρας· εἶναι μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ὀκτὼ γένη,
διαφερόντων τοῖς βίοις καὶ τοῖς ἤθεσιν ἀλλήλων·
ἑκάστῳ δὲ ἀφωρίσθαι χρόνον ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ,
συμπεραινόμενον ἐνιαυτοῦ μεγάλου περιόδῳ. τῆς δ’
οὖν προτέρας περιόδου τελευτώσης καὶ ἑτέρας

Ἐντεῦθεν ὁ ἐμφύλιος ἀνεφάνη πόλεμος β καὶ ξ καὶ χ [ἔτει,
βραχὺ] μετὰ τὸν ἀν [...] θ [...] καθ’ ὃ ἡ π[ρὸς Μιθρι]δάτην
ἤρξατο Ῥωμαίοις ἀπ[έχθει]α. Ἐπισημῆναι δὲ τὴν τῶν
μελλόντων κακῶν φορὰν ἄ[λλα τε] πολλὰ Λίβιός τε καὶ
Διόδωρος ἱστόρησαν καὶ ἐξ ἀνεφέλου τοῦ ἀέρος καὶ αἰθρίας
πολλῆς ἦχον ἀκουσθῆναι σάλπιγγος ὀξὺν ἀποτεινούσης καὶ
θρηνώδη φθόγγον. Καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀκούσαντας ἅπαντας
ἔκφρονας ὑπὸ τοῦ δέους γενέσθαι, τοὺς δὲ Τυρρηνῶν μάντεις
μεταβολὴν τοῦ γένους καὶ μετακόσμησιν ἀποφήνασθαι
σημαίνειν τὸ τέρας. Εἶναι μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ὀκτὼ γένη,
διαφερόντων τοῖς βίοις καὶ τοῖς ἤθεσιν ἀλλήλων· ἑκάστῳ δὲ
ἀφωρίσθαι χρόνον ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, συμπεραινόμενον ἐνιαυτοῦ
μεγάλου περιόδῳ. Τῆς δ’ οὖν προτέρας περιόδου τελευτώσης

Σύλλας, Σύλλου: ὄνομα κύριον. ὅτι ἐπὶ Σύλλα τοῦ ὑπάτου
ὁ ἐμφύλιος Ῥωμαίων ἀνήφθη πόλεμος. ἐπισημῆναι δὲ τὴν
τῶν μελλόντων κακῶν φορὰν Λίβιός φησι καὶ Διόδωρος.
ἐξ ἀνεφέλου τοῦ ἀέρος καὶ αἰθρίας πολλῆς ἦχον
ἀκουσθῆναι σάλπιγγος, ὀξὺν ἀποτεινούσης καὶ θρηνώδη
φθόγγον. καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀκούσαντας ἅπαντας ἔκφρονας ὑπὸ
δέους γενέσθαι· τοὺς δὲ Τυρρηνῶν μάντεις μεταβολὴν τοῦ
γένους καὶ μετακόσμησιν ἀποφήνασθαι σημαίνειν τὸ τέρας.
εἶναι μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ηʹ γένη, διαφέροντα τοῖς βίοις καὶ
τοῖς ἤθεσιν ἀλλήλων· ἑκάστῳ δὲ ἀφωρίσθαι χρόνον ὑπὸ τοῦ
θεοῦ, συμπεραινόμενον ἐνιαυτοῦ μεγάλου περιόδῳ. τῆς
γοῦν προτέρας περιόδου τελευτώσης καὶ ἑτέρας
ἐνισταμένης, κινεῖσθαί τι σημεῖον ἐκ γῆς ἢ οὐρανοῦ

1
2

The numeration of the excerpts is the one given by Mariev (2008) in his edition of John of Antioch .
The numeration of the excerpts is the one given by Mariev (2008) in his edition of John of Antioch.
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θαυμάσιον, δὲ δήλων εὐθὺς τόσα τα τοιαῦτα σοφοῖς γίνεσθαι, ὃτι καὶ τρόποις ἄλλοις καὶ βιοῖς ἄνθρωποι γρόμενοι γέγονασι καὶ θεοὶ ήτον τῶν προτέρων μέλοντες.

Athenonisi Iviron 812 (fr. 98.11 M)

‘Ωτι Ρωμαίοι κατὰ τὴν πρὸς τὴν Μυθριδάτου στρατιάν μέχρι εἰς φυγήν ἐμπρόσθησαν· ὁ δὲ Σύλλας ἀποθεὶ Τᾶμπαν καὶ σημεῖον στρατευομένων ἄρπάσας οὕθεν διὰ τῶν φευγόντων εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους, βοῶν ὡς ἐγὼ καὶ ἄπειροι ζωῆς ἄλλοις καὶ φυγῆς ἔκληκα θάνατον ἀνταλλαξάμενοι, ὑμεῖς δὲ, ὁ ἐννέασιν μὲν γὰρ Ρωμαίοι τὰ πρῶτα καὶ προτροπαίαν δρεγγον· ἐπεὶ δὲ, Σύλλας ἀποθεὶ τοῦ ἱπποῦ καὶ σημεῖον στρατευομένων ἄρπάσας οὕθεν διὰ τῶν φευγόντων εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους βοῶν, ὡς ἐγὼ καὶ ἄπειροι ζωῆς ἀπευδόκητος καὶ φυγῆς ἔκληκά θάνατον ἀλλαξάμενος, ὑμεῖς δὲ, ὁ συστηράτωσα, ἦν ἐροτήτι τοῖς ποὺ τῶν Σύλλαν ἀπολογείται.

**EPL 40**

*Athenson Iviron 812 (fr. 98.19 M)*

Ὅτι Ἡμικρὸν τοῦ εὐτύχου προσαγερείν ἄγιελεπέτει καὶ ποτε θέας αὐτῆς τῆς Ορθρίκγος φαίνη τοῦ Ἐπιστρεφεῖν Βαλλαρίου εξεπίστηκεν τὸν Σύλλου πορευομένου ἐπιβαλεῖ τὴν χείρα καὶ κροκόδιον τοῦ ιματίου πασχαί: τοῦ δὲ εἰπτραφέντος, «οὐδὲν δεῖν» εἰπέν, «αὐτόκτορ ἄλλα βούλαιμα, καγο μικρὸν εὐμυθίας μεταβαλεῖν». Τὸν δὲ υπερπιθηκηθεί το τρήθεστε καὶ μετὰ μικρόν αγαγέσθαι τὴν γυναίκα πρὸς γάμον, τῆς Μετελίνης ἡ δή τελθκήσια.

**EPL 41**

*Athenson Iviron 812 (fr. 98.21 M)*

Ὅτι Σύλλου καὶ Μαρίου στασιασάντων τοῦ τριπλακτέον τῶν προγάματος ἀπότειμα τοῖς τῆς τοῦ Μαρίου τελευτῆν εἰς πάν ἐπέλεξεν Σύλλος τοῖς ἀντιστασιάσοις, ὡς τῆς Μαρίου τελευτῆν αὐτῆς ἀπαίληης ἀλλὰ μεταβάλημα τυραννίδος νομισθηκα-πάση γὰρ εἰς αὐτοῦς ὁμότιτι χρώμενος τελευτῶν ἐστὶν ὡς χρηματῶν ή κτημάτων ἕνεκα ἀπ’ ὑπερείλαθον τῶν ἀντιστασιάσοις, ἧθελαμένον ἀλλὰ μεταβάλημα τυραννίδος. εἰπέν, διὸ καὶ τῆς ἑαυτῶν μετὰ μικρόν εὐμυθίας μεταβαλεῖν. Ἐντὸς μὲν γεγονότα στάσεως, ἀδόκητος δὲ ἐν τοῖς προγεγραμμένοις θεασάμενον εὐτύχα, «Οἶμοι, τάλας, εἰπέν, διόκει με τὸ ἐν Ἀλβανοῖς χωρίον».

**EPL 42**

*Athenson Iviron 812 (fr. 98.21 M)*

Ὅτι ἁπαδευθύντος ὦπατον τοῦ Λεπίδου, χαίροντα Σύλλου τῆς γεγονότο Ποιμηνίδιον ἱδόν, «ἐγένετο διῆρη, τῆς σπουδῆς, ὃ νεανία, ὃ Κατούλου πρῶτερον ἀποδειχθήνετος δὲ ὦπατον Λεπίδου, χαίροντα τῆς γεγονότο Ποιμηνίδιον ἱδόν, «ἐγένετο διῆρη, τῆς σπουδῆς, ὃ νεανία, ὃ Κατούλου πρῶτερον ἀνθρωποφόρεσα Λεπίδου, τοῦ πάντων ἀποδειχθήνετος δὲ ὦπατον Λεπίδου, χαίροντα τῆς γεγονότο Ποιμηνίδιον ἱδόν, «ἐγένετο διῆρη, τῆς σπουδῆς, ὃ νεανία, ὃ Κατούλου πρῶτερον ἀνθρωποφόρεσα Λεπίδου, τοῦ πάντων
ἀνηγόρευσας Λέπιδον, τοῦ πάντων ἀρίστου πολιτῶν
όρα μέντοι σοι σκοπεῖν ὡς ἰσχυρὸν γεγονότα
καταγωνίσῃ τὸν ἀντίπαλον.» τοῦτο μὲν ὁ Σύλλας
ὡσπερ ἀπεθέσπισε· μετ’ ὀλίγον γὰρ ἐξυβρίσας ἐς τὴν
ἀρχὴν ὁ Λέπιδος, πολέμιος κατέστη τοῖς περὶ τὸν
πάντων ἀρίστου τῶν πολιτῶν ὁ Σύλλας ὡσπερ ἀπεθέσπισε· μετ’ ὀλίγον γὰρ ἐξυβρίσας ἐς τὴν
ἀρχὴν ὁ Λέπιδος, πολέμιος κατέστη τοῖς περὶ τὸν
Πομπήιον.
## Appendix II: Tables

### I. The *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *Parastaseis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpta Anonymi</th>
<th>Parastaseis</th>
<th>Excerpta Anonymi</th>
<th>Parastaseis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ στηλῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ Σοφίᾳ (= Excerpta Anonymi 9,14-25)</td>
<td>Ch. 11</td>
<td>Περὶ στηλῶν Σοφίας καὶ Ἀραβίλας (= Excerpta Anonymi 13,18-19)</td>
<td>Ch. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ στήλης Μανάθα στρατηγοῦ (= Excerpta Anonymi 9,26-10,14)</td>
<td>Ch. 12</td>
<td>Περὶ στηλῶν Ἀρκάδιου καὶ θεοδόσιοῦ (= Excerpta Anonymi 13,20-22)</td>
<td>Ch. 35a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ στηλῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ τῆς καμάρας τοῦ φόρου (= Excerpta Anonymi 10,15-20)</td>
<td>Ch. 16</td>
<td>Περὶ στηλῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ τρίβουναλίῳ (= Excerpta Anonymi 13,23-26)</td>
<td>Ch. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ ἐν τῷ βορείῳ μέρει τοῦ φόρου (= Excerpta Anonymi 10,21-25)</td>
<td>Ch. 17</td>
<td>Θέαμα α´ (= Excerpta Anonymi Ch. 37 13,27-14,13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ στήλης ἑφίππου ἐν τῷ μιλίῳ (= Excerpta Anonymi 10,26-28)</td>
<td>Ch. 18</td>
<td>Θέαμα β´ (= Excerpta Anonymi 14,14-24)</td>
<td>Ch. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ στηλῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ περιπάτῳ (= Excerpta Anonymi 10,29-32)</td>
<td>Ch. 19</td>
<td>Περὶ Ἄρειοῦ (= Excerpta Anonymi 14,25-31)</td>
<td>Ch. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ Ἑρωλόφου (= Excerpta Anonymi 11,1-7)</td>
<td>Ch. 20</td>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ κυναρίου (= Excerpta Anonymi 15,1-16)</td>
<td>Ch. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῶν β´ σταυρῶν τῶν ληστῶν (= Excerpta Anonymi 11,8-12)</td>
<td>Ch. 23</td>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ Ἀμασίρηνοῦ (= Excerpta Anonymi 15,17-21)</td>
<td>Ch. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ γεφύρας (= Excerpta Anonymi 11,13-22)</td>
<td>Ch. 22-24</td>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ βοῶς (= Excerpta Anonymi 15,22-2)</td>
<td>Ch. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ οὔσαν (= Excerpta Anonymi 11,23-27)</td>
<td>Ch. 25</td>
<td>Περὶ γοργονειδῶν (= Excerpta Anonymi 15,30-16,7)</td>
<td>Ch. 44a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ στήλης εὐνούχου τινὸς ἐν τῇ χελώνῃ (= Excerpta Anonymi 11,28-12,6)</td>
<td>Ch. 26-27</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν Κονταρίων (= Excerpta Anonymi 16,8-14)</td>
<td>Ch. 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ κυνηγῷ στηλῶν (= Excerpta Anonymi 12,7-23)</td>
<td>Ch. 28</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν Βυγλεντίου (= Excerpta Anonymi 16,15-17)</td>
<td>Ch. 54-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῶν β´ στηλῶν Βηρίνης τῆς γυναικὸς τοῦ μεγάλου Λέοντος (= Excerpta Anonymi 12,24-32)</td>
<td>Ch. 29</td>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ Φιλαδελφίου (= Excerpta Anonymi 16,18-31)</td>
<td>Ch. 56-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ Εὐμηνίας τῆς γυναικὸς Ἱουστίνου (= Excerpta Anonymi 13,1-3)</td>
<td>Ch. 30-31</td>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ ἐν τῷ Φιλαδελϕίῳ σταυρῷ (= Excerpta Anonymi 17,1-6)</td>
<td>Ch. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῆς Ἀρκαδίας εἰς Ἀρκαδιανᾶς (= Excerpta Anonymi 13,4-9)</td>
<td>Ch. 32</td>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ σεβάτου (= Excerpta Anonymi 17,7-15)</td>
<td>Ch. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ στήλης Πουλχερίας (= Excerpta Anonymi 13,10-12)</td>
<td>Ch. 33</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Ῥώμης στηλῶν (= Excerpta Anonymi 17,16-18)</td>
<td>Ch. 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ στηλῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ καμάρα τοῦ μιλίου (= Excerpta Anonymi 13,13-16)</td>
<td>Ch. 34</td>
<td>Περὶ τῆς γεννώσης θήρας ἐν τῷ Ἰπποδρομίῳ (= Excerpta Anonymi 17,19-23)</td>
<td>Ch. 61a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpta Anonymi</td>
<td>Parastaseis</td>
<td>Excerpta Anonymi</td>
<td>Parastaseis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῆς καθέζομένης (= Excerpta Anonymi 17,24-27)</td>
<td>Ch. 61b</td>
<td>Περὶ Ἀετίου (= Excerpta Anonymi 21,12-21,15)</td>
<td>Ch. 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῆς ιάινης (= Excerpta Anonymi 17,28-30)</td>
<td>Ch. 62</td>
<td>Περὶ Ἄσπαρος (= Excerpta Anonymi 21,16-21,19)</td>
<td>Ch. 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῶν ἐπτὰ φιλοσόφων (= Excerpta Anonymi 17,31 - 18,24)</td>
<td>Ch. 64</td>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ Μοδίου (= Excerpta Anonymi 21,20-21,23)</td>
<td>Ch. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ Ἀσκληπιοδώρου (= Excerpta Anonymi 18,25-31)</td>
<td>Ch. 65</td>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ ταύρου (= Excerpta Anonymi 19,1-4)</td>
<td>Ch. 66-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ Φιλαδελφίου (= Excerpta Anonymi 19,5-11)</td>
<td>Ch. 70</td>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ νεωρίου (= Excerpta Anonymi 19,17-20)</td>
<td>Ch. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ Ζευξίππου (= Excerpta Anonymi 19,22-23)</td>
<td>Ch. 73</td>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ ἀγωγοῦ (= Excerpta Anonymi 19,24-25)</td>
<td>Ch. 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῆς κινστέρνης βασιλικῆς (= Excerpta Anonymi 19,26-29)</td>
<td>Ch. 75</td>
<td>Περὶ στήλης τοῦ ἄρμαμέντου (= Excerpta Anonymi 19,30-20,2)</td>
<td>Ch. 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ στήλης τοῦ ἄρμαμέντου (= Excerpta Anonymi 19,30-20,2)</td>
<td>Ch. 77</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Νικομηδείας (= Excerpta Anonymi 20,3-20,6)</td>
<td>Ch. 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῶν Μαξιμιανοῦ (= Excerpta Anonymi 20,7-20,9)</td>
<td>Ch. 79</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν Θεραπόν (= Excerpta Anonymi 20,10-20,13)</td>
<td>Ch. 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ Άρτεμιδος (= Excerpta Anonymi 20,14-20,16)</td>
<td>Ch. 81</td>
<td>Περὶ στηλῶν ἐν τῇ Χάλκῃ τοῦ παλατίου (= Excerpta Anonymi 20,17-20,19)</td>
<td>Ch. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ τῆς ἐν τῷ Ζευξίππῳ (= Excerpta Anonymi 20,20-20,22)</td>
<td>Ch. 83</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν ἐπτῶν (= Excerpta Anonymi 20,23-20,25)</td>
<td>Ch. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περὶ Περσέως (= Excerpta Anonymi 20,26-21,11)</td>
<td>Ch. 85</td>
<td>Περὶ Περιφέρεις (= Excerpta Anonymi 20,26-21,11)</td>
<td>Ch. 86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. The section Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων in the Excerpta Anonymi, the Patria II, the Codex Vaticanus gr. 468 (V), and John Lydus’ De Mensibus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpta Anonymi</th>
<th>Patria II</th>
<th>Vaticanus gr. 468 (V)</th>
<th>John Lydus’ De Mensibus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 4,12-19:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος ἦσος τῆς Ἰανουαρίου</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος ἦσος τῆς Ἰανουαρίου</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος τῆς Ἰανουαρίου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 4,20-27:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος κρατούντος δόρυ</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος κρατούντος δόρυ</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος κατέχοντος δόρυ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 4,28-31:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος κρατούντος κιθάραν</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος κρατούντος κιθάραν</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος κατέχοντος κιθάραν epὶ χερσὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 5,1-14:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος τοῦ ἐν τῷ Λύγουστέωρ ἐφίππου κρατούντος σταυρὸν καὶ σφαίραν</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος τοῦ ἐν τῷ Λύγουστεώρ ἐφίππου κρατούντος σταυρὸν καὶ σφαίραν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 5,15-19:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος ἔχοντος φαλίδα χαλκῆν</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος κατέχοντος φαλίδα</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος κατέχοντος φαλίδα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 5,20-23:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος βαστάζοντος πύργους</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος βαστάζοντος πύργους</td>
<td>De Mensibus, 4.63.2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 5,24-6,3:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος κτένα φέροντος</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος κτένα φέροντος</td>
<td>De Mensibus, 2.11.14-16 and 4.64.57-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 6,4-7:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος τοῦ Ἱρακλέους βαστάζοντος εἰς ἀριστέρα χειρὶ τρία μῆλα</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος ἦσος τῆς Ἱρακλέους βαστάζοντος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 6,8-17:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος τοῦ Διὸς</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος τοῦ Διὸς</td>
<td>De Mensibus 4.67.11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 6,18-27:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτου πτερωτοῦ τοῦ Ἐρμοῦ</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτου πτερωτοῦ τοῦ Ἐρμοῦ</td>
<td>De mensibus 4.76.59-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 6,28-32:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτου τῆς Εὐγνωμοσύνης</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτου τῆς Εὐγνωμοσύνης</td>
<td>De mensibus 4.76.59-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 7,1-12:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτου Πριάπου</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτου τοῦ Πριάπου</td>
<td>De mensibus 4.76.59-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 7,13-16:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτου τῆς Γῆς</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτου τῆς Γῆς</td>
<td>De mensibus 4.76.59-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 7,17-25:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτου ἔχοντος ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ κέρατα</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτου ἔχοντος ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ κέρατα</td>
<td>De mensibus 4.76.59-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc.An. 7,26-8,2:</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων τοῦ Ἐρμοῦ βαστάζοντος μάρσιππον</td>
<td>Περὶ ἀγαλμάτος τοῦ Ἐρμοῦ βαστάζοντος μάρσιππον</td>
<td>De mensibus 4.76.59-73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. The transmission of Malalas’ *Chronographia* through the *Exc.Salm.II*, the *Suda*, and the *Codex Parisinus gr. 1630* (B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malalas, <em>Chronographia</em></th>
<th><em>Exc.Salm.II</em></th>
<th><em>Suda</em></th>
<th>B (ff. 235r-239r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia I</em> 7-8</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 1-3</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> Z 160</td>
<td>235r,15-235v,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia I</em> 11</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 4</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> Θ 417</td>
<td>235v,10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia I</em> 12</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 5</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> Π 1500, 14-17</td>
<td>235v,20-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia I</em> 13</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 6</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> Ζ 160</td>
<td>23v,25-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia I</em> 14</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 7</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> H 661</td>
<td>236r,13-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia I</em> 15</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>236r,18-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia II</em> 1</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia II</em> 3</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 10</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> Σ 867</td>
<td>236r,32-236v,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia II</em> 4</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 11</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> E 3038</td>
<td>236v,2-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia II</em> 6</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 12</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> I 453</td>
<td>236v,18-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia II</em> 11</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 13</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> M 406</td>
<td>237r,9-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia II</em> 15</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia II</em> 18</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 15</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> Σ 253, 5-8; Σ 254, 30-34</td>
<td>237v,14-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia III</em> 9</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 17</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> I 422</td>
<td>237v,28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia III</em> 12</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 19</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> X 79</td>
<td>238r,5-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia IV</em> 3</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 20</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> K 2078</td>
<td>238r,20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia IV</em> 5</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 21</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> Π 2506, 2-8</td>
<td>238r,25-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia IV</em> 9</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 22</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> Π 2506, 8-21</td>
<td>238v,1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia IV</em> 18</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 23</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> Δ 250</td>
<td>238v,4-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia V</em> 2</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 24</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> A 23</td>
<td>238v,27-239r8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia V</em> 9</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 26</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> T 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia V</em> 24</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia V</em> 8</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia VII</em> 4</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 30</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> P 146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia VII</em> 5</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia VII</em> 14</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 32</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> Π 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia VII</em> 17-18</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia VII</em> 19-20</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia VII</em> 43</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia VII</em> 35</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia VII</em> 38</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 39</td>
<td><em>Suda</em> A 4126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia VII</em> 40</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia VII</em> 41</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia VII</em> 42</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronographia VII</em> 43</td>
<td><em>Exc.Salm.II</em>. 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. The common use of passages from the CD tradition in the *Exc.Salm.II* and the *Excerpta Anonymi*

<p>| Direct tradition (Laurentianus Plut. 70,8 &amp; Marcianus 395) | | | |
| Xiph. = Xiphilini epitome | Exc.Salm.II 44 | EA 29,19-21 | |
| EVetV = Excerpta de Virtutibus et Vitiis | Πρὸ δὲ μᾶς ἡμέρας τοῦ βασάνου αὐτοῦ, ἔδωξεν ὅραν ἢ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ πετωκύιαν τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ | Ἡ δὲ γαμετὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ νυκτί, ἐν οἷς ἔδωξεν ὅραν τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ Καίσαρος πᾶσαν συμπεπτωκύιαν | |
| CD 44,17,1 (Laur. Plut. 70,8 f. 140v) | | | |
| ἐν γάρ τῇ νυκτὶ ἐν ἡ ἐσφάγη, ἢ τε γυνὴ αὐτοῦ τὴν τε οἰκίαν σφῶν συμ-πεπτωκέναι καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα συντετρώσθαι τε ὑπὸ τινων καὶ ἐς τὸν κόλπον αὐτῆς καταφυγεῖν ἔδωξε | | |
| CD 37,52,2 (Laur. Plut. 70,8 f. 28r) | Exc.Salm.II 44 | EA 29,25-27 | |
| τῇ μητρὶ συγγίγνεσθαι ὅναρ ἔδωξε | Γάϊος Ἰούλιος Καίσαρ νέος ὡν, ἔδωξε καθ’ ὑπνοις συνουσίαζεν τῇ ἱδίᾳ μητρὶ | Ὡ γὰρ Καίσαρ Γάϊος Ἰούλιος νέος ὡν ἔδωξεν ἐν τοῖς ὑπονοίς συνουσίαζεν τῇ οἰκείᾳ μητρὶ. | |
| CD 45,1,3 (Marc. 395 f. 8v) | | EA 29,28-30 | |
| πρὶν τε ἢ ἐς τὸ φῶς ἔξεσται, ἔδωξεν ὅναρ τὰ σπλάγχνα ἑαυτῆς ἐς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναφέρεσθαι καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐπεκτείνεσθαι | ἡμέρας μᾶς πρὸ τεχθῆναι τούτον, ἐδὲν ἢ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, ὡς τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτῆς ἐξαρπαγέντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔφερε. | Ἡ δὲ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἀὐγοῦστου πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τοῦ τεκείν αὐτὴν ἔθεσατο ένυπνιον ὡς τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτῆς ἐξαρπαγέντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναφέρετο. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD 45,1,3 (Marc. 395 f. 8v)</th>
<th>CD 45,1,3-5 (Marc. 395 f. 8v)</th>
<th>CD 45,2,1 (Xiph. 37,8-38,13)</th>
<th>Exc.Salm.II 45</th>
<th>Exc.Salm.II 45</th>
<th>EA 29,31-33</th>
<th>EA 30,1-7</th>
<th>EA 30,8-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ νυκτὶ καὶ ὁ Ὀκτάουιος ἐκ τοῦ αἰδοίου αὐτῆς τὸν ἥλιον ἀνατέλλειν ἐνόμισεν.</td>
<td>καὶ Νιγίδιος Φίγουλος βουλευτής παραχρήμα αὐτῷ τὴν αὐταρχίαν ἐμαντεύσατο (…) οὕτος οὐν τότε τὸν Ὀκτάουιον βραδύτερον ἐς τὸ συνέδριον διὰ τὸν παιδός τόκον (ἔτυχε γὰρ βουλή οὔσα) ἀπαντήσαντα ἀνήρετο διὰ τί ἔβρασεν, καὶ μαθοῦ τὴν αἰτίαν ἀνέβισεν ὡς “δεσπότην ἡμῖν ἐγέννησας”, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκταραχθέντα ἐπὶ τούτῳ καὶ διαφθείρα τὸ παιδίον ἐθελήσαντα ἐπέσχεν, εἰπὼν ὅτι ἀδύνατον ἐστὶ τοιοῦτο τι αὐτὸ παθεῖν.</td>
<td>καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ νυκτὶ ἐν ὁ Ὀκτάουιος ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἐνόμισεν ἐκ τῶν κόλπων τῆς αὐτοῦ γυναικὸς ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος.</td>
<td>Νιγίδιος δε τὶς βουλευτῆς ἀστρολόγος, βραδύτερον προελθόντος τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἡρωτησε τὴν αἰτίαν, ὁ δὲ ἔφη ὡς ἀυτῷ τεχθήναι κακείνος, “ὡ τί ἐποίησας; δεσπότην ἡμῖν ἐγέννησας,” ἀνέβησε.</td>
<td>καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ νυκτὶ ἐν ὁ Ὀκτάουιος ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλεν ἐκ τῶν κόλπων τῆς αὐτοῦ γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ τὸν ἥλιον ἀνατέλειν.</td>
<td>Νιγίδιος τις Φίγουλος βουλευτῆς ἀστρολόγος, ἡρωτησε ὁ Ὀκτάουιος τὸν πατέρα Ἀθεοῦστον ἄνθ᾽ ὅτου βραδύ προῆλθεν· ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο ὡς ἀυτῷ τετέχθαι κακείνος ἀνέβησε· ὡ τί ἐποίησας; δεσπότην ἡμῖν ἐγέννησας. ὁ δὲ πιστεύει καὶ ταραχθεὶς ἠβουλήθη ἀναλείπεν αὐτὸν. Νιγίδιος δὲ φησι πρὸς αὐτὸν ὅτι Ἰσχύει οὐκ ὅτι σαρκικά τοῦτο ποιεῖν.</td>
<td>Τρεφομένου δὲ τοῦ παιδός ἐν ἀγρῷ, ἀετὸς καταπτάς ἄρτον ἐκ χειρῶν αὐτοῦ ἀφέλετο, καὶ ἐπανελθὼν πάλιν αὐτὸν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἀπέθετο.</td>
<td>Τρεφομένου δὲ τοῦ παιδός ἐν ἀγρῷ ὁ ἄρτος καταπτάς ἄρτον ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ ἀφέλετο, καὶ ἐπανελθὼν πάλιν αὐτὸν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἀπέθετο.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 45,2,1-2 (Laur. Plut. 70,8 f. 154r)</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II 45</td>
<td>EA 30,11-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εκείσει διότι καὶ τὴν διατριβὴν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ποιουμένου, ἐδοξέ ποτε ὁ Κικέρων ὅναρ ἀλύσει τε αὐτὸν χρυσαῖς ἐς τὸ Καπιτώλιον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καθιμήσαι καὶ μᾶστιγα παρὰ τοῦ Δίος εἰληφέναι καὶ οὐ γὰρ ἡ πίστις δότις ἦν, περιέχει τε αὐτῷ τῆς υστεραίας ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Καπιτώλιῳ.</td>
<td>ἐν παισὶ δὲ τελοῦντα ἐὰν καθ’ ὑπονς αὐτὸν Κικέρων χρυσῆ ἀλύσει δεδεμένον, καὶ μᾶστιγα κρατοῦντα ἐν τῷ Καπιτώλιῳ χαλασθῆναι οὐρανόθεν.</td>
<td>Πάλιν ἐν παισὶ αὐτοῦ τελοῦντος ἐθεάσατο ὁ Κικέρων αὐτὸν Ὁκτάβιοις χρυσῆ ἀλύσει δεδεμένου καὶ μᾶστιγα κρατοῦντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ χαλασθῆναι εἰς τὸ Καπιτώλιον.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 65,1,4 (Xiph.193,23-30)</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II 54</td>
<td>EA 31,24-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Οὐτίλλιος δὲ ἐπεὶ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐγένετο, τάλλα τε διώκει ὡς ποικιλοῖς καὶ ἐδόκει αὐτῷ καὶ πρόγραμμα ἐθε- 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>το δι’ οὐ τοὺς ἀστρολόγους ἔξηλασα, προειδοποίησον ἕντος τῆς ἡμέρας, ὑπερασπισθείς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ χαρηθεὶς καὶ αὐτῷ ἐκεῖνον νυκτὸς ἀντιπροθέντες γράφωσαν ἀντιπαράγειν ἀπαλλαγῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ βίου ἕντος τῆς ἡμέρας ἐν ἡ ἐτελεύτησε. καὶ οὐ μὲν ὡς ἀκριβῶς τὸ γενησόμενον προέγνωσαν.</th>
<th>Οὐτίλλιος ἐθηκε πρόγραμμα τοῦ γόητας καὶ ἀστρολόγους ἐντὸς ἡμέρας ἀπαλλαγῆσαι τὴν Ἡταλίας, καὶ αὐτοὶ νυκτὸς ἀντιπροθέντες γράφωσαν ἀντιπαράγειν ἀπαλλαγῆσαι αὐτῶς τοῦ βίου ἐν ἡ ἐτελευτᾶν ἐμελλεί· οὕτως ἀκριβῶς τὸ γενησόμενον προέγνωσαν.</th>
<th>Τὸ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ ὅργισθεν τοῖς γόησι καὶ ἀστρολόγος ἐποίησε πρόγραμμα καὶ ἀνατεθεικεν αὐτῷ ἐμφαίνον ἐντὸς τοῦ βίου ἡμέρας ἐξέρχεσθαι αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς Ἡταλίας ἐντὸς τῆς ἡμέρας ἐν ἡ ἐτελεύτησεν.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Λαργίνος τις Πρόκλος δημοσία προειπών ἐν Γερμανίᾳ ὅτι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔν ἃ ἀπέθανε τελευτήσει, ἀνεπέμφθη τὴν ἡ Ῥώμην ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄρχοντος, καὶ ἐσαχθεὶς πρὸς τὸν Δομιτιανὸν ἔρι τὸ τετί τοῦ οὖσας ἔξειν, καὶ καταδικασθεὶς τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ ἀνεβλήθη τῇ ὑπὸς διαφυγόντος αὐτοῦ τὸν κίνδυνον ἀποδάνη, κἀ τοῦτο τοῦ Δομιτιανοῦ σφαγήν τοῦ ἄρχοντος ἀπέλυθη ἄβλαβης.</td>
<td>Λάργινος δὲ Πρόκλος ἐν Γερμανίᾳ προειπή δημοσία τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς τεθητεί τὸ δός Δομιτιανῷ εἰς Ῥώμην ἐπέμφθη· καὶ ἔπεν ἑαυτῷ εἰς ὑπὸ τὸ αὐτὸ, ὃ δὲ ἐκέλευσαν αὐτὸν φυλαχθῆναι, ὡς ἄν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃς διαδραμοῦσης ἀνερέθη· ἀλλὰ θανόντος τοῦ βασιλέως ἀπελύθη ἄβλαβης.</td>
<td>Λέγουσι γὰρ, ὡς Πρόκλος ἀστρολόγος καὶ γόης ἐν Γερμανίᾳ δημοσίᾳ προειπεῖ τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐν ἢ ἐπικείμενος τῆς Ῥώμην καὶ προσήχη τῷ Δομιτιανῷ καὶ αὐτῷ εἴπεν εἰς ὑπὸ αὐτὴν τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐν ἢ μέλλει τελευτάν· ὃ δὲ ἐκέλευσαν αὐτὸν ἐν δεσμῷς ὡς ὀφείληται ἐπὶ δῆσαιν αὐτὸν ἀναρεθῆναι. τοῦ δὲ εἰπάντος οὐ μὲν μὲ κτενεῖς, ἐπεὶ οὐ τοῖς μόρσιμοις εἰμι, ἐν τῷ μέσῳ Δομιτιανὸς ἀπόλετο.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
σφοδρότητα τοῦ ὑδατος
φυγόντων τῶν φυλάκων κύνες
προσελθόντες διέσπασαν αὐτόν·
ὅπερ μαθὼν ὁ Δομετιανὸς ἐν
φόβῳ ἐγένετο, μήπως καὶ περὶ
αὐτοῦ ἀληθεύσῃ. ὅπερ καὶ
γέγονεν.
V. The use of CD and Pet.Patr. from the 10\textsuperscript{th} to the 12\textsuperscript{th} century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD = Cassius Dio (ed. Boiss.)</td>
<td>Direct tradition (Laurentianus Plut. 70,8 &amp; Marcianus 395)</td>
<td>Xiph. = Xiphilinus’ Epitome</td>
<td>EVetV = Excerpta de Virtutibus et Vitiis</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>44,18,2-3 (Laurentianus Plut. 70,8 f. 141r)</td>
<td>EA 29,14-18</td>
<td>Chronicon, 48.4,11-17 Wahlgren</td>
<td>PS\textsuperscript{1} (Par.gr. 1712 f.74v)</td>
<td>Cedr. 1 p.300,15-17</td>
<td>Brevarium Chronicum, 1825-1829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>44,17,1 (Laurentianus Plut. 70,8 f. 140v)</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.\textit{II} 44</td>
<td>EA 29,19-21</td>
<td>PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.74r)</td>
<td>Cedr. 1 p.300,10-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>37,52,2 (Laurentianus Plut. 70,8 f. 28r)</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.\textit{II} 44</td>
<td>EA 29,25-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>45,1,3 (Marcianus 395 f. 8v)</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.\textit{II} 45</td>
<td>EA 29,28-30</td>
<td>PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.74v)</td>
<td>Zon. 10,13 p.339, 14-17B</td>
<td>Breviarium Chronicum, 1837-1855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>45,1,3 (Marcianus 395 f. 8v)</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.\textit{II} 45</td>
<td>EA 29,31-33</td>
<td>Chronicon, 50.1,4-6 Wahlgren</td>
<td>PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.74v)</td>
<td>Zon. 10,13 p.339, 14-17B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>45,1,3-5 (Marcianus 395 f. 8v)</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.\textit{II} 45</td>
<td>EA 30,1-7</td>
<td>PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.74v)</td>
<td>Zon. 10,13 p. 339, 17-304,3B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>45,2,1 (Xiph. 37,8-38,13)</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.\textit{II} 45</td>
<td>EA 30,8-10</td>
<td>PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.74v)</td>
<td>Zon. 10,13 p.340, 3-5B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1}Par. gr. 1712, 12./13. c. = (O) in Walgren’s edition of Symeon Logotheti. Wahlgren includes the ff. 6r-12v as part of the genuine Sym. Logoth. The ff. 18v-272r transmit Ps.-Symeon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Exc.Salm.II</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.74v)</th>
<th>Zon.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45,2,2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30,11-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Laurentianus Plut. 70,8 f. 154r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,13 p. 340, 5-8B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47,48,4-49,2</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,17-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Xiph. 53,15-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,20 p.364, 5-7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,4,2</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II 46</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronicon, 50,4,18-5,27 Wahlgren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Xiph. 98,16-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS (Par.gr.1712 f.75r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,11,1-2 (Xiph.102,16-25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,35 p.419,11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,11,3</td>
<td>EA 30,27-31,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronicon, 51,2 (in app.) Wahlgren</td>
<td>10,36 p.423, 1-11B Cedr. 1 p.344,2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Xiph.102,25-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.75v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56,43,1-2 &amp; 52,37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56,30,4</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II 47</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronicon, 50,6,27-38 Wahlgren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Marcianus 395 f.201v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.76r)</td>
<td>10,38 p.429,10 Breviarium Chronicum, 1919-1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA 31,14-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Xiph. 154,7-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zon. 11,3 p.443, 4-6B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA 31,18-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59,12,3</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II 49</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronicon, 52,1,2-6 Wahlgren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Xiph. 160,24-161) &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.76v )</td>
<td>Zon. 11,8 p.461,1-8B Breviarium Chronicum, 2003-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59,22,3-4 (Xiph. 166,12-28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57,5,6</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Xiph. 127,13-17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,3,3</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II 51</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronicon, 53,2,2-4 Wahlgren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.76v )</td>
<td>Zon. 11,13 p.481,6-482,2B Breviarium Chronicum, 2031-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63,29,2</td>
<td>Exc.Salm.II 52</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronicon, 54,3,5-9 Wahlgren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Xiph. 185,33-186,5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.77v )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EA 30,13-15

EA 31,10-13

CD 57,5,6 (Xiph. 127,13-17)
| CD 66,16,1 (Xiph. 209,27-29) | Exc.Salm.II 55 | | | | |
| CD 67,16,2-3 (Xiph. 225,9-15) | Exc.Salm.II 56 | EA 32,1-9 | Chronicon, 60,6,13-16 Wahlgren | PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.78v) | Zon. 11,19 p.502, 8-14B |
| CD 67,16,3 (Xiph. 225,15-22) | Exc.Salm.II 57 | EA 32,11-21 | Chronicon, 60,5,10-13 Wahlgren | PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.78v) | Zon. 11,19 p.502, 14-20B |
| CD 67,18,1-2 (Xiph. 226,2-6) | Exc.Salm.II 58 | EA 32,23-27 | | | Zon. 11,19 p.503,5-10B |
| CD 68,3,1 (Xiph. 227,27-228,2) | Exc.Salm.II 59 | | | | Breviarium Chronicum, 2119-2125 |
| CD 69,19,2 (Xiph. 253,19-23+ EVetV) | Pet.Patr. (ES 112) | Exc.Salm.II 60 | Chronicon, 63,3,12-17 Wahlgren | PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.79r) | Zon. 11,24 p.520,9-16B |
| Eutr. VIII 13,2 | Exc.Salm.II 61 | | | | |
| CD 71,34,1 (Xiph. 267,11-12) | Exc.Salm.II 62 | Chronicon, 65,2,5-7 Wahlgren | | | Zon. 12,8 p.546,1-4B |
| CD 74,1,1-2 (Xiph. 293,20-294,3) | Exc.Salm.II 63² | | | | |
| CD 74,14,5 | Exc.Salm.II 64a | Chronicon, 69,2,2-3 Wahlgren | | | Zon. 13,3 |
| CD 74,14,5-6 | Exc.Salm.II 64b | Chronicon, 69,2,3-8 Wahlgren | | | Zon. 13,3 p.17,6-13B |
| CD 78,4,4-5 | Exc.Salm.II 65 | Chronicon, 70,2,5-11 Wahlgren | PS (Par.gr. 1712 f.80v) | Cedr. 1 p.448,22-449,1B |

²According to U. P. Boissovain the *Exc.Salm.II* here seems to transmit a better text of Cass.Dio. (Boiss, 3, 324).
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VI. The *Epitome* and the *HE* of Eusebius of Caesarea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exc.</th>
<th>Epitome</th>
<th>Barocc. gr. 142 (212r-216r)</th>
<th>Ath. Vat. 286 (91r-108r)</th>
<th>Paris. gr. 1555a (7r-9v)</th>
<th>Eusebius' <em>EH</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 1, V.1-2, X.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 1, VI.1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 1, VI.6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 1, VI.10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 1, VII.1; <em>Luke</em> 24, 13; <em>Chron. Pasch.</em> 499, 5-7; <em>Georg. Sync.</em> 439,15-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 1, IX.2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 1, X.1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 1, XI.1-4; Acts 25, 13-14; Acts 26, 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 1, XII.2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 2, II.1-4, II.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acts 8, 26-41; <em>EH</em> 2, I.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 1, XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 2, IV.1, VII.1, VII.4, VII.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 2, IX.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 2, XIII.1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 2, XV.1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 2, V.4, XVII.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 2, XXIII.1-2, 19-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 2, XXIV.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 2, XXV.3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 2, XXV.5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, I.1-3, <em>EH</em> 2, XXV.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, II.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, III.1-5, XXV.2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, IV.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, IV.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, IV.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, V.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, X.6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, XI.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, XII.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, XIV.1, XV.1, XVI.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25, 26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, XVII.1, XVIII.1, XX.1-5; Hegesippus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, XX.8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, XXII.1, XXXVII.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, XXI.1, XXIII.2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, XXIV.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EH</em> 3, XXV.4-6; fontem non inveni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epitome</td>
<td>Barocc. gr. 142 (212r-216r)</td>
<td>Ath. Vat. 286 (91r-108r)</td>
<td>Paris. gr. 1555a (7r-9v)</td>
<td>Eusebius’ EH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 3, XXVII.1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 3, XVIII.1-2, XVIII.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 3, XVIII.1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 3, XXX.1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 3, XXXI.2-3, XXXI.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 3, XXXII.1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 3, XXXIII.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 3, XXXVI.2-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 3, XXXVIII.1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 3, XXXIX.1-2, XXXIX.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Fontem non inveni</td>
<td>EH 4, III.1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 4, VII.3-4, VIII.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 4, X.1, XI.2, XI.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 4, XIV.1, XIV.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 4, XV.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 4, XVIII.1, XVIII.8-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 4, XX.1, XXI.1, XXIV.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 4, XXIII.1-3, XXIII.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 4, XXIX.1-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 4, XXVII.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 5, XX.4, XX.7, XV.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 5, V.1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 5, V.1-2, V.4-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 5, VIII.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 5, XIII.1-4, fontem non inveni, EH 5, XVI.13, XVI.15, XVII.1, XVIII.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 5, XXIII.1, XXIII.3-4, XXIV.1-3, XXIV.12, XXIV.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 5, XXVIII.6, XXVIII.1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 5, XXVIII.8-9, XXVIII.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 6, I.1, V.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 6, VI.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 6, VII.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 6, IX 3-7, X.1, XI.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 6, XIV.2-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH 6, XVII.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc. 75</td>
<td>72</td>
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Summary in English

This thesis is concerned with Byzantine compilation literature and, in particular, collections of historical excerpts. The focus lies in a series of collections, namely the so-called Epitome of the 7th century, the Excerpta Anonymi (10th c.), the Excerpta Salmasiana (8th–11th c.) and the Excerpta Planudea (13th c.). The four syllogai of excerpts are scrutinised in separate chapters in this thesis and seen as products of a common approach to older texts and of traditional excerpting techniques. The thesis embarks on a close analysis of three aspects of the aforementioned texts: a) their method of redaction, b) their literary structure, and c) their cultural and political function. Chapter 1 reflects on the origins of the so-called culture of sylloge and discuss how collections of historical excerpts relate to it. The chapter examines the working method applied in the excerpt collections and shows that three steps and procedures may be identified in the process of redacting a sylloge of historical excerpts. Chapter 2 dates the Excerpta Anonymi to the mid-10th century and studies the structure, content and cultural and political function of the collection. The chapter elucidates the possibility of a textual relation between the Excerpta Anonymi and the Excerpta Constantiniana. The Excerpta Anonymi appear to have made use of material gathered in the first place for the Excerpta Constantiniana. The analysis of certain chapters of the Excerpta Anonymi shows that the passages must have been excerpted from an earlier dossier, presumably a collection of notes on geography as well on political prophecy. The passages on Roman history in the Excerpta Anonymi derive from a collection of excerpts on dreams, which could have been produced during the redaction of the Constantinian collections. Chapter 3 argues that the Excerpta Salmasiana is a compilation of three distinct syllogai of excerpts. The chapter identifies the source texts each of the three syllogai depended on. The series of passages excerpted from Agathias’ Historiae is edited in the appendix (Appendix I: Text III). Chapter 3 shows that the Excerpta Salmasiana share compositional methods and excerpting techniques with all the other collections of historical excerpts examined in this thesis. Chapter 4 shows that the so-called Epitome of the 7th century is a collection of historical excerpts taken from a variety of sources. The chapter focuses on the use of Eusebius’ Historia ecclesiastica by the compiler of the Epitome. The passages excerpted from Eusebius are edited in the appendix (Appendix I: Text V). Chapter 5 takes a close analysis of a series of excerpts on Roman history transmitted as
part of the *Excerpta Planudea*. This series of excerpts must derive from an earlier collection of historical passages compiled by Maximus Planudes himself. The chapter shows that Maximus Planudes made a conscious selection of thematically connected historical passages on Roman history and that his aim was to supply people with moral examples concerning behavioral patterns and to shape cultural and political thinking. The concluding chapter advances the idea that collections of historical excerpts represent a specific group within historiography. Such collections share linguistic, methodological and structural principles, which make them a distinct body of texts. Furthermore, they served the role of history, as manifested in traditional historical genres, that is, in classicizing histories and universal chronicles.

**Summary in Dutch**

Deze doctoraatsthesis betreft Byzantine compilatieliteratuur, meer specifiek collecties van historische excerpten. De focus ligt op een reeks verzamelingen, namelijk het zogenaamde *Epitome* van de zevende eeuw, de *Excerpta Anonymi* (tiende eeuw), de *Excripta Salmasiana* (achtste-elfde eeuw) en de *Excerpta Planudea* (dertiende eeuw). In deze thesis worden deze vier *syllogai* van excerpten in aparte hoofdstukken onderzocht en gezien als producten van zowel éénzelfde gebruik van oudere teksten als van traditionele excerpttechnieken. De thesis onderneemt een gedetailleerde analyse van drie aspecten van voornoemde teksten: a) de redactiemethode, b) de literaire structuur, en c) de culturele en politieke functie. Hoofdstuk 1 behandelt de oorsprong van de zogenaamde *culture of sylloge* en bespreekt de relatie met collecties van historische excerpten. Het hoofdstuk onderzoekt ook de werkmethodes die worden toegepast in excerptcollecties en toont aan dat drie stappen en procedures kunnen worden geïdentificeerd in het redactieproces van een *syllogis* van historische excerpten. Hoofdstuk twee dateert de *Excerpta anonymi* in het midden van de tiende eeuw en bestudeert de structuur, inhoud en culturele en politieke functie van de collectie. Het hoofdstuk verklaart de mogelijkheid van een tekstuele relatie tussen de *Excerpta Anonymi* en de *Excerpta Constantinia*. De *Excerpta Anonymi* lijken gebruik te hebben gemaakt van materiaal dat in de eerste plaats werd verzameld uit de *Excerpta Constantiniana*. De analyse van verschillende hoofdstukken van de *Excerpta Anonymi* toont aan dat passages uit een vroeger dossier moeten zijn gekopieerd, wellicht een collectie van notities over geografie en politieke voorspellingen. De passages over Romeinse geschiedenis in de *Excerpta Anonymi* komen
uit een collectie van excerpten over dromen die geproduceerd kunnen zijn tijdens de redactie van de Constantiniaanse verzamelingen. Hoofdstuk 3 beargumenteert dat de *Excerpta Salmasiana* een compilatie is van drie verschillende *syllogai* van excerpten. Het hoofdstuk identificeert de bronteksten waarvan elk van de drie *syllogai* afhankelijk is. De reeks passages die werden gekopieerd uit Agathias’ *Historiae* zijn uitgegeven in de appendix (Appendix I: Tekst III). Hoofdstuk drie toont aan dat de *Excerpta Salmasiana* compositiemethodes en excerpttechnieken delen met alle andere verzamelingen van historische excerpten die in deze thesis werden bestudeerd. Hoofdstuk 4 toont aan dat het zogenaamde *Epitome van de zevende eeuw* een verzameling van historische excerpten is die werden overgenomen uit een waaier aan bronnen. Het hoofdstuk focust op het gebruik van Eusebius’ *Historia ecclesiastica* door de redacteur van het *Epitome*. De passages die van Eusebius werden gekopieerd zijn uitgegeven in de appendix (Appendix I: Tekst V). Hoofdstuk vijf analyseert van dichtbij een reeks excerpten over Romeinse geschiedenis die zijn overgeleverd als een onderdeel van de *Excerpta Planudea*. Deze reeks van excerpten moeten zijn overgenomen uit een vroegere verzameling van historische passages die werd geredigeerd door Maximus Planudes zelf. Het hoofdstuk toont aan dat Maximus Planudes een bewuste selectie van thematisch gelinkte historische passages over Romeinse geschiedenis heeft gemaakt en dat zijn doel was om mensen te voorzien van morele voorbeelden over gedragspatronen, en om cultureel en politiek denken te vormen. Het afsluitend hoofdstuk brengt het idee naar voren dat verzamelingen van historische excerpten een specifieke groep binnen historiografie zijn. Zulke verzamelingen delen taalkundige, methodologische en structurele principes die hen tot een specifiek corpus van teksten maken. Daarenboven dienden zij de rol van geschiedenis zoals ze werd gemanifesteerd in traditionele historische genres zoals classicizerende geschiedwerken en universele kronieken.